



*Fédération  
Aéronautique  
Internationale*

---

# **101<sup>st</sup> Annual General Conference**

## **Minutes of Working Sessions**

**Held at the Capsis Hotel  
Rhodes, Greece  
12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> October 2007**

*Avenue Mon-Repos 24  
CH-1005 Lausanne  
(Switzerland)  
Tél.: +41(0) 21/345.10.70  
Fax: +41(0) 21/345.10.77  
E-mail: [sec@fai.org](mailto:sec@fai.org)  
Web: [www.fai.org](http://www.fai.org)*

# FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE

## 101<sup>st</sup> ANNUAL GENERAL CONFERENCE

### MINUTES

#### OF THE WORKING SESSIONS HELD ON FRIDAY 12th AND SATURDAY 13th OCTOBER 2007 AT CAPSIS HOTEL, RHODES, GREECE

IN THE CHAIR ..... Mr. Pierre PORTMANN, FAI President

ACTIVE MEMBERS OF FAI :

#### FAI ACTIVE MEMBERS REPRESENTED

#### WITH VOTING RIGHTS

#### HEADS OF DELEGATIONS

AUSTRALIA.....	Mr. Henk MEERTENS
AUSTRIA .....	Dr. Alois ROPPERT
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA.....	Mr. Omer KULIC
BULGARIA .....	Mr. Nick KALTCHEV
CANADA.....	Mr. Jack HUMPHREYS
CHILE .....	Mr. Julio SUBERCASEAUX MAC-GILL
CROATIA.....	Mr. Tonci PANZA
CYPRUS .....	Mr. Demetrakis HADJIDEMETRIOU
CZECH REPUBLIC.....	Mr. Jiri DODAL
DENMARK.....	Mr. Aksel C. NIELSEN
ESTONIA .....	Mr. Urmas USKA
FINLAND .....	Mr. Hannu HALONEN
FRANCE .....	Mr. Jean-Michel CONSTANT
GERMANY.....	Mr. Günter BERTRAM
GREECE.....	Mr. Savramis EVAGELOS
IRELAND .....	Mr. Tom McCORMACK
ISRAEL.....	Mr. Omri TALMON
ITALY.....	Mr. Antonio DENTINI
JAPAN .....	Mr. Yasushi YUASA
KOREA .....	Mrs. Kyung O. KIM
KUWAIT.....	Mr. Salah Al JEEMAZ
LITHUANIA.....	Mr. Stasys MURZA
LUXEBURG .....	Mr. Carlo LECUIT
MEXICO.....	Ing. José Peña BUENROSTRO
MONTENEGRO .....	Mr. Dragan RASIN
NETHERLANDS .....	Mr. E.T.H. WIJNANDS
NORWAY.....	Mr. Otto LAGARHUS
POLAND.....	Mr. Gromoslaw CZEMPINSKI

<b>PORTUGAL</b> .....	Mr. Manuel SILVA SALTA
<b>RUSSIA</b> .....	Mr. Anatoly STARODUBETS
<b>SERBIA</b> .....	Mr. Zeljko OVUKA
<b>SLOVAKIA</b> .....	Mr. Jan MIKUS
<b>SOUTH AFRICA</b> .....	Mr. Stan OLIVER
<b>SPAIN</b> .....	Mr. José Luis OLIAS SANCHEZ
<b>SWEDEN</b> .....	Dr. John GRUBBSTRÖM
<b>SWITZERLAND</b> .....	Mr. Beat NEUENSCHWANDER
<b>TURKEY</b> .....	Mr. Onder AYHAN
<b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> .....	Mr. Keith NEGAL
<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b> .....	Mr. Art GREENFIELD

**INTERNATIONAL AFFILIATE MEMBERS OF FAI :**

<b>O.S.T.I.V.</b> .....	Prof. Louis M. BOERMANS
<b>EUROPE AIRSPORTS</b> .....	Mr. David ROBERTS

**PROXIES :**

Belgium to Luxemburg  
China to Korea  
Mozambique to Portugal  
New Zealand to Australia

**FAI EXECUTIVE BOARD :**

FAI President .....	Mr. Pierre PORTMANN
FAI Executive Director.....	Mr. Willi ARPAGAUS
FAI Executive Director.....	Mr. Robert CLIPSHAM
FAI Executive Director.....	Mr. Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBON
FAI Executive Director.....	Mr. Bengt-Erik FONSELL
FAI Executive Director.....	Mr. Michael HEUER
FAI Executive Director.....	Mr. Jonghoon LEE
FAI Secretary General .....	Mr. Max BISHOP

**PRESIDENTS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF FAI AIR SPORT COMMISSIONS :**

Mr. Tor JOHANNESSEN, .....	Vice President, FAI Air Sport General Commission, representing President
Mr. Jean-Claude WEBER, .....	President , FAI Ballooning Commission
Mr. Pedro CABANERO, .....	President, FAI General Aviation Commission
Mr. Eric MOZER,.....	1 <sup>st</sup> Vice-President, FAI Gliding Commission
Mr. Sandy PIMENOFF, .....	President, FAI Aeromodelling Commission
Mr. David HAMILTON, .....	President FAI Rotorcraft Commission



**SCRUTINEERS :**

Conference unanimously agreed to the appointment as scrutineers of :

Ing. Pierluigi DURANTI, Dr. Michael GOTH, Mr. Michiel KASTELEIJN, Mr. Jean-Marc BADAN

**1. In Memoriam**

The Conference stood in silent memory of all friends of FAI who had died since the 100th General Conference in 2006, and especially of :

**Mr Masashi KAKUDA (Japan)**

Long-serving CIA delegate and Championship organizer

**Mr Paul McCREADY (USA)**

Former World Gliding Champion and celebrated inventor, designer, aerodynamicist and visionary

**Mr. Miroslav UHLIR (Slovak Rep.)**

International parachuting judge and the President of the Sporting Parachuting Commission of the Aero Club of Czech Republic

**Mr. Senji WATANABE (Japan)**

Long-serving CIAM delegate

**Mr. Ed YOST (USA)**

The first living inductee into the FAI Ballooning Commission Hall of Fame in 1995.

**2. Roll-Call of Delegations**

**2.1.** The roll-call was taken and revealed :

39 Heads of Delegations of FAI Active Members with voting rights, those present and represented all being in good standing.

9 Representatives of FAI Air Sport Commissions with voting rights.

1 International Affiliate Member with voting rights.

4 Active Members represented by proxies.

**2.2** The names of Heads of Delegations, Air Sport Commission representatives, observers and those apologising for absence were as recorded above.

**2.3** Voting panels with a total of 330 votes were distributed to delegations. The number of votes required to obtain majorities were declared as follows:

Absolute majority : 166

Two-thirds majority: 220

### 3. Minutes of 100<sup>th</sup> FAI General Conference, 2006

Conference unanimously approved, without amendment, the Minutes of the 100th FAI General Conference Working Sessions held on 26th and 27th October 2006 in Santiago de Chile.

### 4. Report of the FAI President

Mr Pierre Portmann, FAI President, presented his report (**ANNEX 1**) which was adopted by Conference.

In response to a question on the subject of FAI's representation at ICAO in Montreal, the FAI President stressed the importance of having active permanent representation. Mary Ann Stevens continued to represent FAI, but she did not live in Montreal and because of her professional commitments, could not attend all meetings at short notice. An agreement had been negotiated with IAOPA to cooperate on the question of language proficiency. It was important to show to FAI members that the two organizations could work together on certain critical problems. It was acknowledged that FAI and IAOPA had different constituencies and different needs, but there was scope for cooperation where interests converged. It was important to show to member countries that there were times when we should work together, and a step forward had been made in this direction.

President Czempinski of the NAC of Poland asked what European countries that had problems with the ICAO Language Proficiency requirements could do.

The FAI President explained that implementation of the new requirements remained set for 5 March 2008. But all ICAO member countries could serve notice to ICAO that they were not in a position to comply by then. NACs had to work on their Civil Aviation Authority to persuade them that VFR flight was not a problem and did not require Level 4 proficiency in English. ICAO had allowed a 3-year period of grace. This should be used to identify whether there were any flight safety problems attributable to language difficulties in sporting and recreational VFR operations. In Europe we had a unique problem with many linguistic boundaries. NACs should speak to their CAAs and urge them to serve notice on ICAO that they would not comply with the requirement for VFR flight. It was important to act immediately, especially those countries that organize World Championships etc.

President Czempinski confirmed that in Poland they would apply for exemption for pilots in VFR general aviation only, not for ATC controllers, and not for IFR operations.

### 5. FAI Finances

**5.1. 2006 Balance Sheet and Report by Auditors.** The FAI Executive Director (Finance), Mr Robert Clipsham, reported in detail (**ANNEX 2**) on the 2006 Balance Sheet, Income and Expenditure Account, Commissions' finances (**ANNEX 3**), and the report on the FAI's accounts by the Auditors, PriceWaterhouseCoopers at (**ANNEX 4**).

***General Conference unanimously approved the Financial Statements and Auditor's Report for the year 2006, as presented, in accordance with Statute 3.4.1.3.***

## **5.2. 2007 Situation.**

The FAI Executive Director (Finance) reported that a surplus was anticipated for the end of the year. No major financial problems had been encountered in 2007. 95% of subscriptions had already been received. Donations and sponsorship were over-budget, following signature of the Red Bull contract. Expenses were in line with budget expectations. The expected surplus would be appropriately managed by the Executive Board and a full report would be made in 2008.

The subsidy from the International Olympic Committee had doubled, to US\$ 20 000. One-third of this amount had to be allocated to anti-doping measures.

The first instalment of the rights fees for the World Air Games 2009 had been received. All costs associated with World Air Games, including the TSE Consulting contract and the 2 June Selection event had been covered entirely from World Air Games reserves. No members' funds had been used for this purpose.

A system of electronic authorization of payments by Internet had been instituted, and was working very well.

The FAI President commented that despite turmoil in the world financial system, FAI's very conservative policies had paid off. Exposure to the US\$ had been greatly reduced 2/3 years previously, and FAI was heavy in the strong Euro currency. He expected to be able to deliver positive financial news in 2008.

## **5.3. 2008 Scale of Subscriptions and Draft Budget for 2008.**

The FAI Executive Director (Finance) finally reported in detail on the 2008 scale of subscriptions (**ANNEX 5**) and draft budget for 2008 (expenses and income) (**ANNEX 6**).

The Scale of Subscriptions remained the same as in 2007 (adjusted for leaving and arriving members). However, a 5% rebate would be applied to all 2008 subscriptions.

The FAI Secretary General pointed out that the scale of subscriptions was subject to changes resulting from decisions taken on membership of FAI later in the Conference. For budgeting purposes, a "worst-case" scenario had been assumed.

Mr. Omri Talmon (ISR) remarked that there had been a remarkable and commendable increase in projected income from partnership. He wondered whether this income was secured.

The FAI President observed that all budgets were based on assumptions. For reasons of contractual confidentiality, he could not disclose details. But he urged that delegates should accept the figures shown in the budget as being reasonable expectations. He did not expect delegates to be disappointed.

***General Conference unanimously approved the Scale of Subscriptions and Draft Budget for 2008, as presented, in accordance with Statute 3.4.1.4.***

Mr. Jean-Claude Weber informed delegates that CIA had expenditure of E21 000 in 2007 because of a member's failure to organize the annual CIA Plenary as promised. An invoice had been sent to the Member concerned to recover costs. He asked what FAI was doing to enforce this recovery.

The FAI Secretary General stated that the normal debt-recovery action of reminders was being applied. This invoice was not treated differently from any other invoice.

The FAI Executive Director (Finance) thanked NACs and ASCs for carrying out their financial responsibilities, and gave special thanks to FAI Executive Secretary Mme Cosette Mast for her good work in keeping all FAI's accounts.

## 6. Election of Active Members to serve on Air Sport General Commission (CASI)

6.1. General Conference was invited to elect 5 Active Members to serve on CASI in accordance with FAI By-Laws 5.2.1.1 and 5.2.2. The representatives of the following countries, having served for 2 years on CASI, were required to stand down : Australia, Czech Republic, Germany, Spain, Switzerland.

The following countries still had one year of their two-year CASI term left to serve, and did not need to be re-elected in 2006: Canada, France, Poland, Sweden, and USA.

The following countries stood for election to the vacant CASI posts:

Australia .....	(Henk MEERTENS)
Croatia .....	(Tonci PANZA, Alt. Tomislav VAJDA)
Czech Republic....	(Jiri DODAL)
Germany.....	(Günter BERTRAM, Alt. Dr. Jens PLUSCZYK)
Hong Kong China...	(Alex YAN)
Montenegro.....	(Dragan RASIN, Alt. Juskovic NEBOSA)
Serbia .....	(Srdjan PELAGIC, Alt. Sinisa BRADIC)
Spain .....	(Juan Manuel VALLE TORRALBO, Alt. Antonio QUINTANA PEREIRA)
Switzerland.....	(Dr Hanspeter HIRZEL, Alt. Martin MESSNER)
United Kingdom...	(Ian STRACHAN)

6.2. **The representatives of Australia (227 votes), Czech Republic (234 votes), Germany (201 votes), Spain (244 votes) and Switzerland (243 votes) were duly elected.** The full list of CASI NAC Members for 2006/2007 is therefore as follows, listed alphabetically :

Australia, Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and USA.

## 7. FAI World Air Games

### 7.1. Presentation by Turin Local Organising Committee

Mr Bruno Rambaudi (President of the Turin Local Organising Committee (LOC)) and Mr Pierluigi Duranti, Member of the LOC, gave a comprehensive presentation describing plans for the 2009 World Air Games, including a film showing the different venues proposed (**ANNEX 7**).

Mr Olavi Rautio (FAI President of Honour) placed the planned Games in an historical perspective by evoking the 1936 meetings in Italy that had decided on the DFS Olympia Meise as the monotype glider for the Olympic Games. Three construction kits for this glider had been offered free of charge to any country that planned to attend the 1940 Olympic Games in Finland. For geopolitical reasons, these had been cancelled, but Mr Rautio felt that one day gliding could yet become an Olympic sport.

Greece announced that a ceremony could be held for lighting the flame of Icarus on the small island of Icaria. The Minister had said that he would support the transfer of the flame to Turin to

start the World Air Games. Mr Rambaudi thanked Greece for their kind initiative which he greatly welcomed. He pledged to work together with Greece on the matter.

The FAI President offered his thanks to Torino and stated he was looking forward to successful Games in 2009.

## **7.2. FAI Situation Report and Future of World Air Games**

Mr Jean-Marc Badan, FAI Sports and Development Director, introduced a filmed video presentation by Mr Lars Haue-Pedersen and Ms Caroline Anderson of TSE Consulting, describing the process that had led to selection of Turin as the venue for the 2009 World Air Games and outlining TSE's vision for the future of the event and for FAI's development. The video also described detailed plans for the launch of the 2011 World Air Games bidding procedure.

Welcoming this presentation, the FAI President emphasized his hope that FAI was now on track to achieve something worthwhile. It was necessary to proceed by steps to ensure that the Games were attractive both for athletes, organizers and the general public.

Julio Subercaseaux (CHI) congratulated ITA on an excellent presentation. Regarding the 2011 bidding process he urged extension of the dates to allow for southern hemisphere holidays. The FAI Secretary General said that this would be difficult to achieve because there were many constraints. It was not possible to delay for 2011, but the bidding process for 2013 would start immediately after the 2009 Turin Games to give potential bidders much more time. The FAI President recommended that CHI should start planning immediately, using the documents for the 2009 Games. There would not be too many changes.

In answer to a question from Mr Benecos (GRE) it was explained that General Aviation was not in the 2009 World Air Games programme because GAC was developing new events, to be approved in South Africa later. GAC had decided it would not participate in 2009. In 2011, it was hoped to have a GAC competition.

Mr Bert Wijnands (NED) stressed the need for ASCs now to develop interest amongst their own competitors for the new World Air Games concept. They had a mission to persuade. The FAI President fully agreed. ASC Presidents were aware of their responsibilities, and he had confidence in the interest of the ASCs to deliver the very best athletes.

Beat Neuenschwander (SUI) said that in view of the many stakeholders (ASCs, CASI, LOC, NACs, TSE, Secretariat) it would be a challenge to coordinate planning effectively. He hoped for a great success. The FAI President stressed that the LOC carried the main responsibility for organization. FAI awarded rights to organize Games to an external organization, partly for reasons of liability. Jean-Marc Badan was fully dedicated to World Air Games 2009/2011, and an additional person would soon be hired in the Secretariat. ASCs had direct links with event directors locally for each discipline. These local directors had been approved by ASCs. As always in life, it was not possible to exercise total control. Everybody had to cooperate and compromises had to be reached.

Dr. John Grubbström (SWE) emphasized that all delegates had a huge "take-home" mission – to teach everybody what the World Air Games were about. The focus was still strongly on World Championships. Delegates needed to persuade the athletes to want to go to both World Championships and World Air Games.

Jean-Marc Badan said that information was the key element. The Webpages already featured a description of what is a World Air Games Champion, and both of the presentations shown to

delegates would be made available. (An order form would be distributed.) At each Commission meeting, similar presentations would be made.

Alvaro de Orleans Borbon suggested that government funding in some countries might be restricted to World Championships. A letter from FAI would be useful explaining what the Games represented and stressing their importance.

## 8. Amendments to Statutes and By-Laws (I)

The General Conference was invited to consider proposals for changes to the FAI Statutes and By Laws shown in the following paragraphs. The Statutes Working Group's advice on these proposals was distributed after a meeting of the Statutes Working Group (SWG) held in Rhodes on 10 October 2007. The SWG Chairman, Mr. Jean-Claude Weber presented his apologies for not having been able to distribute the Statutes Working Group document earlier and expressed the hope that delegates had nevertheless had time to read through it.

The FAI President commented that in 2008 the SWG would have a meeting in the same time period as the Air Sport Commission Presidents' meeting in May. All recommendations would be considered at this meeting. This would allow SWG members to obtain advice from NAC members if need be. He recognised that it was necessary for Conference delegates to receive the SWG's recommendations well in advance of the plenary meeting, and this would be done in future.

- 8.1.** Proposal from Statutes Working Group to list the FAI Statutes Working Group in Chapter 5 of FAI Statutes as a Permanent Working Group, as required by the statutory definition of this category of Working Group, namely: "A Working Group established for an indefinite period of time *and listed in the FAI Statutes*".

Mr Weber said that this issue was more complicated than it had at first appeared. The Terms of Reference for the SWG had been known for some time, and the General Conference in 2006 had found that these should be in Statutes. But the SWG had then found that several Statutes had to be modified and included in Chap 5. After discussion with the FAI President, it had been agreed to postpone this issue until the next General Conference. It was not a contentious matter, but more time was needed to study the implications. **Conference agreed to defer this matter to 2008.**

- 8.2.** Proposal from IPC to review By Law 5.4.4. (and related By Laws) to determine whether there was a need for secret ballots in Commission Elections if only a single, unopposed candidate accepted nomination.

Mr Weber said that the SWG was of the view that there may or may not be a need, depending on circumstances. But the absolute requirement for a secret ballot was clearly in Statutes. This was a clarification of the existing situation, but not an answer to the question raised. Therefore, there was a need to look into the whole nomination and election process at Commission meetings. The SWG suggested that this should be deferred until 2009.

In response to a question from Mr Evangelos (GRE) concerning the meaning of "unopposed", the FAI Secretary General explained that "unopposed" did not in this context mean that there was no opposition to the candidate, but simply that only one candidate had accepted nomination.

Mr Graeme Windsor (IPC President), who had asked for this item to be placed on the agenda, explained that in IPC the rules had not hitherto been rigorously applied. Delegates were asked for secret nominations. The nominated persons were asked if they accepted nomination. If only one person accepted, he or she was elected by acclamation. Mr Windsor said that he would like the

rules to be examined. Either the way in which elections were conducted had to change, or the rules must be modified.

Dr John Grubbström (SWE) pointed out that there was a valid proposal on the table, and asked that it be examined.

Mr Weber concluded that it was necessary to look in more detail into the whole Commission election process, widening the scope of the question to include other aspects of nomination and election procedures in Commissions.

The FAI President pointed out that he had the power to define the content of the General Conference agenda, and that he agreed to put the expanded question on the agenda for 2008. He did not agree that it was necessary to delay the matter until 2009. FAI was sometimes much too slow in handling such matters.

**General Conference agreed unanimously to the President's proposal that he should place on the agenda for the 2008 General Conference a proposal for revision of the rules governing nominations and elections in FAI Commissions.**

**8.3.** IGC had proposed that a new Statute be adopted to allow Air Sport Commissions and Technical Commissions to decide whether they wished to elect their Bureau members for terms of two-years, or to remain with the status quo of one-year. Since such a decision should not be taken lightly it was proposed that a two-thirds majority should be required to take the decisions and to subsequently change them.

The Presidents, Vice-Presidents and Secretaries ("the Bureau") of the Air Sport General Commission, Air Sport Commissions and Technical Commissions are elected for terms of one-year. By comparison, the position of FAI President and Executive Board positions are only contested every two years.

The proposal sought to align the privileges of the Air Sport General Commission and Air Sport and Technical Commissions with the election protocols for the FAI officers. This would provide a degree of stability for Commission Bureaux, which may assist with the development of major projects within the Commission.

The proposal was originally put forward for review in 2006. However, a number of comments were raised which led to withdrawal of the proposal and resubmission a year later, after consideration had been given to the comments. The comments from 2006 and the subsequent responses adopted in the proposal, as amended by the SWG, are as follows:

- *The description of the two-year terms?* The use of the term "two-year" has been standardised in this proposal.
- *Should Commissions be able to choose whether they move to two-year terms?* The proposal allows Commissions to decide if they wish to retain one-year terms or move to two-year terms.
- *May Commissions switch between one-year and two-year terms?* The proposal limits Commissions to changing the duration of the elected term only at the end of the term of office for the Bureau members.
- *Should this apply to the Air Sport General Commission?* Five of the members of CASI (from Active Members) are elected annually by GC for a two-year term. At the time of the election of the CASI Bureau each year, five members therefore have only one more year to serve and may not be re-elected by GC the following year. For this reason, the proposal should not apply to CASI.
- *Should the two-year appointment apply to the Presidents of Commission subcommittees and working groups?* This was considered to be outside the original intentions of the proposal and was not considered further.

- *How should Bureau members who resign, are unavailable or who are withdrawn as Delegates during their term of office be replaced?* Apart from By-Law 5.6.1, which covers the absence of a Commission President from a Commission meeting, the Statutes and By-Laws are silent on this question. This proposal did not address this question. If it were desired that the Statutes and By-Laws provide guidance, then this should be the subject of a separate proposal.
- *Whether the two-year appointment should also apply to other FAI Vice Presidents?* The appointment of FAI Vice-Presidents was the responsibility of individual NACs. This question was, therefore, not addressed in this proposal.
- *Whether Delegates and Alternate Delegates should be appointed to Commissions for terms of two-years?* The appointment of Delegates was the responsibility of individual Federations. This question was, therefore, not addressed in this proposal.

The SWG recommended that the Statutes and By-Laws be amended to allow the Air Sport Commissions (except CASI) and Technical Commissions to decide whether they wished to elect their Bureau members for terms of two-years, or remain with the one-year term.

**The following Statute and By-Law modifications proposed by IGC and modified by SWG were adopted by General Conference (no votes against, 10 abstentions):**

**Statute 5.1.2.6 (new):**

***Each Commission, other than the FAI Air Sport General Commission, shall determine, by a two-thirds majority vote of the Delegates present or represented, whether the Bureau shall be elected for one-year or two-year terms. Commissions may determine the duration of the term at the end of the current term of the Bureau. The same term shall be applied to all members of a Bureau.***

***By-Law 5.4.4 ~~Annually~~, Each Commission shall elect a President from among its approved Delegates or the existing President by secret ballot. If an absolute majority is not obtained on the first vote, a second vote shall be taken at which a plurality shall carry the election.***

***By-Law 5.4.8. ~~Annually~~, The Members of each FAI Air Sport Commission and Technical Commission shall elect by secret ballot and plurality vote one or more Vice-Presidents from among its approved Delegates.***

**8.4. Proposal from GBR for an amendment to By Law 10.1.3.3. as follows:**

*“Nominations for all FAI awards shall be sent to the FAI Secretariat together with citations not exceeding ~~100~~250 words, and other supporting information required in these By-Laws, to arrive no later than two months before the FAI Commission meeting concerned (by 15 November each year for CIAM Medals and Diplomas) or by 31 May each year in the case of the General Awards shown in Chapter 11.”*

The UK believed that the restriction to 100 words was unnecessarily limiting and onerous and that it was very difficult, in such a short citation, to extol adequately the virtues of an individual who merited an FAI award. By definition, individuals who had earned an international award had usually contributed to sporting aviation in a number of ways and/or have been active in their sport for many years. It was therefore difficult, if not impossible, to describe their contribution sufficiently to provide the FAI with a clear and full picture of the individual.

It was recognized however that some limit should be placed on citations in order to keep the paperwork to a manageable level. It was therefore proposed that By-Law 10.1.3.3 be amended by substituting '250' words in place of '100' words.

The SWG recommended adoption of the By Law change as presented by the NAC of UK.

Mr Tor Johannesen (CASI) suggested that the 250 words should always be in English, but Mr Weber pointed out that FAI had 4 official languages, and that this was therefore not constitutionally possible.

**General Conference adopted the amendment to By Law 10.1.3.3., with 20 votes against and 5 abstentions.**

Mr Jean-Claude Weber expressed his appreciation to the members of his Working Group for their hard work, and the FAI President offered his thanks to the Chairman and all the members of the Group for their efforts to keep FAI's constitution in good shape.

## **9. Situation of FAI Membership**

### **Resignations**

There had been no resignations from FAI since the previous year.

### **Suspended Members**

The following FAI Members were suspended for non-payment of membership fees at 1 October 2007: **Algeria, Cuba, Jordan, Nepal, Qatar, Uruguay.**

### **Defaulters**

Conference was invited to take note of the then suspended members (Algeria, Cuba, Jordan, Nepal, Qatar, Uruguay and to determine what action to take at the end of the year.

The Executive Board had recommended that if these members had not paid by 31 December, they should be considered to have resigned and the debts they had accumulated should be written off. *(Note: Debts to be written off in the event of expulsion : Algeria CHF 10 000, Cuba CHF 5598, CHF 5200, Uruguay CHF 1000, Total: CHF 21 798. (Note: Jordan and Nepal subsequently paid their debts).*

Mr Salah Aljemaz (KUW) kindly offered to investigate the reason for Qatar's failure to pay.

Mr Weber asked if Kuwait could also help with debt recovery from UAE. The FAI President said that such matters should be dealt with outside the meeting and warned all Commissions not to accept bids for annual meetings from unknown persons. In case of doubt, it was necessary to check, visit, and obtain guarantees before committing.

Mr José Buenrostro (MEX) pleaded for gentle treatment of those in difficulty. They should be de-registered, not expelled. It was confirmed that the word "expulsion" was not used, but rather "considered to have resigned".

Dr John Grubbström (SWE) asked what happened if a country wanted to rejoin FAI, a few weeks after arrears had been written off. It was explained that a new By Law had been introduced in 2006 to cover such cases. The FAI President pointed out that most countries did not resign. They just stopped

paying subscriptions and refused to answer communications. This was a difficult policy area and FAI rules may need to develop further.

**Conference decided unanimously to adopt the Executive Board's recommendation that if defaulting members had not paid by 31 December, they should be considered to have resigned and the debts they had accumulated (*Total not exceeding CHF 21 798*) should be written off.**

## **Membership Changes**

### **Moldova**

Exercising the powers conferred by the last General Conference in Chile, the FAI Executive Board had decided to accept the Aeromodelling Federation of Moldova and the Moldovan Paragliding Association as Associate Members of FAI. The Aeromodelling Federation had only paid 70% of its 2007 subscription, but that was likely to be remedied soon (*Note: Fully paid on 4 Dec 2007*). The two federations had been urged to merge and form a NAC. **Conference unanimously agreed to approve the Executive Board's action.**

### **Chinese Taipei**

Following the FAI Secretary General's visit to Kaohsiung in connection with the 2009 World Games, the two organizations from Chinese Taipei that were FAI Associate Members (for aeromodelling and microlights) had agreed to join forces with ballooning, parachuting and other air sport associations to revive a single Active Member organization. Exercising the powers conferred by the last General Conference in Chile, the FAI Executive Board had decided to accept the Chinese Taipei Aerosports Association as an Active Member in Class 9. **Conference unanimously agreed to approve the Executive Board's action.**

### **Bosnia Herzegovina**

In 2006, the Bosnian National Olympic Committee had written to FAI asking that Active Membership be granted to the "National Aero Club in Bosnia and Herzegovina". This organization had paid a Class 10 subscription to FAI (CHF 3 000). According to the NOC, the existing FAI Associate Member for Aeromodelling ("National Aero Club of Bosnia and Herzegovina") was willing to relinquish its membership of FAI in favour of this new Active Member. However, the Associate Member had denied this vehemently, calling into question the credentials of the new organization, and providing evidence claiming that it too was active in all geographical parts and ethnic components of the country. The NOC had subsequently agreed that it had acted prematurely. A claim had been brought before the Court in Sarajevo by the National Aero Club of Bosnia and Herzegovina to resolve the question of entitlement to use the designation "Bosnia and Herzegovina". The Court had made a ruling on 25 October 2006, stating that the claim was inadmissible because it was against an administrative act (decision of registration of two bodies with very similar names) that was not final. Therefore, the Court did not wish to involve itself in the matter. The ruling was not in favour either of one organization or the other. It rejected a claim made by one of the organizations, but did not say that one or the other organization was legitimate and the other illegitimate. Since the date of that Court decision, the Ministry of Justice in Sarajevo had issued a letter, sent to both organizations, urging them to come together and discuss an amicable settlement to the dispute. The Ministry wished to know the date on which the meeting would take place. At the date of the Conference, no such meeting had been arranged.

The present situation was that FAI had an Active member and an Associate Member for aeromodelling, and Conference had exceptionally allowed both of these members to continue in

parallel. FAI had also had correspondence with the Bosnian National Olympic Committee which stated that they were investigating the whole issue and would give advice in due course. But FAI was still awaiting this advice, and had received no reply to the two most recent messages.

In 2006, General Conference had given the Executive Board power to make further decisions in this case in the light of the Sarajevo Court decision and advice received from the Bosnian National Olympic Committee. The Court decision was now known, but the position of the Olympic Committee remained unclear.

The Executive Board had reached the conclusion that FAI was not yet in a position to make a decision in favour of one or the other organization. Therefore, the Board had recommended that FAI should continue for the time being with the existing state of affairs, and that the Conference extend the powers it gave to the Board in 2006 to try to find a resolution. It was stressed that by far the best solution would be for the two rival groups to settle their differences, form one organization, shake hands and move on. This matter was taking a lot of time for FAI staff, and it was not possible for outsiders to understand all the subtleties.

Mr Omar Kulic suggested that the best way forward for FAI would be to accept the National Olympic Committee's decision. However, the FAI Secretary General pointed out that the NOC had officially withdrawn its original advice, and not yet given any new advice. Mr Kulic said that he would arrange for the NOC to send another letter.

**The General Conference agreed to accept the advice received from the FAI Executive Board, and to extend the Board's powers to continue working towards a satisfactory resolution of the problem.** *(Note: On 12 December 2007, FAI was informed that a successful meeting had been held between leaders of the two Associations. Certain agreements and plans for common actions had been made.)*

## **New Members**

### **Monaco**

The FAI Active Member in Monaco was deemed to have resigned from FAI on 1st January 2007 for non-payment of subscriptions in 2005 and 2006. It had been discovered earlier in 2007 that the Club had had major difficulties, including fatal accidents. New management had taken over and wished to rejoin the FAI. The necessary subscription had been paid. **Conference agreed unanimously to accept the Executive Board's recommendation that the Aero Club of Monaco be re-admitted to FAI Active Membership in Class 10.**

### **Bahrain**

An application for FAI Associate Membership had been received through Asiana from the Bahrain Parachuting Association. The Executive Board had decided to invite the General Conference to accept Bahrain as a new Associate Member for parachuting, subject to completion of the necessary formalities. As at 1 Oct 2007, no payment had been received for the membership subscription. **General Conference agreed unanimously to empower the FAI Executive Board to take the necessary action should payment be received.** *(Note: Payment subsequently received for Temporary Membership only.)*

## **Other Membership Matters**

### **NAA/SSA**

The Soaring Society of America's application for Associate membership had not been accepted.

The new NAA President and the SSA President had initiated constructive discussions and the matter was therefore closed as far as FAI was concerned.

**Conference took note.**

**Morocco**

Morocco had been expelled from FAI for non-payment of subscriptions in 2004, and arrears of CHF 14'190.- had been written off at that time. Morocco had applied again for membership, following a change of leadership. In accordance with By Law 2.1.1.5., the applicant had been asked to pay in advance 3 years of subscription (including 2007). Morocco answered that CHF 3'000 had already been transferred to FAI, but that they were not in a position to pay for 2 additional years immediately, and would transfer that amount as and when the necessary subsidies were received from government.

The Executive Board had decided that this was not acceptable, and the FAI President wrote to the President of the Moroccan Federation on 5 June 2007, pointing out that the advance required amounted to less than the cancelled debts, and allowing Morocco, as a prospective member, to participate in 2007 international contests using Sporting Licences issued by the FAI Secretariat. No reply had been received to the FAI President's letter.

**Conference agreed unanimously to give power to the Executive Board to make a decision based on the requirements outlined above.**

**Deutscher Modellflieger Verband (DMFV) / Deutscher Aero-Club (DAeC)**

The DMFV, an aeromodelling association outside DAeC, had applied to FAI for Active Membership, but confirmed that it was also prepared to accept Associate Membership. FAI's Active Member in Germany, the DAeC, had confirmed that it was trying to bring all independent air sport associations in Germany within DAeC, and had been successful with the Hang Gliding/Paragliding and Microlights federations. DAeC had initiated a similar process for aeromodelling and asked FAI not to make any decision until further discussions with the German "Länder" had been completed.

Given that DAeC was the FAI Active Member in good standing for Germany, an application for Associate Membership could only be accepted if there was a proof that DAeC was in breach of FAI Statutes. The FAI Executive Board had therefore authorised the FAI President: 1) to write to DMFV, explaining that their application for Active Membership could not be accepted, given that DMFV covers only one sport, and that Associate Membership could only become available in circumstances where DAeC was in breach of FAI Statutes; and 2) to write to DAeC, informing them that the Board had been made aware of the unsatisfactory situation concerning aeromodelling in Germany, and inviting DAeC to improve the representation of German aeromodellers within DAeC as soon as possible. Information had been received from DAeC that progress was being made towards solving this problem.

The FAI President stressed that urgent change was needed, and a final decision should be made by the end of the year. The present situation was not acceptable to FAI. Germany was long-standing founder member of FAI. Internal problems such as this had to be solved. FAI had now refused 3 times to accept a 60 000-strong organization as an FAI Associate member. We supported our Member, the DAeC. We had only one desire- that this matter be solved quickly.

Günter Bertram (GER) confirmed that DAeC was in discussion with DMFV, which had left DAeC. Efforts were being made to persuade DMFV to rejoin DAeC.

**General Conference took note.**

## **Brazil**

Following information received about serious dissensions within the Brazilian air sports community, the Executive Board had authorized the Secretary General to hold discussions with Brazilian authorities with a view to ensuring that all APs were properly represented, in accordance with the requirements of FAI Statutes. In the meantime, disputed Commission delegates had been removed from the public website. As at 1 Oct 2007, the Brazilian FAI subscription for 2007 had not been paid, and no replies had been received to requests for up-dated information. The FAI Executive Board was very concerned about the situation in Brazil and was following the situation carefully.

In 2006 in Chile, discussions had been held with representatives of the AeCB and of the CAB, a rival Confederation that brought together Brazilian air sports federations. Many of these federations appeared to be unhappy at the way that the AeCB was representing them at the international level. Letters had been received from each of the federations, officially severing their links with AeCB and nominating other delegates to FAI Commissions, in addition to the delegates nominated by AeCB. The FAI Executive Board had decided not to display on the FAI website the names of any delegates because of doubts about the extent of support from the air sport communities for these nominees. The situation remained confused and worrying. FAI was not in a position to say with certainty which groups were the most representative. But a solution had to be found.

The FAI President said that it would probably ultimately be necessary to visit the country. Sometimes it was possible to solve long-standing disputes with a visit. He would need to go accompanied by a Portuguese-speaking lawyer.

### **The General Conference agreed to this proposal.**

In answer to a question from CIVL President Flip Koetsier, as to whether the problems in Brazil could adversely affect Cat 1 contests due to be held there, the FAI Secretary General stated that payment of the 2007 subscription would solve the superficial problem.

## **Ireland**

A request for FAI Associate Membership had been received from the Irish Powered Paragliding & Hang-gliding Association, which considers that its interests were not being properly represented at international level. This application was not supported by the Irish NAC, which was negotiating with this group. The FAI Executive Board was keeping the matter under review.

### **General Conference took note.**

## **Slovenia**

A request for FAI Associate Membership had been received from the Slovenian Free Flight Association, which considers that its interests were not being properly represented at international level. The Association had agreed not to press its application if FAI was reviewing policy on membership more generally. The FAI Executive Board was keeping the matter under review.

### **General Conference took note.**

## **Georgia**

Two Georgian Ministries had written to FAI supporting the "National Aviation Federation of Georgia" as the body that should represent Georgia in FAI. The present FAI Active Member (Georgian Aeronautical Federation) which at 1 Oct 2007 had not paid its 2007 FAI subscription, strongly rejected the position of the Ministries. The FAI Executive Board was keeping the matter under review.

**General Conference took note.**

**Pending Applications.**

Other enquiries about FAI membership had been received from organisations in Angola, Bolivia, Ecuador, Kyrgyzstan, Netherlands Antilles, Somalia, Iran, Costa Rica, Antigua and Barbuda. Conference is invited to authorize the FAI Executive Board to continue membership negotiations with organizations in these countries.

**Renewal of Temporary Membership**

Conference agreed to allow Armenia, Ecuador (2 Members), El Salvador, Mongolia, Paraguay, and Surinam to remain in Temporary Membership of FAI.

<b>10. Prince Alvaro de Orleans Borbon Fund</b>
---

Prof Loek Boermans, Trustee, reported that the Fund, established in October 2000, awarded prizes for technical developments in aviation. The Trustees were Wolfgang Weinreich, Pierre Portmann and himself. Mr Rene de Monchy, who continued to help with the financial administration, had reported that the fund was in a healthy position. In 2006, the Trustees had decided to make an award to the GPS-based glider collision avoidance system FLARM. A Prize of \$20 000 had been equally divided between the 3 inventors. This had been presented at a Prize ceremony held at AERO Friedrichshafen, in the presence of the Trustees. The FAI President asked delegates to nominate good inventors for 2009. It was possible that the next Prize may be presented either at Friedrichshafen or possibly at the World Air Games in Turin.

<b>11. Unmanned Aerial Vehicles</b>
-------------------------------------

Conference noted that there had been rapid growth in recent years in the numbers of civil and military UAVs and in their range of potential application. The pace of progress in UAV technology often outstripped the ability of national authorities to regulate and adjust to the revolutionary operational capabilities and requirements of UAVs. Sporting and recreational aviation were especially affected, since many UAV operations took place at relatively low level, away from major commercial aviation hubs. There were three main problems affecting the FAI community:

- How to Define a UAV: Aeromodelling faced a major threat: regulators may decide on definitions of "UAV" that, perhaps unintentionally, included certain categories of model aircraft. In that way, aeromodellers could be affected by severe restrictions, and subjected to additional costs, when regulators are seeking to control UAV operations .
- Collision Avoidance: The see-and-avoid principle was the primary, and often the only means of separating aircraft under VFR at low altitude in uncongested airspace. The active attention of pilots in both aircraft was needed to ensure effective separation. A UAV's remote piloting system had to be sufficiently reliable to enable it to react to the proximity of other, manned aircraft.

- The Risks of Segregation: Segregating UAV and manned aircraft operations offered a measure of mutual protection, but two issues emerge: is the UAV sufficiently reliable to remain within its assigned airspace; and will the creation of dedicated UAV airspace deny operational areas to sporting and recreational aircraft? The latter question was of great importance, since general aviation faced constant erosion of available airspace in the face of the competing demands on airspace for military, national security and especially commercial purposes.

Written contributions to this debate by Beat Neuenschwander (SUI) and Pierluigi Duranti (ITA) had been circulated to delegates (**ANNEXES 8 & 9**). The FAI President invited a debate on UAVs, the unintentional application of UAV rules to model aircraft, and the need to share airspace. All air sports were concerned. Restricted zones for UAVs already existed, most military, but some non-military.

Mr Sandy Pimenoff (CIAM President) acknowledged that aeromodelling faced a major threat when the definition of models and UAVs overlapped. Other air sports faced other threats. It was important to work quickly on these problems and to create a competent Working Group with an active Chairman.

Mr Alvaro de Orleans Borbon (FAI Executive Director) warned of a great danger for the future of air sport. Environmental monitoring currently carried out by motor gliders can be done much more cheaply by UAVs. What would happen when a UAV collided with an air sports aircraft? Authorities would say that these devices have a public function that air sports do not have. This represented a serious menace to airspace access for air sports.

Mr Omri Talmon (ISR) agreed that the situation was already critical in some places. All sorts of UAVs were already operating, some as big as a B 737, some the size of a pigeon. Authorities were trying to impose limitations on aeromodels. He had been negotiating with his national authority for one year already to define model aircraft and UAVs. The official opinion of FAI could be of critical importance. The present definition relates to purpose, but a watertight definition was absolutely necessary, very quickly.

Mr. Beat Neuenschwander (SUI) said that they had looked for a definition to avoid regulation conflicts with UAVs. In a paper on microdrones, they had clearly recognized that the definition could not be based on wingspan, weight or engine characteristics. It was better to base a definition on the aircraft's mission. Agreement had been reached in Switzerland on a clear differentiation.

Pierluigi Duranti (ITA) noted that the world of UAVs was growing explosively. The subject was complex and highly technical. There were a lot of possible interferences with air sport, and a definite need for a FAI Working Group. UAVs need not necessarily be viewed negatively. They are flying machines and could be part of the FAI family. He agreed that the definitions used must be related to the purpose of the aircraft. UAVs had a dedicated mission to carry out, which was not sport or leisure.

He felt that FAI Records should be revised to take account of a new definition of UAVs. Records should be related to the mission, and not to the speed or height at which UAVs fly.

As far as weight is concerned, it was very important to take into account micro- and mini-UAVs which are those that are easiest to develop in universities. Because they can weigh less than 500 grams, they are more easily compatible with other flying machines. If a pigeon can fly freely, then air sports aircraft should be capable of surviving a collision with pigeon-sized micro- and mini-UAVs. For heavier UAVs, the problem of compatibility is serious and will take a long time to solve.

The FAI President welcomed these substantial and interesting comments. UAVs could endanger our sports, and everybody was now concerned. Commercial and military interests were involved.

A FAI technical working group first had to find out what exactly was going on, what dangers we faced , and what ideas we could propose to solve problems. Specialists were needed for the Working Group.

Mr. Günter Bertram (GER) agreed. VFR flying in future may have to be based on “Sense and avoid” rather than “See and avoid”, using transponders, ADSB or similar devices.

Mr. Otto Lagarhus (NOR) echoed and supported the idea of a Working Group. FAI needed to act quickly to influence things early. The EASA management board, ICAO and national authorities were already discussing these matters.

Mr. Bernald Smith said that, in RTCA, the talk was of IFR, VFR and Electronic Flight Rules (EFR). Airspace management was crucial. UAVs are often autonomous and very small. How could they be seen and see us?

Mr. David Roberts (GBR/EAS) noted that EASA would deal with safety aspects of UAV airspace use within a year.

Dr John Grubbström (SWE) wondered what the liability risks were. Legal aspects needed to be considered. The Group had a requirement for legal expertise.

Accepting the urgent need for a Working Group, the FAI President invited nominations of people who had the necessary time, willingness and competence. It was important to coordinate activity between FAI and Europe Airsports (EAS), so as not to duplicate efforts. We did not have enough forces to waste time. On behalf of EAS, Mr David Roberts fully agreed on the need for careful coordination, and mentioned that Mr. Graham Lynn was very active for EAS on UAVs and might be able to help.

The mission of the Working Group had to be defined carefully. This would be its first job. The mission should include definition of a policy on UAVs that could be proposed to national and international aviation authorities.

**General Conference agreed unanimously to establish a UAV Working Group, and that the following persons should be on that Group:**

**Willi Arpagaus (FAI Executive Board)**

**Pierluigi Duranti (ITA)**

**Jack Humphreys (CAN)**

**Graham Lynn (GBR)**

**Sandy Pimenoff (FIN)**

**Nicholas Sabrakos (GRE)**

**Omri Talmon (ISR)**

**Legal Adviser:**

**Dr. Hanspeter Hirzel**

**The FAI Secretary General was tasked with creating a mailing list for this Group and with coordinating a decision on who should take the lead in driving the necessary work forward.**

## 12. Election of Members to serve on Statutes Working Group (Stats WG)

General Conference was invited to elect 5 Members to serve for a 2-year term on the Stats WG, using the procedures laid down in the Terms of Reference previously adopted by Conference.

The FAI President proposed that **Mr J-C Weber** continue as Chairman.

There being no other nominations, **Conference re-elected Mr Weber by acclamation.**

The FAI President then proposed that the following be elected as members:

**Arne Mathisen (NOR)**

**Eric Mozer (USA)**

**Paolo De Moura Marques (POR)**

**Antonis Papadopoulos (GRE)**

Other nominations were invited from the floor of the Conference. There were none. **The four members above were therefore elected by acclamation.**

The FAI President stressed the importance of this Working Group, and stated that they would receive a task to review the constitution of CASI.

He thanked Art Greenfield (USA) for his work with the Group. Mr Greenfield had asked not to be re-nominated, because of a change in his work circumstances in the USA. The FAI President hope to have him back later.

## 13. Commission Presidents' Forum

13.1. Commission Presidents' and International Affiliate Members' Reports noted by General Conference are at:

**ANNEX 10 FAI Air Sport General Commission (CASI)**

**ANNEX 11 FAI Ballooning Commission (CIA)**

**ANNEX 12 FAI General Aviation Commission (GAC)**

**ANNEX 13 FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)**

**ANNEX 14 OSTIV**

**ANNEX 15 FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM)**

**ANNEX 16 FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC)**

**ANNEX 17 FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA)**

**ANNEX 18 FAI Hang Gliding and Paragliding Commission (CIVL)**

**ANNEX 19 FAI Astronautics Records Commission (ICARE)**

**ANNEX 20 FAI Rotorcraft Commission (CIG)**

**ANNEX 21 FAI Microlight Commission (CIMA)**

**ANNEX 22 FAI Aviation and Space Education Commission (CIEA)**

**ANNEX 23 FAI Amateur-Built and Experimental Aircraft Commission (CIACA)**

**ANNEX 24 FAI Medico-Physiological Commission (CIMP)**

**ANNEX 25 FAI Environmental Commission (EnvC)**

- 13.2.** A pictorial review of the year, showing the high points of the year for all air sport disciplines was shown, and received enthusiastically by delegates.
- 13.3** Commission Presidents were then offered an opportunity to speak on their reports, following which topics proposed for discussion FAI Members were addressed, namely:
- Medical fitness: certification of air sports pilots
  - Effect on sporting and recreational aviation of airspace restrictions and regulatory requirements for electronic identification of aircraft
- 13.4.** President Graeme Windsor noted that there was no mention in his report of The World Games 2009. Parachuting was on the programme for Kaohsiung, Chinese Taipei. Planning would be more difficult there than at previous WGs because there was little if any non-military parachuting in TPE. However, the military, and the Ministry of the Interior had pledged their support, and all systems were go for 2009.
- 13.5.** President Flip Koetsier asked delegates to help CIVL to improve safety by only sending suitably qualified pilots to competitions. Levels of safety were improving, for which he thanked delegates.
- 13.6.** CIAM President Sandy Pimenoff reported that CIAM had worked hard on creating new forms of competition. He showed an impressive video clip demonstrating what had been achieved, especially with indoor competitions.
- 13.7.** CIEA President Michiel Kasteleijn asked countries that were not represented in his Commission to please send delegates. The Commission needed input from everywhere. The generation problem in air sports was important and full information was required to determine future policy.
- 13.8.** CIA President Jean-Claude Weber pointed out that the results of the Coupe Gordon Bennett were missing from his report. The Event had had to be cancelled by the Organisers. CIA was very disappointed to have missed this opportunity. Mistakes had been made. The cancellation provided a good example of the difficulty of sharing airspace with commercial interests. Delegates needed to be aware of those risks.
- 13.9.** CIACA President Pierluigi Duranti asked that countries send delegates to CIACA, a transversal commission that handled all different kinds of flying machines. Most countries declared amateur built activities, but did not send delegates. CIACA wanted to enlarge its activities, and develop new areas of interest. For instance, the Solar-powered Aircraft Sporting Code, written by CIACA had been published.
- 13.10.** OSTIV President Prof Loek Boermans reported that OSTIV publishing had been taken in house. Work continued in three panels. The Sailplane Development Panel had cooperated with EASA on an NPA for crashworthiness dealing with emergency landing loads and crashworthy cockpits. This was the first example of cooperation with EASA, which had taken over the work of the JAR 22 Study Group. OSTIV expected that EASA would also ask for help with operating procedures (Training and Safety Panel). A SOP document was being developed. This would take time, but if we did not reach agreement, bureaucrats would impose their solutions. The Meteorological Panel was working on a book – a revision of the Handbook of Meteorological Forecasting for Soaring Flight, published by the World Meteorological Organization.

**13.11.** Reacting to Professor Boermans' report, David Roberts (EAS) reminded delegates that in gliding, EGU had worked with EASA for several years and had persuaded EASA not to have any operational implementing rules as regards gliding. He thought that it would be unwise for OSTIV to become involved with EASA on technical aspects of this issue, since a political agreement has been reached not to have legally binding operating rules. He pleaded with OSTIV not to cut across what EGU had achieved.

Prof Boermans said that the idea was just to have common agreement on a minimum set of rules generated by our own community, but Mr Roberts thought it would be counter-productive to propose rules, even if minimal, that would be legally binding.

The FAI President noted that OSTIV had done great work on JAR 22/CS22, but warned that if everybody worked separately we would not succeed. We had to pool our forces, and OSTIV must speak to EAS/EGU, and liaise carefully on political aspects. Communication was vital.

**13.12.** Environmental Commission President Dr Michael Goth expressed regret that the environment had not been specifically mentioned in the World Air Games film. His Commission too lacked qualified delegates. Many of those nominated played no active role.

**13.13.** Mr Tonci Panza (CRO) described a problem in his country: Sportsmen could not obtain government subsidies to participate in international championships unless anti-doping controls were in place. FAI could not ignore this. We governed several different activities, and do not know for sure what substances might enhance performance. He urged that the first three competitors in all FAI Championships be tested.

**13.14.** In reply, it was pointed out that there were some 300 events on the FAI Sporting Calendar. Tests had been carried out at a number of FAI competitions and occasional positives identified, normally misuse of recreational drugs or unreported use of prescribed drugs that should have been supported by a Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE). There was no evidence yet of performance enhancement. Much military research in the past had been devoted to trying to find performance – enhancing drugs for pilots, but this had been inconclusive. Testing (in and out of competition) would continue and be reinforced, but FAI's principal efforts would be concentrated on educational programmes to identify drug taking which could have an adverse flight safety impact.

**13.15. Medical fitness: certification of air sports pilots**

CIMP President, Dr Peter Saundby stated that some 3 to 4% of air sport accidents had a medical factor involved, often abuse of drugs or alcohol. These statistics did not differ much from the rest of aviation or vehicle driving. Regulatory regimes varied but the statistics stayed the same. Holding a Cat 1 medical certificate did not preclude dying in the air. Over 90% of accidents were caused by pilot incompetencies of one sort or another- and these were hardly addressed at all by regulatory authorities, who spent all their time tackling <10% of accidents. Older and experienced people can compensate for medical problems with experience and supervision.

EASA was addressing the question of new medical standards for light aircraft air sport pilots, below the ICAO requirements for Class 2. This was a complex matter, but there were some grounds for optimism.

#### 14. Report of the FAI Secretary General

Mr Max Bishop, FAI Secretary General, presented his report (**ANNEX 26**) which was adopted by Conference.

Mr Nick Kaltchev (BUL) reported that his NAC was registered as a data processor. If he gave the address of a person or group to another organization this constituted a felony under Bulgarian law. Everything except name, discipline, licence, and date of birth was personal information, to which nobody had a right of access.

The FAI Secretary General stressed that FAI did not propose to put in place any system that was against any law. Data would not be accessible to the general public, but only to selected individuals who needed to know who the holders of FAI Sporting Licences were.

Mr De Moura Marques (POR) stated that this was not a Bulgarian problem, but a European law. There existed European regulations and directives on the subject. The problem was the interconnection of personal data, which needed to be sent for treatment to someone else. Every country in the EU could request a waiver to send data by saying what was being sent and for what purpose. Another way of circumventing the problem would be to request from licence-holders permission to send this data. Mr De Moura Marques had professional legal experience in this field, and was willing to help. This offer was warmly welcomed.

The only reason FAI asked for contact details was to enable the persons to be contacted more quickly in case of difficulty. It should be easily possible to make the issue of a Sporting Licence conditional upon then holder being willing to release at least basic data such as name, and date of birth. FAI was not trying to put into the public domain private information.

#### 15. Election of FAI Vice-Presidents for 2007/2008

The list of persons nominated to serve as FAI Vice Presidents for 2007/2008 at (**ANNEX 27**) was **unanimously approved** by General Conference.

#### 16. Approval of Delegates Nominated for FAI Commissions 2007/2008

Several amendments to the previously distributed list of nominations had been received, and several countries had submitted new lists of nominees. Conference unanimously approved the list, subject to the incorporation of these amendments. The up-dated list is attached at (**ANNEX 28**)

#### 17. Commission Presidents' Forum (Continued)

Mr. Sandy Pimenoff, CIAM President, showed an impressive video of the new media-friendly events that had been developed to show-case competitive aeromodelling. The indoor event opened up the possibility of attracting thousands of people to an air sport event regardless of the weather.

Introducing a discussion concerning the **effects on sporting and recreational aviation of airspace restrictions and regulatory requirements for electronic identification of aircraft**, the FAI President invited Keith Negal (GBR) to introduce the subject. He noted that problems in the

sharing of airspace were increasing with the number of short-haul flights, low-cost airlines and the introduction of Mode S transponders. Controlled airspace was growing constantly, and outside existing controlled airspace “transponder-mandatory zones” were sometimes being imposed. Aviation authorities sometimes invoked ICAO standards as their justification for increased regulatory restrictions. In Europe, much useful work was being done in Europe Airports. But some of the best examples of electronic identification of aircraft came from outside Europe. FAI was well placed to collect and disseminate information on examples of systems that are being put into place elsewhere in the world. All countries needed ammunition from elsewhere to help them argue against adverse regulation. FAI was a strong organization, well perceived by regulators and thus had the opportunity to exercise leadership. FAI had defined the maximum weight of microlights, and by so doing had created a new sport. The same thing was required here. FAI needed to take the lead, and to go out and make a strong statement.

Mr Alvaro de Orleans Borbon pointed out that the anti-collision system most widely used in Europe today (FLARM) is non-certified, developed outside official channels. It worked - since its adoption, there had been no collision fatalities. FAI had to stop being passive. It had the necessary know-how to solve problems of cohabitation and airspace sharing. There were two options: to watch all airspace users from the ground (radar), or to transmit position data in the air (ADSB). The latter solution was cheaper, but would be likely to be resisted by the air traffic control establishment as it took control away from the ground staff. FAI should develop a concept for an airborne collision-avoidance system, based on experience with FLARM (9000), which he said was essentially an uncertified ADSB system.

Mr. Bernald Smith (USA) referred to his RTCA report (**ANNEX 29**). He strongly supported the establishment of machinery for communication about airspace between FAI Member countries. He was in a position to communicate with RTCA delegates (manufacturers and authorities) at meetings; the products of RTCA were widely used by governments and ICAO (for the writing of SARPS). It was important to put across the notion that “low cost” meant inexpensive in the eyes of the users, not the producers of regulators. Low-power electronic devices were needed. Parachutists and model aircraft were capable of carrying ADSB. This was the future.

The FAI President commented that the situation was complex and very different from one country to another. FAI could not give a single set of advice that suited all circumstances. Each case was different. For example, Mode S had been imposed by manufacturers, with the help of Eurocontrol and EASA, despite the fact that a Mode C transponder can read an S transponder. All VFR aircraft in Europe would now need a Mode S transponder costing perhaps 4000 Euros. This was an unacceptable reality. The USA and AUS had an alternative approach, and FAI needed their input. The problems of Europe may not stay in Europe. ICAO was an influential body and FAI must be aware of what is being prepared there. If national civil aviation authorities liked a proposed ICAO measure they would adopt it with alacrity and blame ICAO if the sport and recreational aviation community was adversely affected. But if ICAO suggested something that commercial aviation did not like, they would always find a way to delay implementation. So certain things could only be done at national level. Exchange of information was very important, and FAI could help NACs to influence their authorities. But the heavy spade-work on operations, maintenance and licensing still had to be done at national level.

Mr Jean-Claude Weber, CIA President expressed his disappointment and frustration that too much time was wasted in complaining and waiting. He was of the view that if NACs were to be effective at home, they needed guidance from the FAI. They need to be shown the way and this was not yet happening. He criticised the Executive Board’s decision to offer a rebate of 5% to NACs on 2008 subscriptions. He would have preferred that this money be attributed to FAI Technical Commissions.

Mr Henk Meertens (AUS) cautioned against automatically assuming a preference for ADSB over transponders. ADSB was very attractive because of the low costs. In AUS, secondary radar would

be disbanded from 2012, and ADSB would become universal above 30 000 ft over the whole of AUS from 2009. But FAI should ask itself the question whether ADSB was always appropriate. A paper was circulating suggesting that ADSB be made mandatory above 5000 ft throughout AUS airspace. The only reason for this was that it was cheap, and provided an enormous amount of information. However, this information was not necessarily useful for the airspace user – possible the contrary. It was necessary to define where and when it was appropriate to use ADSB.

Mr Günter Bertram (GER) agreed that local circumstances varied greatly and the main work had to be done at national level. In GER, an exemption had been negotiated allowing flight up to FL 150 without a transponder until 2015. Early imposition of ADSB would not be welcomed in those circumstances.

Omri Talmon (ISR) noted that Hang Gliding and Paragliding also had airspace requirements. Cell-phone derived whereabouts information could perhaps be used to develop a system to inform airspace authorities of positions. It was necessary to think of unconventional solutions to problems so that sporting and recreational airspace users could continue to fly.

Otto Lagarhus (NOR) urged that work had to be done at international, regional and national levels for maximum efficiency. FAI had to be more effective at ICAO level. FLARM was an excellent example of how industry could solve its own problems. ADSB could be a good solution. OCAS (Obstacle Collision Avoidance System) could be helpful in identifying obstacles (power lines etc) for paragliders. FAI needed to evaluate how we should approach authorities at all three levels to obtain the right balance.

The FAI President thanked delegates for their useful contributions to the discussion and pointed out that a formal proposal from Dr Peter Saundby, CIMP President, to establish a new technical Commission for Airspace and Navigation was on the agenda for consideration later (Open Forum, Item 17). It was clear that the floor was in favour of such a proposal and it would be necessary to find people with the necessary technical competence who were prepared to do the work.

## **18. Approval of Companions of Honour**

The FAI President invited Conference to appoint Mr Ray Johnson and Mr Bernald Smith as FAI Companions of Honour, in accordance with By Law 14.1.2.

**These appointments were approved by acclamation.**

## **19. Open Forum**

The following topics of common concern were raised by delegates:

### **19.1. GBR – Proposals for changes to Annual Statistical Questionnaire (ANNEX 30)**

Mr. Keith Negal stated that UK recognised the need for statistics, but information was increasingly difficult to collect, and results were sometimes unreliable. He proposed reducing the scope of the information FAI collected in order to improve its reliability. Two difficult areas were the numbers involved in competitions, and the number of hours flown. NACs should be provided with reasons why the information was needed.

The FAI Secretary General confirmed that FAI was open to all suggestions as to what questions should be asked in the annual questionnaire. There was no purpose in collecting information that was hard to retrieve and remained unused. The format of the existing questionnaire had been circulated. It was important to know why FAI collected information at all, what it was used for, and

how it could be exploited once collected. A question commonly asked of FAI was: How many people do you have in air sports? It was almost impossible to be sure about the absolute accuracy of figures given, but very important to know how many people FAI and its members represented. Accident statistics were also important.

The FAI President commented that in today's media-oriented world, FAI had to be in a position to provide information about the numbers involved in our sports, overall and for each sport. We could not invent figures. They had to be based on something. It was not possible for FAI to tell the world that it was incapable of gathering statistics.

Bernald Smith agreed. In RTCA, IFALPA claimed to represent 60 000, AOPA 420 000, and FAI 2 million – that figure attracted respect and was important.

John Aldridge (GBR) pointed out that details of how many pilots took part in international competitions could not include 2<sup>nd</sup> category competitions because pilots were not required to enter for these through their NACs.

**The FAI Secretary General was tasked with reviewing the content of the Annual Questionnaire in the light of the comments made.**

## **19.2. Proposal from CIMP President, Dr Peter Saundby, for creation of new FAI Technical Commissions (ANNEXES 31 & 32)**

Referring back to the discussion under agenda item 15, Dr Peter Saundby noted that, in 1985, when he had first joined CIMP, he had been critical of the uncertain task, role and influence of that body. It was now involved in policy-making at international level. Delegates had learnt that to win arguments on policy matters, it was necessary to be more expert than the "experts". To achieve this, sources of reliable information were needed.

A mechanism was needed to make generally available the expertise on key technical matters that already existed within FAI. The general concept had already been explained and well received at the Santiago Conference. Dr Saundby said that his paper had been intended as a floating of ideas for the Executive Board, not as a final document. The Board apparently did not have a high opinion of Technical Commissions and their functions, and therefore did not lend its support. It was disappointing that the Board had taken no action other than to refer the document to the General Conference, and it remained his opinion that if FAI were to lead in world aeronautical affairs, it must have a sound mechanism for communicating technical expertise amongst members. If the present Technical Commissions were not doing their job properly, that was a reason for action, not inaction. Reform was needed, and only the Executive Board could drive that reform. One area required urgent attention above all others: Navigation and Airspace. Because of FAI's need to score contests, it possessed great expertise in navigation. NACs were oppressed by airspace problems. FAI had to decide whether to use its assets to lead in international policy, or simply sit back and wait until something happened before reacting to it.

Alvaro de Orleans Borbon offered strong support. FAI had to do a better job at conserving airspace. It needed airspace to conduct its operations but did not have a formal airspace conservation strategy. There was no point in making rules on how to find the best sportsmen if there was no airspace left for them to fly in. FAI must bring experts together, and get them to agree a way forward. He suggested two guiding principles:

1. Airspace is public domain. It belongs to all. If you take it away for commercial gain, those adversely affected must be indemnified.

2. The rest of the world thinks that the air is reserved for professionals. This misconception must be eliminated.

Keith Negal pointed out that FAI could solve more than one problem with the creation of a Navigation and Airspace Commission. Only a small percentage of those who contributed to FAI participated in sport. They needed to have a reason why they should subsidize international competitors. Airspace conservation was one such reason.

SWE and CRO strongly supported the formation of a Navigation and Airspace Commission. NACs could only wield influence at national level if there was a strong and coherent line put forward by the international body. NACs needed to be informed and guided about these huge problems, which were getting worse.

Referring to a suggestion in Dr Saundby's paper that OSTIV might take over additional responsibilities OSTIV President, Prof Loek Boermans said that OSTIV could not take care of types of air sport aircraft other than gliders.

David Roberts (GBR/EAS) noted that the world of civil aviation was changing and a small window of opportunity had opened to ensure long-term continuation of air sport activity with an appropriate level of regulation (as little as possible) to ensure flight safety, access to airspace, free movement, and the efficient and cost-effective organization of operations.

Air sports did not have privileges, but rights. Airspace belonged to everyone. In Europe, EAS represented the interests of sporting and recreational aviation with regulators, researching issues, and gathering information and intelligence. It was not only a technical function. EAS also identified the intentions of politicians, member states, and regulators and then constructed policies for endorsement by NACs. Rule makers had to be influenced at technical level, but also at political level through lobbying, negotiating, and winning arguments.

As a global organization, FAI needed to face up to the biggest threat affecting us all: the advancing interest of commercial aviation in our airspace.

Günther Bertram (GER) proposed the creation of a single-page FAI policy on airspace that could be presented to the EU and other regulatory bodies.

The FAI President reminded delegates that the FAI General Conference had adopted an official declaration on this subject two years ago, and wondered whether NACs had used it. A formal IGC paper was on the table proposing the creation of a Navigation and Airspace Commission. If it were decided to create such a Commission, NACs would need to nominate competent people as delegates who were prepared to work.

Having established that Dr Saundby was prepared to accept that Conference should restrict its decision to Navigation and Airspace only, leaving aside the three other areas proposed in his paper, subject to the Executive Board's examining at a later date the wider problem of Technical Commissions, their oversight and tasking, the FAI President asked whether it was the wish of the Conference to establish a new Technical Commission for Navigation and Airspace.

Although one or two speakers were in favour of an expert Working Group rather than a Commission, the overwhelming body of opinion favoured the establishment of a Navigation and Airspace Commission, to lend the necessary status and legitimacy, permit the effective dissemination of information through NACs, and allow the creation of an overall FAI policy on airspace that could be used by regional and national bodies.

Although a Commission could not be formally established until the 2008 General Conference, it was agreed that valuable time should not be wasted and that a provisional Commission should be convened, to meet early in 2008.

IGC had proposed a draft of the required Statutes, and it was agreed that the Statutes Working Group should be tasked with working on these proposals.

**Conference agreed in principle (none against, 4 abstentions) to establish a Navigation and Airspace Commission and to authorize a preliminary meeting of delegates to this provisional Commission, pending its formal establishment at the next General Conference through the adoption of constitutional amendments that would be examined in the meantime by the Statutes Working Group.**

The FAI Secretary General stated that NACs would be informed of this decision and invited to submit names of delegates for a meeting to be convened early in 2008. A website page and email mailing list would be set up as soon as practicable.

### **19.3. Proposal from Denmark to use FAI web-site as a commercial platform to promote air sport sponsors.**

Aksel Nielsen (DEN) noted that money was vital for success with air sport events, for example world championships or FAI Conferences. A unique platform for sharing sponsors was the FAI website. Both FAI and NAC sponsors could perhaps use the website as a platform for promoting sponsors.

The FAI President stated that, if there were to be interest on the part of sponsors to advertise on the FAI website, the Board would look at this carefully. FAI already had a Corporate Patron scheme, but so far no interest had been shown in this.

Denmark was asked to provide details of any companies interested in advertising on the FAI website.

<b>20. Presentation of Bids and Vote on Award of 102<sup>nd</sup> FAI General Conference – 2008</b>
---

A bid for the 2008 Conference from India had been accepted by the 100<sup>th</sup> General Conference in Chile. It was based on hotel prices that had subsequently increased very substantially. The FAI Executive Board had therefore decided to re-open the bidding process for this Conference. India's bid remained valid, but no delegation was present in Rhodes. Other countries that had submitted bids (Ireland, Italy, Montenegro) were invited to present their bids, in order drawn by ballot: **Italy, Montenegro, Ireland.**

The results of the first round of voting were:

**Italy 164**

**Ireland 135**

**Montenegro 32**

A second round of voting was therefore held with Montenegro dropping out of the reckoning. The results of the second round were:

**Italy 188**

**Ireland 142**

**Conference therefore decided to award the 102<sup>nd</sup> FAI General Conference 2008 to St Vincent, Aosta Valley, Italy.**

The FAI President congratulated Italy and thanked India, Ireland and Montenegro for their very well-prepared proposals. Mr Bruno Rambaudi (ITA) thanked delegates for their confidence.

#### **21. International Calendar of Sporting Events for 2008**

This calendar was distributed and noted. The up-dated version is attached at **ANNEX 33**.

#### **22. Calendar of Meetings for next 12 Months**

This calendar was distributed and noted. The up-dated version is attached at **ANNEX 34**.

#### **23. Presentation of Bids and Vote on Award of 103<sup>rd</sup> FAI General Conference – 2009**

Denmark, Korea and Portugal were invited to present their bids for the 103<sup>rd</sup> FAI General Conference in order drawn by ballot: Portugal, Korea and Denmark.

The results of the voting were:

**Korea: 206**

**Portugal : 87**

**Denmark: 37**

The FAI President congratulated Korea and thanked Portugal and Denmark for their very good presentations.

Paying tribute to Mme Kim Kyung-O, the President reminded delegates that she had been attending FAI Conferences for so many years, and did an excellent job promoting FAI in her country. It was due recognition for what she had done that FAI should now go to her country. He thanked all who had worked on the presentation, and reminded delegates that Asia was a continent on which there was a great future for air sports. This decision showed that FAI was a true world federation.

#### 24. Recommendation of Museums

No applications had been made for Museum recognition under FAI By Law 15.1.1.

#### 25. Arrangements for Future General Conferences

The following Members indicated or reconfirmed their intentions to bid for the 2010 and 2011 FAI General Conferences:

Czech Republic (Prague)	2010
Ireland	2010
Kuwait	2010
Russia	2010
Spain	2010
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2011
Croatia	2011

#### 26. Discharge of FAI Executive Board

The FAI President invited the General Conference to discharge the FAI Executive Board of responsibility for the management of the FAI's affairs during the year from 27 October 2006 to 13 October 2007.

**Conference unanimously gave discharge to the Executive Board.**

#### 27. Any Other Business

Omri Talmon (ISR) stressed that the World Air Games was a key project for FAI, and he hoped all members would support it as their first priority. FAI had to create a tradition, to increase the number of air sports practitioners and give FAI the image of a powerful organization, with a moral legitimation.

Regarding CASI, he argued that there was a need for new blood from time to time. It was not healthy that re-election was the norm. He announced his intention of proposing a change that would limit the number of consecutive terms that a country could serve on CASI.

The President then closed the Conference, thanking all delegates for their cooperation and the NAC of Greece for its outstanding organization.

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Report by FAI President  | <b>Pierre PORTMANN</b>                      |
| 2. Financial report by the Executive Director Finance   | <b>Robert CLIPSHAM</b>                      |
| 3. Report on FAI Commissions' Finances  |   |
| 4. 2006 Financial Statements and Auditor's Report   |   |
| 5. Scale of Subscriptions for 2008  |   |
| 6. Budget for 2008  |   |
| 7. Turin LOC World Air Games 2009 Report  |   |
| 8. UAVs – Paper by Beat Neuenschwander (SUI)  |   |
| 9. UAVs – Paper by Pierluigi Duranti (ITA)  |   |
| 10. Report by the President of the FAI Air Sport General Commission(CASI)                       | <b>Henry LINDHOLM</b>                       |
| 11. Report by the President of the FAI Ballooning Commission (CIA)                              | <b>Jean-Claude WEBER</b>                    |
| 12. Report by the President of the FAI General Aviation Commission (GAG)                        | <b>Pedro CABANERO MARIMON</b>               |
| 13. Report by the President of the FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)                                 | <b>Robert HENDERSON</b>                     |
| 14. Report by the President of OSTIV  | <b>Prof. Loek BOERMANS</b>                  |
| 15. Report by the President of the FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM)                          | <b>Sandy PIMENOFF</b>                       |
| 16. Report by the President of the FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC)                             | <b>Graeme WINDSOR</b>                       |
| 17. Report by the President of the FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA)                             | <b>Mike HEUER</b>                           |
| 18. Report by the President of the FAI Hang Gliding and Paragliding Comm.(CIVL)                 | <b>Flip KOETSIER</b>                        |
| 19. Report by the President of the FAI Astronautics Records Commission (ICARE)                  | <b>Segismundo SANZ FERNANDEZ DE CORDOBA</b> |
| 20. Report by the President of the FAI Rotorcraft Commission (CIG)                              | <b>David HAMILTON</b>                       |
| 21. Report by the President of the FAI Microlight Commission (CIMA)                             | <b>Tomas BACKMAN</b>                        |
| 22. Report by the President of the FAI Aviation and Space Education Commission (CIEA)           | <b>Michiel KASTELEIJN</b>                   |
| 23. Report by the President of the FAI Amateur-Built and Experiment Aircraft Commission (CIACA) | <b>Pierluigi DURANTI</b>                    |
| 24. Report by the President of the FAI Medico-Physiological Commission (CIMP)                   | <b>Dr. Peter SAUNDBY</b>                    |
| 25. Report by the President of the FAI Environmental Commission (Env.C)                         | <b>Dr. Michael GOTH</b>                     |
| 26. Report by the FAI Secretary General   | <b>Max BISHOP</b>                           |
| 27. List of Vice-Presidents for 2007-2008   |   |
| 28. List of Delegates of Commissions for 2007-2008  |   |

- 29.** Report of RTCA and EUROCAE **Bernald SMITH**
- 30.** GBR Proposal for changes to FAI Annual Statistical Questionnaire
- 31.** CIMP President's Proposals for Creation of New Technical Commissions
- 32.** IGC-endorsed Proposals for Constitutional Amendments to create a Navigation and Airspace Commission
- 33.** International Calendar of Sporting Events 2008
- 34.** Calendar of FAI Meetings

*Additional documents are annexed as follows:*

- 35.** List of FAI Award Winners for 2006
- 36.** List of Participants at the General Conference
- 37.** List of Companions of Honour
- 38.** List of FAI Members

Minutes approved by Mr Pierre Portmann, FAI President on 19 February 2008