



*Fédération
Aéronautique
Internationale*

113th Annual General Conference

Minutes of Working Sessions

**Held in Lausanne (Switzerland)
5th and 6th December 2019**

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

FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE

Founded in 1905 - Honorary Patron: Dr. Bertrand Piccard

OFFICERS OF THE FAI 2019 / 2020

Presidents of Honour

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

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

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

President

Robert HENDERSON

Executive Directors

Abdullah M. AL JAWINI
Alvaro DE ORLEANS-BORBÓN

Agust GUDMUNDSSON
Mary Anne STEVENS

Marina VIGORITO
Jean-Claude WEBER

Vice-Presidents

Australia – Terry CUBLEY
Austria – Wolfgang MALIK
Belgium – Jo VAN DE WOESTYNE
Brazil - Sergio MASSAHITO
KAWAKAMI
Bulgaria- Ani STAMENOVA
Denmark – Peter ERIKSEN
Finland – Petteri TARMA
France - Bruno DELOR
Germany – Stefan KLETT
Greece – Nikos MAKRAKIS
Hong Kong, China - Andy CHAU
India – Rajiv Pratap RUDY
Indonesia – Chepy NASUTION
Ireland – Tom MCCORMACK
Italy - Renato RICCI
Japan - Hiroyasu HAGIO

Latvia – Gints GAILIS
Luxemburg - Claude ESCHETTE
Mexico - Ing. José Peña
BUENROSTRO
Netherlands – Ronald SCHNITKER
New Zealand - Elizabeth KING
Norway – Asle SUDBO
Russia – Sergey ANANOV
Spain - Pedro Cabañero MARIMÓN
Switzerland - Yves Joel
BURKHARDT
Thailand - Veerayuth DIDYASARIN
Turkey – Bertan NOGAYLAROĞLU
United Kingdom – Rob HUGHES
USA – Greg PRINCIPATO

Ex Officio

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

Presidents of FAI Air Sport Commissions

A. PAPADOPOULOS (GRE) / CASI - Air Sport General
Commission

M. SULLIVAN (USA) / CIA - Ballooning

A. HUBMANN (SUI) / CIACA - Amateur Built & Experimental
Aircraft

A. PAPADOPOULOS (GRE) / CIAM - Aeromodelling

J. BERLO (BEL) / CIG - Rotorcraft

W. LINTL (GER) / CIMA – Microlight & Paramotor

N. BUCKENHAM (GBR) / CIVA - Aerobatics

S. MALBOS (FRA) / CIVL - Hang Gliding & Paragliding

R. BLOIS (GBR) / GAC - General Aviation

A. OHJA (GBR) / ICARE – Astro. Records

E. MOZER (USA) / IGC - Gliding

G. RAYNER (FRA) / IPC - Parachuting

Presidents of FAI Technical Commissions

A. TWIGG (GBR) / EduC – Education

P. DUVAL (FRA) / EnvC - Environment

Dr. M. OSINGA (NED) / CIMP - Medico-Physiological

HEADQUARTERS *(situation as of 6 December 2019)*

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

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

Secretary General: Susanne SCHÖDEL

Communication Manager: Faustine CARRERA
Sports & Events Director: Markus HAGGENEY
Assistant Sports Manager: Annick HAUSER
IT Manager: Visa-Matti LEINIKKI
Finance Controller : Paola LOPEZ

Team Assistant : Sally O'BRIEN
**Head of Administration, Members & Services Manager
and Anti-Doping Manager:** Ségolène ROUILLON
Competitions Manager: Christine ROUSSON

FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE

113th ANNUAL GENERAL CONFERENCE

MINUTES

OF THE WORKING SESSIONS
HELD ON THURSDAY 5 AND FRIDAY 6 DECEMBER 2019
At the Olympic Museum, Lausanne (Switzerland)

IN THE CHAIR..... Mr Bob HENDERSON, FAI President

FAI ACTIVE MEMBERS
WITH VOTING RIGHTS

HEADS OF DELEGATIONS

ALGERIA.....	Mr. Abdelmalek HAMMOUM
AUSTRALIA	Mr. Grahame HILL
AUSTRIA.....	Mr. Manfred KUNSCHITZ
BELGIUM	Mr. Jo VAN DE WOESTYNE
BRAZIL.....	Mrs. Marina POSCH KALOUSDIAN
BULGARIA.....	Mrs. Ani STAMENOVA
CANADA	Mr. Stephen SZIKORA
CHINA, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF.....	Mr. Zhaofang HAN
CYPRUS.....	Mr. Demetrakis HADJIDEMETRIOU
CZECH REPUBLIC	Mr. Vladimir MACHULA
DENMARK	Mr. Peter ERIKSEN
EGYPT	Mr. Samir RAOUF
FINLAND.....	Mr. Petteri TARMA
FRANCE.....	Mr. Bruno DELOR
GERMANY	Mr. Jürgen LEUKEFELD
GREECE.....	Mr. Gorgios BENEKOS
HONG KONG, CHINA	Mr. Andy CHAU
INDIA.....	Capt. Pankul MATHUR
ITALY	Mr. Stefano BIANCHETTI

JAPAN.....	Mr. Hiroyasu HAGIO
LIBYA.....	Mr. Hassan KHASHEBA
LUXEMBOURG	Mr. Claude ESCHETTE
NETHERLANDS.....	Mr. Ronald SCHNITKER
NORWAY	Mr. John Eirik LAUPSA
POLAND.....	Mr. Jerzy MAKULA
RUSSIA	Mr. Sergey ANANOV
SAUDI ARABIA.....	Capt. Ayed ALKASME
SERBIA	Mr. Zeljko OVUKA
SLOVAKIA	Mr. Pavol KAVKA
SPAIN.....	Mr. Manuel ROCA VIAÑA
SWEDEN	Mr. Anders ÅKVIST
SWITZERLAND.....	Mr. Yves BURKHARDT
TAIPEI, CHINESE.....	Ms. Elsa MAI
THAILAND.....	Capt. Veerayuth DIDYASARIN
UNITED KINGDOM	Mr. David MONKS
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Mr. Greg PRINCIPATO

FAI ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

EGYPT..... Mr. Ahmed EISSA

FAI TEMPORARY MEMBERS

None

FAI INTERNATIONAL AFFILIATE MEMBERS

OSTIV..... Mr. Rolf RADESPIEL

PROXIES

Albania to Greece
Korea to Japan
Malaysia to Saudi Arabia
New Zealand to Australia
Philippines to Chinese Taipei
South Africa to Germany
Singapore to Hong Kong
Slovenia to Italy
Serbia to Slovenia
Turkey to United Kingdom
Vietnam to India

FAI EXECUTIVE BOARD

FAI President	Mr. Robert HENDERSON
FAI Executive Director (Finance)	Mr. Jean-Claude WEBER
FAI Executive Director	Mr. Abdillah AL JAWINI
FAI Executive Director	Mr. Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN
FAI Executive Director	Mr. Agust GUDMUNDSSON
FAI Executive Director	Mrs. Mary Anne STEVENS
FAI Executive Director	Mrs Marina VIGORITO
FAI Secretary General	Ms Susanne SCHÖDEL

FAI AIR SPORT COMMISSIONS

Mr. Antonis PAPADOPOULOS	President, FAI Air Sport General Commission (CASI)
Mr. Alfons HUBMANN.....	President, FAI Amateur- Built and Experimental Aircraft (CIACA)
Mr. Antonis PAPADOPOULOS	President, FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM)
Mr. Jacques BERLO	Representative, FAI Rotorcraft Commission (CIG)
Mr. Wolfgang LINTL	President, FAI Microlight and Paramotor Commission (CIMA)
Mr. Nick BUCKENHAM	President, FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA)
Mr. Stephane MALBOS.....	President, FAI Hang Gliding & Paragliding Commission (CIVL)
Mr. Rodney BLOIS	President, FAI General Aviation Commission (GAC)
Mr. Eric MOZER.....	President, FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)
Mrs Elisabet MIKAELSSON	Representative, FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC)

FAI TECHNICAL COMMISSIONS

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

FAI REGIONAL VICE-PRESIDENTS

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

FAI PRESIDENTS OF HONOUR

Dr. John GRUBBSTRÖM..... SWEDEN
Mr. Pierre PORTMANN..... SWITZERLAND

FAI COMPANIONS OF HONOUR

Mr. Bob CLIPSHAM CANADA
Mr. Michiel KASTELEIJN NETHERLANDS
Mr. Bernald SMITH UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Mr. Tor JOHANNESSEN..... NORWAY

FAI SECRETARIAT

Ms. Faustine CARRERA FAI Communication Manager
Mr. Markus HAGGENEY FAI Sports & Events Director
Ms. Annick HAUSER..... FAI Assistant Sports Manager
Mr. Visa-Matti LEINIKKI FAI IT Manager
Ms. Paola LOPEZ FAI Finance Manager & Controller
Mrs. Sally O'BRIEN..... FAI Team Assistant
Mrs. Segolene ROUILLON..... FAI Members and Services Manager
Ms. Christine ROUSSON FAI Competitions Manager

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE WERE RECEIVED FROM :

Mr. Frits BRINK, FAI President of Honour
Mr. Atul DEV, India, Companion of Honour
Mr. Bob SKINNER, NAC South Africa
Mrs. Gillian RAYNER, President of FAI Parachuting Commission
Mr. Mark SULLIVAN, President of FAI Ballooning Commission
Mr. Alan TWIGG, President of FAI Education Commission

SCRUTINEERS

The Conference unanimously agreed the appointment of the following scrutineers:

Mr. Bob CLIPSHAM
Dr. John GRUBBSTRÖM
Mr. Pierre PORTMANN

DAY ONE

1. Opening

The FAI PRESIDENT, Mr Bob HENDERSON, welcomed the FAI members to the 2019 General Conference in Lausanne. He welcomed the opportunity to renew and refresh their friendships. The tortuous route they had taken to arrive at this General Conference reminded him of the need to be attentive to procedures and in considering decisions. He thanked everyone for their patience and flexibility in adjusting to the revised schedule and location.

He welcomed the new team from the Hungarian Aeronautical and Airsports Association and Dr Marja OSINGA, the new CIMP President. Elisabet MIKAELSSON was here to representing IPC in the place of Gillian RAYNER, who had sent her apologies. He welcomed Presidents of Honour Pierre PORTMANN and John GRUBBSTROM and Companions of Honour Bob CLIPSHAM, Tor JOHANNESSEN, Michiel KASTELEIJN and Bernald SMITH.

As they prepared to discuss some serious issues, he asked everyone to be respectful in their conversations, be thoughtful about their contributions, and seek to help everyone arrive at solutions that would benefit their venerable institution as the FAI moved into its 114th year. The future of the FAI was in all their hands, and the decisions they made over the next two days would benefit from the collective wisdom of them all, and would impact on the future generation of aviation sports people who were only now starting their journey.

He invited everyone to stand for the FAI anthem.

2. In Memoriam

The FAI General Conference stood in silent remembrance of all the air sport persons and friends who had passed away since the 112th General Conference, and who will be greatly missed. The PRESIDENT drew their attention to Ms Lin, who was tragically killed in an accident in Taipei.

- Ladislav BEZAK
- Igor CHERNIGIN
- Jiri CIHLAR
- Miodrag "Micko" CIPCIC
- Geraldyn "Jerrie" COBB
- Sarah FENWICK
- Claude FRONTEAU
- Dr Richard GARRISON
- Colonel Piero GOFFIS
- Barron HILTON
- Laird G. JACKSON
- Lydia JAECQUES
- Marita KRAFCZYK
- Alexey LEONOV
- Ms LIN
- Dr Jan LITTVA
- Igor NIKITIN
- Evangelos SAVRAMIS
- Jaroslav STEPANEK

- Miroslav SULC
- Artan VENHARI

3. Roll-Call of Delegations

3.1. Roll Call

Mr Visa-Matti LEINIKKI (FAI IT Manager) conducted the roll call.

Active members present	35
Proxies received	7
Affiliate members present	0
Air Sports Commissions present	10
Votes belonging to active members	255
Proxy votes	21
Air Sports Commission votes	40
Total of votes	316 votes
Absolute majority	159
Two-thirds majority	211
Absolute majority of active members	139
Two-thirds majority of active members	184

The FAI currently had 79 active members in good standing, >50% of which came to 40 members. With the proxies, the quorum of 50% had been met. Without the proxies, they were below 50%.

The PRESIDENT asked if there was anyone present representing an organisation whose name had not been called. There were none.

3.2. Apologies for absence

Those who had sent apologies were as recorded above.

3.3. Announcement of Proxies

Proxies were as recorded above.

3.4. Declaration of conflicts of interests

The PRESIDENT asked if anyone present wished to register a conflict of interests or potential conflict of interests. There were none.

3.5. Appointment of scrutineers

The scrutineers were unanimously appointed as recorded above.

3.6. Adoption of modifications to the agenda

None.

3.7. Call for items for Open Forum

There were no items for Open Forum that had not been previously notified.

4. Voting system

4.1. Reminder of voting procedures and presentation of the electronic voting system

Mr LEINIKKI explained the four types of majority used at the General Conference.

- Simple majority (>50% of votes cast)
- Absolute majority (>50% of votes present or represented)
- Plurality vote (the candidate with the biggest number of votes was elected from the list)
- Qualified majority (minimum of two-thirds of votes present or represented)

He noted that, in the case of an absolute majority vote, the vote of anyone choosing not to vote would in practice count as a vote against the motion.

Unless otherwise stated in the Statutes, decisions at the General Conference were taken by an absolute majority. Items not on the agenda required a two-thirds majority to be discussed; in order to be voted on, at least half of active members had to be present.

The general quorum for decisions at the General Conference was 25% of active members in good standing. To change the Statutes, at least half of active members in good standing had to be present or represented, and a vote required a two-thirds majority.

The election of the Vice Presidents would be a list vote.

For CASI members, the first round was a simple majority. If an insufficient number of candidates were elected on the first round, a second round would take place with a plurality vote.

5. Minutes of the 112th FAI General Conference 2018

The PRESIDENT proposed that this item be voted on by show of hands.

There were no comments or suggested amendments.

The FAI General Conference approved the Minutes of the 112th FAI General Conference held in Luxor, Egypt in 2018.

6. Report of the FAI President

The PRESIDENT opened his report with a little FAI history, because he felt it was important to understand where they had come from, as FAI moved forward.

2019 might not go down in history as a great year for the FAI. It would nevertheless be a turning point for their organisation. Progress was normally made through small, incremental changes over a long time, with marked step changes periodically occurring when a dramatic shift in paradigms happened. They were all familiar with this happening in the world of technology. The arrival of powered, manned flight in 1905 was one of those paradigm shifts. It was followed by step changes in aircraft design between 1912 and 1920, again by 1940, and then turbo jets and rockets. Of course, the speed of development in both those decades was driven by external factors. Concorde was a dramatic aeroplane, twenty years ahead of its time. Then there were the moon landings, and now they were on their way to Mars. Could the Wright Brothers, when they were trying to get their craft flying and under control in 1905, have conceived of any of the things that happened in the subsequent century? Their attention had been focused on trying to stay above a flat piece of sand

on a beach, and keep their aircraft under control for a few seconds. Their achievements were not recognised initially. They were called liars, and the accusations were only withdrawn when the people who had made them witnessed powered flight for themselves.

A few weeks ago, he had shared his paper on FAI 2020 – Refreshing the FAI. The introduction provided a brief history of the FAI. In the beginning there was ballooning. With the advent of the aeroplane, balloons and aeronauts were soon overshadowed by aeroplanes and aviators. Aviation became for all practical purposes just powered flight. Importantly, there was little distinction between amateur and commercial aviation during the first two decades of the 20th century. The aero clubs were pioneers of all forms of aeronautical activity, and this pioneering nature attracted many from the upper levels of society, including royalty. In this respect, the aero clubs outshone even the early automobile clubs. This was the historical basis of the high standing that many aero clubs still enjoyed in society to this day. It was a natural consequence of this environment that the FAI had been designed as a worldwide organisation of national aero clubs, where only one organisation from each country could be a member. By 1919 the military role of aviation was firmly established, and commercial aviation took off on its own. This changed the role of the aero clubs. The non-commercial part of aviation remained prestigious, but had no financial clout. Throughout the '20s and '30s, private flying remained primarily a sporting activity. The aero clubs increasingly became caretakers of a leisure activity, retaining a strong sporting element. In the early '30s, gliding entered the scene as the first separate air sport. Later, aeromodelling came under the FAI umbrella. It was recognised as an important entry stage to aero club activity, and was also embraced by the aero clubs without conflict. The four decades from 1945 to 1985 saw the emergence of new air sports: parachuting in 1949, modern ballooning in 1965, hang gliding in 1974, microlight in 1980s, paragliding in 1985. In this century FAI added drones, and electric and solar-powered aircraft.

At the General Conference in 2000, some fundamental structural changes were made to the governance of the FAI, including the creation of an Executive Board, replacing the Council formed of the vice-presidents. The intention was that the EB members be elected from competent business and organisational people, which was why there was a requirement for a CV to be provided well in advance. The Secretary General's powers were considerably expanded to include day-to-day financial authority and hire-and-dismiss powers. The Air Sport Commission presidents were made ex-officio Vice-Presidents with full voting powers, a confirmation of a decision first taken in Athens in 1992. Sanction fees were instituted by the ASCs, as the FAI central body never funded any of the Commission activities. As they developed, the Commissions needed funds to grow their sports and for administrative costs. It was never intended that these funds should be each Commission's property, separate from the FAI, but it was clearly understood that each ASC could use these funds as they saw fit, limited to whatever amounts each Commission generated. In return for this privilege, the ASCs agreed they should strive to secure and protect the media rights of all their international events for the sole use of FAI centrally, for revenue generation. All media rights to international competitions were defined as FAI property. This was decided in 1996 at the General Conference in Bled (Slovenia). It was determined that each section of the FAI Sporting Code should list the base rights of FAI to all media rights. The intention was to secure a platform for the FAI to promote air sports in a coordinated manner, and it had been successfully used in two major media contracts, in 1998 and 2000.

The sporting activities of the FAI had been gradually developing over the last decades. Each sport was now serviced by a very competent specialist Commission that created and guarded the rules for that sport. The overall rules by which all air sports activities were conducted were the responsibility of CASI and were provided in the General Section of the Sporting Code. The intention that income could and should be derived from sports events for the wider FAI organisation had its roots in the decision taken at the General Conference in Stockholm in 1987, that a centralised event, the World Air Games, could generate income for the FAI. The first of these events was run in 1997. There was a long history of proposals and decisions from the GC supporting the development of multi-sport events for the wider benefit of the FAI.

Today, in 2019, FAI seemed not to have progressed very far. In terms of multi-sports events, there was a lack of significant progress. There had also been interference from organisations outside the

FAI, such as the Olympic Council of Asia (OCA), which had cut across the FAI's ability to ensure safe events for their sports people.

Looking at finances, the baseline cost of running the organisation had been laid on the members since the beginning of the FAI. The last time membership subscriptions had covered general administrative costs was around 2008. As already noted, since 1987 there had been a desire to bring in additional income so that the members, the NACs, were not burdened with all the costs.

There was a clear need to resolve the situation FAI is in at present, to evolve the function and therefore the structure of the FAI, so that it is better suited to the demands and needs of today. This included finding a way of funding the organisation that did not rely on an outdated subscription scheme that had a limited basis in auditable facts. With the best will in the world, it was difficult to validate the membership numbers that NACs claimed, especially when a significant number of members did not have the courtesy to respond to the annual survey requests.

This was what was behind the FAI 2020 project, about which they would hear more later in the conference, including some initial feedback.

On the positive side, a neutral financial outcome was anticipated for 2019. This had been delivered by attending to costs. The EB now met on Zoom. They had changed hotels, and EB members had been asked to seek external funding to cover the costs of their travel. A role profile exercise had been conducted to understand exactly what work was being done in the office and by whom. It had been a revealing exercise, because it showed what work was real. The work going on in the office was in some ways quite different from what might be assumed from looking under "Deliverables" in the Statutes. This was normal in an organisation. However, the Statutes had not kept track with the changes arising from various GCs.

For too long, the office had been expected to respond to continuing and increasing demands to deliver more outcomes, without adequate thought being given to the resources required, both human and financial, that these requests needed in order to make them work. This exercise in role profiling would help determine the staffing of the office, as they rolled to the end of the 2020 project, and as they understood what people wanted as outcomes from the central office.

He was grateful for the thought that had gone into a submission provided by the Royal Aero Club. Included in that report was a suggestion that they rent out the current office space and move elsewhere. This had been researched. There would be a saving, although probably not a great deal in Year 1. In fact, the reality was that, when they had finished FAI 2020, it would become a question of where to relocate the office resources, and whether it would work. This was on the table, but as a possible outcome of the exercise.

In 2018 the Global Association of International Sports Federations (GAISF) had conducted a governance survey of all its members, looking at three key areas: transparency, integrity and democracy, and development and control mechanisms. The FAI was a very small IF, but it had scored in the top 15% of all IFs. This was an outstanding result, and it reflected very well on the dedication and integrity of everyone in the organisation. The volunteers created huge value for the FAI.

Regarding alternative sources of income, discussions were ongoing with a major Asian airline regarding potential sponsorship. There were ongoing discussions with a company intending to move into the space vacated by the Red Bull Air Race. They were working very closely with Mr Erich Wolf, General Manager of the Red Bull Air Race, to understand the potential steps forward. This company had asked for the FAI's support, branding, technical expertise and IP, and there would be a price to pay. They were at the very beginning of this conversation.

The World Drone Racing series continued to generate revenue. A productive meeting had taken place yesterday with the team from ASFC in China about the series, and next year's event. Quattro Media, FAI's media production and distribution partner, continued to develop products for the FAI from selected events. Under the FAI 2020 project, this kind of commercial work was potentially a role that FAME could fill. If they put the right people with the right commercial expertise in there, it would create an opportunity that could support the FAI and its members, as it was set up to do.

In conclusion, this General Conference would be asked to take some hard decisions over the next two days, about finances, sports, and how they prepared the FAI for its future. They were responsible for ensuring that the FAI would succeed for future generations. The way they did business and how they funded the organisation needed to be reviewed now and for the long term. This responsibility lay with every person in this room. He was conscious that there could be significant debate. He asked for observance of “Robert’s Rules”, which he believed were a good way of conducting a meeting such as this. Delegates who wished to speak on a topic should carefully consider their points, and present them only once. He would also be vigilant about people who repeated information that had already been shared. Any proposals from the floor had to be seconded. The proposer of the amendment had the right to speak again, generally at the end of the debate. The seconder had the right to speak when they choose. He reminded the members also that the heads of delegations held the speaking rights, but he would assume that anyone else who took the floor had the approval of their head of delegation. He asked them to be respectful, and address comments and questions to other people through the chair.

He asked for solution-centred conversations rather than circular arguments, repetition and history.

7. Report of the FAI Secretary General

The FAI SECRETARY GENERAL, Susanne SCHÖDEL, presented her report (see **ANNEX 1**).

She gave an overview of Category 1 and 2 events held in 2018, and provided a comparison with 2008. 2019 and 2020 would see around 700 events, which contrasted strongly with most other International Federations. This meant there were 700 different event organisers, and even more experts from the Commissions. Although this was positive, the FAI office tended to see only the problems, not the successes. They dealt with NACs not approving events and not responding to enquiries, from either air sports persons or the FAI. There were issues with countries not issuing FAI sporting licences to people wanting to compete, sometimes for political reasons. They had difficult cases of complaints, protests and appeals against decisions made at FAI events, which sometimes made them lose sight of the achievements of all the event organisers. With the current process of reshaping the FAI, she hoped they could find a better structure, where they had more regular awareness across all entities of the FAI, and were closer to what was actually happening in air sports.

Although the FAI Statutes outlined the responsibilities of the FAI office, these headlines did not show the complexity of the daily execution.

There would be some changes to the office team. Cosette MAST had left after 20 years’ service. Paola LOPEZ had taken over as Finance Manager and Controller, and Ségolène ROUILLON had taken on the additional role of Head of Administration. Sally O’BRIEN had joined as Team Assistant. Annick HAUSER would be leaving at the end of the year after being a staff member since 2012. The SECRETARY GENERAL thanked Annick for everything she had done. Greg PYZALKA, an independent contractor, would also be leaving.

She gave an update of IT services, focusing on the tools available to help the NACs and Commissions streamline their operations.

She thanked the President for guiding the FAI through the current difficult phase. She felt it was very important for the FAI to decide about its renewed future structure through the FAI 2020 process. It built on previous work and experiences and was a window of opportunity to reshape the organisation with a view to having a shared, long-term and sustainable agreement.

8. FAI Membership

The SECRETARY GENERAL presented the Membership report (see **ANNEX 2**).

8.1. Resignations, suspensions and expulsions

There were no resignations in 2019.

If membership fees were not paid by 31 December 2019, the following countries would be suspended: Argentina, Bahrain, Mexico, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Iraq, Morocco, Palestine, Qatar, and also associate members Armenia, Portugal, Trinidad & Tobago and Uruguay.

The General Conference was invited to agree that, if the outstanding debts were not paid by 31 December 2019 the membership of the countries concerned would be suspended at the end of 2019.

The motion was approved by show of hands.

Mr Antonis PAPADOPOULOS said that he would need the information by the end of the year, because some of the countries had intended to register an event on the calendar, and if they were suspended he needed to know. He asked the SECRETARY GENERAL to inform him if there was any change of status.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that they would have to wait until after 31 December, because sometimes payments would arrive at the last minute. In the first week of January all members and Commissions would be informed about membership status. Nevertheless, all currently suspended members were visible on the fai.org website under Members.

The General Conference was invited to agree that, if the outstanding debt were not paid by 31 December 2019, the membership of Armenia would be expelled at the end of 2019.

The motion was approved by show of hands.

8.2. Consideration of revocation of Associate Membership of Egyptian Sport Parachuting and Aeronautics Federation (ESPAF)

See **ANNEX 3** and **4**.

The PRESIDENT noted that Egypt had an active member, the Aero Club of Egypt (ACE), and an Associate Member, the Egyptian Sport Parachuting and Aeronautics Federation (ESPAF). He reminded delegates that an Associate Membership could be given to a country that already had an active member provided that member had no objection. He invited the Aero Club of Egypt to explain the situation from their perspective, and then the ESPAF would be given the opportunity to respond. He asked that the explanations be limited to around five minutes.

Mr Samir A. RAOUF (President of the Aero Club of Egypt) apologised for bringing this matter to the General Conference. In 1988 the Egyptian Parachuting Federation (EPC) had been formed and declared under the Ministry of Youth. In 2007, due to various pressures, the Aero Club of Egypt had delegated to ESPAF the sporting power for the parachuting committee, aiming to enhance and reinforce these activities. In 2008, with the support of the ACE, ESPAF had joined the FAI as an Associate Member. He noted a long history of dispute between ESPAF and ACE, the latter having been an FAI member for more than 110 years. ESPAF had continued to send letters to the FAI PRESIDENT to damage the reputation of the ACE, with the aim of replacing it by any possible means. The ACE had hoped to extend and enhance sports activities in Egypt by collaborating with a new entity specialised in the field, but started facing a very destructive situation. The Egyptian Parachuting Federation had filed an urgent case against the ACE to cancel the Paramotor World Slalom Challenge 2017 Cat B Championship, just four days before the start. The EPF stated in its by-laws that it was solely responsible for air sports in Egypt, and had registered with the NOC without having an official mandate from the FAI nominating them as the active member in Egypt. This was neither legal nor acceptable. ACE is recognised by the Minister of Aviation and there is conflict between the Minister of Aviation and the Minister of Youth, who recognise ESPAF. The EPF had unethically blocked the application of the ACE to join the Egyptian Olympic Committee. Mrs Gillian Rayner, the IPC President, had witnessed the parachute show in Luxor last year on the occasion of the General Conference, and noticed that there was a major deterioration of performance, violations of safety rules and an unprofessional manner of administering parachuting activities in Egypt, which

confirmed the technical complaints she had received from Egyptian skydivers. The ACE had worked out an ambitious plan to develop air sports in Egypt and North Africa that could not be realised and sustained under the current situation.

Mr Ahmed EISSA, President of ESPAF felt that a committee should be established to investigate the truth. The ACE was not a sports entity under Egyptian sports law. He asked the FAI to form a committee as per article 2.9.2.2 of the Statutes. He stated that Egyptian sports law prevented the ACE from practising any kind of sport. He had sent letters to the FAI because he was obliged to do so by Egypt's sports law as ESPAF was the sole entity in Egypt that was legally permitted to practise air sports. He was aware that the ACE had been a member of the FAI since 1911. He requested that the ESPAF be allowed to continue as an Associate Member while the situation was investigated by a committee.

A representative from Greece asked if they could hear the professional response of the FAI PRESIDENT, given that he believed most of the members did not fully understand the difference between the two bodies.

The PRESIDENT referred to the letter sent to the Egyptian Ministry of Sport which pointed out that, under the FAI Constitution, there was a recognised active member in Egypt, which was the ACE. With the ACE's support, Associate Membership had been granted by the GC of the FAI to the Egyptian Parachuting Federation.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that, under the Olympic Charter, a National Federation could be recognised by a National Olympic Committee if that NF was a member of the IF. It was not the right of the NOC to decide who represented a sport.

The PRESIDENT said the FAI Constitution did not specifically provide for the intent to revoke Associate Membership. It did, however, provide the FAI with the ability to spend a significant amount of money on a board of inquiry to investigate the situation and apply a range of different sanctions, which included suspension. Suspension would still come back to the GC for a final decision. The reason this matter was on the table was because of the specific request from the ACE that Associate membership by ESPAF be revoked. He did not know if the GC was comfortable being asked to make that decision, or whether the GC would rather direct the President to establish a board of inquiry to investigate, and then apply sanctions.

Mr Stéphane MALBOS (CIVL President) noted that, if he correctly understood the Statutes, the matter had to go to a board of inquiry before it could be put to the GC, which would then act as a court of appeal.

A representative of India, without getting into the specifics of the case, wished to talk in general terms. The associate membership had been granted with the support of the NAC, the NAC being the top body in the country. There should be a provision in the constitution to manage this kind of situation. He felt it was a constitutional issue, rather than a specific country issue. Local politics in every country varied, and in general a longstanding NAC would encounter opposition from new bodies that would like to take their place.

In response to Mr MALBOS, the PRESIDENT said that the idea behind the formation of a board of inquiry in this sort of instance was to handle situations where an organisation recognised as representing a country was not fulfilling its obligations. In this case it was unclear. He suggested that the GC should either agree that they were competent to vote on this, when there was no clear constitutional mandate, or instruct the President to form a board of inquiry.

He asked for a show of hands as to whether the delegates wished the President to form a board of inquiry to investigate this matter on their behalf.

The General Conference indicated their approval for the formation of a Board of Inquiry to investigate the dispute between the Aero Club of Egypt and the Egyptian Parachuting and Air Sports Federation.

8.3. Consideration of applications for admission of new FAI members

The SECRETARY GENERAL explained that the previous FAI member for Hungary had been dissolved, and this request represented the formal handover to the new organisation, the Hungarian Aeronautical and Airsports Association.

The General Conference was invited to endorse the Hungarian Aeronautical and Airsports Association's application to replace the current NAC.

The motion was approved by show of hands.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS asked for clarification regarding the new member they had just approved, the Hungarian Aeronautical Association. As he understood it, there used to be two additional entities – an aeromodelling federation and a gliding federation. He was not aware of their status in terms of delegated sporting powers. Would the new entity take over the delegated powers, or would it have to resubmit?

The SECRETARY GENERAL said she would follow up, however from her understanding, there was a consensus within Hungary on how to manage the situation.

Ms Marina VIGORITO confirmed that the new Hungarian President had the consensus of all the air sports in the country.

8.4. Re-approval of temporary members

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that the idea of temporary membership was to be able, after a certain period, to become an Associate or Active member. Paraguay had been a temporary member since 2003, and Lao since 2013.

The FAI General Conference was invited to renew the Temporary Membership of Lao and Paraguay, provided that membership fees were paid before 31 December 2019.

The motion was approved by show of hands.

8.5. Change of class

The SECRETARY GENERAL reported that three countries had applied for a change of class, the first two of which would result in a reduction of the membership fee. The changes would be applicable as of 1 January 2020.

- USA (change from Active membership Class 1 to Class 2 for 2020)
- Belgium (change from Active membership Class 5 to Class 6 for 2020)
- Palestine (change from Temporary membership to Active membership Class 10 – already in place as of 2019)

The General Conference approved the changes of class by show of hands.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that effect on the Scale of Subscriptions was a reduction in membership income for the FAI of around CHF 50,000.

Mr Stephen SZIKORA (Canada) asked for the floor. He noted that he was abstaining from many votes because he did not have the information. A change of class reflected a change in the number of sports persons, but they had no information about how many sports persons there were. The President had mentioned that one difficulty was being able to verify numbers from the NAC as reported. It seemed easy for NACs to have their subscription fee reduced by reporting fewer members.

The SECRETARY GENERAL explained that, as a principle, the membership scale of subscriptions was defined by the number of air sports persons. This was in the by-laws and was originally a decision from the FAI GC. The members declared the number of air sports persons to the FAI. In the overall discussion of the FAI finances and the effects of the continuing reduction of declared

numbers of air sports persons, the EB had considered conducting an audit of these numbers. However, this was a long-term procedure, complicated by the languages involved, and a lack of public information available from which they could derive the actual figures. At the moment, the declaration made by members was taken as fact.

The PRESIDENT explained the process: the NAC formally wrote to the SECRETARY GENERAL with the figures, and the SECRETARY GENERAL submitted the figures to the EB. In this case, the EB had asked the office if they could complete an audit, and the office had said they were not in a position to do so. The numbers had not been presented to the General Conference because this was a direct recommendation from the EB.

Mr Pierre DUVAL noted that this had been a problem for a few years. In his memory, an air sports person was a person who did air sport in the country. It was not people who participated in meetings, commissions or competitions. If this definition still stood, then China should definitely be in Category 1, along with the USA, France and Italy. However, for a few years, countries had been writing to ask for a category change, and the result was now a CHF 50,000 reduction in the FAI budget.

Mr Vladimir MACHULA saw two options: to completely change the subscription structure, or trust the numbers provided by the NACs. The GDPR rule in Europe meant that he could not allow anyone to access his membership database, and this meant the FAI had no way to audit anything in any country. He added that the class changes had already been approved.

The PRESIDENT said that they had thought that, in an annual report published in a public document, they might find a record of numbers of participants, not names. However, it had proved impossible to find even that level of information. He therefore agreed that they had to either trust the NACs or change the subscription model. This was currently being proposed. The EB was conscious of the imposition on certain members, and they would have to look carefully at how they could make this work better in the future for the members, and ensure the visibility of payments, income and voting rights that everyone had.

He thanked everyone for their thoughts.

9. Election of FAI Vice-Presidents for 2019/2020

The SECRETARY GENERAL invited the delegates to vote on the list of Vice-Presidents (see **ANNEX 5**).

The General Conference approved the list of persons nominated to serve as FAI Vice-Presidents for 2019–2020.

10. Report on FAI Finances 2018

10.1. Financial statements (Balance Sheet and P&L Statement) and Audit report

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

He drew the delegates' attention to the report of the Auditors to the General Conference on the financial statements 2018, prepared by BDO as required by Statute 7.5.1 (see **ANNEX 6**).

He wished to thank the SECRETARY GENERAL and the FAI Finance Manager and Controller, Paola Lopez. He also thanked the long-serving Cosette Mast, who had left at the beginning of the year.

He invited the SECRETARY GENERAL to present the 2018 Finance Report, based on the 2018 Balance Sheet and Report by the Auditors and the financial situation as of 31 October 2019. The

GC would then be asked to approve the FAI auditors for 2020 and invited to discharge the FAI EB of responsibility for the management of FAI affairs during the financial year 2018.

The SECRETARY GENERAL referred to the BDO report on the audited financial statements 2018. The structure of the report had been changed. There were now three areas: general FAI activities (membership revenues, commercial revenues, marketing and communication expenses, operating expenses, administration); competition activities (competition revenues and related operating expenses, use of special reserves, budgets for World Air Games and World Drone Racing Championships); and, financial income and costs, and other income. The net result had been achieved through further allocation and dissolution of FAI reserves for the year. 2018 was the last year of dissolving reserves dedicated to sports development. For 2019, this only concerned the dissolution of the reserve for the MSI, created when the building was bought, in order to ensure an amount was available to cover the annual mortgage payment, which would end in 2020.

Further details were provided about deviations between budget and actual figures. The result overall had been slightly better than anticipated, although still negative by CHF 260,000. Looking at the figures for membership subscription and competition revenues, in 2018 the FAI had further invested in drone activities, and the main deviations were in drone-related development programmes. There had been further costs, mainly for legal advice. The auditing process, because of the complexity of FAI reporting, was also more expensive than planned. On the other hand, they had saved on special projects, where less had been spent than anticipated.

For competition activity expenses, the WAG and central events were not budgeted, and all their expenses were covered by external income. The Commissions overall had a negative result of CHF 34,000, which was covered by the dissolution of the ASC reserves. These figures included everything Commission-related.

On the comparison slide, the deviation of Commission results between budget and actual figures gave an indication that this was something to be worked on for the future, in order to have better forecasting.

Mr Sergey ANANOV had a question about operating expenses related to competition revenues. The budgeted figure was CHF 303,000 and actual expenditure was CHF 837,000, a threefold increase. What was the reason for such a dramatic increase in expenses?

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that they had budgeted 657,000, but they had income of 1.1 million. Expenditure had increased in line with this. This referred to the WAG budget and the world drone racing championships. These had not been shown in the budgeted figures, but their expenses were covered by income.

Mr ANANOV asked in that case if the income was a positive balance of CHF 485,000.

The SECRETARY GENERAL explained that the remaining difference was mostly from the fact that the Commissions had budgeted an overall positive result, but the actual figures had been negative.

Mr ANANOV had a second question about the trend. As far as he remembered, for many years there had been a trend of Commissions spending more than budgeted. Was there a reason why this continued to happen?

Mr MALBOS said that sometimes Commissions saved money and sometimes they spent it. This year they would be spending one-third of their reserves. If they saved, this gave them the ability to spend and invest in their sport. They were currently in an investment phase.

The PRESIDENT clarified that the Commissions gained income from the sanction fees from their activities. The primary reason for the income was to facilitate their activities by covering their expenses, and to enable them to fund projects to develop their sports. To give an example, IGC had just put a proposal to the Board for expenditure on a project that would be funded out of the IGC special reserve. Such projects went through a rigorous process, which meant that the Commission's planned income and expenditure was presented to the GC as part of the overall budget. If the Commissions then had expenditure on projects outside of what had been passed by the GC, there was a sequence of approval processes to enable further expenditure. This came to the SECRETARY

GENERAL and the Finance Director and, depending on the level of expenditure, to the full Board. He confirmed what Mr MALBOS had said, about the spending routinely going on investment and development of their sports.

Mr WEBER thanked Mr ANANOV for his question, and assured him that there was no trend. In fact, the Commissions managed their finances very prudently. Generally, when there was a bigger expense coming up, this came to the attention to the Board, and the Board took a decision. There was no real risk. Looking back at the last 10 years, there was no trend for bigger deficits. But some years there was a deficit, and the Commissions were then asked to be very cautious when they presented their budgets. He believed they cooperated fully in this. Moreover, the Commission budgets were approved by the GC.

Mr MACHULA had a few questions on the Commissions overview, which included money for central events that came from the dissolution of Commission reserves. This meant that drone racing and WAG expenses came out of Commission reserves. They had heard that Commissions sometimes earned more and sometimes spent more. Could they actually see the accounts of the Commissions, showing that they had saved money in the last five years? This was not shown anywhere. On the other hand, he knew from when he had been a CIVL delegate that there was money from the past, but it was not shown what money belonged to which Commission.

The PRESIDENT noted that the document everyone was looking at was part of the audited accounts, which was updated each year. The balance at 31 December each year showed the consolidated position of the funds held in special reserves for each of the Commissions. The activities of the Commissions, in terms of their income and expenditure on a year-by-year basis, was being tracked, and was being shown faithfully.

The SECRETARY GENERAL confirmed that these reserves concerned only Commission activities, not the WAG or World Drone Racing Championships.

Mr David MONKS asked if expenses had gone up because there was additional income.

The SECRETARY GENERAL confirmed that this was true for part of the activities.

Mr MONKS asked where this income was shown.

The SECRETARY GENERAL pointed to the line item "Competition revenues".

Mr MONKS noted that the budget approved in the previous year showed a 2018 budget also. Under "Central events" 100,000 had been included. This year the actual budget was CHF 444,910. They had achieved an additional 344,000 in revenue. The expenses against that, however, were greater than 344,000.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that she did not have those figures to hand, but "Central events" was just a working term. For the FAI WAG and the Drone Racing Championships, which was a joint project with CIAM, the principle was that a sanction fee was paid, which went to the FAI. Organisational costs were budgeted, and were required to be paid by the organiser. There was income from sanction fees, organisational costs, and expenses related to the organisational costs.

Mr MONKS thanked the SECRETARY GENERAL for her answer.

One delegate asked how much of the sanction fee for the drones went to CIAM for sport development, or whether it all went to the FAI.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS confirmed that, further to an agreement made the previous year during the meeting in Istanbul, it had been agreed that CHF 5,000 from the Drone World Championships would be available for projects within CIAM.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS had a political question regarding drones. A lot of money had been spent for the drone championships on consultancy and external agencies to promote the event. However, the results of this investment had not been shown to the members. He wondered if the agreement could be evaluated, and whether the FAI considered this to be successful or not. In his opinion, they had spent a great deal of money with nothing to show for it and had nothing that could be used for the next year.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that this related to the “Marketing, Communication and Sponsorship Acquisition” item. There had been an evaluation with the agency that was working for FAI, Lagardère Sports. There had been other activities, mainly directed at seeking investors who would be willing to enter into a joint venture with FAI to explore developing drone racing as a global racing series. The concept had been presented at last year’s GC. There were various reasons why this had not worked out as thought. One of the partners they had been talking to was a large sports equity group which had recently agreed with the ITF to take over the Davis Cup, which meant they could not explore drone racing further. The other part of this was that the FAI did not have enough control of the drone racing events taking place around the world to guarantee that they could be elevated to what would be the Formula 1 of drone racing. This was the reality. For that reason, the conversations had gone no further. However, the FAI had recently been approached by an agency working for a potential investment group. This was a work in progress and they would take the lessons they had learned from the previous exercise into any future round of conversation. The key question was: had any value been created out of that activity. The values created were that the FAI had launched a series of drone races around the world based on input from sports marketing experts, which was different from doing it in a regular Category 2 World Cup series. They had been talking about pilot recruitment, and what kind of commercial programme around that could be used to generate extra revenue for the organisation. The way they currently organised these events did not allow the FAI to be in full control of all these elements, and that was something they were stumbling over. They needed to discuss how they wanted to organise it in the future.

As far as communication activities were concerned, around the drones they had done a lot of good communication and media production. The sponsorship values generated out of the cooperation in Shenzhen last year, based on an objective evaluation of the media output, was around 360,000 euro. That was now the proposal that could be made to potential sponsors. They now had to go the last mile, to talk to partners and get sponsors on board, put on good events and generate extra income. This would be further discussed as part of the 2020 budget. At the moment, the EB had proposed that this would not continue.

Mr MALBOS noted that what worried him, looking at these huge numbers, was that most of it went to communication and very little went into the actual sport. CIAM had received a regular sanction fee of CHF 5,000. And then, when they built an online application system for its 376 competitions, they were asked to pay for it. This was absurd.

The SECRETARY GENERAL had noted this comment. The budget spent on drones included all the costs for all officials attending the event, the scoring system and the people running the event. Thus a large proportion of the budget had been invested in the sport.

Mr MONKS noted that these figures were summaries, not detailed. What was the makeup of costs in the central events?

The SECRETARY GENERAL explained that there were budgets and reports for these events but providing all the details in the audited FAI report would not make any sense. The figures were available if anyone wished to consult them. The organisational costs were defined in the organiser agreement, and recorded accordingly in the bookkeeping system.

Mr MACHULA asked if the detailed numbers could be provided.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that they were now drilling down into history. He was not sure the purpose of this, because these were audited accounts. The questions and concerns about the amounts being spent and the fact that there was not an absolute cash return had been noted. It was agreed that they needed to change the way they did business. He was not sure how much value there was in continuing to debate accounts that had been audited.

On behalf of the members, Mr MONKS noted that this was something the General Conference had to approve. They were just trying to understand the limited information on which they had to make a decision.

The PRESIDENT added that all the detailed accounts were available to anyone who wished to consult them. The discomfort in the room had been noted. He proposed the accounts be put to a formal vote.

Mr LEINIKKI stated that the total number of votes was currently 320, which meant the absolute majority was 161 and a two-thirds majority was 214. Absolute majority of active members 140, two-thirds majority 186.

Mr MACHULA asked if they could have the detailed numbers now, and then perhaps vote tomorrow. Last year in Egypt there had been many questions about the budget. He personally had many questions and would like to see the numbers and then decide.

The PRESIDENT noted that anyone could have asked to see all the sheets at any time before the GC. In order to schedule this for the following day they would have to change the agenda.

Mr SZIKORA wanted everyone to understand that, when you reached this point of a meeting report, they were simply accepting the reports that had been produced. They were not approving the line items within the reports, they were accepting that the maths had been done correctly and that the accounts had been correctly audited. It was not their role to make a determination on what money should have been spent where. That was a question for the budget.

The PRESIDENT thanked Mr SZIKORA for this clarification.

Mr MONKS noted that, given that the next item was to discharge the EB, they really did need to understand. He did not think it was right to challenge every line, but it was important to have an understanding of what they were agreeing to.

The PRESIDENT referred to the point just made by Mr SZIKORA, which was that the GC was being asked to accept accounts that had been through the auditors, and accept that they provided a truthful record of the business of the organisation, as opposed to examining the decisions sitting behind the numbers. He suggested they move on. He accepted that some people had concerns, and they were welcome to contact the SECRETARY GENERAL to seek more information. If they moved this item to another part of the agenda they would have to vote on that.

The votes were as follows: Yes 248, Abstain 34, 38 No.

The General Conference adopted the 2018 Financial Statements.

10.2. Financial Situation at 31 October 2019

The PRESIDENT noted that the date had been changed from 30 September to 31 October because of the delay to the meeting.

The SECRETARY GENERAL explained that these slides were in response to enquiries received prior to the meeting, about knowing the cash balance and receivables of the FAI. Around CHF 100,000 of receivables was membership subscriptions. Since 31 October, almost half of that had been received. There were no long-term debtors apart from one long-term project that was still promising to pay the invoice that dated back to 2017. There were no major deviations from the budget, and the overall situation, including the forecast to the end of the year, was still trending towards a zero budget result.

The EB received forecasts for the FAI office actual figures and budget until the end of the year, and this procedure would continue for the following year. The planned office budget would be balanced. With the Commissions, they could only have an indication, it was not possible to make a forecast. The General Conference should note two projects that were at risk: the WAG and the World Drone Racing Championships, mainly because payments had not been received in time.

Mr Greg PRINCIPATO noted that receivables included money from THK for the World Air Games. As he understood the situation, this money was unlikely to be forthcoming.

The SECRETARY GENERAL explained that the EB was aware of the situation. The amount in question was CHF 150,000.

Mr Rob HUGUES asked if this document was available for the members to consult.

The SECRETARY GENERAL said it would be uploaded to the Cloud after the session.

The PRESIDENT explained that it was provided for information only, and was not in fact a statutory requirement.

Mr Rob HUGUES noted that his Commission insisted on information being available for the meeting beforehand, and it would be good to follow the same pattern.

The PRESIDENT noted this request.

The SECRETARY GENERAL pointed out that the agenda was sent out 3 months in advance, and there was an opportunity to ask for information in advance of the GC. The FAI had certain procedures which had been established in past years. They were now providing more information than had been given previously. It would be good to understand what exactly what was expected.

Mr Wolfgang LINTL noted that he had seen a lot of numbers in a short space of time. He had missed one big income position. Last year in Luxor one of the current Board members had made an extraordinary promise, that with his experience he could resolve any of the FAI's financial problems. He wondered where they could find the numbers relating to this problem.

The PRESIDENT assumed the question was about the business development options and opportunities that were discussed in Luxor. They were continuing. He had spoken about a couple of them in his report. Nothing had been put in the budget for 2019, because in the past, some years ago, there had been expectations of money being put into the budget with figures put into the income stream where no contract had been signed. There were plans to create opportunities, and he invited Mr AL-JAWINI to speak about this.

Mr Abdullah AL-JAWINI noted that they were currently looking into reactivating FAME, as the President had mentioned, in the area of business transactions, not connected with sporting matters. The strategy going forward would be to have the office deal with everything concerning sports, and FAME dealing with everything concerning business transactions, promotions and agreements. Later they could consider employing specialised professional people in business development and marketing. First they would work on developing a business plan for the company, to give clarity.

10.3. Approval of Auditors for 2020

The FAI General Conference approved BDO as the auditors for 2020.

11. Discharge of the FAI Executive Board

The PRESIDENT invited the General Conference to discharge the FAI Executive Board of responsibility for the management of the FAI's affairs during the financial year 2018.

Mr MONKS did not think it was appropriate for the GC to vote on something they had not confirmed themselves. They had accepted the fact that the accounts had been audited, but they had not satisfied themselves that what had been audited was correct.

The PRESIDENT thanked Mr MONKS for his comment.

The votes were as follows: Yes 199, Abstain 40, No 81.

The General Conference agreed to discharge the FAI Executive Board of responsibility for the management of the FAI's affairs during the financial year 2018.

The PRESIDENT thanked the General Conference for the faith they had shown in the Board, allowing them to move past the 2018 audited accounts.

Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBON noted that the majority of the General Conference had just agreed with the job the Executive Board members had done, but on the other hand, one-third had

not agreed. This was extremely serious. His first reaction was to urge them to make it more clear what they wanted. It was difficult to discharge with complete satisfaction something that perhaps had not been fully instructed or had been misunderstood. This was his positive reading of the situation.

12. Commission Activities and Work

Mr Eric MOZER moderated this session. He referred the delegates to the Commission reports (**ANNEXES 7 to 19**). This was an opportunity for the NACs to speak to the Air Sports Commission presidents.

FAI Microlight and Paramotor Commission (CIMA)

Mr LINTL said he was not very happy with some of the NACs. At his last plenary they had numbers present similar to the GC, and it had been hard work approaching the delegates to ask if they would be attending. Some countries did not respond at all. The NAC presidents were responsible for sending delegates, and they should take care to select the right people. The Commissions needed the support of the NAC delegates.

FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)

Mr MOZER noted that the FAI Gliding Commission generally got between 30 and 40 NAC delegates to attend their conference, regardless of where the event took place. There was great interest in gliding from countries in Eastern Europe.

Mr LINTL confirmed that CIMA had had 19 NACs and 6 proxies

FAI General Aviation Commission (GAC)

Mr Rodney BLOIS reported that 20-22 countries had attended their last plenary. The Commission was very healthy. They had competitions scheduled up to 2024. At the last plenary it had been felt that the spirit of GAC was very much alive, and very focused on the concept of promoting the best pilots and best championships. The general view was that the WAG was not something the GAC could put its heart into.

FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC)

Ms Elisabet MIKAELSSON thanked all the NACs that had sent delegates to the IPC plenary. In 2019 they had had around 50 NACs represented, including proxies, which was more than usual. She hoped to this trend would continue.

FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM)

Mr PAPADOPOULOS said his Commission generally had close to 40 NACs represented, and in total had exceeded 100 delegates. During the plenary, CIAM accepted not only delegates but also observers and technical experts, because they had a lot of working groups. This weekend they would host their Bureau meeting at the MSI in Lausanne.

FAI Amateur Built and Experimental Commission (CIACA)

Mr Alfons HUBMANN noted that, out of the approximately 111 NACs worldwide, only 30 had attended his general assembly. This was a pity because he knew there were many more countries building aircraft. At their next general assembly the commission would have a presentation on new aircraft technologies, including the hydrogen aircraft currently being developed in Switzerland. It was a fascinating sector, and highly educational for young people.

FAI Medico-Physiological Commission (CIMP)

Ms Marja OSINGA noted that her Commission also dealt with rule-making, anti-doping, human performance, psychology and psychiatry. They also had a low number of delegates at their annual meeting. There were approximately 10 active members. She strongly urged the NACs to send delegates, and she encouraged the other ASC presidents to come with any questions they might have in the areas she had mentioned.

FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA)

Mr Nick BUCKENHAM said that 2019 had been a very interesting year. The world championships had taken place in France with an extraordinary 17,000 visitors on the final day. 23 NACs and 4 proxies had attended the plenary in the UK.

FAI Hang Gliding and Paragliding Commission (CIVL)

Mr MALBOS noted that his Commission had run 300 competitions, amazing top-level competitions, using an incredible scoring system with live tracking. The best of the best was the world paragliding championship, with 150 pilots from 48 nations, which had been a great success. The bad news was that in recent years the FAI had lost its soul and sold out to commercial dreams that never materialised. Sport had been totally forgotten in the process. The FAI had spent over 1 million on the Air Games Series, on commercial, marketing and studies alone. There had been three consecutive projects, and not once had the people in charge of the projects come to the Commissions, to ask what the Commissions could deliver. In recent years, every time the Air Games Series had come up at the GC he had always supported it, because he had thought something would trickle down to the Commissions. He felt stupid and naïve, because nothing had trickled down. He was hoping that the Noosphere event management system built for the Air Games Series would trickle down to them, but it didn't – Cat 1 could apparently use it, but Cat 2 had to pay. However, it was too intricate for Cat 1 to use and it had to be run by Noosphere. It was not designed for the FAI's 700 competitions. It had not been used in any of the competitions, across all the Commissions. It had been used at three events: drone racing, the Gordon Bennett and the WAG. The Noosphere e-navigator was so poorly done that CIVL was now paying for its own event management system, because they needed it. When Noosphere had designed its system with the FAI they had totally forgotten about sport. CIVL was now paying to have a system created that could be used for any Cat 2 event. The system would be simple and online. The third fiasco was the WAG. After Dubai no one had wanted to do it again because, although Dubai was beautiful, it had required a great deal of work. Out of it, the Commissions had received EUR 7000. After a 3-day seminar the decision had been taken to create a wonderful showcase event for their sports. But they had done exactly the opposite, creating a series of world championships, which was destroying their development strategy. The Commissions had not been involved in the decision to go ahead with THK, it had been imposed on them. The Commissions had accordingly put in the work, but no money had come back to the sport. It had stayed in the system. Before today CIVL had not even had a budget to work on. CIVL was supposed to organise four Cat 1 world championships, but they did not know the budget. Now the WAG had been cancelled, so they had to find a new venue for their 2022 Cat 1 championships. The bids should have been in a few days ago, but the schedule was now completely shot. The FAI had announced that it would impose a tax of 20% on the sanction fee. CIVL had six championships, and this tax represented 10% of their budget. This was unpleasant, but it was the reality. The FAI could count on the Commissions to run the sport – they had been doing it brilliantly. However, he urged the FAI to go back to basics – help the Commissions to build their sports, build the foundations, give them software to manage their sport, give them a decent sporting licence database. The mandatory online sporting licence database was seven years old. It was a struggle when a jury president had to go through the database to verify 100 pilots.

FAI Environmental Commission (EnvC)

Mr Pierre DUVAL said there were few topics that were as difficult for the future of aviation as the environment. No one knew what rules would be established in the coming months or years, what new constraints they would have. But what was certain was that air sports would be impacted. They had tried to foresee this. Many things had been included in their rules and codes of conduct, but unfortunately it was not being used. However, what worried him most was that not only did they have just 4-6 people attending EnvC meetings, they had no point of contact within the NACs. In order to improve participation in their meetings, the Commission had decided that next year it would meet during the GC, in order to have all the delegates on board, and to spend a few hours together to review what they were looking for in the field of the environment, and what the Commission could do. He was completely sold on the idea of organising races based on electric or other types of propulsion, which should attract the attention of the public and authorities to the fact that air sports

were working hard to improve the way they used energy in their sports. He was very worried about the next decisions from the European Commissions, because they were under pressure from the greens to do something, and he felt strongly that air sports made good scapegoats. It would be very easy to block them, and impose more constraints. He wanted to fight, but he couldn't do it alone. He hoped everyone understood that these issues were shared by everyone.

FAI Rotorcraft Commission (CIG)

Mr Jacques BERLO said he had always been fascinated by air sports, as both a balloon pilot and a helicopter pilot. Helicopter was a real sport because there were many human factors that influenced a pilot's performance. They had to be physically and mentally fit. It was about leadership, building a team, sharing experience. It was also about respect, for other people, for different cultures and languages. That was an important message they had to deliver, both inside their sporting community and outside, to the public and sponsors.

Mr Greg PRINCIPATO thanked everyone for all the work they did. He wished to repeat something he had said at the recent NAC presidents' meeting. He had talked to many air sports people in the USA, and consistently they were looking for a strong FAI, but what they wanted from the FAI was a records process that was well-run, efficient and with integrity, and a series of championships that was well-run, efficient and with integrity. The Olympics, the World Games and the WAG were seen as an expensive and unnecessary diversion. He would like to know if other countries had similar opinions.

Mr LINTL explained that the microlight and paramotor commission had a product to present at the WAG or Air Games Series, the paramotor slalom over water, which was fun for the pilots, quick, visible and easy to understand, and if the circumstances were right they were happy to deliver.

Ms MIKAELSSON said that the WAG had seemed like a good idea when it started in 1997 but had not lived up to expectations. No one in the IPC saw any value in it anymore.

Mr MOZER asked if he was correct in understanding that the American air sports persons had little interest in outside air games.

Mr PRINCIPATO confirmed that they had no interest in them.

Mr MOZER noted that in that case, they wanted quality competitions they could attend, with achievable records that were recognised.

Mr PRINCIPATO pointed out that they saw everything else as not adding any value.

Mr MOZER said that his Commission held only a few competitions each year. They took bids three years out and looked at them intensively. It was critical because they had so few competitions that they did everything possible to make them the highest quality and the fairest. They were not the easiest to understand, but in the end they selected the best of the best. Air sports people wanted to be recognised if they were the best of the best, and have the opportunity to become the best of the best. The Commissions made rules and held meetings with a view to providing what their air sports persons wanted.

Mr HAN Zhaofang wished to express his sincere thanks to all the Commission presidents, with whom he had cooperated to organise events in China. He looked forward to enjoying their help in the future.

Mr BLOIS wanted to look at the WAG from the perspective of the host country. The Commissions were being asked to create and devise a spectator-friendly sport that they could transport to a foreign city, to try to create something that was outside their normal area of expertise, in order to be part of a travelling cabaret. Regardless of what the ASCs gained, it was hard to see what value they brought to the people on the ground.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS thanked everyone for being present at the GC. Taking the opportunity of the report presented by the SECRETARY GENERAL, where she had talked about participation in competitions, and from what Mr PRINCIPATO had mentioned, he would like to know, at least in aeromodelling, what was preventing them from organising or participating in FAI competitions. They used to hear that the FAI was euro-centric, for example. But what was preventing people from

applying to host an event, or from participating in an event? The FAI was eager to solve the problems. They had regional vice-presidents, but they did not have the input they needed to promote participation in some regions. There was only one event in Africa, for example. Countries such as India, Chinese Taipei, Libya etc., what could they do to help?

Ms Marina POSCH KALOUSDIAN replied to this question with the example of Brazil. In countries like hers, she felt they had to bring the athletes closer to the FAI, in order to avoid misunderstanding and wrong explanations. One suggestion was that each Commission start to think about providing online courses or video orientation on risk management, measuring team courses, scoring systems, how to be a jury member or a steward, etc.. Some athletes did not have access to this kind of information from their NAC or their discipline association, but the ASCs had it. The athletes could pay to take such a course. In her country, they came from a tradition where each association selected their own delegate. But how could she check that they were passing on the information? Perhaps this was easier in Europe or North America. She felt the athletes had to have the opportunity to get closer to the FAI and the Commissions. The athletes opened the doors for new venues. In the Southern Amazon there was a wonderful area to host a big paramotor event. Because there was an alternate delegate in paramotor, he was teaching everything, and bringing paramotor pilots into the FAI system. This also occurred within paragliding and hang gliding. Another point was that they needed to hold more Cat 2 events in other disciplines. In paragliding and hang gliding Brazil had improved enormously through holding inexpensive, easy Cat 2 events, which brought thousands of people to participate. Another point was that some disciplines did not have continental records. Brazil would never break a ballooning world record – so they had to start with regional events. The FAI should help to build up this foundation, with a database of the people involved. Each athlete would sell the FAI idea much better than an association president or NAC president, because the athletes would always be there. This was why they had to work with the athletes. There could be a bad NAC president who would not take the information back to their country. To give an example, she had talked with a helicopter company about perhaps starting some events, but the information they needed was difficult to come by. Finally, she had seen in her four years with the NAC how amazing it was that technology from one discipline could help another. Ballooning had encountered many problems, but paragliding had offered to help and now they were working together.

Mr MOZER thanked Ms POSCH KALOUSDIAN for her wonderful comments. He particularly liked the idea of having a portal for the athletes to access information and learn.

Mr MACHULA wished to support the idea put forward by Mr PRINCIPATO. He would like to add that the NAC of the Czech Republic was quite active in first-class events, and sent delegates to all the Commissions each year. Over the years, the FAI had shifted from providing only records to providing only events – very good events organised by very enthusiastic volunteers within the Commissions. He urged them to bear in mind that the FAI had changed a lot. Nowadays, records could easily be processed automatically, or by a part-time employee. The Head Office now had to focus even more, trust in its volunteers, and focus on the Cat 1 events. The athletes who attended the events were the most important part, not the commercial projects.

Mr SZIKORA wished to address several items, particularly the fact that there was disappointment that not all NACs were represented in the Commissions. Based on comments others had made, each NAC operated on a decentralised model. For each sports discipline in the FAI there should be a local national organisation under the NAC. However, not every NAC had an association for every sports discipline. For example, Canada had people who wanted to go to paramotor events, and who had tried to set rotorcraft records in Canada but had no rotorcraft association. Under their structures, they relied on the expertise of a local national organisation for that discipline to identify individuals who could go to FAI events. The Canadian NAC was merely an administrator of that process. For many Commissions, there would be NACs that simply did not participate in the sport. The challenge was how to move forward from that. He also wished to address the pyramid idea that had been mentioned by several people. One fundamental problem for all air sports was the focus of the FAI on the pinnacle of the pyramid, when it was not really a pyramid. There was a pointy bit at the top, sitting on a pile of rubble. The bottom of the pyramid had been smashed. The biggest problem in air sports was that at the grassroots level there were no local events. In each sports discipline, there

were a few people who identified with the FAI, who attended world championships, and then the vast majority of people in many air sports associations who had little experience or no interest in competition at grassroots level. The NACs thus had difficulty finding support and maintaining those associations in the NACs because they saw the FAI as an elite organisation. Everyone had to pay into the system so that a few people could enjoy it. He encouraged local competition, but it was a tough sell. As a society, they were getting more and more away from grassroots competition. This was not the FAI's fault, but it had to be recognised. To Ms POSCH KALOUSDIAN's point, the more the FAI could do to help the local communities around the world to get involved in competition and see the value in it, the better. To the environmental Commissioner, he mentioned that an electric air race series was about to start, sponsored by Airbus. The FAI was not involved.

Mr MOZER said that gliding had had its first electro-glide event in Italy this year. It was an initial concept event based on gliders that used energy very efficiently. Not every Commission was involved in this, but gliding was, and Mr DUVAL had been very helpful in raising awareness of electric power. Another frustrating point was what the FAI could do to help grow their sports. In gliding, he was often asked why the IGC was not growing gliding. The answer was that they relied on volunteers, and they did not have that much cash available. According to the statutes of IGC, its purpose was to create events to identify the best of the best. They tried to spread the events around, and step outside of Europe. People talked about fewer people participating in gliding, but their measurables were world championships – people who were willing to host them and participate in them. As long as there were still people available, the IGC was doing its job.

Mr MALBOS noted that one thing the FAI could give them was tools to run their competitions – an event management system from the beginning to the end – registration, website template, scoring – that was online and free of charge. He applauded the efforts of past administrations to try to find creative ways to build resources so that they could reach the level they wanted. The Air Sport Commissions worked very hard for everyone.

Mr ANANOV took the opportunity to thank everyone for the work they did. He wished to develop a little the idea put forward by Ms POSCH KALOUSDIAN, to bring athletes closer to the FAI. Media activities formed part of the basic functions of their organisation. Today the communication manager would search through all the media sources to find information, photos and videos of different events and channel them to the FAI website, newsletters, etc. He suggested they find an easy and cheap application to do this automatically, that would connect the Facebook and Instagram pages that even the smallest event now had, and channel photos, media galleries and athlete comments directly to the FAI website. It was technically feasible, and would greatly ease the work of the people currently doing the task. Another point was that some competitions were held outside the FAI calendar. Did the ASC presidents think this trend was increasing or decreasing? He also had a question about franchising, giving sports events to entrepreneurs. Was it a good idea, and was it feasible, to prepare the ground for other people who had the ability to make money through sport to do this, using the experience of the FAI, and in the financial interests of the FAI?

Mr PAPADOPOULOS said that the matter of air sports competitions held outside the FAI was something they should consider very seriously. The first issue was intellectual property. In order to pass a rule, how many countries took part in the plenaries, how many delegates travelled to vote? People were having an easy ride, taking FAI rules and putting on competitions without even referring to the local aero club. It was not a problem as long as the FAI was strong enough. CIAM tried to be in contact with these kinds of organisers, and ask them to join the FAI, or sign an agreement with the FAI, to keep track of what was going on. Nevertheless, unless they were prepared to take every case to court to protect their intellectual property, this kind of situation could not be avoided.

Mr MOZER said that gliding had developed a relationship and had an agreement with the world's largest decentralised gliding competition. The IGC had decided what was most important to them, and what they could control. They had decided that the term "World Champion" was an important property for the FAI and IGC.

In reference to the franchise issue, Mr MALBOS said his Commission was happy if the organisers made money from their competitions. Competitions outside the FAI would always happen. The only

way they could get them inside the family was to add value to their competitions. And this meant providing an event management system, a ranking scheme and visibility, with access to the CIVL website and Facebook pages.

Mr MONKS thanked the Commission presidents for making themselves available, as well as the EB and many of those here today, who were all volunteers. He had a request that, when they had their plenaries, the ASCs push it home to their delegates that they should report back to the NACs and communicate what was going on. The NACs were interested, and some were quite removed from their delegates. In this way the NACs might be able to contribute more.

Mr MOZER noted that he had been a Commission president for 8 years. One disturbing issue as he ran the meetings was that the ASCs sent out the material 60 days beforehand, but at times he had the sense that not everyone was prepared. He realised that could not be controlled by NAC presidents, but underneath the NAC were different sporting organisations. He was unsure how the NACs could control them, but he would encourage the NAC presidents to find out what was going on in the various plenaries, and ensure their views were known to their delegates. IGC encouraged delegates to participate and asked them to report back.

Mr MONKS recognised that most of the work in the Commissions came through the NACs via the delegates, and the Commissions serviced that. However, in terms of the WAG and similar types of events, that workload had been supported by a central events team and FAI office. He asked if anyone could share their experience of that process, because it was completely different from having it coming via the NACs.

Speaking on behalf of gliding, Mr MOZER said it had been very frustrating. They had tried to work with these types of events, tried to get information. It was not the fault of HO, which probably did not get the answers they needed from the organisers. It was not a very satisfying procedure.

In answer to Mr ANANOV, Mr DUVAL said that in his field there was no one working for free, investing at the level needed to change their sources of energy, etc. Commercial operators were the only ones willing to put money in, in return for sponsorship. The problem was that they could not work with everyone, so they had to be careful.

Mr Pavol KAVKA noted that, in reference to events outside the FAI, the FAI had a monopoly, so if you were a member of the FAI you could not attend any other World Championship or Continental Championship.

A delegate from Libya asked why the FAI and ASCs did not cooperate to give support to small NACs by encouraging bigger NACs to help them improve their athletes and grow. The smaller NACs in question could contribute with transport, accommodation, etc.

Mr Wolfgang LINTL said that if a request was made, they would definitely respond.

Mr MOZER said that every Commission had country development procedures for helping anyone who asked. FAI HO had been very helpful in this regard. He received requests all the time from NACs and individuals. He thanked all the panellists. He thanked everyone in the FAI office for the work they did for the ASCs. The Commissions could not do it all alone.

The PRESIDENT thanked everyone for this very interesting conversation. Behind these conversations were the discussions he had had on Tuesday morning with the Commission presidents, and discussions with the NAC group. Ideas about what everyone would like the central organisation to be able to do to facilitate their activities and the involvement of their athletes were starting to come into focus. It was clear that, once they started listening to each other, they could generate good ideas about how they should be doing business. He thanked Mr Mozer for his moderation and the Commission Presidents for their participation, as well as everyone else in the room.

13. Expectations on Sport in the Olympic Movement

See **ANNEXES 20 to 22**.

The PRESIDENT explained that, while he appreciated the observations that had just been made about where the FAI should focus its energies, this part of the session had been planned, and guests had been invited previously. He felt it would be useful to listen to the perspectives of other organisations in terms of managing sports and how to determine the focus and priorities on the sports.

Mrs Irina GLADKIKH, IOC Associate Director Sports Department, introduced some of the initiatives being organised by the IOC, Agenda 2020, the process and criteria for being included on the Olympic Programme and the gender equality review.

Mr Andrew HOFER, IOC Senior Manager in charge of recognised federations and organisations, began by looking at the IOC Agenda 2020. When Thomas BACH had become IOC President in 2014, he had implemented Olympic Agenda 2020, a series of reforms to make the Olympic Games relevant again. A series of “new norms” had been created, in order to transform the process of bringing the Olympic Games to a city in such a way that the Games would adapt to the city and not the other way around. Paris and Los Angeles would be the first cities to take on this new challenge. In Paris, 93% of the facilities would be temporary or existing. In Milan (2026), 80% of venues were already built. This was a massive change for the IOC.

He explained the remit of the Olympic Programme Commission, and the process by which new sports could be added to the programme, taking into consideration the wishes of the OCOGs concerned, athlete quotas, youth engagement and gender equality among other criteria.

Ms GLADKIKH explained the IOC’s gender equality review project, which had resulted in 25 recommendations, summarised in the IOC Gender Equality Review Report, which was available from the IOC website. It was not just about numbers of athletes, but also about competition schedules, equipment, coaches etc. In terms of portrayal of female athletes in the media, only 8% of coverage was on women, and the rest was devoted to male athletes. The portrayal guidelines had been developed to help IFs in their communications. There were also recommendations on funding, governance and human resources

The PRESIDENT thanked them for their presentation. The FAI had a project on women in aviation, because representation was a long way from being equal, and this reflected the general level of representation across aviation. These resources would be very helpful.

14. FAI World Air Games 2022

See **ANNEX 23 and 24**.

The PRESIDENT noted that the intention had been to hold the World Air Games 2022 in Turkey. Concerns had been expressed by some Commission presidents about the process by which this was progressing. Those concerns had been taken on board in terms of how they did business in the future. When the decision had been made by Turkey to move from 2020 to 2022 there was already in place a top-level governance committee, the Coordination Committee, jointly headed by the president of THK and the FAI PRESIDENT, with representatives from the boards of both organisations, plus their specialist sports management teams. They had met routinely and had established terms of reference so that they had clear responsibilities. The primary drivers were to ensure that the event was safe, well organised and financially sound and viable. THK had recently been put into administration. The president had been replaced, a commissioner had been appointed to chair the board, and two further commissioners had been put in place by the government. The organisation had been restructured, and its funds had been frozen. At Turkey’s request, its organisational payments were being made monthly, and some payments started to be missed. At the same time, the FAI Board and CoCom members, including Messrs ANANOV and MONKS, had

already started to think about the risk to which the FAI was exposed. They had investigated further, and discovered other issues within the organisation,. With assistance from legal counsel Me MORAND, the FAI had looked at the organiser agreement and decided the only fit course of action was to notify Turkey of the FAI's intention to terminate the organiser agreement because of failure to confirm financial viability for the event. These papers had been filed along with the draft termination letter with the team in Ankara 10 days previously. They had then followed up with a Zoom meeting, which had been attended by two people from Turkey and the whole FAI team. The request from Turkey was to move the event to 2025. The FAI had said they would take that under advisement, but in the meantime they would appreciate a formal response to meet the 8-day deadline to resolve the issues raised in their letters. The correspondence had been received on Tuesday, saying Turkey wished to delay the event to 2025 and freeze further payments until 2023. He had shared this with the Commission presidents on Monday evening. On Wednesday, when they had had the formal meeting between the Commission presidents and the EB, the information in the letter had been shared. The Board had taken a decision that they would terminate the organiser agreement, which covered 2020, following consultation with the Commission presidents. The Commission presidents all agreed to this course of action.

The WAG 2022 would not occur. They still needed to do their best to recover the funds owed under the organiser agreement signed by Turkey. THK was still liable for that debt, and the FAI would try to recover it, however slim their chances of success. They were thoughtful about reopening bidding for a WAG some time after 2022, and were not inclined to simply accept Turkey's kind offer. The Board and CoCom understood the pressure they had now put on the Commissions, and he had given every Commission an undertaking that the FAI would provide all the support they could to assist with relocation of events etc.

The other side of this was that it created an opportunity for the Commission presidents and board to test the entire WAG question. This conversation had taken place yesterday morning. The information he had taken from that meeting was that, amongst the Commissions, some had a product that they thought worked in that environment and they were happy to make it work. Taking IGC as an example, he had not fully understood how gliding could work in a multi-sports event. However, in Dubai Mr MOZER and his team had created a completely new style of gliding event that worked extremely well and that the pilots enjoyed. The position they were now in was that they should continue to try to make it work, being careful to use the Dubai style of having everything as close together as possible. It was not a World Championships Cat 1 event, but it was a high-status event.

To conclude, the WAG 2022 would not go ahead, but they would take this opportunity to review what the WAG product could look like before making a decision on 2025. They would do their best to recover the funds. The working papers for item 14 were thus withdrawn.

He concluded with a quotation from Mr Max BISHOP, Secretary General in 2009. *“What of the future? It is clear to me that FAI competitions of the future, whether we like it or not, will probably have to be shorter, more professionally organised, more interesting for the public, partially financed from commercial sources. As President Portman has noticed, we can still keep our traditional championships but we cannot expect others to pay for them, and the costs of running such events are going to continue to rise disproportionately because of the increasing scarcity of willing and competent volunteers and the expectation on the part of competitors of professional standards of organisation.”* He felt this statement still rang true for their current situation.

He agreed the Commission presidents did a brilliant job of looking after their products, and that was their role. They would adjust to the expectations of the members, but they were totally reliant on volunteers to do it.

The current situation was due to commercial circumstances within the Turkish company, which had impacted directly on their intention to put on the WAG. The Turkish team were extremely concerned by the situation, and the FAI was sympathetic to their situation. However, the FAI needed to be very careful about engaging and contracting with people outside the organisation for the delivery of products and services. He would be very precise about contracts, and about the deadlines, from now

on. What was frustrating was that one of the FAI members was now potentially in default, which was embarrassing for both parties.

15. Multi Sport Events

The PRESIDENT introduced Mr Max BISHOP, FAI Secretary General for 17 years, and now vice-president of the International World Games Association.

Mr Max BISHOP said he had been vice-president of the International World Games Association (IWGA) for 13 years. The problems the FAI was facing with multi-sport events were familiar problems.

FAI had been a member of the IWGA since around 1994. The first event they had participated in was in Lahti, Finland. Over the 40 years of the Games' existence they had seen substantial growth. The 37 sports in the World Games shared the common feature that they were not Olympic sports. However, if any showed themselves to be particularly successful, or commercially interesting, the IOC tended to look more closely, and in fact had taken some of the most successful sports of the World Games to showcase them in Tokyo in 2020 and Paris in 2024.

He explained some of the arrangements for the next World Games, to be held in Birmingham, Alabama, USA in 2021. The FAI EB had decided that Canopy Piloting and Drone Racing would be the air sports presented. Broadcasting contracts had already been concluded with NBC and the Olympic Channel, so that at least the finals would be broadcast in a wide range of countries.

The 2025 World Games would take place in Chengdu in China, a very green city. The World Games site, a new sports university campus, was under construction.

He concluded by saying that the IWGA had just finished putting together a strategy paper which identified some of the challenges lying ahead, and how they proposed to tackle them. One big problem was the proliferation of multi-sports events. GAISF was currently creating all sorts of new multi-sports games which were essentially money-generating brands. The merit of the World Games was that it was a members' organisation, not a commercial entity. Their aim was to help its members to showcase and develop their sports. The purpose of the paper was to try to plot how best to do that in the future, and to sort out the problem of Olympic vs non-Olympic sports. Some Olympic federations in IWGA had grandfather rights, as founder members of the IWGA, which caused some concern among those not in the Olympic Games. He would be happy to hear the FAI's comments on the document.

The PRESIDENT thanked Mr Bishop for his presentation.

Mr DE ORLEANS BORBON asked if Mr BISHOP could sum up the outlook for participating sports.

Mr BISHOP said that at the Olympic Games, all expenses of participating athletes and officials were paid. Up to now, the IWGA had paid all in-country travel, board and lodging, but had not been able to cover flights to the venue. They hoped that by 2025 they would be financially able to do that. An element of the strategy paper was that they were trying to persuade the NOCs to take their responsibilities to the non-Olympic sports much more seriously. There was great temptation among the majority of NOCs to look after the already fortunate sports and ignore the non-Olympic sports. The ambition of the IWGA was both financially and in terms of exposure and support, to try to help its members. The FAI had been a supportive member of the IWGA for a number of years, and they hoped that this relationship continued.

In answer to a question from the floor, Mr BISHOP explained that the plan was to use helicopters for airlift in the canopy piloting event.

Mr AL-JAWINI asked whether, in the history of the World Games, they had had any last-minute cancellations. If so, how had they dealt with that in terms of their contractual obligations.

Mr BISHOP said they were supposed to go to Port Elizabeth in South Africa in 2013 and the organisers had pulled out. The IWGA had had just under two years to find an alternative venue. That

was when they had gone to Cali in Colombia, which had been a great popular success. In terms of contractual obligations, he believed the IWGA had had some money from Port Elizabeth. Going back to 2013 they were not so savvy about contractual matters.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS noted that, when a federation took part in the Olympic Games, everything was adjusted according to the programme and dates of the Games. It was a very prestigious event. Was there the same expectation around participation in the World Games?

Mr BISHOP said that it depended on the sport, but in many sports, yes. Clearly, an Olympic medal was extremely prestigious, but the athletes who participated in the World Games took it very seriously. As far as potential clashes of dates were concerned, they had established a committee to try to de-conflict dates. In the strategy paper, they insisted that the World Games was an event of greater priority than the others.

The SECRETARY GENERAL added that, for those that had participated in the World Games, once you were part of the World Games you were also part of the national delegation, which was an Olympic-style organisation, and they would have all the appropriate support with uniforms, etc. In a few cases, winners of World Games had subsequently secured a government subsidy for the sport for a number of years.

Mr BISHOP said that the IOC President, Thomas BACH, had written to all NOCs urging them to ensure their teams for the World Games were given priority, financial help and a uniform. They had already seen some results from this letter.

Mr MOZER had a question about the athletes. Given the fact that the athletes did not have all their expenses covered, did top athletes go to the World Games?

Mr BISHOP explained that it was an absolute requirement in their rules that they get the top athletes. The IWGA approved the selection procedures and could verify that the right athletes turned up.

The PRESIDENT thanked Mr BISHOP for his presentation.

16. Developing and innovative sports

Mr Bruno DELOR gave an overview of drone racing's introduction to the FAI, in response to the rapid worldwide development of drone racing. In 2015 a new class had been introduced, along with a world cup and, as part of CIAM, a new subcommittee. An event package had been created, on the advice of Lagardère Sport. This would culminate in December with an event that would determine the best FAI drone pilot. They could now say that, in terms of amateur drone racing, the FAI was the most important organisation, in terms of number of events, competitors and countries. There was no problem securing coverage on TV, the internet, YouTube and Twitch.

Drone racing provided a further opportunity to connect with esports, which represented a big community and considerable financial interests. This was a huge opportunity for the FAI to offer simulation of their tracks and organise e-competitions. Drone Soccer was another new drone sport which had been given its own new class in the FAI, and the only team sport in aeromodelling. The FAI should try to take leadership on that. The first FAI-sanctioned event had taken place in Korea.

Mr ANANOV thanked Mr DELOR for his presentation and his work. He reminded him of their conversation regarding drone permissions.

Mr DELOR responded that drone racing had introduced an innovation, the FAI drone permission, in 2017. New people coming into drone racing were generally unaware of the FAI and the NAC. They had decided it was important to try to connect them with the NAC, and so had introduced the possibility of an FAI drone permission. Now, the large majority of NACs supported drone sport. His position was that, for next year, he saw no good reason to maintain the FAI drone permission for those NACs that supported drone racing. But there were some countries that were still interested in keeping it. His recommendation would be that, for the countries that organised World Cup events,

who sent a national team to the Grand Final, there was no reason to continue with drone permissions. There could be some discussion with the other countries. Russia met these criteria.

Mr ANANOV said that in that case Russia would like to stop drone permissions.

Mr DELOR invited him to send an email to the FAI.

Mr MALBOS noted that this part of the story showed how poorly the sporting licence scheme worked. Some NACs would give them away and others would charge \$150, and no youngsters would be prepared to pay that. He wondered if drone racing should not continue to operate outside the regular sporting licence scheme, because that scheme was broken. He admired the work CIAM was doing; it was the only Commission that brought in money to the FAI. He hoped that the money would trickle down to the other sports.

Capt. MATHUR asked for clarification about drone permissions. If the NAC issued a sporting licence it was fine, but if not there would be a drone permission from the FAI. Was that correct?

Mr DELOR said he would prefer to discuss this case privately because he was unsure of the arrangements for India. He thought there were no competitors from India competing in the World Cup or World Championships, and no World Cup events organised in India. He realised this could change next year, so he would like to discuss how to help India to develop drone racing.

Capt. MATHUR said that recently, some drone teams had got together on their own, and approached FAI for a sporting licence to participate in competitions. The FAI had guided them to the NAC, but the people involved had not wanted to go through the NAC. If the FAI supported anyone wanting to bypass the NAC, this would be a dangerous precedent.

Mr DELOR said there was no intention to bypass the NACs. The point was to help the NACs to attract these people.

The PRESIDENT thanked Mr DELOR for this wonderful initiative.

DAY TWO

17. Roll Call of Delegations

The PRESIDENT opened the session by thanking the staff for their hard work the previous day, and for the excellent dinner and awards ceremony.

FAI Gold Air Medal

He noted that there had been an error in the presentation of the awards and diplomas, for which he apologised. The FAI Gold Air Medal for 2019 was a posthumous award, and one that was extremely well deserved. For some time, the protocol had stipulated that posthumous awards were given to the family. The recipient, Mr Domina JALBERT was from Canada and US. Attempts had been made to contact the family through the NACs and CIVL, and had been unsuccessful. As per the protocol, without being able to contact the family, there was no easy way to proceed. They had now found someone to receive the award – Greg PRINCIPATO of the USA. He would now proceed with the award of the FAI's most prestigious medal.

The award was for Mr Domina JALBERT (b. 1904), who was attracted by all things flying, gaining his pilot's licence in 1927. In the 1930s he began making advertising kites. He built a combined kite and balloon that he named the 'Kytoon'. Eventually he gained employment working on blimps and barrage balloons. Throughout the war years and into the 1950s, he spent his time on research and development of balloons, kite-balloons and parachutes. His efforts concerning parachutes were always directed towards improving the glide ratio. He realised that the way forward was to think of the canopy as a wing rather than a device for generating drag. His experience with inflated flexible forms combined with his parachute work led him to the elegant solution with which they were familiar today: the ram-air double surface, rectangular-planform wing with aerofoil-section fabric ribs. He had called it a Parafoil. This new wing flew for the first time in March 1964 and was patented in October of the same year. JALBERT had shown the way; the future would lie in refining his concept and adapting it for foot-launching. Today, the simplest and most popular forms of aviation – parachuting and paragliding – owed their success to JALBERT's design. Hundreds of thousands of pilots throughout the world flew under JALBERT's wing. It is high time for FAI to recognise his unique contribution to air sports and to award him its most prestigious award: the FAI Gold Air Medal. He invited Mr PRINCIPATO to receive the medal.

Roll Call

Mr LEINIKKI conducted the roll call.

There 35 active members present, 11 proxies. OSTIV + 10 ASCs.

Votes belonging to active members: 254. Proxies: 28. Affiliate member: 1. ASCs: 40. The total number of votes was 323. Absolute majority : 162. Two-thirds majority: 216. Absolute majority of active members: 142. Two-thirds majority of active members: 188.

Code of Ethics

The PRESIDENT said he had been approached by a number of people expressing concern about an incident that occurred at dinner the previous evening, involving Stéphane MALBOS.

He felt he must act because there had been a clear violation of the FAI Code of Ethics and of the CIVL's code of ethics, and he asked Mr MALBOS to leave the room for the day.

The PRESIDENT noted that there was a CIVL Vice-President present, who could take up the position if he so wished, in which case he would need to surrender his NAC vote.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that Commission presidents were present at the General Conference and had voting rights but could not get a proxy. NACs had voting rights and could hold

proxies. The question was whether Zejlko OVUKA from Serbia was representing the NAC, or if he wanted to represent CIVL.

Mr Zeljko OVUKA said that at this time he would like to represent CIVL.

Mr MONKS suggested that Serbia award a proxy to someone else and then take the Commission seat.

The PRESIDENT recorded that Serbia had given its proxy to Slovakia.

Ms Alicia HIRZEL said when they were in Bali and she was CASI president, she had also held the vote of Switzerland at the same time. This appeared to be a similar situation.

The PRESIDENT said that the only provision in the FAI Statutes stated that active members carried proxies. It looked like an error had been made in Bali.

The SECRETARY GENERAL said that the Commission was represented at the GC either by the Commission president or someone appointed from the Commission itself.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS thought that in Bali Ms HIRZEL had been acting president of CASI. Graham Windsor was president. This might explain the situation.

The PRESIDENT apologised to anyone affected by the incident the previous evening. An error had been made, and there was a normal, respectful way of drawing attention to it.

18. Executive Directors and RVP Reports

18.1. Executive Directors

Mr Agust GUDMUNDSSON explained about his role. He had worked with his NAC for many years, and at commission level he had been a member of the CIVL Bureau for 10 years, and president for four years before joining the EB. He was a competition organiser, and still organised three competitions a year in paragliding, microlight and general aviation. He was also active in flying in general aviation and ultralights. He had 300 hours on a hang glider, he flew paragliders and did home builds, and also built and flew drones. Because of his background in IT and new technology, this was his portfolio on the EB. He had been on the WAG coordination committee and in the One FAI working group, and he was a point of contact and support for the NACs of Asia. Although he was from Iceland, sometimes within a region it was better to have a neutral person to talk to, so this had worked very well. He was the point of contact and support for IPC, CIMA and ICARE. He wished to point out that the EB was not made up of people who knew nothing about sport. Most of the items on the agenda had been discussed on several occasions by the EB, in depth. One of the most important roles of the NACs at the GC was to speak up with suggestions, and the EB was here to listen. The EB continued to put forward new ideas to make the FAI more effective, and they welcomed all suggestions.

Mr DE ORLEANS BORBON wished to raise a very important issue. He had responsibility for the Women in FAI portfolio. His starting point had been to look for a woman who had proven success in this area, and he had found one: the president of the largest Italian gliding aero club. Margherita ACQUADERNI had for many years organised a women's flying day in Italy. She had found more people, and they now had a network of around 15 women all over the world in different air sports. They had held a lengthy first Zoom conference. This was clearly in the FAI's interests, because roughly half of the planet's population had no contact with air sports. The presence of women in air sports was very low. From a purely utilitarian point of view, FAI was missing at least half of its customer base. Another question they had asked was, why did women not come to FAI competitions? This was not at all clear. In most of the FAI Commissions, the community that made the rules was made up of men. One obvious suggestion was that the rules did not work for women. The FAI rules were devised to select the best competitors. Every ten or twenty years, they asked themselves the question, what did it mean to be the best? In gliding, in the 1930s this meant how many hours you could stay aloft. Once people started being able to stay aloft for 50 hours, they

realised this no longer worked. The next idea was how far you could go, and this also reached its logical conclusion. Twenty years later they had come up with today's idea, which was how fast they could go. This might or might not be of interest to women, but they had no way of knowing because they had never got women together in a room to ask them. This showed how deep the problem went. They were now looking into this. There were many other ancillary issues, such as a lack of adequate facilities for women. There was evidence that it could be the sum of small aggravations that led women to choose other activities. He hoped to have a more complete report next year.

Mr Peter ERIKSEN mentioned a scientific study that had been completed, which analysed the question of why there were so few women in air sports.

Ms Mary Anne STEVENS reminded the delegates that the EB members were also volunteers. One of her files this year had been to chair the One FAI working group. She was quite pleased that most of its members were present. She had worked with a colleague to inquire into a dispute between a NAC and an ASC. She had served on the Coordinating Committee for the WAG in Turkey. Zoom meetings took place at odd times of the day. She had continued to serve as the liaison with the Statutes Working Group. Her favourite responsibility in the past year had been in relation to the Commissions, where she had served as liaison with the Rotorcraft Commission, and she had enjoyed learning about a new sport, and she highly recommended it. She had also served as liaison for the newly reconstituted education commission and was excited about the possibilities for this Commission. There were many things that could be done as outreach from FAI, as education not only for young people but for many target audiences. She asked the NACs, if they had not identified a delegate, to consider doing so. It was an under-utilised resource of the FAI, and one benefit the FAI could provide, especially for smaller or newer NACs, to give them something they could take back to their members.

Mr AL-JAWINI explained that his main portfolio for the past year had been to find the best opportunities for allocating external sources of income. He had presented various projects to the Board, many of which were still under consideration. One of his projects had been to compare the FAI to various other similar organisations, and most of the organisations that functioned in a somewhat similar way generated significantly higher revenues from their membership. That did not imply that FAI would seek any additional membership fees – indeed he was opposed to that. Most of these organisations generated their revenues through individual, inexpensive memberships at \$10 or \$15 each, spread across a pool of hundreds of thousands of members. At the FAI level, over the years, even though they were 50 or 60 years older than many of these organisations, they had not taken the opportunity provided by the different locations of their annual GC to really increase awareness of their organisation, what it did and how to get involved. One area they had looked at was perhaps restructuring the way they conducted the business of the GC. As he had always said, the people who made the most profit from the GC were the hotels. No one in the city knew they were there. It would be good to open up and have at least one day for the public to come in and see what the FAI was about. FAI had history and knowledge at all levels of different air sports. Other potential projects included the level of membership revenue generated for FAI. Their commercial and other revenues represented less than 50%, while membership from the NACs represented over 50%. This was one of their core problems. They had to increase revenue from other sources. As they had all seen, the budget was tight. They could not keep slashing the budget to the point where it would be ineffective for them to serve the members of the organisation. The delegates would be informed over the coming months about other projects coming down the pipeline.

Ms Marina VIGORITO said she was excited about the new anti-doping group, which would be introduced later in the meeting. She was the EB point of contact for Europe, and she was happy that they had finalised a new MoU with an association doing a great job in terms of protection of air space, which in Europe was very congested. Drones might affect the air space available at a lower level. She was very happy to have three Commissions in her portfolio: FAI Environmental Commission, she was personally very concerned about the environment, so she really appreciated the job that this Commission was doing; plus Aeromodelling and her "home" Commission, IGC.

Mr ANANOV had an observation about the Executive Directors' reports. When he and other members had elected the new EB, he hoped they were choosing the best people who were

specifically capable of coping with the problems their organisation was experiencing. It was obvious to him that one of the major problems was finances and fundraising. It was the privilege of the President to assign EB members to specific portfolios. However, it looked like Mr ALIAWINI alone had been assigned the most important task of bringing in additional revenues. They had no results as far as this work was concerned. At this critical moment, he felt that all the Executive Directors should be concentrating on solving this most serious problem. He would like to see all the Executive Directors being more effective in this emerging task.

The PRESIDENT thanked Mr ANANOV for his comments.

18.2. RVP

See **ANNEX 25** and **26**.

The PRESIDENT noted that both Regional Vice-Presidents did tremendous work, providing support, contact and assistance. He acknowledged the work of Tengku ABDILLAH, who would regrettably be standing down from his role. The Airsports Federation of Asia (AFA) was now well established under the leadership of President Group Captain Tang and Secretary General Andy Chau. The AFA was ready to take over the baton to coordinate and support air sports development in East and South-East Asia. Mr ABDILLAH could feel rightly proud of the contributions he had made. Mr Ayed ALKASME was working for them in the Middle-East and North Africa.

Mr MACHULA asked if they could have access to the presentation of the 2018 finances, as discussed previously, ahead of the discussion of the 2020 budget.

The PRESIDENT noted that the presentation was not ready because the focus of the organisation was on the GC and there had not been time to extract it. A promise had been made that the information would be made available if he made contact with Head Office to receive it. He reminded the GC that they were adopting the audited accounts of the organisation, which had been scrutinised by auditors. One would not routinely reopen those accounts. Certainly, questions relating to what had occurred within those accounts could be explored. This was not, however, the forum in which that could be done. Those questions could be put to Head Office, which would be happy to assist.

Mr Ayed ALKASME (Regional Vice-President, Middle East and North Africa) noted that there were 19 countries in the Middle-East and North Africa region, 14 of which were active members of the FAI. The challenges they faced in MENA countries were mainly related to unavailability of air space and security concerns around drones. There was also a lack of promotion of air sports in the region, and insufficient competitions. The main air sports were general aviation, gliding and paramotors.

Mr Tengku ABDILLAH (Regional Vice President, East and South-East Asia) took this opportunity to thank FAI for giving him the trust and opportunity to serve the FAI in the region of East and South-East Asia. He wished to highlight a few items from his report. He felt it would benefit the NACs and the FAI to understand more about each other. He suggested that this kind of summit should be held more frequently, perhaps twice a year. He would be leaving at the end of the year, having served FAI for seven years under three different presidents and two secretaries-general. He expressed his appreciation to the FAI PRESIDENT, SECRETARY GENERAL, EB and Head Office staff for all their support. He also thanked the NACs of East and South-East Asia.

Ms Nouf ALNAMI explained that she worked in the Saudi Arabia ballooning federation. Saudi Arabia had opened for tourism, and she wished to highlight one specific destination: Al-Ula in northwest Saudi Arabia was a vast area of spectacular landscapes and thousands of years of heritage. To soar above it was an extraordinary experience. Earlier in the year, the Saudi Arabian Ballooning Federation had moved its headquarters to Al-Ula and scores of ballooners had gone to Al-Ula for the balloon festival, one of the highlights of the winter cultural season. The next festival would be in January. She showed a video of the event. The Al-Ula commission was also building state-of-the-art conference facilities, and she would be happy to provide more information to anyone who was interested in learning more.

18.3. Anti-Doping

Ms VIGORITO noted that as she had been appointed to this portfolio just one month earlier, the report would be presented by the FAI Anti-Doping Manager, Ms Ségolène ROUILLON.

Ms Ségolène ROUILLON introduced her presentation on the FAI's fight for clean sport. She explained the anti-doping structure within the FAI, and its relations with other international anti-doping organisations such as WADA and the ITA. She gave information about the FAI's testing programme, both in- and out-of-competition. She noted that the National Anti-Doping Organisation of any country could also conduct testing at FAI events.

She explained the purpose of Therapeutic Use Exemptions (TUE) and the procedure for applying for them. She urged the NACs to spread the message to their athletes that applying for a TUE took just a few minutes, whereas an adverse finding could result in a four-year suspension. WADA was now placing great emphasis on education.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS had some information from a competition that had taken place in Greece in March, where a competitor had made the comment that he had no problem with doping controls, because it meant that they were now a sport.

Ms ROUILLON added that it not only showed they were part of the sports community, it also showed that the athletes were considered elite.

Mr Jürgen LEUKEFELD noted that athletes did not always understand what substances they were supposed to be taking, in order to improve their performance. He asked how many positive doping cases they had had in air sports. Was doping actually an issue in the FAI?

Mrs ROUILLON said that since she had been in her role they had had two cases of adverse analytical findings.

The PRESIDENT noted that this information was then used in talks with WADA to explain the risks in aviation sports and discuss how much testing should be done. He pointed out that not all the testing Mr LEUKEFELD had been exposed to necessarily came from the FAI. The German NADO had its own testing programme.

Mr MOZER thanked Ms ROUILLON for all her work. He asked if an athlete applied for a TUE and it was refused, was there an appeal process?

Ms ROUILLON said that she would have to check the rules, but in past cases a refusal had been followed by discussion and communication.

Mrs Marina VIGORITO said that an Italian pilot had experienced this situation in Italy. The pilot simply changed his medication.

19. ONE FAI and Open Forum

19.1. ONE FAI

19.2. FAI 2020 – Refreshing FAI

See **ANNEX 27** and **28**.

The PRESIDENT noted that the ONE FAI outcomes had probably frustrated everyone. The Chair and working group members were not overly satisfied. He nevertheless thanked them all, particularly Ms Mary Anne STEVENS, for their dedication to a difficult task, especially when they were given insufficient guidance, in his opinion, as to the outcomes expected. This was partly his fault, as he did not know the working group had no terms of reference, and had not taken steps to remedy the situation when he became aware. However, the workshops in 2017 and 2018, and subsequent work by the working group had yielded results that would be built on to move the FAI into the future. From the ONE FAI workshops they knew that they needed to work on communication, decision-making and sporting licences. Two specific projects had made good progress. The NAC handbook would be shared in its final version soon, and he thanked Bengt LINDGREN and everyone else involved. The

work on sporting licences had been developed to inform the work that would be covered under items 21 and 22. He referred to the paper distributed in November: FAI 2020: Refreshing the FAI.

Everyone acknowledged that the FAI should focus on “selecting the best of the best”, which was something it did well. In 2015 a survey had been conducted to determine why people engaged with air sports. It was important to understand what differentiated air sports from other sports, and the key words mentioned were “freedom”, “inspiring” and “thrilling”. There was now a need to identify what the FAI should look like, in order to be able to deliver in the future the outcomes desired for the organisation, coupled with the ability to finance those activities. They could now build on the work already done under the ONE FAI banner.

The work was larger than sorting out the financial stability of the FAI. It was also larger than the proposals from ONE FAI to strengthen communications and decision-making between the EB and Commission presidents.

On Tuesday a meeting had taken place with the Commission presidents, followed by a meeting with the NAC presidents. The purpose was to start exploring a constructive discussion on what the key elements of an FAI structure might be for the future. From his own perspective, he felt that both meetings had been very positive, and there were thoughtful contributions that had paved the way for the FAI 2020 project and in some ways overtaken what he had already prepared. Some potential outcomes discussed might well be able to be implemented in very short order, and he would do so. FAI 2020 needed to consider the role of the members, the role of the Commissions but also the role of bodies like CASI, Statutes Working Group and the overall governance of the organisation. The PRESIDENT was starting this work, and he was looking for the GC to identify suitable candidates to work on this project. He had circulated draft terms of reference. He had received some very thoughtful and valuable feedback on the draft, which would be used to guide the decisions on suitable nominees. Once he had a group of people to work on the project, the core terms of reference would be finalised. He suggested they have a strategy group which would be primarily responsible for the outcomes, then a reference group to provide assistance. The suggested timelines still applied, but he was mindful that now they might need just a single group of people, given that they had made more progress in the last two days than he had anticipated. He expected the work would result in structural and functional changes to the organisation for the future. He asked them to think about who would be able to devote a significant amount of time in the next few months to ensuring that they asked the right questions of the right people, and created an environment where they understood what the Commissions and NACs wanted to be delivered by the central body. A good point that had come through from the recent meetings was that everyone saw value in having an organisation called FAI. The question was how big it should be, and what exactly it should do. He would appreciate receiving some nominations in the near future.

This project formed the core of the internal work they needed to achieve in 2020, which would determine the scope, shape and size of the FAI and the capabilities required in the office. The delivery of a competent budget for 2021, with revised income streams, clarity about required outcomes and potentially a redefined decision-making process, would hinge on the FAI being able to continue to function in 2020.

Mr MONKS noted that there were some existing initiatives proposed for this year. As this project provided for a full review, would the FAI continue with the current projects or stop at the end of the year? He was referring to Statute changes, for example.

The PRESIDENT noted that one Statutes Working Group proposal would be taken off the table at the request of CASI. He saw no significant reason to withdraw any of the other proposals.

19.3. Regulating Air Sports and the position of air sports in Russia

Mr Ronald SCHNITKER had some information about what had happened after the signing of the manifesto reserving air space access for air sports, one year ago in Luxor. Shortly after the conference in Luxor he had attending the meeting of the European air sports in Vienna. He had informed the meeting about the manifesto, which had been very positively received. He had also attended the EASA annual safety conference, which had the promising subtitle “A vision for the

future of general aviation”. He had also taken the opportunity to inform the staff and members of EASA about the FAI manifesto, and to present his book. EASA had said the book was of great importance for aviation, and there had been a proposal to strengthen contact between EASA and FAI. During the EASA conference he had heard some other interesting voices. The director of aviation for the EU Commission had said they must ensure that everyone could use the same air space safely. Another delegate had said that this was possible if air space was used flexibly by anyone who needed to temporarily use a certain area, saying that air traffic controllers must stop claiming air space to handle their own commercial or military traffic. A German delegate had mentioned that glider pilots in Germany were able to use airports when they were not being used by commercial traffic, and he did not understand why this had not already been implemented elsewhere in Europe. The conclusion of the conference was that general aviation should make use of the same airspace as commercial and military aviation. There was a need to integrate all users into one shared airspace.

At the Luxor conference, the members had been asked to share the manifesto with governments and institutes. He had presented it to the head of air traffic control in the Netherlands and the minister of infrastructure. He hoped other members had taken similar steps. However, if only a few had responded this would be disappointing.

EASA had expressed a desire to reach out and work with the FAI. He did not know if FAI wanted to do that, and who in the organisation would pick it up. It was now up to the Board to decide how to proceed further.

Ms OSINGA noted that Mr SCHNITKER had mentioned cooperation with EASA and other institutions. On behalf of CIMP she wanted to say they had good contacts with EASA and ICAO.

Mr ANANOV said that since he had been elected president of the Russian NAC he had been working on one major subject, which was to define the proper place of sport aviation within the Russian civil aviation regulations. In Russia, air sports suffered from over-regulation. As a consequence, they were often involved with traffic authorities, sport authorities, police, prosecutors etc. For many years the state regulator of civil aviation in terms of registration, certification, airworthiness etc. was the transport ministry. As a result, the requirements for sports aviation were basically the same as for other types of civil aviation, such as large transport airlines. It was obvious that a commercial airliner and a sports aircraft could not be approached in the same way. For this reason, he was lobbying hard for radical changes to the air code in Russia. He wanted to introduce into law the definition of a sport aircraft, to exclude it from regulation as a means of transport. The same applied to the concept of “sporting flight”. Alongside these, it was possible a concept of “sport aviation” was needed, which should be governed not by the ministry of transport but by the ministry of sport. Russia’s regulatory framework provided for three types of aviation: civil, state and experimental. In his opinion, measures were needed to radically deregulate sports aviation, and transfer responsibility to the ministry of sport. In the future, the sports ministry would be able to delegate some of their rights as regulator to sports organisations. He explained all this in the hope that there were some present who would be able to share with him their experience dealing with a similar situation in their own countries.

Mr DE ORLEANS BORBON wished to comment on Mr SCHNITKER’s presentation. Everyone had heard about the crusade of Greta Thunberg which, whatever their thoughts about it, was a strong and broad movement. He left them with the thought that taxing air space was a lucrative use of something that was in the public domain. However, the concept of “flight shame” was becoming more prevalent, and they could think about making the point that controlled air space was polluting and should be minimised.

Mr Samir RAOUF said he agreed with what Mr ANANOV had said, and he was very concerned. His country faced the same problem. They were now revising all the regulations controlling air sports, under which a glider was considered the same as a Boeing 747. He recommended that the FAI regulations committee be revived. They could stipulate a standard regulation, so that any NAC that wanted to convince their civil aviation authority would have the FAI reference.

Mr Rolf RADESPIEL had a comment about air sports regulations as they concerned gliding in particular. These discussions had been ongoing for several years, including with one of the major

certification authorities, the EASA. There had been a years-long exchange about this problem, which had led to a major policy change within EASA. He was happy to communicate the state of affairs with any interested person from other countries. A great deal had happened within the gliding community, together with EASA and sailplane manufacturers, including matters related to gliding operations and licencing of pilots.

The PRESIDENT said this would be very valuable.

Mr MONKS wished to remind people that much of this work had been done with EASA over the last 15 years or so. Historically, everything the FAI wanted to do in terms of regulation in Europe should be done through EASA. The reason was that Europe Air Sports knew what was happening and had agreements in place. If FAI were to try to cut across that it could be damaging rather than creating benefit. EASA was their representative on regulatory matters in Europe.

20. FAI Budget 2020

20.1. Scale of subscriptions for 2020

See **ANNEX 29**.

Mr WEBER noted that much had lately been said and written about FAI's economic success and financial management. Prior to this GC the members had been provided with a lot of information to allow them to form their own opinions. This report should help to answer the remaining questions. Very wise and intelligent people had provided input and counsel, and most were convinced that they held the right answers already. He welcomed honest advice and good will, and people were right in some areas, and their views fit into a cohesive larger vision, which was now being developed with the FAI 2020 initiative. As a side note, he did not welcome alternative facts or truths, and rumours spread by not-so-wise and not-so-intelligent people, resulting in misinformation of the members and air sport persons at large. This was a quality in the relationship with members and ASCs not seen by him in the last 50 years he had been involved with FAI. He sincerely regretted what was happening.

In the course of this year, since the last GC in Luxor, the FAI had had several experiences they could have done without. They did not affect this year's finances, but they would heavily impact the next and following years. When he had told the members last year that the financial situation was critical, he was not aware how critical it would become in 2019. Indeed, the three-year contract for the World Drone Racing Championships in China had been terminated, effective 31 December 2019. The WAG 2022 had had to be cancelled. For many years the FAI had been relying on what he called 'high-risk commercial revenue' to supplement its two main streams of revenue – subscriptions and air sports events. No commercial revenue sources had been secured in the medium to long term. It was a fact that their products, with a few exceptions, were not yet ready for the sports industry. The FAI had learned this at its own expense. Big efforts had been made to secure additional commercial revenue, but unfortunately they had been unsuccessful. Efforts to commercialise existing Cat 1 events continued to fail because the FAI was unable to consistently control the events in a way that made them interesting for commercial partners. As a consequence, and if they wished to move on and to develop the FAI for future challenges, they now absolutely needed to generate temporary new revenue to bridge the forecasted lack of revenue between now and 2021-22, when sustainable revenue avenues were being planned for. The budget for 2020 that they would now discuss took this lack of revenue into account and was nevertheless a balanced budget. However, it was balanced only because they assumed that huge efforts could be provided by Head Office and by the FAI members. It would be a nice example of solidarity in hard times. As they all knew, many FAI members were faced with sometimes agonising reductions in membership and revenue, and it was a myth to believe this would not affect FAI. Subscription fees revenue had been decreasing and would continue to do so. For this reason, it was proposed to have a new FAI subscription scheme based on individual FAI sports IDs – sporting licences – which would generate reduced subscription fees for the members and additional revenue for FAI. The GC would be asked to approve these principles later today. Relying solely on direct membership revenue to assure the level of services required by the

members and ASCs was not enough. They needed to find other ways to generate more revenues if they wanted to maintain and develop their present high level of quality service to the air sports community.

Anaemic revenues also sidelined medium- and long-term considerations at the expense of short-term fixes and narrow advantages for members or ASCs. However, these considerations would not affect next year's subscriptions, which would remain the same as this year. He asked the President to invite the General Conference to approve the 2020 scale of subscriptions as presented.

The SECRETARY GENERAL referred to the scale of subscriptions as provided to the conference delegates. The total amount would be CHF 951,456. There was a difference of CHF 5,600 from the 2020 budget.

The PRESIDENT noted that, as has been mentioned many times, this was an established process of determining subscriptions. It was presented before the budget because, if the members did not agree on the scale of subscriptions, there would have no income in the budget.

Mr LEUKEFELD asked if there was any variation from previous years' subscription fees.

The PRESIDENT replied that the scale of subscriptions had remained the same since 2012. Since then external income had been used to protect the members from subscription increases, when in fact they should have been increasing membership subscriptions, at least in line with inflation. The value of the Swiss franc also had an impact on individual countries because of the exchange rate.

Mr ANANOV noted that they would subsequently be discussing the budget, and it would be difficult to see where expenditure could be cut. There were many suggestions for increasing revenues, and he agreed with most of them. But he did disagree completely with one of the key suggestions and he had an alternative suggestion for how to generate more money, rather than making this radical decision about the sporting licences. This might be a good time to reconsider the suggestion made one year ago, which at the time the members had rejected because they did not realise how bad the situation was, to increase subscription fees by 10%.

The PRESIDENT clarified that Mr ANANOV was proposing an amendment to the scale of subscriptions, to increase them by 10%. He asked if there was a seconder for the proposal.

Mr MACHULA seconded the motion.

The PRESIDENT opened the discussion on increasing the subscription fees by 10%.

Mr MACHULA wished to point out that the cost of living had apparently decreased in Switzerland by four points.

The PRESIDENT said he had been informed that this was not correct. He urged the delegates, if they were going to use numbers, to ensure they were correct.

Mr MACHULA said he fully supported Mr ANANOV's proposal, or even a higher increase. However, as he had mentioned last year in Luxor, he believed there first had to be some cuts, and value for the subscription fee they were paying.

The PRESIDENT said that reductions were being proposed in the budget. For example, they had removed from the 2020 budget anything that flowed outside the organisation, i.e. anything that did not add value directly to the members, to ensure they focused on the work they needed to do as per the Statutes, as opposed to work that was nice to do to support decisions made in previous years with a view to try to create commercial opportunities.

Mr LEUKEFELD noted that, when discussing changing the membership fees, they should keep in mind what had brought FAI into this financial situation. In his opinion, it was producing advertisements for the sport, producing movies, pictures etc., and taking the GC to places where there was almost no air sport such as Asia etc., This was intended to promote the whole of air sport. The expenditure for that, and the consequent risk, should be borne by the widest possible base, which was not the small community of those who attended international championships, and spent a lot of time and a great deal of money to help the sport, which was the lifeblood of FAI. In his opinion it must be borne by all the members equally. He had read the financial review and outlook, and he

had been happy to see that the arbitration fee for world records was now split into three classes, with a higher fee for those operating in a commercial environment. They were now proposing a spread from CHF 300 to CHF 3,000, for those who used a 50-tonne device to set a sporting record. The behaviour that had brought FAI to this financial disaster had been done to promote all the air sports, especially those that were living in those parts of the planet where there was no air sports. They could not be excluded from resolving the situation. It was not the task of the air sports persons that ran the sport to bear the burden. He was against the additional fee on the sporting licences and he was against a tax on the sanction fee collected from international championships, because those were issues that were part of the statutory requirements for FAI. FAI's finances were fed by membership fees and any other income. In his opinion, a tax was not an income. They must first have income to raise a tax. He supported raising the subscription fees by 10%.

Mr PRINCIPATO said he was torn on this proposal. One reason they were talking about this was because the USA had gone from Class 1 to 2. He saw that as part of the risk they took with an organisation such as this. In the end he would reluctantly end up voting in favour of the proposal.

Mr RAOUF said he was against the idea of cutting parts of expenditure here or there. He thought they should make the expenditure more efficient, to cover their needs. The FAI had a very good product. Yesterday they had heard that, in hang-gliding alone, 300 competitions had taken place. They should find a way of selling these products to the media. This was the only way they could really improve their income, in a way that served air sports. He was in favour of the proposal.

Mr SZIKORA said he felt the scale of subscriptions was poorly designed from the outset. A very slight difference in membership numbers could mean a big difference in the fee to the FAI. It was a very coarse process, and the jumps between levels were too significant, which added risk to the organisation because the budget could swing significantly, just by a couple of countries changing their numbers. He thought they needed to give the Board enough time to review all the matters they wanted to do as part of the FAI 2020 process. It was nevertheless important to understand the maths. A 10% increase in the scale was only CHF 90,000. The fee alone on the licences was projected to be over CHF 200,000. They should not think of it as either/or. A 10% increase would not eliminate all the other changes, and all the other proposals would have to be adjusted as a result.

Mr MONKS said that the UK acknowledged that over the years, with all clubs, subscriptions should go up by inflation at least, as a matter of course. All clubs that did not would run into problems at some stage, and they would have to make a large adjustment. No one wanted that. As far as the subscription increase was concerned for the FAI, he believed there should be one. However, there were various other proposals in the paper that would need to be discussed, and he hoped they would have an overall rather than a line-by-line discussion. At the moment he did not support voting on subscription increases because he would prefer to discuss the overall value of the budget.

Mr LINTL said he supported the proposal, because as a Commission it did not affect him. As Mr Monks had said, over time they had experienced inflation, and as an employee he would never accept his income not being raised in line with inflation over a nine-year period. 10% was in fact far below what it needed to be. He understood Mr Monks' view that they should discuss the whole picture, but as the proposal was on the table he supported it.

Mr Yves BURKHARDT noted that, since 2010, inflation as published by the Swiss government was 0.6%. He supported all the ideas he had heard and hoped they could discuss everything first and then take a decision.

The PRESIDENT invited Mr ANANOV to respond.

Mr ANANOV thanked everyone for discussing the proposal. As he understood it, everyone who had taken the floor was in favour except for Mr MONKS, who had said he was not yet ready to vote. His suggestion was, if possible, to postpone the voting until they had discussed the cuts proposed in the budget.

The PRESIDENT said he could accept this proposal to postpone the vote on the amendment if Mr MACHULA, as seconder, accepted it.

Mr MACHULA agreed.

20.2. FAI Budget 2020

See **ANNEXES 30 to 33.**

The PRESIDENT said that the budget they were about to discuss had probably had the greatest scrutiny of any budget ever presented to a conference. The project he wanted to drive, FAI 2020, was always going to happen. The financial pressure they were now under made it imperative they achieve that in the short term, make it thorough, precise, positive, and have innovative proposals ready to present next year. This was the time for everyone to be involved. He thanked the members for the conversation they had just had, because it showed they were involved. They needed to ensure the organisation survived and was able to go forward to thrive. There was thus a lot of focus on the budget, and he knew it had caused concern. The proposals that had been put forward had been worked on for some time by the EB and shared with everyone in the finance paper. A great deal of effort had gone into trying to be careful about what was done.

Her referred to the principles applied to the preparation of the budget. They had stopped using central reserves. In the past they had used central reserves that were actually allocated for sports development. No allowance would be made for future income through sponsorship until they had a signed contract. Serious discussions were now taking place, but they were not locked in and therefore could not be counted. Income and expenditure around the Commissions was taken as provided. Something they needed more clarity on in the future was the activities taken on by the FAI office and how they supported which parts of the organisation. There would always be overlaps. Finally, anything beyond the statutory requirements had to be covered by matching external income. They had done their best to remove everything the members had expressed concern within connection with the audited accounts from 2018.

To prepare the 2020 budget they had taken the axe to the 2019 budget to make it a balanced budget for the year. Further reductions had been applied to the 2020 budget, which the SECRETARY GENERAL would explain. The current administration costs had been reviewed line by line in the EB. The budget they presented had been reduced to the absolute minimum for the organisation as it was currently structured. Because of the shortfall between membership subscriptions and the minimum budget that the Board believed was reasonable, there were some proposals for one-time, temporary increases in revenue. They could cut and slash now, reduce capability and staffing levels, however, that could cause untold damage to the operational capability of the organisation. The end result could be a loss of knowledge and expertise, and potentially, further along, increased costs to bring on and train new staff. He hoped they would be able to work through the FAI 2020 programme and revisit the entire organisation, then make sure they structured income to support that.

To quote the UK Royal Aero Club's correspondence with FAI, "*FAI cannot continue to sustain such losses, and for the FAI to succeed in the future the financial situation needs to be reviewed now and for the long term. All bodies of FAI have to take responsibility.*" They were also doing due diligence on the financial health of the organisation. An independent, external, review of the financial situation had been provided to the SECRETARY GENERAL. The summary was: "*Measures should be taken to guarantee the medium- and long-term going concern of the FAI, whereas no issues were perceived in the short term.*" In other words, they were nowhere near insolvency, but they did need to move, because every year they delayed pushed them closer to that possibility.

The proposed initiatives included making the work in the office more efficient, making the way the members worked more efficient, and reducing the complexity of the organisation. The need for a leaner budget was linked to the requirement to review and reshape the FAI. This project included the proposed changes to the sporting licence, which helped drive a new subscription scheme. As an aside, during the lunch break, one member had shared a completely alternative way of running a membership subscription scheme that looked like it had value for FAI. That would now become part of the investigation of FAI 2020.

His deep concern was that they would get the order of the changes wrong and make cuts without understanding the wider consequences. He urged the members to think very carefully about facilitating the FAI 2020 project by adopting the budget the Board had put together. That would give

them nine months in which to reshape the organisation and the financial situation with certainty and clarity.

Mr SZIKORA asked, before going to a vote, if they could take a few minutes to entertain questions that were simply clarifications.

The PRESIDENT asked if it would be useful to run through the budget presentation and then take comments.

Mr WEBER noted that trying to forge new policies was very difficult and, despite their best efforts to invite the members to participate prior to the GC, they had very little success. He hoped that the FAI 2020 project would remedy this lack of participation. However, little about the FAI was simple. It tended to move very slowly, with shifts creeping forwards over years. NACs could feel like different universes, and it was tricky to identify common trends and, even more, to anticipate them. If the EB's proposed remedies were refused, would the present economic shortcomings cause a near-death experience? Would it harden the mood against integration and increase divergencies? Would FAI enter the 2020s as a more hard-nosed figure with a patchwork of shared interests? Or would the FAI enter 2020 in one piece, but divided and less relevant? These were important questions. If the EB's proposed budget was approved then the more positive, optimistic way forward to a multi-tier structure in which overlapping and concentric circles of stakeholders could be better operate could be envisaged. Different coalitions of the willing might emerge to do different things. Would the members choose to only support efforts to ease the process of decline, or would they choose to support efforts to promote vigorous reforms that would boost growth? Or would the FAI become more realistic about the difficult choices it faced, and therefore strive towards the more optimistic of these two scenarios? Would the FAI use this crisis to push it forward? He sincerely wished and hoped so, because FAI's muddled complexity was fortunately matched by its simple virtues. It remained the largest cluster of people striving to enjoy air sports. Unfortunately, the average IQ of the leadership seemed to be deteriorating, as they had seen that morning. When an NAC president did not like the ASCs' plenary decisions, he simply ignored and changed them. The quality of governance was collapsing. These were harsh words but they must be said. Future financial developments must include, as part of the FAI 2020 project, a view of current financial procedures in FAI, including the ASCs, which were very complex, time-consuming and lacking transparency. They had different reimbursement procedures, different currencies, different policies regarding event bidding and payment of deposits, sanction fees, entry fees, non-use of rights at events, etc. The dissonance could hardly be more flagrant. FAI strategies and policies as approved by the General Conference had always been adhered to, and continuing and increased efforts to improve the FAI's situation had been made. The budget for 2020 that was proposed for adoption today had been examined and approved line by line by the EB to identify expenditures not related to the core services that they had to provide. Any non-essential or "nice to have" items had been eliminated. Resources were becoming stretched, and without the proposed measures being adopted, the HO resources necessary to successfully master all the challenges would be severely impaired, and several projects would be negatively affected. They were faced with a large deficit, and therefore the EB had decided to not only propose consequent expenditure reduction, but to also propose to temporarily increase income through new measures. These would be his closing words as FAI Finance Director: please stop chasing the money, and start chasing the passion again.

The SECRETARY GENERAL presented some slides that had already been discussed and approved in the EB. Their purpose was to walk through the annexes the members had received and explain more of the detail behind them. Since the FAI budget was complex, for the procedure and discussion afterwards they had agreed that she and Mrs Stevens would track possible agreed budget positions for the Head Office and Commissions columns, so that they always had an updated net result.

She began with a reminder of what was currently and for next year covered by FAI HO: finance and control, sports and events, including records and management around Cat 1 and 2 events, communication (which would be reduced to the statutory requirements), administration and members, including anti-doping, IT, running the FAI sporting licence database, helping to get the officials database on board, running the central FAI database, and resources for overall team support.

The next slide showed FAI general administration costs and their development over the last 10 years. It showed that some developments did indeed contribute to the increase of administration costs. For instance, depreciation had grown, because they had invested in IT tools, which were used by the air sports community and FAI. However, these tools also helped the FAI to operate. There was also an increase in general administration and management fees, which was related to the fees they had to pay for bookkeeping, audit support and legal fees. Legal fees had increased because they had more cases where professional legal advice was needed. Against that, revenues showed a decrease in membership subscriptions over the years, and sponsorship income had not been sustainable. Commissions' income and expenditure were separate, and the next slide showed income vs expenses over the years. Over the last three years, investments had been made, which had been covered by the special reserves, but that needed to be looked at in the FAI 2020 process.

Looking at the updated budget 2019, expenses had already been cut this year to be able to balance the budget, as reported in the financial situation as of October. The second column showed the draft budget as it had been sent to the members on 23 September. The net result for the year 2020 was CHF 8,552.

The SECRETARY GENERAL said she would go into more detail and provide more background information on how the decisions from the EB about the 2020 budget were reflected in the line items.

The next slide showed part of the overall budget, representing only those lines that were relevant because there were significant reductions in expenses. For marketing and communication, activities had been significantly reduced, including printing of the annual report. Operating expenses (which was not part of administration expenses) referred to meeting costs, travel and accommodation, subsidies for ASC plenary meetings when they took place in Lausanne, and development programmes. This had been reduced basically to zero, which meant that, for its meeting costs in 2020, the EB had a budget of only CHF 10,000.

Under administration expenses, there was a reduction in salaries as a result of one staff member leaving. They had reviewed all elements on what could be done, but had to acknowledge that, since the WAG activities were now in question, they had to change one proposal regarding the relocation of part of the staff budget. This would secure operation for 2020. A small reduction had been achieved in general administration expenses. One provider for IT management had been changed, with a reduction in expenses. The depreciation amounts had been updated and special projects had been reduced. The remainder mainly comprised anti-doping and member services for IT matters, which should not be cut at the moment.

It was important to acknowledge that for the competition areas, the WAG was still included. The decision to terminate the organiser agreement was very fresh. The only effect that had to be taken into consideration for the budget 2020 was whether the EB proposal to include income from the sanction fee would be accepted or not and if it was realistic or not. Income and expenses were the same. If the activities did not take place there was no money to be spent and no income. Termination of the WAG was irrelevant regarding income and expenses, because if there were no activities there would be no costs. They had also taken the bold step of saying they would not put into the budget any income or expenses regarding the World Drone Racing Championship, because the experience from the past two years had shown that they should not be accounting for this income if they did not have a signed organiser agreement. This also meant that the sanction fee income recorded for this year was missing as income for next year. There was a change in the line "FAI – Other Events" – this was related to the fact that this was the cost line for the Red Bull Air Race safety delegates, which were covered by the respective income. There were no changes in bank interest and management fees. The EB had reviewed this in detail and there was no possibility of making any changes.

Looking now at income proposals, there was income of CHF 255,000 from the proposal to have a one-time sporting licence registration fee. There was a proposal to increase the fees for the Air Sport Medal from CHF 100 to 200. This would generate extra income of CHF 5,000. There was an EB proposal to have a one-time administration fee of 20% on the respective sanction fees of all the Commissions for events awarded in 2020, assuming that there would be around 20 awarded at an

average amount of around CHF 1,000. The sanction fees across the Commissions varied from CHF 500 up to CHF 6,000. The next proposal was to change the payment schedule for the WAG sanction fee. The payment was planned for 2022, but they had taken it into account for 2020. However, the situation had now changed. A decision had been taken not to reinvest dividends from share income but, for 2020, to take the dividends as cash. Lastly, they had changed the pricing scheme for record claims. The current fee across all records was CHF 200 per claim. They proposed to increase the fee to CHF 300 for the “classic” air sports, increase the fee for records in the categories General Aviation Aircraft above 3 tonnes to CHF 1,000, and point-to-point records set with commercial aeroplanes would cost CHF 2,000. The total amount, calculated on the basis of the 2019 numbers, was CHF 82,600.

The next slide showed the budget, identifying the two separate areas of Head Office and Commissions. For HO there were two changes. One significant change was the reduction in staff costs to CHF 990,000, making an amount of CHF 50,000 not accounted for in the budget that members had received in September. They had identified a minor deviation regarding membership subscriptions. The September budget had showed CHF 957,000 and the correct amount was CHF 951,000. The budget currently showed a positive net result of CHF 52,000. The second column showed Commission activities overall, and the members had received the detailed budgets per Commission. The principle was that the Commissions accounted for income and expenses. Different Commissions had different policies, for example regarding who paid officials’ expenses at events. The net result was shown at the end. Every time there was a negative result, it would be covered by their respective special reserves.

Mr Pierre PORTMANN spoke as FAI President of Honour and former President for three mandates. Like all those present, he had been shocked to hear, a few weeks ago, about the great financial difficulties of the FAI. Over the last two days they had learned more about the situation, including that there would be no World Air Games, which was an important source of revenue. He was convinced that important and quick decisions had to be made, here today, by the NACs and ASCs. Certain temporary measures had been proposed by the President and his board, and at the 2020 GC there would many even more important decisions to be made. They had to get the finances right for the FAI in 2020. This meant not huge profits, but a sound situation once again, and ideas for 2021 and 2022. This situation could not be supported any more, and they had to stand together to get things in order. They should give great thanks to the President, because he had agreed last year to become President in what was already a very difficult situation. The FAI also could not work without the Commissions, or without good office people. They could not allow the old lady to collapse because they were incapable of standing together to save one of the oldest world sports federations. He asked the members to make the right decision today to get them through 2020.

Mr SZIKORA thanked the SECRETARY GENERAL for her excellent presentation, which had answered all the line-item questions he had. He now realised how bad it was. On the expense side he saw no problem with any proposal, and he saw no more fat to be cut. If they took all the revenue increases proposed together, decided instead just to increase subscriptions, it would require a 44% increase. If they removed just one of those items, the fee on sporting licences, that alone was the equivalent of a 27% increase in subscriptions. This put Mr ANANOV’s proposal in context, because a 10% increase did nothing to eliminate these other proposals, although it did help. In response to the Finance Director, who had taken a lot of effort to mould together a number of decreases and increases to make a balanced budget, what was missing in the proposal from the EB was the effect it had on individual NACs. Every NAC was organised differently, so the effect of these specific line item increases would hit them differently. He knew Russia issued around 4,000 sporting licences, which meant that one line item increase of CHF 15 meant a CHF 60,000 impact on Russia, which was impossible. Canada issued around 135 licences a year, so that increase would be small enough for the NAC to absorb. The same applied to a 10% increase in fees. Each country would be affected differently, whether it was an increase in subscriptions or user fees. He could comfortably support the Board proposal as written because he had done the calculations on how it affected Canada and it was reasonable to Canada. But he recognised that others in the room had valid concerns about that type of proposal. The question was how they could compromise. He agreed with the impassioned plea made by Mr PORTMANN: they had to solve the problem here and now.

Mr ANANOV wished to speak first not as NAC president but as head of the former finance advisory group. To his mind it had all happened five years ago, in Rotterdam in 2015, when a new sports and marketing strategy, including the air games event series, had been introduced. The members had supported it. Russia had been a strong supporter because they really considered it a breakthrough. The General Conference had accepted the risk, and had established the finance advisory group to monitor the situation and progress. In the first year his report had been quite positive. In the second year, he had warned the GC of the problems. In the third year he had been quite negative about the results, and the group had been terminated. As he understood it, what the FAI had gained from that exercise had been some promotional materials, but no commercial revenues. They should work hard to use those materials to raise funds. That three-year period, when they had had the credit of trust from the members, had ended. Federation expenses should be limited to basic needs for administering the federation. In his mind, the membership fees, the standard income component of the budget, should be equal to the operational costs of administering the federation. All other revenues could be used for promotional purposes. Development could be realised only with extra revenues. He supported all the proposals from the EB with one exception: the sporting licence registration fee. They had talked a lot about minimising the cost of sporting licences, which should be at minimum cost or free of charge, to make it easy for people to enter the sport. The proposal went completely against this. The 3,000+ sporting licences that Russia gave to its members were free of charge. Many people went over the heads of the organisations and practised sport on their own. They did not understand what the NACs and FAI brought them. If they added an additional financial barrier to entry for those people, it would take them in the opposite direction. Russia, having issued the licences free of charge, would now be in contradiction with themselves. If they chose to accept a 10% increase in membership fees this would provide an additional CHF 90,000. The gap of CHF 140,000 could be closed by making more cuts.

Capt. MATHUR agreed with Mr SZIKORA that there was nothing more they could do to trim costs at the moment. However, in their earnestness to fill the gaps they were likely to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. He completely supported the sporting licence part. All he suggested was that this go through the NACs. The FAI had a database with the number of sporting IDs issued through the year, and each NAC could be invoiced for that amount. The amount could be debated, but this would also help to address the Indian NAC's concern over misuse of the easy availability of sporting licences. Regarding the record fee proposal, he thought there was a presumption that any commercial airline route record being claimed was funded by the airline. This was not true, it was paid for by the crew, and CHF 2,000 would kill that goose that laid the golden egg. He had four similar records and he could not afford to pay CHF 8,000. He thought all the records should remain at the same level. He would also welcome the views of other NACs. He added that this act of attempting and breaking records on a commercial airline route or a recognised course was also a way of encouraging other air crews to participate, thereby increase revenue by numbers.

Mr DE ORLEANS BORBON offered some thoughts as a member of the EB, with a corporate mindset. He apologised for having participated in bringing the FAI to this situation – a near-death experience. He promised that in the residual time of his current tenure he would do his best to see they got out of the hole and that the situation and the thinking that had brought them here would be corrected and this would not happen in any foreseeable future.

Mr PRINCIPATO thought that after the presentation this discussion would be just technical questions, and the debate would follow. However, it sounded as though the debate had started. He appreciated how difficult this situation was. As Mr SZIKORA had pointed out, the proposals affected the NACs differently. He was concerned about the sporting licence proposal, which was a tax, and if approved today they would have three weeks in which to implement it, which would be very difficult. If it passed he would at least need it to be delayed for three or four months.

The PRESIDENT said that comment had been taken on board and agreed.

Mr PRINCIPATO continued by saying that, as the budget was currently presented, he would vote against it. He noted that the change to record claim fees would really hurt the USA NAC. The airlines did not pay for commercial records, the pilots did, and record claims would go to zero. General aviation records would also reduce dramatically. Not only was the record income an important part

of the USA's budget, but corporate members would reassess whether they wanted to remain as members. It would be an enormous problem, and he did not think it would have the positive budget impact the EB had assumed.

Mr Bruno DELOR said he completely supported the idea that FAI could not sustain significant losses of money, and agreed that the financial situation needed to be reviewed rapidly for the long term. But he had doubts about the final impact of some proposals for increasing revenue for the 2020 budget. There was a clear risk that imposing a registration fee for each sporting licence would rapidly lead to a significant decrease in the number of sporting licences issued. France shared the view of the USA regarding implementation of this proposal in such a short time frame. They were not closed to the principle but they had to take care not to end up in a lose-lose situation. For 2020 he suggested adopting a transitional budget, pending the conclusion of the Refreshing FAI reflections. For that transitional budget they must very clearly focus on the priority, which had been clearly defined over the last two days, both by the ASCs and NACs. This priority was to support air sport activities and ASCs. The question was how much money they needed to do this.

The PRESIDENT said his answer was that he believed the budget presented did that: they had trimmed external expenditures so the budget now represented the support. He accepted that this was support as the organisation did business now, and in the future they would have a much sharper view of how the FAI did business.

Mr MOZER said he was confused about the sanction fee for the WAG, given the information they now had. He assumed the revenue of CHF 50,000, which would go away, was offset by a reduction in expenses. Given the importance, he was distressed that the budget discussion had been put off to such a late stage. Given the passion and information and discussion that every delegate wished to have, they were now pressed for time.

The PRESIDENT noted these comments. He then adjourned the meeting for the lunch-break.

The GC re-convened and the PRESIDENT reported that some proposals had been made over the lunch break. One was that the proposed budget increase of CHF 20,000 from the Commissions would be provided, although from a different source from that suggested.

Mr Nick BUCKENHAM warned it would be better to say that it *might* be provided. He was aware of some other actions that might soon be forthcoming that could overtake this.

The PRESIDENT said that the opposition to the budgeting proposal that the Commissions had shared before the meeting had now been resolved, because it was being viewed in an alternative way.

Mr MONKS wished to propose an amendment to Mr ANANOV's proposal. As everyone was aware, the Royal Aero Club had taken a keen interest in the FAI's finances over the last year. They had supported FAI for 114 years and intended to continue to do so. He, therefore, had a complete proposed budget which he put to the floor.

The PRESIDENT said that this was not an amendment to Mr ANANOV's proposal.

Mr MONKS said he would run through some suggestions. It included a 10% rise in subscriptions, showed savings of CHF 220,000 in administrative expenses and reduced the proposed losses. The net result for the year would be CHF 273.

The PRESIDENT asked how that fit with the EB's proposals.

Mr MONKS said he would have to show it line by line.

The PRESIDENT asked how the members could make an informed decision.

Mr MONKS explained that all the additional proposed income was off the table.

The PRESIDENT noted that they had a valid amendment to the scale of subscriptions from Russia. Mr MONKS was suggesting that this be carried forward into his updated budget. He therefore proposed that they vote on the amendment from Russia. This would result in a new scale of subscriptions, which they would have to vote through. As this new scale of subscriptions was

embedded in the RAC budget, the GC could then take the new budget as an amendment to the one originally proposed.

Mr ANANOV proposed they continue the discussion, to understand how this CHF 255,000 could be covered by further reductions.

Mr MONKS explained that his budget completely removed all these new income proposals, including the registration fee.

The PRESIDENT asked for a vote on the amendment to increase the scale of subscriptions by 10%.

Mr LEINIKKI updated the persons and votes present. There were currently 35 members and 12 proxies, totalling 58 voters present. This came to 325 votes, which meant an absolute majority was 163 votes.

Results: Yes 247, Abstain 21, No 56.

The General Conference agreed to increase the scale of subscriptions by 10% for 2020.

The revised scale of subscriptions was shown on the screen.

The PRESIDENT invited the members to vote on this new scale of subscriptions.

Results: Yes 277, Abstain 15, No 33. Total 325.

The FAI General Conference approved the amended scale of subscriptions for 2020.

The PRESIDENT said they would now discuss the proposal from the UK, which was an amendment to the budget as produced by the EB. He asked if the proposal had a seconder. Mr MACHULA seconded the proposal.

Mr SZIKORA said he had talked to Mr MONKS about his proposal over lunch. They had just increased subscriptions by CHF 95,000. The six revenue increase items proposed by the EB added up to CHF 420,600. At this point, based on what they had voted so far, they were short CHF 327,600.

Mr MONKS showed the draft FAI 2020 budget, alongside the draft RAC UK proposed budget. Against the annual registration fee for the Sporting Licence database he had put the figure of CHF 95,706, which should be for an increase in subscriptions. Under Administration, salaries and social charges included a saving of CHF 100,000. Given that there was no marketing budget, this translated into less activity in the office. General administration was lower due to the reduction of postage and similar items. Management fees, for accountancy, auditing and legal fees, had been reduced to a reasonable figure for this size of organisation.

The PRESIDENT noted that, as far as legal fees were concerned, the members should be aware that FAI had incurred significant legal fees, not only with contracts but also in resolving disputes between the family.

Mr MONKS agreed that a budget sometimes had to be a “best guess” based on previous history. For special projects, unless they were currently ongoing and signed up to until completion, the RAC believed they could be reduced. The net result was not CHF 273 as he had previously stated but CHF -24,727, which he felt was not so bad for the end of the year.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that the proposed salary reduction was equivalent to CHF 190,000, but it did not equate to less marketing activities. They had agreed to end any occasional marketing consultancy, there were no further marketing activities taking place at the moment with the dedicated position in the office, and not with this kind of salary.

Mr MONKS pointed to the figure of CHF 1,040,000, which needed to be adjusted accordingly. The reduction proposed by the RAC would therefore not be as much.

The PRESIDENT asked for the opinion of the Commissions on the CHF 20,000 in the proposal from the Board.

Mr Nick BUCKENHAM noted that the suggestion had been that the CHF 20,000 included for 20% sanction fee increase could be provided from the World Grand Prix of Aerobatics fund, which had remained at around CHF 100,000 for many years.

The PRESIDENT thought it would be reasonable to add this CHF 20,000, which would make the end-of-year deficit of around CHF -4,727. In the interests of allowing them to move forward, he said he was very grateful for the effort people had put into thinking through these issues. He was grateful to the Royal Aero Club for the work they had done.

Mr WEBER thought a lot of brain power had gone into the budget on both sides. The relative merits had to be judged by the members. He was in favour of sticking with what the EB had proposed.

The PRESIDENT noted that the EB had proposed a budget, the UK RAC had made some adjustments to that budget and come up with a proposal.

Mr OVUKA spoke as acting CIVL president. It was not clear to him whether the CHF 20,000 would remain in the budget or not.

The PRESIDENT confirmed that it was in, but it was being taken from a fund that had been established some years ago, which was technically under the oversight of the aerobatics commission.

Mr PORTMANN was afraid that making these changes in a few minutes was very dangerous. If the members had any reservations, they should say no.

The PRESIDENT noted that there were some significant changes in the budget proposed by the UK. The proposed CHF 20,000 income from the Cat 1 events was back, although it was no longer from Cat 1 events. The 10% increase was now in the budget. The CHF 255,000 registration fee had been removed. The CHF 5,000 for Air Sports Medals, the sanction fee for the WAG, and the CHF 82,600 increase in fees from records had been removed, along with the share reinvestment. He suggested the share reinvestment remain under the control of the Board. He also noted separate discussions that suggested a more modest increase in the administration fee for records could be accepted. He also suggested the CHF 5,000 for the increased cost of air sports medals be accepted.

The SECRETARY GENERAL referred to Mr PORTMANN's comment about the impact of the proposal by the Royal Aero Club. In the very detailed discussions within the EB, the opinion had been that they should cut expenses where they could, but not go beyond what was possible. The proposal made here went beyond that point. The reduction of management fees from CHF 84,000 to CHF 35,000 left nothing to manage the organisation. The principal had been to reduce the staff budget, but they needed to maintain the human resources in the office to do the tasks needed as part of the reorganisation process. This proposal, in the view of the majority of the EB, was not in line with the intention of the 2020 budget.

Mr KAVKA suggested that they not touch salaries and social charges now.

Mr MACHULA noted that the original proposal included the annual registration fee for licences, records etc, as well as the administration fee for Cat 1 events. He was sure those numbers were considerably overstated. The figures would be much lower. The Czech national aero club issued approximately 1,000 FAI licences per year, to motivate people for Cat 2 events. If there was any kind of fee, there would be a maximum of 200, which would be taken up only by those sportsmen who really needed them to participate in first category events. The situation in other active countries would be very similar. The same went for the administration fee for Cat 1 events, and the records.

The PRESIDENT said that a lot of research had gone into looking into what the probable incomes would be from these sources. They were best estimates.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that the budget presented here was the combined office and Commission budgets. Some of the items also incorporated Commission activities. Specifically, the amount of CHF 84,000 for Management Fees included a significant portion for Commission management. The question was what would actually be taken out.

Mr PRINCIPATO felt that the record claim fee proposal in the original budget would not come anywhere near the CHF 82,000 income they claimed. The President had referred to discussions about a more reasonable records fee increase. An across-the-board increase to CHF 300 was a 50% increase, resulting in income of up to CHF 60,000, compared with the proposed CHF 82,000, which he did not think they would achieve.

The PRESIDENT said that the EB had concerns as to whether this was viable. The GC had heard the concerns of the SECRETARY GENERAL and the EB, as well as opinions from the floor about touching the current staffing levels of the organisation.

Mr SZIKORA thought they should remember one thing before this motion went to a vote. It was not a case of choosing this or the EB's initial proposal. He suspected the EB's initial proposal would now have to be modified, given that they had just agreed to a 10% increase in subscriptions.

The PRESIDENT said that the members were asked to vote whether they accepted the Royal Aero Club's proposal as an amendment to the main budget. They would then go back to the budget as provided by the EB, and effectively decide whether these changes had been accepted. There would clearly be more debate about this.

Mr MONKS noted that Royal Aero Club had made some difficult decisions whilst addressing this budget. They were aware that such things were not always comfortable, but occasionally, when in distress, discomfort was necessary for things to improve. He believed what they were suggesting was fair. They had considered the ASCs' contribution to the budget, but it was included as the total.

The PRESIDENT invited the General Conference to vote on whether to accept the amended budget as provided by the UK. That would then change the main budget. The USA had suggested that they change the line item regarding record fees. The difficulty they now had was that all these line changes came across to the main budget. This meant that each line-item change technically had to be voted.

Mr MOZER said they could make it a friendly amendment, so that they did not have to vote separately, if the UK was in agreement.

Mr LEINIKKI invited the members to vote on the amendment given on the screen: the General Conference is invited to approve the amendment from UK on the budget proposed.

Results: Yes 267, Abstain 25, No 33.

The General Conference voted to accept the amendment to the 2020 budget proposed by the UK Royal Aero Club.

The PRESIDENT said that they now had a suggestion of changing the EB's budget. Some key things had impacted particularly on the Office, without the Board having been able to exercise due diligence on them. He was unsure about how to proceed.

Mr ERIKSEN suggested a motion. In this situation where the EB had no opportunity to analyse the consequences of the budget, they could give the EB the freedom, within the framework of the approved expenditure figure, to operate with discretion.

The PRESIDENT repeated that the budget presented by the EB was what they believed was an appropriate budget. There were some lines in the budget the GC had just accepted that, without knowing where the reductions came from, were potentially activities that no longer existed in the office. He was unhappy to have been deprived of the chance to do due diligence on this budget. The General Conference had approved a budget which the President was now required to implement, and he asked their indulgence to see if the board could make it work. He was unhappy because he felt he had both hands tied behind his back, with very little room to manoeuvre. He had a major project he wanted to run, which he felt had been jeopardised because of the cuts in Office and the central administration. They had already had requests from members at this conference to spend money to assist them, and that would not now be possible.

Mr MONKS wished to say a final word about the budget: it was a move to save the FAI, help it on its way and allow it to become stronger. He was amazed by the number of people who had voted for it,

but he felt it was a clear signal that everyone wanted the same thing. He apologised if it was uncomfortable, this was not what they wanted, but they did want the FAI to be successful.

The PRESIDENT said he understood and appreciated the thought and energy and effort that had been put into it. The vote helped the members to feel comfortable because they had provided the FAI with a budget. He felt uncomfortable because he had not had the opportunity to conduct due diligence on the impact of the changes. He had an analysis of what the Office would look like if the budget was reduced much below what had been provided; around two-thirds of the work currently done in the office would cease.

Mr MOZER thought the suggestion from Denmark should be taken under advisement. The President had a number to work with, and within that the EB now had an opportunity to find a way to meet the budget. He understood what the SECRETARY GENERAL had said, he thought there might be ways the EB could work with the NACs and ASC presidents to look at it. It was a fundamental change, but it was a necessary change because the FAI was at a critical point. No one wanted to see services disappear, but they had to take a hard look. Mr Eriksen had given a very good suggestion, which had been dismissed.

Mr ABDILLAH realised that the issue of how to handle the sporting ID was an emotive issue for everyone here. Many members felt it should be given out free. He maintained that this was not the best idea. One NAC had suggested that they currently issued around 1,000, and this would be reduced to 120, because only those who were serious competitors would come in. But that was the purpose of the sporting licence. It was not to be issued frivolously. If someone was interested in securing a sporting ID for the purposes of participating in a competition, 10 or 15 CHF per year would not be going to affect them, provided it was passed on to the individual sports persons. If the NAC was expected to absorb the cost, that would be more difficult, because the NACs were in a similarly difficult financial situation. He suggested that all those present seriously consider passing on the cost of the sporting IDs to the sporting persons. It would help them to tide over many similar issues. It was a drastic change in the thought process, but he felt it was about time.

The PRESIDENT noted that the registration fee on the sporting licence did not exist in the UK proposal. He thought Mr ABDILLAH might be thinking of the suggested Sports ID and new membership scheme, which they would probably not get chance to discuss. The proposal on the floor from Denmark was that the General Conference expected the Executive Board to operate within the total budget expenditure figure. The SECRETARY GENERAL had just pointed out that the budget that had just been voted on was only for the Office and did not include the income and expenditure accounts for the Commissions. Was this correct?

Mr MONKS explained that the figures in the column were the combined figures of the ASCs and Office.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that the total amount for management fees represented CHF 45,000 for HO and CHF 35,000 for the Commissions. This had been reduced to CHF 35,000. Did this mean there were zero management fees for the Office?

Mr MONKS felt the motion currently on the table, to allow the EB to manoeuvre within the total expenditure figures provided, was a suitable suggestion.

The PRESIDENT noted that a potential unintended consequence was that some of the fees were part of the Commissions budget, which the Office could not touch.

Mr Ayed ALKASME thought that the freedom to move money between categories was totally wrong. It could not be considered a budget. Movement within one category was OK.

The PRESIDENT thanked him for this comment. He asked if there was a seconder for the proposal from Denmark. Mr MOZER seconded the proposal.

Mr DE ORLEANS BORBON thought it did not make much sense that they were expected to operate within a total expenditure figure. If he were offered an opportunity to make EUR 3 million, and it would cost 1.5 million, he would certainly choose to spend more to make far more revenue. He felt that issuing an order of this nature to the EB was much too strict and unreasonable. He would prefer

the original proposal by Mr Eriksen, which he understood meant that the budget was flexible. This could be difficult to comply with and might even be against the interests of the FAI.

The PRESIDENT asked Mr Eriksen if the amendment as written reflected his intention.

Mr ERIKSEN said he would like to expand it a little more. Given the current situation, where the budget had been changed by the General Conference without time for the Executive Board to analyse it, the GC gives the EB freedom to operate within the total expected expenditure.

As Mr WEBER understood it, Mr Eriksen wanted the Board to operate over the coming year within the envelope defined by the General Conference. The EB was not expected to go outside of the envelope, but they could move positions from one project to another. In his view, this was the most important thing. He had to point out that within the budget they had both ASC budgets and HO budgets. Were they allowed to move from one to another? This had to be made clear.

Mr David ROBERTS, speaking as an observer, a finance person and someone who had contributed to the Royal Aero Club proposal, said it was sensible to have that flexibility within the budget. It was technically called “veering and hauling” between the different heads of expenditure. The main message he had heard was that the General Conference did not want the EB to launch in the next 12 months projects which, based on recent history, were risky. The EB would have to come back to the members to get approval for specific expenditure where they were hoping to generate more revenue.

The PRESIDENT asked how this would work if he had a project that generated revenues so that he could then spend money?

Mr ROBERTS thought what the Conference was saying was that the EB was constrained for the next year, to get the ship back on course, before launching any new revenue generation initiatives, unless there was such a golden opportunity that it warranted writing to the members to ask for their support. The members today were trying to save the organisation from failure. The price for that was a certain constraint for a period of time. He thought they should accept that and operate within that framework. He was speaking as an individual.

The PRESIDENT now had an expectation to place on the General Conference. When he came back to them to ask if they agreed that the Board go down a revenue-generating pathway, which would therefore enable them to increase expenditures, he trusted he would get a quorum response. He needed everyone to contact the FAI office to confirm their contact details were correct, and engage in a closed-loop conversation. That did not happen at the moment, and it was one of the reasons they found it difficult to get information out. He urged them to make sure he was able to do what he had been instructed to do. Otherwise, he could not do his job, and he could not save the FAI for them.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted in response to Mr ROBERTS that there were no budget positions for any extra projects. The budget presented by the FAI EB was a core operational budget, which had now been cut. They currently had to cope with a budget that dictated they would have to release another staff member. Although they had been told they could move money around, she did not see where they could do this. They had deleted a complete position for management fees, which included the cost of the annual audit, external bookkeeping resources, regular work on that item plus legal costs. They had also deleted anything related to IT development, including website maintenance and extranet development, which helped NACs to get better access. This was the area where the main cuts had been made, so that was what the EB had to work with. It would work with that, but it went beyond a bare-bones budget. If any members had any suggestions, she would welcome them.

Mr MOZER said he was a little offended and disturbed by the way the Finance Director had portrayed the opportunities or possibilities that the EB might consider in reshuffling the finances. ASC projects and reserves were specifically mentioned, and he was not in favour of the idea of moving them into another column. He asked for clarity that this was not about taking money from the Commissions to save a position or a project.

Mr WEBER said it was not his intention to offend. He just wanted to make the members aware that with this motion, it was a possibility. He did not say he approved of that. He did not believe that would be the right way to handle it, but the motion made it possible. Another point he wanted to make was that, in a budget they tended to talk about expenses, but they also needed to talk about revenue. Could they go outside the envelope if they found new revenue?

The PRESIDENT had asked that question and had been told he had to seek permission from the members to do that. For clarity, he stated that there was no intention that the Board would interfere with the special reserves of the Commissions.

The understanding was that, within the Office part of the administration, the General Conference would allow the EB to move money around so that they could continue to function as best they could.

Results: Yes 225, Abstain 28, No 31. Total: 284 votes.

The General Conference voted to allow the FAI Executive Board to adjust expenditure lines in the budget.

Mr GUDMUNDSSON thanked the General Conference for their trust, despite the position they were in.

The PRESIDENT reiterated that he appreciated the energy and effort being put into these discussions. He understood that the General Conference had given them what they believed was sufficient funds to be able to run the organisation.

Mr LEINIKKI pointed out the votes of the Commission presidents' votes had been inadvertently excluded from the vote.

The PRESIDENT asked the ASC presidents if they wanted to call for another vote.

The ASC presidents declined.

The PRESIDENT said he appreciated everyone's patience, and he appreciated their thoughtful contributions. He wished to formally record his thanks to the United Kingdom for the work they had done to help the FAI arrive at a solution that the members believed they could live with. The Board would have to examine the proposal and work out their plan for the year. Another suggestion from the UK was that they would also see if they could engage the voluntary services of a financial planner, so that they had someone with a different set of eyes to look at what was happening.

21. Future Membership Subscription Scheme and FAI Sports ID

Not discussed.

See ANNEX 34.

22. Future Officials ID

Not discussed.

See ANNEX 34.

23. Amendments to Statutes

See ANNEX 35.

23.1. Terms for the FAI President

See **ANNEX 36**.

The PRESIDENT said that this proposal was to revert the term of the FAI PRESIDENT to being the same as that of the EB members. Two conferences ago a proposal had been made to change the term of the President and Board to four years. They had ended up with the President being moved to a four-year term and the EB members being retained on a two-year term. His opinion was that that did not add any value to the work of the Board. He would like the Conference to consider that they revert the position of the President to a two-year term, being able to be re-elected twice, for a total of six years. This way the President and the Board were aligned in their terms.

There being no comments, voting was opened.

Mr LEINIKKI noted that Commissions were not permitted to vote on this item. The required majority was 190 votes.

Results: Yes 227, Abstain 5, No 13.

Proposed amendment approved.

23.2. Voting for FAI President and EB Members at General Conference

See **ANNEX 37**.

The PRESIDENT reminded the members that in Luxor they had had a debate about the first round of voting for the President, which was currently limited to active members. Two options were proposed. Option 1 was that, since the President served everyone in the organisation, it was suggested that the Commissions should be involved in the first round of voting. The second round of voting was by simple majority. Option 2 was to permit only active members to vote for the President and the Executive Board.

Mr SZIKORA asked if this change had been vetted to ensure it complied with Swiss law. In every other country that he was aware of, you had to be a member to be able to vote. To have Commission members able to vote for presidents or board members would be out of the ordinary in most countries.

The PRESIDENT replied that it had not been specifically vetted. The person who had written the rules initially, Max Bishop, had been asked why he had done it, and had been unable to recall.

The SECRETARY GENERAL thought that Mr SZIKORA's question had not been considered.

The PRESIDENT noted that the conundrum in the current Statutes was that only active members could vote for the President.

The PRESIDENT invited the members to vote on the proposed decision Option 1.

Results: Yes 210, Abstain 10, No 63. The motion was passed.

Proposed amendment approved.

Option 2 was therefore not voted.

23.3. Report of the Statutes Working Group to the General Conference 2019

Recommendation 1: Inclusion of a definition of "Air Sport Person"

The SECRETARY GENERAL presented the Statute changes discussed by the EB and put forward for the decision of the General Conference. They came as part of a review aimed at aligning the Statutes and by-laws, and taking steps towards introducing a new understanding of the term "Air Sport Person".

The first proposal was to include the definition of "Air Sport Person" in the Statutes. Currently, the definition was based on a GC decision taken some time ago, and it formed part of the FAI by-laws. These were managed by the EB, whereas the Statutes were agreed by the General Conference. It

was inconsistent to see that Air Sport Persons were central to the FAI concept but were not part of the Statutes, which was why this proposal had been put forward.

In response to a question from India, the SECRETARY GENERAL explained that the FAI Statutes were the foundation of the constitution, then there were the by-laws, which were managed by the EB, and the General Section of the sporting code, which had to be regulated within the FAI Statutes.

Mr LEUKEFELD asked if this referred to any person the NAC named as a member, not just those who took part in championships or events.

The SECRETARY GENERAL said that was correct.

Mr ANANOV asked if he was correct in understanding that this definition made it possible for sporting licences to be issued not just by the NACs, with the delegated power from the FAI, but also by the FAI office directly.

The SECRETARY GENERAL explained that the right of the FAI to issue sporting licences centrally was restricted to countries where there was no FAI member.

Mr Art GREENFIELD (USA) pointed out that this was not a changed definition as he understood it, it was just moving a definition from the by-laws into the Statutes. There was no change in the definition.

The SECRETARY GENERAL thanked him for that clarification.

The members were invited to vote.

Results: Yes 216, Abstain 25, 25 No.

Proposed amendment approved.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS noted that “Air Sport Person” was part of the definition in the General Section. Since they were allowed to change the General Section, he recommended removing the definition from the General Section in order to avoid duplicate references.

The SECRETARY GENERAL agreed.

Mr Bruno DELOR noted that they had voted on the transfer from the by-laws to the Statutes, but he was still not comfortable with the definition. It was not very clear and not easy to implement. He recommended that they try to clarify it.

Mr ALKASME asked if any security clearance was needed to approve air sport persons and give them a licence.

The SECRETARY GENERAL said that security clearance might be a legal requirement in some countries, in which case it would be the NAC’s responsibility to regulate that. The FAI did not interfere with national regulations.

Mr AL JAWINI thought this question referred to people from countries that had no NAC. Did the FAI office perform any security clearance before issuing a licence directly?

The SECRETARY GENERAL had noted this comment. They could have a direct conversation to clarify this. The FAI concept of Air Sport Person had nothing to do with security clearances and ICAO licences.

Recommendation 2: Definition of “sporting licence”

The SECRETARY GENERAL explained that the intention of the proposal from the FAI EB was to clarify the purpose of the FAI Sporting Licence based on recurring discussions within the FAI. The previous definition mentioned competitions, “national or international sporting events” or record attempts. However, in the FAI’s Statutes “FAI activities” were also defined, and these included competitions and records, so it would make sense to update the definition of the FAI sporting licence to have a broader interpretation in regard to activities by these people. It was not about competing but about participating in FAI air sport activities, which were defined as events and records. They

also had the requirement that FAI sporting licences could only be issued to air sport persons, which was why this definition had been added.

Mr LEUKEFELD felt there was a danger of excluding people who did not hold a sporting licence from helping at events, such as judges, officials and assistants. The word had changed from “compete” to “participate”, which implied that all those who participated, not just those who competed, required a sporting licence. There was a danger that this would lead to the exclusion of people who were willing to help out at events.

The PRESIDENT thanked him for this comment. Agenda item 22 was “Future Officials ID”, which covered the situation to which he referred. The Officials’ ID was also planned to have insurance attached to it. This was an enabling change so that the officials’ ID could be introduced.

Capt. MATHUR had an objection to the sentence “by the FAI Secretariat”, because the licence was issued by the NAC on behalf of the FAI in the first place. This sentence introduced the possibility of people bypassing the NACs to get their sporting licences.

The SECRETARY GENERAL confirmed that this was not the case, because the secretariat could only issue sporting licences in countries with no FAI members. That was the way this was implemented in practice, and this provision had already appeared in the Statutes before.

Capt. MATHUR said that was why the provision should be reworded, so that in the future it was not misinterpreted and misunderstood.

The SECRETARY GENERAL pointed out that this definition had always been in the Statutes, and the procedure had never been done any other way.

Capt. MATHUR asked if it was possible to check whether the definition itself clarified the idea that this applied only when there was no member available.

The SECRETARY GENERAL took note of this suggestion.

Mr ANANOV asked what was the reason for deleting “if appropriate”.

The PRESIDENT said that, in the interests of time, he would withdraw this Statute change proposal.

Mr LINTL asked for clarification, did “withdrawn” mean that, in the future they could not ask a team leader to hold a sporting licence?

The PRESIDENT did not fully understand the purpose of this question. Part of the information that was missing, which would have helped to inform the decisions, was the presentation of the Sports ID, Officials’ ID and new membership scheme. They were now asking for decisions without the appropriate awareness of the planning that was also going on for other changes. The amendment would be submitted again at some future time.

Recommendation 3: Right to refuse to issue a Sporting Licence

Recommendation withdrawn.

Recommendation 4: Creation of “FAI Supporter”

The SECRETARY GENERAL explained the background to this proposal. It was assumed that there were people who were interested in FAI but were not necessarily participating in FAI activities, such as recipients of the FAI newsletter, and people who were interested in air sports. This person would have no rights at NAC level or any right to participate in FAI activities.

Mr LEUKEFELD noted that the declaration of interest to work for air sports was limited to air sport persons, who were defined as being a member of an NAC. Many people worked at competitions who were not a member of the NAC. This proved the danger he had mentioned before.

The SECRETARY GENERAL took note of this.

Mr PRINCIPATO said he could not support this. Firstly, the staff had too much to do. Second, he saw no market for it.

Mr ERIKSEN noted that this was the first time he had seen an attempt to connect people to the FAI in general, and not via an air sport. He was not in favour of this approach.

Mr ANANOV asked who was supposed to issue this identity card.

The SECRETARY GENERAL said it was supposed to be done by the FAI secretariat, but they would not have the resources for it at the moment.

The SECRETARY GENERAL asked for a show of hands from those who in principle supported this idea. There would be no vote. This was part of the renewed understanding of how air sport persons were affiliated to the FAI members and the FAI.

The majority of members were against the idea.

Recommendation 5: Education Commission

The SECRETARY GENERAL explained that the Education Commission had been reinstated but had no definition in the Statutes. The proposed definition was identical to the one used in the past.

The SECRETARY GENERAL asked for a show of voting cards.

Results: Yes 180, Abstain 10, 0 No.

The recommendation was approved.

Recommendation 6: Nile Gold Medal

The SECRETARY GENERAL explained that this proposal was to delete the definition of the Nile Gold Medal from the Statutes and move it to the by-laws.

The recommendation was unanimously approved by a show of voting cards.

Recommendation 7: IPC Commission name change

The IPC had suggested that its name be changed from International Parachuting Commission (IPC) to International Skydiving Commission (ISC). This change would reflect the introduction of indoor skydiving.

The recommendation was approved by a show of voting cards.

Results: Yes 185, Abstain 5, 0 No.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that the wording elsewhere in the Statutes would be updated to reflect this change.

Recommendation 8: To correct references

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that the SWG had identified some incorrect references in the Statutes and by-laws.

Recommendation unanimously approved by a show of voting cards.

Recommendation 9: Deadline for GC agenda

The current situation was that proposals had to be sent to the FAI three months before the GC. In these days of electronic communication, it was felt that this could be shortened to two months. At the same time, they had also changed the deadline for sending out the materials, which would be one month before rather than two months. It was relatively difficult for the EB to set everything up three months before the GC, particularly in terms of finance and budgeting. This would result in the documents presented to the GC being more up to date.

Recommendation unanimously approved by a show of voting cards.

Recommendation 10: FAI Air Sport General Commission

Withdrawn by CASI.

The PRESIDENT noted that CASI had identified that more work needed to be done in this area in conjunction with updates to the Code of Ethics.

He thanked everyone for their contributions.

Proposals from Sweden

See **ANNEX 38** and **39**.

There were two more Statute changes proposed by Sweden.

Mr PAPAPOULOS said that, as far as he remembered, Statute changes had to be introduced either by the GC by proposal to the SWG, or endorsed by the EB and forwarded to the GC. Were they now allowing Statute changes to be proposed by members?

The SECRETARY GENERAL clarified that these proposals were not being put forward as actual Statute changes. They were being submitted for a discussion of the principle.

The PRESIDENT confirmed that if the GC agreed to them as draft proposals they would be submitted to the SWG.

The first proposal was asking for a Commission to have the ability to elect its Bureau for one, two, three or four years. The current rule provided for terms of one or two years.

The PRESIDENT asked for a show of voting cards, who was in favour of this proposal.

Results: Yes 10, Abstain 0, 70 No.

The proposal was not supported.

The second proposal was that the General Conference be changed from an annual meeting to being held every two years.

Mr Anders ÅKVIST (Sweden) explained that the Swedish NAC did not have a lot of money. This was an opportunity to ask whether they could actually afford to meet every year, and potentially provided an opportunity to save money. The chaotic organisation of this year's GC had wasted a lot of money. Sweden had ended up with non-refundable flight tickets to Morocco. He would prefer to spend his NAC's money on air sport activities.

Mr DE ORLEANS BORBON thought that if the FAI's owners could only issue instructions to the EB every two years, this would really be a problem.

Mr LEUKEFELD noted that if they extended the time between General Conferences to two years they slowed down the work of the FAI when they should be trying to increase the decision-making dynamic. Within the ASCs there was an intention to increase the number of meetings each year. He believed they should stay with an annual meeting.

Mr ÅKVIST noted that they did not have to meet physically in order to have discussions and make decisions. There were more modern ways.

Mr ROBERTS brought up the issue of Swiss law, which required annual accounts.

The PRESIDENT asked for a show of voting cards.

Results: Yes 16, Abstain 0, 100 No.

The proposal was not supported.

24. FAI Code of Ethics

Not discussed.

25. Proposals from NACs and Commissions

Not discussed.

26. Future General Conferences: Recommendations from EB

The SECRETARY GENERAL reiterated the new approach to awarding General Conferences in the future, based on previous experiences. This had been communicated in the FAI Members' Info. The previous process of having NACs submit a bid for the GC would no longer be accepted. The bid was now required to state who would be the professional partner that the FAI office would work with to organise the GC. That meant releasing the NAC from the burden of being involved in the logistical details of organising General Conferences. It ensured that the FAI had a tourist office or convention centre as a contractual partner and would also provide financial security in regard to the organisation of the conference. As a reminder, since 2014 they had always had problems organising FAI General Conferences, and in every case the NACs were the organisational partners.

Secondly, with all the changes this year they had not had time to properly launch a process for determining who could host the GC in future years. A complete bid had been received for 2021, which had been reviewed by the EB. Proposals had been received from other countries which had not been followed through. A timeline would be set up for future organisation of these conferences, which made it clear that if the deadlines were not adhered to, the bids would not be considered. The EB would also communicate the date by which a deposit and organiser agreement had to be completed. If that deadline passed the GC would not take place in these locations.

27. Presentation and Election of Active Members to CASI

The candidates for election to CASI were as follows: Ani STAMENOVA (Bulgaria), Bruno DELOR (France), Hubertus VON SAMSON HIMMELSTJERNA (Germany), Andy Chau (Hong Kong), Giovanni VIVOLO (Italy), Alicia HIRZEL (Switzerland), David MONKS (United Kingdom).

At the request of the PRESIDENT, each candidate confirmed that they accepted their nomination.

Mr LEINIKKI explained that the members could vote for up to six candidates. It was a simple majority vote. If all candidates received a simple majority it became a plurality vote, which meant those candidates with the most votes would be elected.

Results: Switzerland 254, UK 237, Germany 236, Italy 200, France 199, Hong Kong 186. These countries were elected.

The PRESIDENT congratulated the new CASI delegates.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS asked the CASI members to join him for a meeting during the break.

28. Election Statutes Working Group Chair and Members

The PRESIDENT said his choice of chair for the Statutes Working Group had been dictated by the fact that he expected there would need to be significant statutory work done as part of the FAI 2020 project over the next 6-8 months. He had asked Ronald SCHNITKER if he would mind standing down. He was extraordinarily grateful for Mr SCHNITKER's in the SWG over the last six years. He

proposed Jean-Claude Weber as the chair. He was a member of the Executive Board, which was permitted under the rules. That meant he was embedded in the EB discussions, and the discussions and reports around the FAI 2020 project, which shortened the communication loops. Mr Weber had also chaired the SWG previously. The PRESIDENT asked if there were any further nominations for the chair of the SWG. There were none.

The General Conference approved the appointment of Mr Jean-Claude WEBER as Chair of the Statutes Working Group by show of hands.

He would now seek to appoint another Executive Director as Finance Director.

The following candidates had been nominated for the four positions on the SWG: Gail BRADLEY (Australia), Georges DE MOURA FERREIRA (Brazil), Stefan KLETT (Germany), Andy CHAU (Hong Kong), Wing Commander Harbir Singh GULATI (India).

The PRESIDENT asked if there were any further nominations from the floor. There being none, they proceeded to a vote.

Results: Australia 264, Brazil 260, Germany 235, India 183, Hong Kong China 140.

The candidates from Australia, Brazil, Germany and India were elected.

The PRESIDENT congratulated the new members of the Statutes Working Group.

29. Vote on Award of 115th FAI General Conference 2021

The SECRETARY GENERAL was pleased to inform the GC that the EB had reviewed the bid from Serbia, which fulfilled all the necessary requirements. Serbia would celebrate the 100th anniversary of air sports in 2021.

115th FAI General Conference 2021 awarded to Serbia.

30. Appointment of FAI Companions of Honour

The PRESIDENT explained that it was his privilege to nominate as Companions of Honour persons who had demonstrated considerable value and contributions to air sports and aviation sports.

The first person he proposed as Companion of Honour for 2019 was Dr John LANGFORD of the USA. He was CEO and President of Aurora Flight Sciences Corporation, founded in 1989. Before that he had worked for the Institute for Defence Analysis in Alexandria Virginia. While at MIT he had organised and led a series of human-powered aircraft projects culminating in the Dedalus project, which in 1988 had shattered the world distance and endurance records for human-powered flight, with a 72-mile flight from the Greek islands of Crete and Santorini. Earlier, he had worked for the Lockheed Corporation as an engineer on the development of the F117 stealth fighter, and also as an intern at the White House office of science and technology policy. He had been awarded the Cliff Henderson Trophy by the NAA, and had received a number of other prizes from prestigious organisations in the USA. He was a Fellow of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics and was currently president of that organisation. He was also a Fellow of the Royal Aeronautical Society in the UK, and served on academic advisory boards at MIT, University of Maryland and Mississippi State University. He had been a director on the board of the NAA, been involved with the AAA on the executive committee and in various other governance roles. He had also served with NASA on their advisory council. He was a lifelong aeromodeller with membership of the national association of rocketry and the academy of model aeronautics. He had also been a competitor and US team manager in 12 space model world championships, and served as the US liaison to the FAI. His whole life had been devoted to the development of aviation, and some of the work he had done was very close to the work of the FAI. He invited the General Conference to confirm Dr John Langford

as FAI Companion of Honour. As Dr LANGFORD was not present today, the award would be made by arrangement with him.

The second proposed nominee was a very dear friend: Mr Tengku ABDILLAH. In 2017 he had received the FAI Bronze Medal. He was the RVP for East and South East Asia, where he had served since the inception of the role in 2012. He had been instrumental in the creation of the AFA and various air sports organisation in Asia. He was involved in relations with the Olympic Council of Asia in regard to participation of NACs in OCA events like the Asian Beach Games and Asian Games, and had also served as president of NAC Malaysia from 2011 to 2015. For the PRESIDENT, however, Mr ABDILLAH's major contribution to the FAI was that he had always selflessly sought to help and assist the nations in East and South-East Asia to understand about the FAI, bring them on board and help them develop.

The General Conference agreed to the appointment of Dr John LANGFORD and Mr Tengku ABDILLAH as FAI Companions of Honour.

31. Closing

31.1. FAI President's closing remarks

The PRESIDENT said that it had been an interesting journey. The Board would be very carefully considering the challenge the General Conference had placed on them, making sure they understood exactly what they were able to do, and working on their priorities. He thanked the delegates for their patience and their contributions. The Board was faced with a challenge, but he also understood the desire of the General Conference that they accept that challenge and protect the future of the FAI. They would come back in 10 months with an organisation that was back on a stable footing and a growth path.

31.2. FAI Anthem

The PRESIDENT invited the General Conference to stand for the FAI Anthem.

32. Annexes

1. Presentation by Secretary General
2. Membership report
3. Request NAC EGY_ESPAF
4. Memo_EPAF
5. List of FAI Vice-Presidents for 2019-2020
6. Financial Statement 2018 and Auditor's report
7. Report by the President of the FAI Air Sport General Commission (CASI)
8. Report by the President of the FAI Ballooning Commission (CIA)
9. Report by the President of the FAI Amateur Built and Experimental Commission (CIACA)
10. Report by the President of the FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM)
11. Report by the President of the FAI Rotorcraft Commission (CIG)
12. Report by the President of the FAI Microlight and Paramotor Commission (CIMA)
13. Report by the President of the FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA)
14. Report by the President of the FAI Hang Gliding and Paragliding Commission (CIVL)
15. Report by the President of the FAI General Aviation Commission (GAC)
16. Report by the President of the FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)
17. Report by the President of the FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC)
18. Report by the President of the FAI Medico-Physiological Commission (CIMP)
19. Report by the President of the FAI Environmental Commission (EnvC)
20. "Future of Global Sport"
21. "Review of Governance of International Federation Members of ARISF and AIMS"
22. GAISF governance review - Ranking FAI
23. FAI WAG Master Concept
24. FAI WAG reference documents from General Conferences
25. FAI RVP ESA Annual Report 2019
26. FAI RVP MENA Annual Report 2019
27. Refreshing FAI
28. ONE-FAI
29. FAI Scale of Subscriptions 2020
30. FAI Budget 2020 - last update
31. FAI Draft Budget 2020 and Updated Budget 2019 – as presented before GC
32. FAI Draft Budget 2020 / HO and Commissions separate – as presented before GC
33. FAI Finances – Review, budget and outlook – as presented before GC
34. FAI Sports ID - Officials ID - Sporting Licences and Membership Brief
35. Amendments to Statutes - Proposed Statutes changes
36. Proposal Terms for FAI President
37. Proposal Voting for FAI President and EB Members at GC
38. SWE Proposal Change statutes Bureaus
39. SWE proposal Change statutes GC

Additional documents are annexed as follows:

40. Calendar of FAI Meetings 2020
41. List of Delegates of Commissions
42. International Calendar of Sporting Events 2020-2023

- 43.** List of FAI Award Winners for 2019
- 44.** List of Participants at the General Conference
- 45.** List of Companions of Honour
- 46.** List of FAI Members
- 47.** List of FAI Championships Winners for 2019

Minutes published on 23 April 2020 and subject to acceptance by the FAI General Conference 2020.