

International Fencing Federation

83rd Ordinary Congress

**Leipzig, Germany
22 and 23 November 2003**

SUMMARY

| | |
|---|----------|
| Attendance | Page 3 |
| Agenda | Page 7 |
| Speech of the FIE President | Page 8 |
| Validation of the new federations and validation of the proxies | Page 10 |
| Approval of the minutes of the 2001 Congress in Havana (CUB) and 2002 Extraordinary Congresses in Antalya (TUR) and Lisbon (POR) | Page 11 |
| Proposals submitted to the Congress and reports of the Commissions | Page 12 |
| Speech of Mr. Thomas Bach | Page 65 |
| Presentation for the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens | Page 67 |
| Award of the Challenge Chevalier Feyerick | Page 93 |
| Nomination of Members of Honour | Page 93 |
| Attribution of the World Championships | Page 95 |
| Urgent decisions | Page 98 |
| Candidacies for the 2004 and 2005 Congresses | Page 99 |
| Results of the vote in respect of the propositions on foil and sabre | Page 100 |
| Referees admitted in A category | Page 102 |
| Rules modifications according to the report of the SEMI Commission | Page 103 |

Annexes

| | |
|--|----------|
| List of main decisions | Page 105 |
| Minutes of Refereeing Commission | Page 120 |
| Minutes of Disciplinary Commission | Page 124 |
| Minutes of Legal Commission | Page 126 |
| Minutes of Medical Commission - 26-27 October 2002 | Page 140 |
| Minutes of Medical Commission - 21-22 June 2003 | Page 142 |
| Minutes of Promotion and Publicity Commission - 26-27 October 2002 | Page 144 |
| Minutes of Promotion and Publicity Commission - 21-22 June 2003 | Page 146 |
| Minutes of Rules Commission | Page 149 |
| Minutes of SEMI Commission | Page 155 |
| Minutes of Special Commission on foil and sabre | Page 162 |

ATTENDANCE

The meeting opened at 9 a.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. René ROCH, President of the F.I.E.

Were seated on the tribune :

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| •Mr. René ROCH (MH) | President |
| •Mr. Thomas BACH (MH) | IOC Vice-President |
| •Mr. Mario FAVIA (MH) | Secretary General |
| •Mr. Peter JACOBS (MH) | Secretary Treasurer |
| •Mrs Rafaela GONZALEZ (MH) | Vice-President |
| •Mr. Max GEUTER (MH) | Vice-President |
| •Mrs Nathalie RODRIGUEZ M.-H. | Administrative director |
| •Mr. Ioan POP | International technical director |

Honorary members present :

- Mr. Wolf G. DIEFFENBACH (GER)
- Mr. Guido MALACARNE (ITA)
- Mr. Edoardo MANGIAROTTI (ITA)
- Mr. Mostafa SOHEIM (EGY)

Members of the Executive Committee present :

- Mr. Jean-Claude BLONDEAU (FRA)
- Mr. Ali Youssef HUSSAIN (KUW)
- Mr. Jenö KAMUTI (HUN), President European Confederation
- Mrs Ana PASCU (ROM)
- Mr. Samuel CHERIS (USA, MH)
- Mr. Emmanuel KATSIADAKIS (GRE)

Member of the Executive Committee excused :

- Mr. Arthur CRAMER (BRA, MH)

Presidents of Confederations present :

- Mr. Abderrahmane LAMARI President African Confederation
- Mr. Anibal ILLUECA President Pan-American Confederation
- Mrs Helen SMITH President Oceanian Confederation

Presidents of Confederations excused :

- Mr. Young-Soo CHANG President Asian Confederation

Federations present or represented :

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| SOUTH AFRICA | Mr. George RUIJSCH VAN DUGTEREN |
| ALGERIA | Mr. Abderrahmane LAMARI |
| GERMANY | Mr. Gordon RAPP |
| | Mrs Erika DIENSTL |
| | Mr. Wilfried WOLFGARTEN |
| | Mr. Claus JANKA |
| ARGENTINA | Mr. Victor Sergio GROUPIERRE |
| | Mr. Omar VERGARA |
| ARMENIA | Mr. Achot MELIK-CHAHNAZARIAN |
| | Mr. Lusine KHACHATRYAN |
| ARUBA | Mr. Austin THOMAS |
| AUSTRALIA | Mrs Helen SMITH |
| AUSTRIA | Mr. Benny WENDT |
| AZERBAIJAN | Mr. Yashar MAMEDOV |
| BELARUS | Mr. Serguei Prikhodko |
| | Mr. Igor KRENTIK |
| <i>BELGIUM</i> | <i>Represented by Portugal</i> |
| BOLIVIA | Mr. Alejandro Bleyer |
| <i>BRAZIL</i> | <i>Represented by Cuba</i> |
| BULGARIA | Mrs Hristeva VELICHKA |
| | Mr. Asen DIAKOVSKI |
| <i>BURKINA FASO</i> | <i>Represented by Algeria</i> |
| CANADA | Mrs Marie-France DUFOUR |
| CHILE | Mr. Rodrigo Moreno Castro |
| CHINA | Mr. Hu XIAOTIAN |
| <i>CYPRUS</i> | <i>Represented by Greece</i> |
| <i>COLOMBIA</i> | <i>Represented by Panama</i> |
| SOUTH KOREA | Mr. Kun Bae LEE |
| | Mrs Yu Mi SEO |
| <i>COSTA RICA</i> | <i>Represented by Rafaela Gonzalez</i> |
| CROATIA | Mr. Sanjin KOVACIC |
| CUBA | Mrs Rafaela GONZALEZ FERRER |
| | Mrs Barbara FERNANDEZ |
| | Mr. Julio Cesar GONZALEZ TIRADOR |
| | Mrs Xiomara ROJAS |
| | Mr. Jose Miguel MOREJON |
| DENMARK | Mr. Norman JOERGENSEN |
| EGYPT | Mr. Abd El Moneim EL HUSSEINY |
| EL SALVADOR | Mr. Ernesto RAMIREZ VALLADARES |
| ECUADOR | Mr. German NAVARRETE |
| SPAIN | Mr. Marco Antonio RIOJA PEREZ |
| | Mr. Antonio GARCIA HERNANDEZ |
| <i>ESTONIA</i> | <i>Represented by Denmark</i> |
| USA | Mrs Stacey JOHNSON |
| | Mr. Carl BORACK |
| | Mr. Jeffrey BUKANTZ |
| | Mr. George KOLOMBATOVICH |
| FRANCE | Mr. Pierre ABRIC |
| | Mr. Serge PLASTERIE |
| GEORGIA | Mr. Moris SAKHVADZE |
| GREAT BRITAIN | Mr. Keith SMITH |
| | Mr. Steve HIGGINSON |
| GREECE | Mr. Emmanuel KATSIADAKIS |
| GUATEMALA | Mr. Arnaldo VAZQUEZ |

| | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| GUINEA | <i>Represented by Senegal</i> |
| NETHERLANDS | Mr. Patrice MASSON |
| | Mr. Bert Van de Flier |
| HUNGARY | Mr. György GEMESI |
| | Mr. Andras FELKAY |
| | Mr. Tamas KOVACS |
| | Mrs Zsuzsa JANOSI |
| | Mr. György NEBALD |
| | Mr. Jozsef MESZAROS |
| | Mr. Arpad NEMETH |
| | Mr. Laszlo NEDECZKY |
| HONG-KONG | <i>Represented by China</i> |
| INDIA | Mr. Pradeep RANA |
| INDONESIA | <i>Represented by Max Geuter</i> |
| IRAQ | Mr. Muhannad OTHMAN |
| IRELAND | Mr. Tom RAFTER |
| | Mrs Nuala MC GARRITY |
| ICELAND | Mr. Gudjon GESTSSON |
| ISRAEL | Mr. Arthur BAR-JOSEPH |
| ITALY | Mr. Antonio DI BLASI |
| | Mr. Giorgio SCARSO |
| | Mr. Roberto COSTANZO |
| | Mrs Giselda ABATE |
| | Mr. Marcello BAIOTTO |
| | Mr. Lioniero DEL MASCHIO |
| JAPAN | Mr. Atsushi HARINISHI |
| | Mr. Hinoshita KENICHI |
| | Mrs Yuko KADOWAKI |
| JORDAN | Mr. Khaled ATIYAT |
| | Mr. Wasfi Obidat |
| KUWAIT | Mr. Ali Youssef HUSSAIN |
| MACAO | <i>Represented by René Roch</i> |
| MALAYSIA | <i>Represented by Korea</i> |
| MALI | <i>Represented by Qatar</i> |
| MALTA | Mr. Kenneth SPITERI |
| MEXICO | Mr. Jose Antonio CISNEROS |
| | Mrs Maria A. DE LA ROSA |
| MOLDAVIA | Mr. Ion BOLFA |
| MONACO | <i>Represented by France</i> |
| NICARAGUA | <i>Represented by El Salvador</i> |
| NORWAY | <i>Represented by Sweden</i> |
| NEW-ZEALAND | <i>Represented by Australia</i> |
| PALESTINE | <i>Represented by Jordania</i> |
| PANAMA | Mr. Anibal ILLUECA |
| PARAGUAY | Mr. Pedro CORNET |
| PERU | <i>Represented by Italy</i> |
| PHILIPPINES | <i>Represented by Kuwait</i> |
| POLAND | Mr. Adam LISEWSKI |
| | Mr. Jacek BIERKOWSKI |
| PUERTO RICO | Mr. Gregorio LIMA |
| PORTUGAL | Mr. Florindo MORAIS |
| | Mr. José Edoardo DOS SANTOS |
| QATAR | Mr. Ali BELHADJ |
| | Mr. Khalid JOHAR |
| DOMINICAN REPUBLIC | <i>Represented by Ecuador</i> |
| CZECH REPUBLIC | Mr. Frantisek JANDA |
| SLOVAK REPUBLIC | Mr. Julius KRALIK |
| ROMANIA | Mr. Alexandru MIRONOV |
| | Mr. Octavian ZIDARU |
| RUSSIA | Mr. Yury BYTCHKOV |

SAN MARINO
SENEGAL
SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO
SINGAPORE
SWEDEN

SWITZERLAND
TAIPEI
THAILAND
TUNISIA

TURKEY
UKRAINE
URUGUAY
VIETNAM

Mr. Valeri KHARKHALOUP
Mrs Fatima ALIEVA
Represented by Egypt
Mrs Cécile FAYE
Represented by Romania
Represented by Taipei
Mr. Lars LILJEGREN
Mr. Roland HALVORSEN
Mr. Per PALMSTRÖM
Mr. Pierre THULLBERG
Mr. Hans NOTTER
Mrs Monica HO
Mr. Sutthent NOPPORN
Mr. Abdelaziz ZOUARI
Mr. Nourredine ROBBANA
Mr. Halim SENER
Mr. Maxim PARAMONOV
Represented by Argentina
Represented by Japan

AGENDA

- 1 – Speech of the President of the FIE and of Mr. Thomas Bach
- 2 – Approval of the new federations and validation of proxies
- 3 – Approval of the 2001 Ordinary Congress in Havana (CUB) and 2002 Extraordinary Congresses in Antalya (TUR) and Lisbon (POR)
- 4 – Proposals submitted to the Congress and reports of the Commissions
- 5 – Urgent decisions
- 6 – Candidacies for the 2004 and 2005 Junior/cadet World Championships, for the 2005 and 2006 World Championships and for the 2004 Veteran World Championships
- 7 – Miscellaneous
 - Award of the Challenge Chevalier Feyerick
 - Nomination of Members of Honour
 - Candidacies for the 2004 and 2005 Congresses
 - 2004 Olympic Games in Athens

1. SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT

Mario Favia (ITA, MH): Ladies and Gentlemen, first of all I would like to greet Mr. Arthur Cramer who could not attend this meeting because of the loss of his son. I invite you to share this bereavement as well as the one of the Chilean fencer injured during the World Championship in Havana and to add Dominique Solaris Master in Dakar. I am kindly asking you to accept a minute of silence.

Minute of silence.

Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : Ladies and Gentlemen Members of Honour, Mr. President of the German Fencing Federation, Presidents, dear friends, in the name of the FIE allow me to greet and welcome you. I thank you for your presence at this very important Congress in Leipzig, during which we are going to discuss the future of our sport and at the same time celebrate the 90th anniversary of our Federation.

During the past 90 years, our sport gained a legitimate celebrity to the point that it can not be dissociated from the Olympic spirit. It became an inevitable discipline of the program and for this reason let me thank all my predecessors who have worked very hard to reach this universal recognition.

It is true that our discipline is bewitching but we also have to consider that our competitions, the same as for any spectacle, must fulfil a minimum of three requirements : first of all to have a good presentation, secondly to be practiced by prestigious actors and finally to have a public in the stadium or in front of the television.

Today, we have reached with satisfaction the two first requirements. The third one remains a problem, reason why it must become our main preoccupation in a competitive market, in which we have to evolve and act quickly, while keeping our tradition and ethical value.

Our economic future does not allow us to neglect television and public. Universalization and a better comprehension of our regulations thanks to a very objective refereeing are an absolute necessity. In brief, clearer regulations and a refereeing which does not depend on the subjectivity of the referees.

If we wish to widen the audience and develop the base of our discipline, these two requirements should constantly direct the processes of our action. We have certainly made a lot of progresses during the last few years in respect of the standardisation of our competitions, as for their presentation, we have brought fencing in new countries and conquered new continents.

We have extended the fencing family and we are holding a much more important place in the world of sport. But the fight between the Olympic disciplines does not allow us to rest. We have to fight for our place and always look forward to improve

This is in this spirit that I wish to start this Congress. Everybody must understand that his effort is not only favourable for the other but also for himself, we have to fight to prove that all disciplines deserve the same opportunities to be part of the Olympic program. Nothing is final and this is thanks to our solidarity and faculty to adapt to the 3rd millennium that we will obtain recognition for our sport.

In conclusion allow me to thank all the people who worked very hard for the organisation of this Congress and especially the German Fencing Federation as well as the City of Leipzig. I will not forget the praiseworthy administrative staff.

I wish you an excellent Congress.

Applause.

2. Ratification of the new federations, attendance and validation of proxies

Nathalie Rodriguez : I am going to call the roll of the countries. I am kindly asking you to let me know whether the country is represented or not.

Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Aruba, Aruba is not present ? Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Spain, France, Great Britain, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Ireland, Iraq, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Japan, Korea, Kuwait, Moldova, Mexico, Malta, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Qatar, Romania, South Africa, Russia, Senegal, Switzerland, Slovakia, Sweden, Thailand, Taipei, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, USA.

Before moving on to the list of proxies, I remind you that in 2002 and 2003, the Executive Board had approved the provisional affiliations of Guinea, Congo, Vietnam and Sierra Leone. I am asking the Congress to ratify these provisional affiliations.

René Roch (MH) : Does the Congress agree to ratify these provisional affiliations ? Is there anybody against ? None – in that case I think that these countries are new countries affiliated to the FIE. Thank you.

Applause.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We have now 113 countries affiliated to the FIE.

I now move on to the list of proxies : Belgium assigned its proxy to Portugal. Does Portugal accept it ? Brazil to Cuba. Does Cuba accept it? Burkina Faso to Algeria. Does Algeria accept it? Colombia to Panama, does Panama accept it? Costa Rica to Rafaela Gonzalez. Cyprus to Greece. Does Greece accept it? Estonia to Denmark. Does Denmark accept it? Guinea to Senegal. Does Senegal accept it? Hong-Kong to China. Does China accept it? Indonesia to Max Geuter. Does Max Geuter accept it? Macao to René Roch. Mali to Qatar. Does Qatar accept it? Malaysia to Korea. Does Korea accept it? Monaco to France. Nicaragua to El Salvador. Does El Salvador accept it? Norway to Sweden. Does Sweden accept it ? New-Zealand to Australia. Does Australia accept it? Philippines to Kuwait. Does Kuwait accept it? Palestine to Jordan. Does Jordan accept it? Peru to Italy. Does Italy accept it? Dominican Republic to Rafaela Gonzalez who already has a proxy, or to Panama which already has a proxy, or to Ecuador. Does Ecuador accept it? Serbia and Montenegro Ex-Yugoslavia to Greece which already has a proxy to Romania. Does Romania accept it ? Singapore to Taipei. Does Taipei accept it? San Marino to Egypt. Does Egypt accept it? Uruguay to Argentina. Does Argentina accept it? And Vietnam to Japan. Does Japan accept it ?

René Roch (MH) : While awaiting the exact number of countries present at this Congress, we will start with the agenda. We are at point 3 of the agenda.

3. Approval of the minutes of the 2001 Ordinary Congress in Havana (CUB) and 2002 Extraordinary Congresses in Antalya (TUR) and Lisbon (POR).

René Roch (MH) : You should have received some time ago the minutes of the Congresses, does anybody have a remark ? We have not received any remark so far. Do you wish to make any remark today ? If not, we are going to approve the minutes of the 2001 Ordinary Congress as well as the 2002 Extraordinary Congresses in Antalya and Lisbon as published. Thank you.

We will now move on to point 4.

4. Proposals submitted to the Congress and reports of the Commissions

René Roch (MH) : We have first of all the propositions of the **German Federation** regarding the **Fencer's publicity code**. The proposal intends to increase the possibility of the advertisement for the fencer in the following way: Increase of the surface of advertisement to 125 cm² by logo (4 logos to a total of 500 cm²) and permission of the use of the mask of the fencer (under the conditions established in letter 5/2003 of the F.I.E. allowing the use of the mask with a colored drawing). Reason : The surface of logos and their places are not sufficient for the television, the media and the partners require more attractive places.

The Executive Board is in favour, the Rules Commission is also in favour on condition that publicity may never be positioned on a fencer's clothing in such a way that it could distract or be a nuisance to the opponent – and that any design on the mask, be it publicity or decorative, must beforehand be submitted for the approval of the Executive Committee. The Promotion Commission is in favour of this proposal. Does anybody want the floor ? If nobody, do you agree to approve this first proposal from the German Federation ? Who is against ? Who is for ? We can say that we are unanimously for. Thank you. Application. I think that the application can be rather quick, it can be immediate as it does not disturb us, it is just a problem for everybody to apply this new publicity code if he prefers.

Nathalie Rodriguez : There are 59 countries present, the number of proxies is 26, which makes a total of 85 countries present or represented.

René Roch (MH) : I think that a representation of 85 countries is a record for our Federation. Congratulations.

Nathalie Rodriguez : I am kindly reminding you to say your name and country whenever you take the floor. Thank you. We move on to the **2nd proposition of the German Federation regarding refereeing**. With the letter 5/2003 the F.I.E. made a decision on the fine to be paid in case a national federation does not respect the quotas for World Cup Referees (cf. Rules for events o.88). "We propose that the amount of the fine to be paid by a national federation when announcing that they will not bring the required referees less than two weeks before the competition will be paid directly and at once to the World Cup organizer's at his/her disposal."

The Executive Board is in favour but indicated that the fine should be paid back to the FIE if the organizer does not provide a referee outside his country. The Refereeing Commission is in favour, but indicates that the money must revert to the organiser to cover expenses defrayed. The Rules Commission is in favour. The Legal Commission did not discuss it. Does anybody want to take the floor ? We can vote. Is someone against this proposition ? Any abstention ? **This proposal is unanimously accepted.** I think that we should indicate that this proposal is valid as long as the organiser is the one to assure the services of a referee, on the contrary, the money will go to the FIE.

René Roch (MH) : The aim of this proposition is to have a good refereeing. It means that if a country declares that it is coming with a referee, it has to come with this referee. If it does not come with this referee or declares it less than 15 days in advance that he is not coming, it is penalized. Of course, this is then up to the organiser to appoint a referee to the competition. If the organiser invites this referee and does what is necessary to do to have a suitable refereeing, we must, in that case, give him the amount of the fine. If on the contrary, he does

not act and do not consider the replacement of the declining referee, this is clear that the fine will go to the FIE. We want the organisers to take care of the refereeing as much as possible and it must be a worry of the organiser to arrange an excellent refereeing. I think it is clear for everybody.

Serge Plasterie (FRA) : Mr. President, one simple question : can the substitute referee come from any country, including the one from the organiser ?

René Roch (MH) : I think yes, he can come from the host country. We fully agree.

Serge Plasterie (FRA) : This is just a precision. Thank you very much.

Stacey Johnson (USA) : Just one question : will the funds meant for the FIE be shared with the organising country ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : This is what we have explained, if the organising country can assure the services of a referee, the total amount will revert to him. This is only in the case that it can not assure the services of a referee, that the money will go to the FIE. The application of the proposition takes immediate effect.

We will now move on to the proposals of **South Africa**.

This proposition intends to **amend the article t.129 in the FIE Rules for Competitions**. The first modification is to insert a new paragraph on the provisional suspension : When a fencer is notified that his A sample is positive, the fencer is immediately provisionally suspended. This means that the fencer is barred temporarily from participating in any competition prior to the final decision of the Disciplinary Tribunal.

The second implemented modification is that any case of doping during a competition automatically leads to invalidation of the result obtained with all its consequences, including forfeit of any medals and prizes, irrespective of any other sanction that may be applied, subject to the provisions of point 6 of this article.

The other modification in addition to the automatic invalidation of the result in case of doping, any subsequent competition results obtained from the date the positive sample was collected to the start of the provisional suspension shall also be invalidated. Finally in the event that a fencer who is a member of a team is found guilty of doping, the invalidation of the fencers results will, unless fairness requires otherwise, result in the invalidation of the team's results also. I must indicate that this proposal must be put together with the one of the Executive Committee, which is the proposition nr 18 at page 6-7 of your proposition book. Sorry, this is page 11-12-13 of the proposition book. I wanted to stress that there are two similar propositions and that they should be kept together. In brief, the one from page 11-12-13 and 14.

René Roch (MH) : This is, in particular, the bottom of page 13 and page 14, which correspond to this proposition, where it is indicated in page 13 "any case of doping during a competition automatically leads to invalidation of the result obtained either in a individual or in a team competition, with all its consequences, including forfeit of any medals and prizes, irrespective of any other sanction that may be applied, subject to the provisions of point 5 of this article.

Point 5 : "Any fencer suspended for doping during a competition loses the points obtained during this competition (with all its consequences, including forfeit of any medals or prizes) and the other fencers are ranked up of one place in the results of the competition". To rank up of one place is new, earlier, we used to leave the place vacant. We are therefore

proposing to rank up of one place all the fencers. In the event that a competitor, who is a member of a team, is found guilty of doping either in an individual or in a team competition, the team who used the fencer guilty of doping will loses the points obtained with all its consequences, including forfeit of any medals and prizes and the other teams are ranked up of one place in the results of the competition. The team who used a fencer during its period of suspension loses the points obtained with all its consequences, including forfeit of any medals or prizes, and the other teams are ranked up of one place in the results of the competition.

The important point to underline is to say that the fencer should automatically be suspended as soon as a positive result form the A sample is announced. This is the base of the article proposed by South Africa. Afterwards will follow all the consequences and this is clear that we will not be able to suspend a team who used a fencer who was found guilty individually, because he participated in this team. This is not possible. We can not use a suspended fencer, this is evident, but if we did use this fencer in the past, the results of the team are valid. Do you have any comments ?

Pierre Abric (FRA) : Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, of course I agree with the texts but the only question I would like to raise relates to the proposition of South Africa on the A sample. I would like to be sure that we are in concordance with the code of WADA and the IOC and the question I am asking to myself is on the confidentiality of the A sample in the sense that a fencer is immediately suspended, why not, but this sounds important to me and I think this should be specified in the texts, that the analysis of the B sample must be done rapidly, this is a capital point to enable us apply this principle. And I would like to know if the Legal Commission expressed itself on the declaration of a suspension based on the A sample, as normally, the result of the A sample is just a suspicion as there could be some laboratory mistakes or others. Did this Commission discussed it and is certain that there can not be any appeal or if this suspension is provided by WADA or the IOC, which took the same measures.

Nathalie Rodriguez : In order to reply to this question, I am suggesting to give the floor to Mr. George Van Dugteren and then to Mr. Samuel Cheris.

George Van Dugteren (RSA) : Mr. President, the analysis of A samples are most of the time reliable, there were only 2 incorrect cases. You can without risk say that if the results of the A sample are positive, the B sample will be the same, according to this point of view, I think that we can without risk suspend an athlete starting from the moment of notification to him that the A sample was positive and that logically the B sample will confirm the result, as soon as possible, I agree with you Mr. Abric. Thank you.

Samuel Cheris (USA, MH) : Mr. President, we would like to have a clarification on the wording of the proposition on the fact that being member of a team is not sufficient to have the results cancelled, the person must have fenced and participated as a team member. If the fencer was only a reserve and did not participate, the results of the team can not be cancelled.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : To reply to the question raised by Mr. Pierre Abric, the draft of directive rules of WADA in respect of the preparation of the anti-doping code by international sport federations confirms this strategy, I have it in front of me. A draft is already included in the terminology of the FIE and says that "the Board of the FIE, in accordance with the Anti-Doping Revision Committee, will be able for the time being to suspend an athlete before a full audience, based on the results of the A or B samples". To reply to your question, this proposal is in accordance with the principles underlined by WADA.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does anyone else want to take the floor ? We can therefore move on to the vote. Is someone against the proposition (text of the Executive Committee with the remark made by the Legal Commission, that the fencer who fences in the team and also the suspension of the fencer based on the A sample) ? Knowing that these dispositions will be published in the future anti-doping code of the FIE. Is someone against this proposition ? Does anybody abstain ? One abstention. **The proposition is approved.**

This is the proposition of the Executive Committee with the remarks concerning the fencer of the team and the suspension with A sample. Is the date of application January 1st ? **Date of application : 1st January 2004.**

We will now move on to the propositions from **Brazil**.

René Roch (MH) : I think that some propositions can be discussed but some others should be postponed. The first proposition, which relates to the renumbering system should be postponed as it was principally suggested by Mr. Arthur Cramer and I think he should be here to present and defend it if necessary. I think that this first proposition should be postponed for the next Congress.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We now move on to the **2nd proposition**. The following points must be clarified by the Congress because they are not clear, in our opinion, regarding the refereeing.

Proposition : adopt the same text already used for the start of the pool, match or start of the direct elimination bouts. This proposition is connected to the one of Mr. Jacobs on page 41 and 42 of your proposition book. The Executive Committee is in favour of this proposition, the Rules Commission agreed with this proposal modified as follows : **that the same penalty should be applied to a fencer who fails to present himself on the piste when called during a pool or series of direct elimination bouts as at the beginning of the pool or direct elimination bouts.** In regards to the proposition of Mr. Peter Jacobs, the Executive Committee would like to make some slight modifications to the text. Page 42, the following modifications are effected : For any fencer not present, or any team which does not have all its members present, when called by the Referee at the time published for the beginning of the pool, match or bout of direct elimination, there will be two repetitions of the call, at intervals of one minute, to be followed by exclusion from the competition by the Referee if the fencer or the entire team have not presented themselves by the third call.

René Roch (MH) : Practically, we wanted to apply for the beginning of the competition what is already applied during the competition. The only problem is to apply the same thing during the match and during the competition, that what is applied for the beginning of the competition and beginning of the match.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does anybody wish to say something on this proposition ? Then we pass to the vote. Is anybody against ? Does anyone abstain ? **So, the proposition is unanimously approved.** The application is immediate. The full text of Mr. Jacobs amended by the Executive Committee is approved. **The application is for January 1, 2004.**

Other proposition from Brazil regarding the salute, if, in a direct elimination bout, the winner has not saluted, only annul the hit? And afterwards, annul the hit how many times ? There will be ensuing sanctions ? The Executive Committee is in favour of this proposal, which should be put together with the one of Mr. Peter Jacob on page 42 of your book. The opinion of the Rules Commission indicates that this proposal is already dealt with the one of Mr. Jacobs further on. The Commission finds that, with the simplification of the article as proposed by Mr. Jacobs, there is no confusion : the hit is not annulled, the points or titles already obtained at the moment the fault is committed remain valid, but the fencer is suspended for the remainder of the competition and for the next two FIE competitions at the

same weapon. The Commission also hopes that the referee, as he announces the winner, could remind him at the same time of his obligation to salute, which would allow one to distinguish between "failure to salute" and "refusal to salute".

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : I want to clarify that this is not a new proposition. The reason of the proposition is that there has been for several years a mistake in the application of this decision. The original regulations were not showing the right procedure to resolve the hit of the guilty fencer. We have then decided that the sanction should be a suspension for future competitions. Unfortunately, in the regulation, we did not take out the original text which resulted to two paragraphs in the regulations. We are in contradiction with the system of sanctions for the same fact. What we are doing now, is taking out the paragraph which should have been taken out long time ago and delete the article in the regulation. This is not a new politic.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does anybody wish to say something?

Messrs Bert Van De Flier and Arthur Bar-Joseph take the floor to approve this proposition.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Then we pass to the vote. Is anybody against this proposition ? Yes, I confirm that this is the text published on page 42 of the propositions book, therefore the proposal of Mr. Jacobs that we are voting for. The full text. Is anybody against ? One abstention ? 2 against ? Four ? Four against. **So, application on 1st January 2004.**

So for the **next proposition form Brazil**, I am kindly asking you to refer to the following document situated just after the rules proposition. This is a **text on passivity** which was established by the Rules Commission. I am going to read the text :

During the first and second periods of a direct elimination bout and the first eight bouts of a team match, when both fencers make clear their desire to stop fencing or show evident passivity, the referee will immediately call « halt » and the two fencers will in individual direct elimination take their regulation one minute rest, in team matches will proceed to the next bout. In bouts in pools and in the third period of a direct elimination bout or the ninth bout in a team match, should there be passivity on the part of both fencers in the first two minutes and only in the first two, the referee will warn the fencers (but without imposing a yellow card). If there is obvious repetition, the referee will call "halt" and proceed to the last minute of the time allowed for the bout. This minute, which will be fenced in its entirety, will be decisive and will be preceded by a drawing of lots to decide the winner should the scores be equal at the end of the minute.

Should there be manifest passivity or unwillingness to fight during the third minute, the referee will neither give a warning nor stop the bout. He will stop the bout only in the last 15 seconds and only if the scores are equal. In this case the fencers will fence a last minute, to be preceded by a drawing of lots to decide the winner should the scores equal at the end of the minute; the first hit scored in this minute will be decisive.

I am going to give the floor to Mr. Steve Higginson of the Rules Commission.

Steve Higginson (GBR) : We have once again discussed this proposition and the question of the last minute, we have fairly changed the proposition to say that in the last minute of this last bout or last period of the direct elimination pool, we do not take into account a possible passivity, the referee will not intervene. In case of manifest passivity or unwillingness to fight during the third minute, the referee will neither give a warning nor stop the bout. We do accept passivity in the last minute, the rules remain simple to enable the referee to apply

them and it allows in particular for the match at foil to give more time to the fencer to re-establish the hit if necessary. We have just changed the last paragraph.

Nathalie Rodriguez : So, the entire last paragraph after « nor stop the bout » is deleted ?

Steve Higginson (GBR) : Yes, this is it. He will neither give a warning nor stop the bout. The rest is removed.

René Roch (MH) : I think that we should remind you why we have this text on passivity. We are trying to avoid any passivity from the first second of the bout until the end of the match, because this is very bad for television, for the spectators, this is bad for everybody. Of course, once we reach the third minute of an individual match or once we reach the end of the third period for direct elimination bout, we should not intervene. We can tolerate one minute of immobility if this is a tactical problem. What is not tolerable in the beginning of the match, is tolerable at the end, reason why we do not apply passivity during this last minute.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Another remark. This proposal contains two objectives : the first one is to improve our Rules on the passivity and the second is to follow the decision taken by the Executive Board last spring, to apply the Rules on passivity also to team competitions. In spring, the decision was taken to widen the regulations but no text had been provided. So this text is meant for both paragraphs.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does anyone wish to give his opinion on this proposition ? Then, we pass to the vote. Who is against ? As it was read with its modifications except for the last paragraph, which is removed, as we stick to “ the referee will neither give a warning nor stop the bout”. The rest of the text is out. Any abstention ? **Then, the proposal is unanimously approved.** Of course, the **application is for 1 January 2004.**

The following proposition from Brazil. To make the texts of the schedule of Offences and Penalties and the preceding articles on the subject of “person not on the piste who disturbs the order of the competition” consistent, add on the first infringement, a warning shown by a Red Card. The Executive Board is in favour of this proposition but indicated that the red card should be valid during the entire competition. The Rules Commission feels that the Rules are already quite clear on this matter and that it is merely a matter of dotting the ‘i’ to insert the mention of the red card: moreover, since a red card signifies a penalty hit (which is not relevant in this case), it would anyway be more logical to refer to a yellow card. Does anyone wish to give his opinion on this proposition ?

Serge Plasterie (FRA) : This is just a question of wording, to call it yellow or red card, is the same, so in order to make sure that everybody understands it, effectively this yellow card is more explanatory because there is no hit but it should be stipulated that the yellow card will not be valid for the match but for the entire competition and just after, it will eventually be followed by a black card, more or less immediately after, because I am reminding you that according to the regulations, we can not give a black card just after a yellow card. Besides, we can give a black card, the referee can indeed give directly a black card. Effectively, in the current wording, the fencer can receive a card and then be excluded, or the accompanying person or the coach a warning, which means a yellow card and then he is expelled. This is true that between the words “expulsion” and “exclusion” it is rather difficult for television and others to understand them, so it is better to simplify it.

Nathalie Rodriguez : The proposition is then becoming « on the first infringement, a warning shown by a yellow card », in stipulating that this yellow card is valid for the entire competition. It can then be followed by a black card. Is someone against this proposal ? Any abstention ? **Then, it is unanimously approved.** Of course, **application for the 1st of January 2004.**

We move on to the **following proposition** : **“The judges must change ends halfway through each bout or after each period”**. But what period ? The period of a direct elimination bout or the period of a team relay ? Is it that the judges must change after each bout of the team match ? Proposition : add “and after every two bouts at a team relay match”

The Executive Committee is in favour of this proposal. The Rules Commission is quite happy to add this detail but suggests that it should be specified as “after each fight for direct elimination bouts, the judges change ends after each three minute period”, which would thus be the same in the team matches. Does anyone wish to take the floor ? Then we pass to the vote. Who is against ? We are voting on the proposition of the Rules Commission, with the modifications of the Rules Commission. No abstention ? **So the proposal is unanimously approved with application on 1st January 2004.**

Next page, page 5. **Proposition** : there are situations where a fencer could win a bout with an action by which he hits his opponent and commits a fault at the same time. Thus, the referee must give the penalty and at the same time announce the fencer at fault as the winner. For example : **corps à corps at foil and sabre, taking hold of electrical equipment while fencing, covering or substituting the valid surface with another non-valid part of the body, etc.** Proposal – principle, if a fencer hits his opponent while committing a fault, preceding or simultaneous with the hit, the hit will be annulled. The Executive Committee is in favour of this proposition. By a majority the Commission was in favour of the proposal, but could see no point in inserting the words “preceding or simultaneous”. If the offence precedes the hit, the hit could not be given in any case. Does the President of the Rules Commission wish to take the floor ? Yes.

Steve Higginson (GBR) : We agree to accept Mr. Cramer’s proposition. If we add an asterisk at the article t.120 for the 3 mentioned faults : “corps à corps at foil and sabre, taking hold of electrical equipment while fencing, covering or substituting the valid surface”, in the same way as for the other faults where a possible hit is annulled, then the problem is solved. This is just to simplify the asterisk to satisfy Mr. Cramer’s proposition.

René Roch (MH) : We are trying to avoid that a fencer commits a fault and makes a valid hit at the same time. If we have committed a fault while hitting, we can not take it as a valid hit because the hit is not valid. This is the opinion we used to have and this is the opinion of the Executive Committee.

Serge Plasterie agrees with the proposition.

Melik Chahnazarian (ARM) : I just would like to clarify something. If during the bout, an epee fencer hits his opponent and then jostles him, then it is a sporting fight, he made a hit, then jostled him, are you also asking to annul this ? Or if the hit was done with an illegal gesture ?

René Roch (MH) : This is the reason why we had added « preceding or simultaneous ». If he hits and then bumps into his adversary, this is not simultaneous and not preceding, this is after making a hit. If he does jostle him at the same time, I effectively think that the hit should be annulled. But if he hits, leaves and then bumps into his adversary, I don’t see why the hit should be annulled.

Several persons are taking the floor : Peter Jacobs, Wolf Dieffenbach, Steve Higginson, Stacey Johnson, Serge Plasterie and Arthur Bar-Joseph.

Nathalie Rodriguez : It is finally decided to follow the proposition of Messrs Plasterie and Dieffenbach, and to add, in the schedule of offences and penalties, asterisks for the faults

involved and not to modify the text. Is anybody against ? Abstentions ? So, **this is approved**, we do not modify the text but add asterisks for the faults involved in the schedule of offences and penalties. **Application, of course, for the 1st of January 2004.**

Last proposition from Brazil. There are expressions in the Rules that need concrete examples added to clarify them for referees and fencers. So, there is a list of all the wording for which Brazil would like to add examples and also wishes to replace in the Rules the word "collusion" by "fraudulent agreement". The Executive Committee is in favour of this proposition, the Rules Commission accepts the proposal to study the text and is not against this specific example, but would like to point out that a dishonest agreement is as difficult to establish as collusion.

René Roch (MH) : I don't think that there is a big difference anyway, there is collusion when there is fraudulent agreement. I don't think that it will make a big difference, I think that we can leave the text as it is. Do you agree ? So we leave it like this.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We now move on to the proposition of the **Canadian Federation.**

Proposition : Any organiser who cancels an event that has been approved on the FIE calendar less than four months before the date when the World Cup was scheduled to be held not be allowed to hold the World Cup the following year. In addition, any organizer cancelling a World Cup less than two months before the event was scheduled to be held will be liable for a fine of EUR 5'000, and also loses the privilege to host the event the following year.

The justification of the proposition is as follows : following the high number of last minute cancellations experienced this year on the World Cup circuit, our federation has registered a collective loss in the amount of over USD 40'000, due mostly to the fact that we need to set our program early in the season in order to be able to take advantage of preferential rates available from air carriers. Unfortunately, these are also, for the most part, non-refundable tickets, thus leading to unacceptable losses. For example, the junior World Cup that did not take place in Cuba this year cost us over USD 30'000. We are certain that other federations must also be feeling the brunt of this situation as many are likely to want to take advantage of cheap travel fares, and thereby risk incurring enormous losses every time one of these events is cancelled at the last minute. The situation has become intolerable, and such occurrences even seem to be increasing from year to year. We believe that, unless strict situations are applied to delinquent organizers responsible for such appalling lack of foresight, the situation will indeed only worsen. The Legal Commission is favourable with the modifications noted, but should be an administrative rule, not a statute, therefore the text of the Statutes which would be modified would be "in addition, any organizer cancelling a World Cup less than two months before the event was scheduled to be held will be liable for a fine of CHF 7'500.- and also loses the privilege to host the event the following year, except in case of force majeure approved by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is in favour of this proposition as written. Does anyone wish to take the floor ?

Pierre Abric supports the proposition but think that the organizers should take an insurance against cancellation risks.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does anyone wish to take the floor ? I remind you that there are two different texts, there is a change of date and venue, which is one thing and there is a cancellation, cancellation means that an event will not be held. The change of venue is something different. Now, we are talking about the cancellation of a competition, just a cancellation and not a change of venue.

René Roch (MH) : This is true that if there is a change of venue, this is often a case of force majeure, so it can be accepted by the Executive Committee. We shall have the opportunity to discuss it again during our Congress.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does anyone else wish to take the floor ? We can pass to the vote. We are voting on the text proposed by the Legal Commission, which was amended as follows "except in case of force majeure approved by the Executive Committee". Is someone against ? Does anyone abstain ? **So, the text is unanimously approved. Application 1st January 2004.**

Now, we have a coffee break, just in front of the room.

COFFEE BREAK

Nathalie Rodriguez : Now we move on to the propositions of the President, the Bureau and the Executive Committee published on page 7. The propositions concerning foil and sabre will be dealt tomorrow as we do not have all the material. Then, these propositions on page 7 will be dealt tomorrow.

Modification to the rules : **proposition nr 1, article o.42** to be replaced by the following text : except at the team events of Junior World Championships, at each weapon teams consists of three fencers, with or without a reserve. A team may only begin a match if it is complete. At the three team events per weapon, foil, epee and sabre, teams consist of 4 fencers, 2 male and 2 female fencers. A team may only begin a match if it is complete.

René Roch (MH) : Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that this proposition should be withdrawn. Since the proposition has been made, I have consulted the International Olympic Committee, I have consulted the IOC President Rogge, and it seems that the International Olympic Committee will not be in favour of mixed teams in the future. Thus for several reasons : first of all, it does not admit it in other sports, except for Badminton, but the mixed team in badminton has been existing for a very long time.

Besides, it is difficult to conceive these teams in countries where it is not appropriate to let fence men and women together, there are some opposition and lobbying within the IOC, which does not allow us to arrange mixed teams. This is a big problem. I think that we could even face difficulties in Junior events if we adopt it. I am not against adopting it but I don't think that the issue will be favourable in the future of the IOC. The IOC is clearly against mixed teams.

Mr. Thomas Bach will be present tomorrow morning. He is actually arriving tonight and will be here for the reception and will spend all day tomorrow with us. I am therefore suggesting you to seek for his advice on this subject tomorrow and after having heard his opinion, we might be able to discuss this issue again and make our own opinion. What do you think about it ? I think that it is safer not to fight with the IOC as we are having excellent relationships, we have possibilities for the future. This is clear that up to 2012, it will be very difficult to obtain 2 additional medals. This is also clear that the IOC will not really appreciate any change in our teams, especially that everybody agrees with the fact that our teams, as they are today, are exceptional and represent an excellent spectacle. If we modify our team event according to the potential of medals, it will look like that we do not have real team event and that we can create new teams depending on the necessity. This is not very good, it is better to say that a fencing team consists of three fencers, for the male and for the female, and it is better to fight for 2 additional medals rather than move our position, and not be too much vulnerable on the team's side.

This is the reason why, I am suggesting you to wait until tomorrow morning and seek for Mr. Bach's advice before discussing this proposition. Do you agree ? Do you agree to wait until tomorrow ? Thank you. In that case, we also wait for the second proposition as they are both related.

We now move on to the **third proposition** which is a **modification of the article o.54**. For World Cup competitions, it is recommended to the delegations to send the number of fencers to be entered at least three weeks before the date of the event. I want to add that in the propositions of the Executive Committee, the modifications are underlined, what is not underlined corresponds to the current text. The organizers must, at the risk of penalties of EUR 1'000, refuse the entry of fencers not included on the lists corresponding to this recommendation, any entry which would not be requested by a federation and any entry of fencer or referee non-holder of a FIE license valid for the current season.

The Rules Commission agrees with all the texts proposed, with only reservation that federations should be able to make modifications to the list of names up to midnight on the Tuesday preceding the competition, the opinion of the Rules Commission goes in the sense of the actual text. The Promotion Commission is suggesting the following changes and is in favour of the proposition as amended : "for Grand Prix competitions it is recommended that delegations send their entry form at least three weeks before the date of the event. The names of those entered including the alternate if any must reach the organisers no later 15 days prior to the event. The name of the chief of delegation must be identified on this document, as well as the name and category of each referee being brought". This concerns Grand Prix. For individual World Cup competitions, the organizers must, at risk of penalties of EUR 1'000, refuse any entry of fencers who would not appear on lists corresponding to this recommendation, any entry which would not be requested by a federation and any entry of fencer or referee not holding and FIE licence valid for the current season. The Executive Committee is in favour of the amended proposition of the Promotion Commission. Does anyone wish to take the floor ?

Juan Antonio Cisneros (MEX) : I would like to know in this case how to do with the updating of the list of referees because in our case, 2 or 3 referees do not appear on the list.

Nathalie Rodriguez : I want to draw your attention to the fact that paying for a licence does not mean that you have it. You must order it on the FIE website once the payment has been made. They will then be published and be sent to you. It is not sufficient to pay them, you have to order them, also for the referees.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : We should give the amount of the fine in Swiss francs, as it is our currency, we can write CHF 1'500 instead of EUR 1'000, as we did it for the statutory propositions.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Treasurer Peter Jacobs indicates that as for all statutory propositions, or rules, the amount of the fine should be in Swiss francs, then CHF 1'500 for EUR 1'000, as all the amounts stipulated in the Statutes or the Rules are first in Swiss francs. Does anyone else wish to take the floor ? Then we pass to the vote.

Claus Janka (GER) : I think that this solution should be valid only for Grand Prix competitions and not for all World Cup competitions. The reason is that we do not have enough time between the competitions. At this period of the year, we sometimes have a competition each week-end and we can not nominate the fencers 15 days in advance. This is the point of view of the Promotion Commission.

René Roch (MH) : I think that this is the reason why we said that the registration should be sent 15 days in advance, but the names of fencers could be changed until the Tuesday preceding the competition.

Claus Janka (GER) : What does the Executive Committee propose to the Congress if the text amended by our Commission insists on the fact that the registration should be sent 15 days in advance for Grand Prix and for World Cup, does it remain Tuesday ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : The Executive Committee is in favour of this text. The text amended by the Promotion Commission.

Giorgio. Scarso (ITA) : In view of the international situation, there are many problems with visas for the countries which want to go to Europe, because the authorities need time to obtain a visa.

Nathalie Rodriguez : This is clear that many delegations need to receive invitation a long time in advance to obtain a visa, they must therefore know which fencer is going to take part in which competition several weeks in advance, especially for competitions taking place outside Europe or the other way round.

René Roch (MH) : In that case, it seems very difficult to change the name of a fencer on the Tuesday preceding the competition. I think that this issue will be considered once we discuss the number of fencers that will be accepted for the Grand Prix, but for the time being, I don't think that this is the problem.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We are now discussing the deadline for sending back registration forms, as well as the required information, but we are not discussing the number of fencers.

René Roch (MH) : If you wish to have reserves for the Grand Prix, we shall of course discuss it once we shall discuss the new proposition on the Grand Prix. I don't think this is the right time.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does anyone else wish to speak about this proposition ? Then, who is against ? We are therefore voting on the text amended by the Promotion Commission, which also indicates that EUR 1'000 equal to CHF 1'500. Then, who is against ? Any abstention ?

René Roch (MH) : I think that we agree to vote on the proposal of the Promotion Commission and the amendment of the Rules Commission, which means that we also agree that the list of names can be modified until the Tuesday preceding the competition. We are voting for both and are agreeing with both. Is that correct ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : This is already like this in the Statutes.

René Roch (MH) : So, if it is already in the Statutes, it should not have been proposed. If this is the current regulations, no need to do a proposition for something which already exists.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Who is for ? Who is against ? 18. Does anyone abstain ? Nobody, then 18 against, **the proposition is approved.**

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Who is voting for the proposition ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : 32. Approved. Then we have approved the text of the Promotion Commission in keeping the current rule, which allows the modification of the list of names until the Tuesday preceding the competition.

Proposition nr 7, article o.68 : refereeing at World Championships and Junior/Cadet World Championships is carried out by referees chosen by the Executive Committee of the FIE at the proposal of Refereeing Committee. Referee's travel and board and lodging costs are paid by the Organising Committee that will receive the entry fee as a counterpart. Referees must attend the refereeing meeting which takes place the day before the World Championships. The Rules Commission approved the text unanimously and the Refereeing Commission is in favour. Does anyone wish to take the floor ? Anybody ? Then, we pass to the vote ? Who is against ? Any abstention ? **So, the proposition is unanimously approved, application 1 January 2004.**

Proposition nr 8, article o.69 : « Any proposed candidature for the World Championships must be studied at the venue concerned by an ad hoc delegation designated by the Executive Committee, at the invitation of the candidate federation. The organisers of the World Championships that receive the entry fees from the participating delegations must, at their own expense invite the following international officials (tourist-class return air fare, board and lodging)”. Points 1 to 6 are already in the rules and are not amended, the only modification refers to the point 7, which is “the referees designated by the Executive Committee”. The number of these referees will be situated between 28 and 34 depending on the number of available referees from the organising country, available on the official list of international referee of the FIE.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : And we must indicate that it is compulsory to add referees in the list because this is the decision taken earlier, everything is automatic.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Yes, exactly, this is why I am indicating that the modification concerns the point nr 7, which is underlined « the referees designated by the Executive Committee » and there will be between 28 and 34. Does anyone wish to give his opinion on this proposition ? Nobody ? Who is against ? Any abstention ? **Then, it is unanimously approved and the application is for January 1, 2004.**

Proposition nr 9, article o.74 : replace the 2nd paragraph by « furthermore, the Congress will not accept candidates proposing to organise combined Junior and Cadet Championships ». I must indicate that there is a slight difference in the English translation of the document. We have to understand that the Congress will not accept candidates proposing to organise not combined World Junior and Cadet Championship, in English, this is then “not combined”. The Rules Commission has unanimously approved the text. In fact, we have already been applying this rule for a very long time.

René Roch (MH) : This is the current practice, there is no modification but the old text had remained and we are therefore deleting some part of the old text.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does anyone wish to take the floor ? Nobody. Who is against ? Any abstention ? **Unanimously voted.**

Proposition 13, article o.88 : A-grade competitions, candidate to A-grade and Grand-Prix. The number (quota) of A and B referees that must accompany delegations to A-Grade and Grand Prix competitions, except for Grand Prix-Arbitres, is : 1 to 3 fencers, no obligation, 4 to 9 fencers, 1 referee, 10 or more fencers, 2 referees.

For Grand Prix-Arbitres competitions, for which referees are designated by the Executive Committee, on the proposal of the Refereeing Commission, delegations will no longer have to bring referees. 8 referees will be designated by the Executive Committee, at the expense of the organisers, who will receive any entry fee of CHF 100.

The organiser will thus have at least 8 referees designated by the FIE, plus at least 4 referees designated by the organising country, at its convenience. The organisers must take the necessary actions regarding the meeting of the referees to take place the day before the competition GP-Arbitres. The Promotion Commission does not support this proposal, but rather recommends upholding the status quo for a year and draft a new proposal addressing the problem for the Congress following the Olympic Games. Was discussed the impact on and cost differential incurred by organizers if they were obliged to financially support the services of all referees used. Mr. Roch will consider having the FIE provide some support under criteria it will set. The Commission supports this initiative and recommends it be included as a line item on next year's FIE budget.

We are therefore going to speak only about the point A as the Executive Committee has agreed to postpone this proposal for next year following the recommendation of the Promotion Commission. So, for the time being, we are not going to deal with this proposition.

René Roch (MH) : The problem is as follows : we are always trying to look for a better refereeing. We would like to have designated referees, even in A-grade competitions. For this year, let's try it with the Grand Prix only, it is good to see how it goes with the Grand Prix and after this experience we can consider to extend it to A-grade competitions, but for the time being, it would be abnormal to go so fast. We want first to see how to do it, how to handle it because this is not easy, not easy neither for the Refereeing Commission, nor for our Treasurer. I think it is better to wait with this modification, because the aim we are trying to reach is not to force countries to come with more referees but to have a real objective refereeing, which means referees nominated by the Refereeing Commission. This is why, I think that the small A should be postponed, however, small B is another thing.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Regarding point B, Grand Prix-Arbitre competitions, the Promotion Commission is in favour of the proposal modified as follows « on the proposal of the Refereeing Commission and with a consultation of the organiser ». That is what is being done at the moment, as Federations have the opportunity to indicate to the FIE if the designations are suitable and eventually propose some modifications.

René Roch (MH) : That is what has already been done. Then, we agree with the amendment of the Promotion Commission.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does anyone wish to take the floor ? No, who is against ? Any abstention ? Then, **the proposition is unanimously approved** with the amendment of the Promotion Commission. **Application for January 1, 2004** as the Grand Prix are starting in 2004.

René Roch (MH) : We are having the visit of Mr. Kralik, who just arrived.

Nathalie Rodriguez (MH) : So, we have 60 countries present and 26 represented, which makes 86.

Paragraph C : For A-grade competitions, the Executive Committee made a slight modification, this is "or candidate to A-grade" and we have deleted "Grand Prix", "should a national federation not bring the required number of referees, it will be charged a fine of EUR 500 if the organiser was informed 15 days before the competition or EUR 1'000 if the organiser was not informed before the competition. This fine will have to be paid by the organizer that will keep this amount provided that he appoints the required referees to replace the missing referee(s). In any case, any national federation that does not pay the fine must reduce the participation of its fencers in conformity with the quotas. I remind you that this proposition has already been dealt with the proposition of the German Federation, that the text is complete, but the proposition has already been approved.

Proposition 14, article o.91, B. « scale of points » : The points obtained at a Grand-Prix competition are multiplied by a factor of 2. For the World Championships and the junior and cadet World Championships the points are multiplied by a factor of 3. This proposition should be looked at with the Spanish proposition published at page 30 and 31 of your propositions book. Does anyone wish to take the floor ?

René Roch (MH) : The Spanish Federation is proposing other coefficients, it is proposing 1 for the World Cups, 3 for the Grand Prix and 5 for the World Championships. We thought that the difference was too big and therefore proposed a coefficient of 1 for the World Cups, 2 for the Grand-Prix and 3 for the World Championships.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does anyone else wish to give his opinion on this proposition ? When we talk about World Championships, we have to include the Olympic Games, as the World Championships are replaced by the Olympic Games during the quadrennial and our Rules clearly specify that the Olympic Games are our World Championship at the end of each Olympic cycle.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : We also have to clarify that we are not talking about Team Championships but Individual Championships only.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Then, we can pass to the vote. Is anyone against this proposition ? Any abstention ? **So, it is unanimously approved.**

René Roch (MH) : I think that the modification can be applied only after the Olympic Games. It can not be applied immediately.

Serge Plasterie (FRA) : We should underline what was just said by Peter, these modifications are only valid for Individual competitions. The Team World Cups as well as the Team World Championships are not concerned. It is better to clarify it as there could be some confusion.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We will then add for A-grade competitions and individual, we will therefore add « individual » for A-grade competitions or candidate to A-grade. Mr. Kolombatovitch.

George Kolombatovitch (USA) : I would like some clarification. Should the 8 referees designated for the World Cups come from other countries ? Can the referees belong to the organising country ? as we can have 5,6,7 referees coming from the same country.

Nathalie Rodriguez : The Executive Committee indicated that amongst the 8 referees, there could well be referees from the organising country if it does have enough of them, that is actually what is being done during this season. This is already applied. Then, this proposition will only be applicable after the Olympic Games, for the 2004/2005 season, as the scale of points will be amended.

Proposition nr 15, article t.34 : referees can not have another function during the tournament such as member of the DT, team captain, official delegate of their national federation, etc. The Rules Commission approves the text unanimously, does anyone wish to take the floor ? Who is against ? Any abstention ? **So, the proposition is unanimously approved, application on 1st January 2004.**

Proposition 18, article t.129 : sanctions for doping. The proposition has already been dealt with the proposition of South Africa, as we mentioned that we were voting on the proposition

nr 18 of the Executive Committee and that it has been approved, so we have already approved the proposition 18.

Proposition 21, article 2.1.3 (new) mask in colour or with drawings : « fencers may use masks in colour or bearing drawings. However, and to avoid any negative effect on the image of fencing and of the FIE, these drawings and colours must be sent to the FIE head-office for approval”. This proposition was already explained in a circular, you have been informed several months ago.

René Roch (MH) : I would like to add “for approval of the Executive Committee”.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. I want to indicate that the Promotion Commission is in favour of the proposal except for promotional logos, of course. Does anyone wish to take the floor ? Who is against ? Then, **the proposition is unanimously approved and the application is for 1 January 2004.**

Proposition 22 : IV specific regulations, advertising which is worn or carried, fencing clothing and equipment. « fencers must display their name and their nationality », the Executive Committee made a slight modification, it indicated « in all FIE competitions and at each level of those competitions, in dark blue capital letters, on the back of their jacket. The letters must be between 10 cm maximum, and 8 cm, minimum, high. The width of the letters will vary according to the length of the name. The rest of the text is deleted as we had included this part in the previous sentence. This proposition should be put together with the one of Mr. Jacobs at page 41, which is the proposition nr 5. I go on with the reading of the proposition as this is the one approved by the Executive Committee. “and the design of these national colours on the clothes of the athletes belonging to the same federation must be identical in both individual and team competitions, from the beginning of the competitions for the World Championships and from the table 64 for the Senior World Cup competitions. These drawings must be sent to the FIE for approval. “should the clothing of a fencer not conform to the drawings sent to FIE”, and the Executive Committee put in parenthesis “national colours or name in the back or nationality, the fencer will be sanctioned by a red card at each presentation on the piste”. The promotion commission agrees on the proposal but this will require an amendment of the current Rules in the list of offences which requires a red card. Does anyone wish to take the floor ?

Serge Plasterie (FRA) : The content of the proposition is good, but not the form. Imagine that during a World Cup or a World Championship a fencer in a sweat must change his clothes, and take the jacket of a friend, who of course does not have the same name in the back. Is this fencer going to be sanctioned by a red card because he does not wear the right jacket ? This happens a lot in competitions.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We are talking about lack of names in the back.

Serge Plasterie (FRA) : This is not what we have just said.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Yes, if there is no name in the back, no national colours nor name of the country. This is what we are talking about.

Serge Plasterie (FRA) : I think that we should specify that if the name is different but the country the same, we could authorise it. Imagine a World Championship, and it happened in Cuba, the sweating fencers have sometimes changed their jacket, they did not have the same name in the back, not even the same country because his friend let him his jacket. Is he going to be sanctioned by a red card ?

René Roch (MH) : I think you are right, if they indeed were wearing their name and nationality. I think we should keep it like this, but should specify : except in case of force majeure. This is difficult to sanction a fencer with a red card in the situation described earlier. He proved his goodwill by having a jacket in his name, he takes another one, because he can not use it anymore, this is a case of force majeure.

Nathalie Rodriguez : So, we indicate « except in case of force majeure » just after « compulsory ».

Norman Joergensen indicates that he does not approve the proposed sanction.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : You are saying that if they do not commit other faults, they can participate in the competition without their name at the back without being sanctioned ?

Norman Joergensen (DEN) : Exactly.

René Roch (MH) : It needs more explanations. We are requiring the fencers to have their name in the back. We made it to help the public understand our sport. I am myself unfortunately often travelling and see many competitions. Some competitions are not in the frame of the International Federation, and names are not compulsory in the back. If you are in such a competition and in addition to the lack of the board, there is no name of fencer, you have no idea of what is going on in the fencing competitions. This is very bad for our publicity, for our public, who does not understand anything, even myself do not understand it, and what happened once, I said in a competition that it is not worth for me to go as I do not know who are the fencers involved, I do not know their nationality, I do not see anything. In my opinion, this is very bad, and this is why we have chosen to give a bigger sanction. Now, if you wish to give to the fencer at his first presentation on the piste a yellow card and then at each presentation a red card, why not ? It gives him the opportunity to rectify rapidly if necessary. But I think it is a normal penalty because we should think that fencing is not only devoted to fencers. Indeed, we do know almost all fencers, even if we do not know exactly if we are in the sixteenth or eighth of final in case of lack of boards and names of fencers in the back. This is why we have suggested a stronger penalty. This is not to apply it but to avoid such situation.

Claus Janka (GER): I agree with the red card but my question relates to the text itself. Do I understand that the fencer will be sanctioned by a red card at each beginning of bout ? Is it correct ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : Yes.

Marcello Baiocco (ITA) : Concerning the sanction of the red card for the fencers presenting on the piste with their name at the back, we must think and at the moment there is a preventive control on the clothing of the fencer. If a fencer presents on the piste without his name on the back, there will be no control mark of the service of prevention, so he must be sanctioned with a red card in the same way as he would be sanctioned in case of a weapon non conform or a body-wire not checked, isn't it ? It is working for World Championships but it is different for A-grade competitions.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Yes, there are no strict control for clothing in the A-grade competitions. If I read carefully the propositions, there is a difference between both cases, missing of names and non conformity of the drawings approved by the Executive Committee. If I understand properly, a fencer who does not have his name on the back, can not fence, this is not a red card. He can not fence and on the other hand, if we take the drawing, it is different. If the drawing are not approved by the Executive Committee, he will receive a

sanction according to the proposition, but for the name, I think that the proposal is clear, he can not fence.

Nathalie Rodriguez : No, we have precisely indicated that in case of clothing not conform, this is valid for national colours, the name at the back or the nationality. I have indicated it as being a modification of the Executive Committee, I clearly specified that it was for the colours, name or nationality.

Max Geuter (GER, MH) : I think that we all agree with the red card, but we should find a solution for the World Cup at women's weapon, I am not jealous of long hair but those are hiding the name and the nationality. This is therefore not fair for the one who could be punished. We must find a solution to see what could be done with these women.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does anyone else wish to give his opinion on this proposal ? **Then, the proposition is unanimously approved**, modified as mentioned "except in case of force majeure", **application 1st January 2004**. This is already in force anyway. We now pass on to the **modifications to the Statutes**.

Proposition nr 1 : add in the end of the **article 1.6**, the amounts of the fees above are determined by the Executive Committee and approved by the General Assembly for the following season. It happens that in the Statutes, the Congress is always the one to approve the amounts but now it is up to the General Assembly to approve the financial points. This is then an adaptation of the texts, this is not the Congress anymore but the General Assembly which approves the financial points as the financial report is presented by the General Assembly and not the Congress anymore. The Legal Commission is in favour but it should be added to 3.2.1 and as new 5.1.15 as well the amounts of the fees above, 1 to 4, etc. This is simply to change the Congress for the General Assembly. Is anyone against ? Any abstention ? **Then, the proposal is unanimously approved**.

Proposition nr 2, article 3.2.3 : The Congress establishes, controls and steers the general policy of the FIE. It determines the modification to be made to the Statutes and to the Rules of combat. The opinion of the legal commission is to retain the original language. Add to 5.5.2 that the next General Assembly may ratify in addition to the next Congress. The Congress establishes, controls and steers the general policy of the FIE. It determines the modifications to be made to the Statutes and the Rules for competitions. Does anyone wish to give his opinion on this proposal ?

George Van Dugteren (RSA) : I am afraid that the English version is confusing as it is repeated. The modification to the Statutes is mentioned twice.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : For the time being, the Congress must approve the modification of Rules, any section of the Rules. The proposal is for the Congress to approve the changes in the t book, technical rules. The article of the rules for example in the o book, organisation of the rules can be modified by the Executive Committee and the recommendation of the Rules Commission is to reject the proposal.

George Van Dugteren (RSA) : Excuse-me, but I think that we must clarify this proposal. The proposition that the Executive Committee can modify, will the Rules be proposed or will the proposal be rejected ? My position regarding anti-doping, I am talking about the T or just the Rules. Are the Statutes supposed to be the rules in this document ? The Rules are o, t and m. Then, it is not very clear for me. If we are saying that we need the Congress to modify t.129, which concerns doping, whose list is changing every year, we could not change this list during the Congress.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Reason why the Executive Committee made this proposal.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : To clarify, at present, the Statutes are saying the Rules can be changed by the Congress only. The proposal on this table as already said, remains the same for the t section, which includes Anti-doping, but the o section for example can be modified by the Committee. But, in case of urgent decisions to be taken, such as urgent modifications in the anti-doping code, the Executive can make the modifications and make them retroactively approved by the Congress. It has always been the case and if the rules of anti-doping are becoming an attachment rather than a part of the Rules, it will probably be dealt differently in the future.

George Van Dugteren (RSA) : Thank you, I understand this explanation but what is reflected in the text on which we are going to vote, is what was modified on line with explanation.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : The Legal Commission retains original language.

René Roch (MH) : The problem is as follows, this is a practical question. It is difficult to gather a Congress at any modification of the anti-doping code. Some of the rules, which are not rules for combat; it means that we had proposed that all the rules for combat, are very important, we surely need the opinion of the Congress and in case of more administrative problems, such as anti-doping rules and there could be other propositions, this is clear that this is technical and even us have to refer to the specialists. It is difficult to give our opinion on doping, I must say that we are obliged to say that the Commission is making proposals and we are accepting them. There are therefore 2 solutions : either we mention it in our Statutes and we are saying that the Congress is the governing body regarding the Statutes, the Rules, the Rules for combat and for the rest we are referring to the Executive Committee. I would rather like have the Executive Committee than the Bureau and after this it will be clear. At present, we are saying that it is the governing body for everything and then we will say that if it is urgent, the Bureau will have to decide. It does not look good to me, I think it is safer to have things clear and say, that is what we decide, that is what the Congress can automatically decide and that is what the Executive Committee can decide. It would be clearer but if you wish to keep the current position, this is also possible but it does not look frank to me anyway.

Samuel Cheris (USA, MH) : Mr. President, the problems of rules for combat is that most of the rules discussed on the changes on foil and sabre, would be authorised by this proposition without being seen by the Congress as we don't find them in the Rules of Combat but in the Rules of Material. Subsequently, important changes could be done on the way of fencing without being presented to the Congress. With this proposal, only part t of the Rules, which is the Rules for combat, would remain in the Rules and the entire part m (material), which brings important technical information such as security, transparent mask, clothing, would disappear from the Rules and the modifications would not go through the Congress. This is why the Legal Commission recommends that the Rules remain as they exist and the same for the Statutes. All the competitions rules must be approved by the Congress and urgent matters should be temporarily dealt by the Executive Committee until the following Congress.

René Roch (MH) : I agree with this point of view, and this is possible to do it this way but I think it depends on what we incorporate in the Rules of combat. Of course, if you point out something very specific such as something related to the foil, in that case, it should be included in the Rules of combat. Now, if you wish, we can keep the current situation, it is convenient to me but I hope to have clearer things. But let's keep it vague if you wish, it does not disturb me, besides this is a proposition from the Bureau. Do you agree to leave it as it is ? So we practically do not change anything, we go on like this, if there are urgent modifications to do such as on doping, the Bureau or the Executive Committee will be forced to take a decision, I would prefer have the Executive Committee to take decision as much as

possible, which will be ratified by the following Congress. Do we agree ? We remain like this ? Nobody is against ? **So we agree and remain to this position.**

Nathalie Rodriguez : Proposition nr 3, Article 3.3.3 b) 1st paragraph : « The only valid proxies are those received by the FIE before the opening of the Congress : the proxy must have the signature of the President of the member federation». This is a slight adaptation of the current text which says that proxies should be remitted to the FIE the day before the Congress and at the opening of the Congress. I think it is better to indicate that proxies are valid until the opening of the Congress and not to have 2 different dates. The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposal ? Does anyone wish to speak ?

Jenő Kamuti (HUN) : I would like some precision on the opening of the Congress. The opening of the Congress at 9.00 am ? The opening during the day ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : This is the opening of the Congress, which means at the moment where the President opens the Congress. It could be 8.30 am but this is at the moment where the President opens the Congress. Is anybody against this proposal ? Any abstention ? **So, it is unanimously approved.**

Proposition nr 4, Article 3.4.3 : « The President of the FIE must send the agenda to all the member Federations, with any necessary clarification annexed, at least one month before the Congress or the General Assembly». This is the same, this proposal is a slight amendment of the article 3.4.3, which currently says that the President of the FIE must send at least one month before the Congress. It was then added “ and General Assembly”, this is the sole modification and the Legal Commission was in favour of this proposal. Does anyone wish to speak ? Any abstention ? **Then, unanimously approved.**

Proposition nr 5, Article 3.6.4 : « The General Assembly elects professional auditors as auditors for a period of one year, who can be reconducted». Here as well, this is a small modification to the article 3.6.4, which says that the Congress elects auditors, but as the financial report is now being approved by the General Assembly, we have just changed Congress for General Assembly. In the past, the auditors were elected for 4 years but in order to be softer, the Executive Committee proposed to elect them for 1 year and reconduct their mandate, then this is the only modification. Furthermore, this is what has been done in the previous General Assembly, we have reconducted the auditors for one year. Is anybody against this proposal ?

Bert Van der Flier (NED) : I suppose that this is the English translation, but in the translation, it is said that the General Assembly elects the professional auditors, it does not appoint them. It should be appointed, isn't it ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : Yes, this is appointed.

Bert Van der Flier (NED) : Okay, we are going to change for appointed.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Is somebody against this proposal ?

René Roch (MH) : I think this is correct, we are saying “to appoint” in French, we do not say that they are elected, they are appointed. We propose and they are simply cheered, we agree.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Is anybody against ? Any abstention ? **Then, the proposal is unanimously approved.**

Proposition nr 6, Article 4.1.4 : « The candidature must be done through a form provided by the FIE, only one page A4 ». In fact, the aim of this proposal is to standardize the application for candidatures presented by the candidates because some were presenting one page and the others three pages. The idea was to make a first page with general information such as name, first name, date of birth, photo, etc. and at the back, to keep one page for the Curriculum Vitae of each candidate, in order to have the same form for everybody. The Legal Commission is in favour with the noted modifications. The candidature must be done through a form provided by the FIE, only one page A4, which should include languages spoken and degrees or other qualifications for the particular commission. This is exact that these information should appear at the back of the form because they are general information and they are informative. Does anyone wish to give his opinion on this proposal ? Who is against ? Any abstention ? We are voting on the text and the modification brought by the Legal Commission.

René Roch (MH) : Maybe, we should write « which will include » instead of « which should include ».

Nathalie Rodriguez : So, which will include. And the FIE will establish this form. **So, the proposal is approved** with the modification “which will include languages spoken”

Proposition nr 7, article 4.2.1 : Besides, a candidate to the Presidency must speak fluently one of the three working languages of the FIE and be able to understand and speak the two other working languages. The Legal Commission is in favour of the proposal as amended. Besides, a candidate to the Presidency speaks fluently one of the three working languages of the FIE and it would be desirable that he be able to understand and speak one of the two other working languages. Who wish to speak on this proposal ?

Lars Liljegren (SWE) : Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, we really do not like this kind of paragraph. We will have later a discussion on the age of the President, but in my opinion, this is always the same main discussions. In Sweden, we do not use any rules on the colour of our hair, eyes, language and we do not speak about the age, it will be asked for, once it will arrive. Everytime we take this type of decision, which concerns the demography. This is clear that we have to take the right decision at the right moment. This is of course an argument for a candidate, who speaks fluently all the languages of the world, but what does fluently mean ? And what am I suppose to understand ? In being careful, we are excluding a big part of the earth. The new world is not included in our fencing family. I really do not appreciate that kind of alternatives. But the amendment of the Legal Commission are better than the one of the Executive Committee. I am kindly asking the Executive Committee to change its spirit while listening to these arguments. On the other hand, I would like to explain you on which manner is your mistake if you did it. Thank you.

Applause.

Norman Joergensen (DEN) : Mr. President, I would like to go along these lines. I think that if we agree with this proposal, we will need a Commission, which will decide that a candidate for the Presidency will have to speak one of these languages. In order to be a member of this Commission, we must be a professor in languages, I am a professor in languages and I am qualified for this but I do not accept it just for a professor in languages.

Applause.

Alejandro Bleyer (BOL) : I think that it is more important to have a FIE President able to lead without the need to speak several languages.

Alexandru Mironov (ROM) : Just one word if you agree, I do not think that this is a chance for the life and for the good sake of the President to speak at least two languages. What is wrong with that, it is that we need a person able to represent us in front of the Olympic Committee and the rest of the world.

Steve Higginson (GBR) : I do appreciate the philosophical principle we are talking about, which is the exclusion according to the language. I have been attending the Congress for already many years, and on the quality side, this is in my opinion crucial, for whoever is going to succeed to the Congress, that he should at least be able to cope with one language or the other. The main problem that the world of fencing is facing, is that nobody is able to express himself perfectly in order to be well understood. Whatever is the philosophical topic on the exclusion or integration on a divided point of view, people who speak several languages are preferable. Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : I also think that the President should at least speak one of the three working languages, it seems a necessity. Then, I also think that the wording of the Legal Commission is very convenient and this is desirable that he understands other languages, that is all what we can say, this is preferable and that he at least speaks one of the languages. You know, it happens that we have in Commission people who do not speak any of the languages. This is very difficult to communicate. This is why it is a wish that he speaks at least one of the language fluently. I do not think that this is asking too much, this is really necessary. Now, that it is only preferable, I also agree, this is only a wish, but anyway this is up to you to decide. It is not because we are going to write it that you will be obliged to vote for such candidate or such other candidate, this is clear that the Congress will anyway decide. Here we are, I think that we can get back to the proposal of the Legal Commission, which sounds better to me. Do you agree ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : Then, we are taking back the text amended by the Legal Commission, which indicates that "it would be desirable that he be able to understand and speak one of the two other working languages". Is anybody against ? Yes, the modification is "speaks fluently one of the three working languages of the FIE and it would be desirable..." "

René Roch (MH) : Anyway, this is the text approved yesterday by the Executive Committee.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Who is against ? Any abstention ?

René Roch (MH) : So, we are adopting the text of the Legal Commission.

Nathalie Rodriguez (MH) : Proposition nr 8, articles 4.2.2 and 4.2.4, : « If a candidate for the Presidency withdraws before an election and if he is the unique candidate, new candidates can be presented up to the moment of the election, subject to the general conditions of election enumerated in 4.1.1 et 4.1.2. ». The Legal Commission is favourable as modified « if all of the candidates for the Presidency withdraw before an election, new candidates can be presented ». A slight difference. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposal ? Who is against ?

René Roch (MH) : Then, I think we can formulate it « if the candidate or all the candidates for the Presidency withdraw before an election ».

Nathalie Rodriguez : If the or all the candidates ?

René Roch (MH) : Yes.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Then, the proposal is « if the or all the candidates for the Presidency withdraw before an election, new candidates can be presented ».

René Roch (MH) : Does everybody agree ? **So, we adopt this proposal.**

Nathalie Rodriguez : Article 4.2.4 : « If in the first round of voting no candidate receives the majority of the votes cast, the candidate who received the less votes is eliminated and one additional round is organised. If during the second round an absolute majority is not obtained by a candidate” and here the Executive Committee added “expressed” to make it clear that it is the “expressed votes” , the candidate who received the less votes is eliminated and one or several additional rounds are organised until one candidate obtains a majority of votes or until two candidate remain. In this, the candidate who receives the most votes at the following round is elected. Should there be a tie between two candidates for two rounds of voting, the youngest candidate is elected. The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposal.

Melik Chahnazaryan (ARM) : I would like to ask one question. If we can not make the choice between two candidates with the same number of votes, to tell the truth, I am myself for the progress of youths but we are not in a weightlifting competition. To choose the one who is the lightest, the youngest or the one who is a woman, I am asking the Executive Committee and all its members, maybe to try to find other criteria because I do not think that we are dead-lock and that we can not find another possibility to choose one of the two candidates with the same number of votes. Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : I think that for example in case of tie between two candidates for the Presidency of a Commission, the youngest is the one to be elected. I think that we are applying what is already being done inside the Commissions, to the Presidency of the Federation. I think that we should have the same regulations for everybody, not one rule for the Commissions, and another one for the Congress for the election of the President.

Nathalie Rodriguez : This is also the case for the Executive Committee.

René Roch (MH) : This is the same for the Executive Committee.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Then, this is just an additional application ?

René Roch (MH) : This is simply an application, which has been generalised. This is not a particular application, we have taken back what is already being done. Do you agree ? If two candidates have the same number of votes, the youngest candidate is elected. Does everybody agree ? No problem.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Who is against ? 10. Any abstention? 1. Who is for ? **So, the proposal is voted.**

Proposition nr 9, article 4.3.1 : « Besides, a candidate to the Executive Committee must be able to understand and speak one of the three languages of the FIE. The opinion of the Legal Commission is the following : Besides, a candidate to the Executive Committee must be able to understand and speak one of the three languages of the FIE and it would be desirable that he be able to understand and speak one of the two other working languages. The Legal Commission is extending the proposal a little bit.

René Roch (MH) : The Legal Commission is more strict.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Here we are.

Melik Chahnazaryan (ARM) : Sorry, but if we have extended the existing rule concerning the candidates for the commission and for the Executive Committee, isn't it for the President

who would be elected ? Then, I have a question : is the point that we are currently deliberating also concerns the members of the commissions ? Because, this is with stupefaction that I found out that some members of commissions do not speak any of the three languages, therefore, I would like to know if the same rule exists for the election of the members of commissions.

Nathalie Rodriguez : This is included in the proposal nr 11, which deals with this subject.

René Roch (MH) : We are going to deal later with the proposal nr 11.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Then, I repeat that the Legal Commission would like to use here the same text as the one for the President “and it would be desirable that he be able to understand and speak one of the two other working languages”. “And it would be desirable”, this is just an hypothesis.

René Roch (MH) : This is conditional.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Do you agree with the modification made by the Legal Commission ?

René Roch (MH) : Which is more strict that the one suggested as it was suggested that a member of the Executive Committee speaks at least one of the three languages. Now, the Legal Commission says that he should speak one of the three languages and that he be able to understand and speak one of the two other languages.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Is anybody against the proposal of the Legal Commission ? 2 votes against. Any abstention ? **So, the amended proposal of the Legal Commission is adopted.**

You will now have **the proposals nr 10 and 12**, to raise to two the number of elected women to the Executive Committee and commissions. You will pass from one to two. For this, I have prepared a Powerpoint presentation, because last year, I made a research in the frame of my Master on women and management in the Olympic international federations. For these 2 propositions, I have prepared a small presentation of what is happening in the other federations in respect of the number of elected women in the Executive Committee and commissions.

René Roch (MH) : I want to add that Nathalie passed last year her master with flying colours and we can therefore warmly applaud her.

Applause.

Nathalie Rodriguez : As the original presentation was made in English, it is easier for me to carry on in English. The objectives were to try and determine, within the International Olympic Federations, women representation at all layers, the current appointment practices for hired and elected personnel, the perceptions on forms of discrimination by the stakeholders involved and women’s proposals for success and tackling the obstacles presented to them. The presentation you will view now is thus not the original which is very long, but a presentation I have done especially for this Congress.

The situation in all international federations : there are huge gaps between the 35 Olympic Federations, but figures had to be grouped in order to be readable. The Presidents of International Federations represent from 0 to 9 % in 75 % of the IF. The members of the Executive Committee represent from 0 to 8 % in 55 % of the IF. And from 0 to 9.5 % in 45 % of the IF. The Presidents of national federations represent between 11 and 23 % in 24 % of the IF, from 11 to 33 % in 45 % of the IF and from 10 to 28 % in 50 % of the IF.

The situation of the FIE : the goal set by the IOC being at least 20 % of women at decision-making positions for International Federations and National Olympic Committees at 31 December 2005. At the FIE, we have 8 % of women as President of a national federation. We have 17 % of women in the Executive Committee but our Statutes are currently providing only one woman. The situation could be completely different in 2004. If we do not vote in favour of a representation of two women in the Executive Committee, we might have only one left, and therefore fall again to 9 or 10 % of women in the Executive Committee. With regards to the members of commissions, we have 11 %.

What is the international rule ? The United Nations have voted in favour of the equality of rights of men and women in the small and large nations. The full and complete development of a country, the welfare of the world and the cause of peace require the maximum participation of women on equal terms with men in all fields. It has been clearly established that all kind of discrimination was unacceptable.

This is the ideal situation. What is the reality ?

The UN's report on the 4th World Conference on Women in Beijing states that although women's participation is critical to building democracy and fostering social progress, women are under-represented in the decision-making positions in virtually all countries. There are obstacles of all kinds whether cultural, technical or economic.

Many women have been discouraged from "going for the top" by a set of "myths" suggesting women are not suited for top management. Prejudges such as :

"Women are not interested in sport, thus how could they manage it ?"

"Women are not as serious about their careers and often "drop out" to have children"

"Women are not suited for top management because they are not aggressive enough and lack the self-confidence required for the top jobs"

"Any women can make it to the top if she is competent and works hard. That is how men make it and, after all the corporation is looking for the best person for the job"

Hiring or electing the most qualified individual also brings the question of equality of opportunity. Affirmative action requires that available jobs be made accessible on an equal basis for all qualified persons. The principle of equal opportunity states that persons with the same ability and talents should have roughly the same prospects of success. Race, religion, sex, sexual orientation and family background should not be relevant to one's success or failure in the competitive struggle.

The Olympic Charter, Chapter 5, article 52 provides that « any new sport seeking to be included in the Olympic program has to include women's events »

The IOC strongly encourages, by appropriate means, the promotion of women in sport at all levels and in all structures, particularly, in the executive bodies of national and international sports organisations, with a view to the strict application of the principle of equality of men and women.

Finally, I will say that sport is a birth right and it is a uniquely human activity. But there remains so much to do in this area, particularly at the level of the education of children right from the beginning. It is not fair that people are prevented from taking part in sport which they

love and that no-one does anything to encourage or help them. Sport is a way of educating people, part of the education process; why should women be deprived of it ?

Sport and sport management are not « private preserves ». Women have already been managers, team owners, referees, promoters, communicators, Presidents of international and national federations. They can do it , they do it.

There is room for everyone, so let them in !

Applause.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Then, we are going back to the proposition nr 10, Article 4.3.4 which says : “If the 11 members who have obtained the most votes do not include 2 women, the Executive Committee will consist of the first 9 members elected and the 2 women candidates for the Executive Committee who have obtained the greatest number of votes. If one of the women so selected is of the same nationality as one of the first 9 men elected, she will be stood down in favour of the next woman of a nationality not already represented”. The Legal Commission is favourable as modified “if one or more of the women so selected is of the same nationality as one of the first 9 men elected, she (or they) will be stood down in favour of the next woman of a nationality not already represented”. Who want to speak on this proposition ?

René Roch (MH) : Simply, I think that we should say « if one » and not « if one of the ». If one or more women so selected are of the same nationality. We should not put the « of the ».

Nathalie Rodriguez : « If one or more women ... »

René Roch (MH) : I suppose that with the presentation made by Nathalie, we surely agree with the text.

Nathalie Rodriguez : No, you have the right to be against, this is democracy.

René Roch (MH) : Well, I think that nobody is against ? We are all for ? Ah, a remark from Mr. Max Geuter.

Max Geuter (GER, MH) : My remark concerns the propositions 10 and 12 related to two persons of the same nationality. In the past, we used to have only one nationality, the possibility is that a member of honour nominates someone, a man or a woman. I do not want to cut the rights of the members of honour, but if a federation proposes a man and a member of honour proposes a woman from the same country with the approval of the country, I think it should take back the nomination of the men because otherwise we have two possibilities for one federation which, in my opinion, does not behave as the others.

Nathalie Rodriguez : I am sorry but this is not quite correct as the member of honour must present the candidate in agreement with the national federation, if the national federation does not want it, the member of honour will not be able to present his candidate.

Max Geuter (GER, MH) : But if he does have the support of the federation and that the federation has already nominated a man, do they have to take out one of them ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : But this is up to the Federation to take him out, to take the decision.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Max, if you allow me, I do not have the Statutes here, they are with someone else but if I remember correctly, the Executive Committee and the

Commissions can not have more than one person from the same country, this is therefore automatically not possible to elect two candidates from the same country.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Yes, but now this is only one candidate, then the federation will have to choose and will do it itself.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : The texts are very clear Max. The principle of a Federation to present a man, or the other way round, a member of honour to present a woman or a man, the democratic law is applicable. If the man is elected in 4th position and the first woman in 15th position, I am sorry, the man can not be removed, for me this is a democratic law, the man is elected and we will then look for the next woman. We have to keep the democracy. If he takes the first position at the elections and because a member of honour with the approval of the Federation had presented a woman ranked at the 15th position, she would pass, this is anti-democratic.

Kenneth Spiteri (MLT) : I would like to know what would happen in the case that the 11 members obtaining the majority of votes would all be women ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : Could you repeat please?

Kenneth Spiteri (MLT) : If the 11 members obtaining the majority are all women, what would happen ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : All women ?

Bert Van Der Flier (NED) : We have anticipated this problem in the Statutes of the European Confederation. Our Statutes are saying that if they are several women in our commission, we should change the Statutes, it should be at least one man and one woman, in order to solve the problem.

Omar Vergara (ARG) : There is a mistake in the Spanish translation because it is indicated « disqualified » instead of « stood down », is that correct ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : I suppose that this is a mistake in the translation.

Omar Vergara (ARG) : The translation of « stand down » is « descartar »

Nathalie Rodriguez : It will be corrected.

René Roch (MH) : The problem is to know if we can effectively present 2 persons of the same nationality at the Executive Committee. It seems no, and that there could be anyway only one person. Then, the federation which presents a candidate and also accepts that a member of honour presents a candidate from the same country is in contradiction with the regulations. It does not exist ! Max, I do not think this is a big problem. This problem can not arise, there will always be only one candidate of a nationality to represent the Executive Committee.

Nathalie Rodriguez : But the Congress will take the decision.

René Roch (MH) : I think that if there are two candidates and only one elected member, this is normal, the one with the highest number of votes will be kept.

Nathalie Rodriguez : But, it will be up to the Congress to decide whether to elect the man or the woman.

René Roch (MH) : Absolutely. I think the vote will decide and that is all, we do not have to foresee these things.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : If I have understood properly the remark of Mr. Abric, this is a quite complicated difference. Depending on the advantage given to the women in the election, the 2 first women in the election, even if they are at the bottom of the list, will be elected in priority, before the men with more votes ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : Peter, excuse-me, but let me remind you the text of the Statutes 4.1.2 : « Only one candidate may be proposed by each Member Federation for each post. Only one candidate may be proposed by each Member of Honour for each post ». It means therefore that if the member of honour would eventually present a man or a woman, he should have the support of his Federation, and his Federation is not going to present 2 candidates as it can present only one. So, the federation will make its own choice. There can be only one candidacy.

René Roch (MH) : But this needs to be specified as this is not the case now.

Nathalie Rodriguez : This is the case in the Statutes, I just read the article 4.1.2.

René Roch (MH) : But no, it says that a federation can present only one candidate, but a member of honour can also present a candidate with the agreement of the federation. This is the agreement, it does not mean that the Federation is presenting him. This is the problem, if we wish to have only one candidate per Federation, we have to express it clearly in saying that there will be only one candidate, presented by a Federation.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : This is our Statutes and there is no proposition in the agenda to cancel the right of a member of honour to present a candidate from any country but with the approval of the President of the federation, so we could say that if the President of the federation accepts a second candidate from his country, he takes the risk to turn upside down his priorities, but this is up to the President to accept it or not. You are absolutely right in case the second candidate presented receives less votes than the first one, but if this is a woman, she can take the first one out. This is correct.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : Excuse me but as we can not now change the Statutes, we must take a concrete example, a federation presents a man or a woman, it does not matter, a member of honour says to the Federation "I would like to present such Mr. or such Mrs.", for the time being, we can say yes, in view of the quality of the person, then a country is going to present for example a man or a woman. The result of the elections simply provides a ranking and it must be the one with the highest number of votes who will be elected what ever is a male or a female and with regards to the positions dedicated to the women, if the woman arrives in second position compared to the man, then this is the next woman on the list who will be elected, as she can not be elected for the Executive having the same nationality as the man who received more votes. I think that as long as we have not modified our Statutes, the democratic law, the respect of the Congress, is applicable.

Nathalie Rodriguez : I am just reminding you, Mr. Abric, that there is already a provision in the Statutes about one woman. We have just raised it to two.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : But it has nothing to do with that dear Madam, nothing ! For the moment, I agree to have two women, I am talking about the result of the votes in the current status of our Statutes, we can not give priority, we can not forbid to have two candidacies from the same country for the Executive.

René Roch (MH) : I fully agree, the only thing that Nathalie intended to say is that this is now like this. There is no innovation, the only difference between the old and the new text is the raise of the women from one to two.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : I have understood, the only point I want to say is that if the French man is elected before the French woman, there is no reason for him not to be elected.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : But logically, according to this argument, what is the logic to give priority to the women in all the conditions ? If we follow the argument you are offering, what is the result for, if we do not give priority to the second French woman against the first French man, why do we give priority to the first Belgian against the first French because the Belgian is a lady for example. According to your argument, we can not have the necessity to keep a certain percentage for each sex.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : My argument is very simple, we are anyway saying that there could be only one per country, then the next woman will be elected because she can not be elected as there is already someone elected at the Executive. This is the logical democracy. I am not saying that we should not have two women. I am saying yes, yes for two women.

Rafaela Gonzalez (CUB, MH) : I think that women have found their place thanks to the vote of the Congress. Two women are in the Executive Committee and they have obtained these votes by their own means and not because we must have two women in the Executive Committee. This is very important for the national federations to be conscious of the situation and that they do their best to propose more women, because the basis of all this are the propositions made by national federations to allow women to have a position in the commissions. I think that women have moved forward within the International Fencing federation, they have proved they were up to the granted trust. It is important that each one of us think over it for the next Congress and propose more women for the Commissions. This is a legitimised right not a gift. Thank you.

Applause.

Interpreter of Mr. Di Blasi : What we want to say is that Italy agrees to have at least one elected woman, but we think that it will not be guaranteed that two women be elected. We think that the limitation of the number of elected women might probably be embarrassing for these women. An elected woman should not have a guarantee through the law but each woman should merit it.

René Roch (MH) : Ladies and Gentlemen, personally, I think that what was just said by the Italian President is not quite correct, if we want to be in line with the IOC, to have, from 2005, 20 % of women in our different commissions, at the Executive, etc. I think, that this is an obligation. Furthermore, concerning the fact of having 2 persons of the same nationality, a man or a woman, we have rules. It will then be up to the President of a national federation to give his approval to have a second candidate, he knows that he takes the risk that this man for example might go over, even if this man got a certain number of votes. This is a risk, this is up to him to know whether he wants to present this second person or not. I think that the Rule presented by the Legal Commission and proposed by the Executive Committee is valid, there are very few risks, between us it has never happened. First of all, when a President accepts to present a second member, they are big chances that neither one nor the other be elected. I think he will have more facility to elect the woman rather than the man. We are going to listen to Mr. Joergensen as he is present but I think that with the presentation of Nathalie, with the obligation we have towards the IOC and the little problem raised by this article, it could be accepted as it is.

Norman Joergensen (DEN) : We must remind us that we are going to approve this decision, not for the cause of women but for the cause of fencing, being an organisation, we do need women, not because they need to be heard. And we will therefore have to pay the price to have women in the commissions. This is not for the cause of women, but for the cause of fencing.

René Roch (MH) : I think that we fully agree Mr. Joergensen, as we have almost only women working in the FIE office, you see, we think that they are exceptional women.

Melik Chahnazarian (ARM) : I don't think that we have to discuss to have one or two women. I had the pleasure to participate, with my female colleague, 5 times national champion, in the IOC Congress in Paris on Sport and Women, and I hope that we will take part in the same conference scheduled to hold next year in Morocco, during which they will probably see how the IOC prescriptions have been resolved in the different national federations. Then, this is not a question to be discussed, but if you allow me, I would like to propose what Armenia suggested at this IOC Conference, which is to invite international sport federations to suggest national federations to include one woman before 2004 and two women after in the composition of their directional organisations. I want to add that the international Volley-Ball federation followed this proposition and one year later, the national Volley-Ball federation of Armenia got already one woman in the Executive Committee and will surely soon have two. I would like to propose, because we have not written it but will do it later, that the international fencing federation suggests national fencing federations to follow these IOC prescriptions. Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : I think concerning national federations, this is up to the National Olympic Committee and I think that they might also be recommendations from the National Olympic Committee in every country and I think this is up to the National Olympic Committee to propose to the national federations to include women in their management, but this is another problem. For the time being, our problem is to have two women in the Executive Committee. Do you agree with this proposal as presented, with the slight modification of the Legal Commission ?

Wolf Dieffenbach (GER, MH) : Just one question. What do we do if we do not have the candidacies of two women ? With this text, do we decrease the number of members to 8 ?

René Roch (MH) : No, we remain with the same number of members but there will be no women, that is all, we can not force the presence of two women in the Executive Committee.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Excuse-me, but this is already the same text which is currently existing, just passing from one to two. Nobody is stood down and if there are no women candidates, there will be no elected woman.

Giorgio Scarso (ITA) : One question, if there are three women candidates and they obtain more votes than the men. What will happen ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : There will be three elected women.

René Roch (MH) : We are saying a minimum of two women, we are not saying only two women, then there will be 3 elected women, if they are elected, we do not do any discrimination.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We must not take into account the fact that there are women or men. They are normally elected, without quota.

René Roch (MH) : We are not going to say that we want only two women, we are saying that we want a minimum of two women. Well, I think that we can vote. Do you agree with this text ? Who is against ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : Any abstention ? Who is for ? **Then, unanimously approved.**

René Roch (MH) : Listen, we are going to make a lunch break, we are already late for this lunch, women preoccupied us a lot.

LUNCH BREAK

René Roch (MH) : Please take your seat, we have to carry on with our Congress, otherwise we will have to add an additional day.

Eduardo Mangiarotti (ITA, MH) : Ladies and Gentlemen, may I present you a solution that I have achieved in collaboration with the city of Milan, to try to eliminate the registering of hits that are made flat on a valid surface at foil. We have therefore produced a point with a travel (stroke). It has a travel of 0.5 mm and the spring resists a pressure of 1000 g., this can be set up to 1500 g. Obviously either the travel of the spring can be modified as desired. This depends on whether we want to do some tests with the SEMI Commission and establish the most convenient solution for modifying foils. You can see now that no hits delivered flat register any more, with any apparatus we have in the entire world and from any manufacturers, while the hits made with the point according to the Rules of the foil, that we still have in our Rules and are cut over actions, which do not end with the flat of the blade but with the point on the valid surface, are OK. Right now, I believe that this could be a solution. I am presenting it, this is a personal proposition and I hope to find the most convenient solution for everybody. I must add that the point does not cost more than the others, as we are using them now. It is the same price, it is a different technical solution, but naturally, the weight and dimensions of the point, etc are the same, so there is no big change.

(Public demonstration conducted with two fencers).

Please, get on guard. Ready, play.

Explanations from Mr. Mangiarotti on the demonstration : The fencers are still using the new point, it has not rung, it was flat. Did you see ? It was a flat hit, it has not rung.

Let me continue, the actions are good, we can also demonstrate it with other foils with an even stronger weight, the foil used now is set at 4 mm travel, with a pressure of 1500 g., so, you have seen that it is still ringing.

Thank you Gentlemen.

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : Thank you Eduardo for this demonstration, I believe that this effectively proves that with a new point we can force fencers to fence in what is perhaps a more classical way and so that flick hits will not score, that only hits that are genuinely made with a thrust will be valid. What Eduardo is saying is that this is easier to change the points and not the duration of contact time of the apparatus, it will allow us to keep the same duration of contact time, but in the contrary to change the point, this is something that will be discussed tomorrow morning, thank you, Eduardo, we are going to carry on with the Congress and this is clear that we will have time to review what has happened this afternoon.

Applause.

Nathalie Rodriguez : So, we go back to the propositions book. Proposition nr 11, page 17. Mr. Di Blasi ?

Interpreter of Mr. Di Blasi : Mr. Di Blasi wants to precise that this was a personal experience of Mr. Mangiarotti and it is not representative of the opinion of the entire Italian Fencing Federation.

René Roch (MH) : Very good.

Nathalie Rodriguez (MH) : **Proposition nr 11, Article 4.4.2** : « Besides, a candidate to the Commission must be able to understand and speak one of the three languages of the FIE. The candidates for Commissions requiring specific professional knowledge have to show a diploma justifying this knowledge.». For example, for the legal and disciplinary Commissions, Bachelor of Law or an equivalence, for the medical Commission, a diploma of Medical Doctor or equivalence, for the SEMI Commission, an engineering degree or an equivalence. The Legal Commission is in favour and drafted a full proposal on page 17 of its report. The opinion of the Executive Committee is that for the Legal Commission 60 % of the members must be Bachelor at Law or equivalent.

Then, the proposal of the Legal Commission is as follows : The candidates for various commission require specific professional knowledge or credentials as follows :

Medical Commission : all candidates must have completed the educational requirements for being an MD or a kinesthesiologist.

Disciplinary Commission : all candidates must have the educational requirements for or be practicing as a lawyer, judge, arbitrator or professor of law

Legal Commission : 60 % of those elected (6 persons) must have the educational requirements or be practicing as a lawyer, judge or notart (European)

SEMI Commission : 60 % of thus elected must have a college degree in engineering or science or be practicing as an engineer.

For the Legal and SEMI Commissions, the elective rule of precedence shall be similar to those for women be elected to a commission

Does anyone wish to say something about this proposition ?

Melik Chahnazarian (ARM) : I effectively think that for the SEMI or Medical Commissions, the members should have a specialised diploma. I also think that for those who are going to apply to the Legal Commission, should also have the appropriate diplomas or an equivalence. But in this case, the conditions required are so strict that you have left aside all those who have for example a diploma in international law. In fact, the Legal Commission does not take care of the fines or infractions to judge the referees or examine cases for instruction judges, judges, etc. We should maybe think to accept all those who have studied law, in one way or the other.

Wolf Dieffenbach (GER, MH) : This is very easy to give such a ruling, 60 % of the members of the Commission should have a diploma in such or such profession. But how do we practice with the elections ? You have elections, you have candidates, how are you going to elect candidates and follow this rule ? Ladies and Gentlemen, this is almost impossible to do so, because you have a third criterium after the nationality and the sex, you have a third criterium to be respected in the elections. This is almost impossible to follow this rule, reason why we must think properly before adopting a rule, how will it be in practice.

Alejandro Bleyer (BOL) : I suppose that within the international fencing federation and national federations, some people are not professional. The majority of people present here

are here because they like sport, so we can not force them to be professional. We need people involved in fencing and not people who do not know anything.

Bert Van der Flier (NED) : I think that we start being too much paternalistic. I think that the Congress is perfectly able to decide who it wants to elect or not. If the Curriculum Vitae explains what we have done in life, this it then up to the Congress to decide if the person tells the truth or not and if it wishes to elect him. This is the same for the spoken languages. Furthermore, who is going to verify the diplomas, I mean verify that the diploma really does exist and is valid ? It will be a big mess. We have now too many criteria for the elections. Why do we not leave the Congress the possibility to elect someone according to the good and old methods : to post the candidacies. And if the person does not speak the required languages, it does not matter. And we might even realise during the commissions that the people have finally more diplomas and knowledges than thought. This is better this way, we must stop our paternalism.

Stacey Johnson (USA) : I also support Bert and what you have just said, but I would add that there is a growing tension between the opening and the fact of becoming more involved, and it tends to grow more and more. So, I also agree that the Congress should decide.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : Following what we have just heard, personally, I am really in favour to also have criteria in the technical commissions, to have qualified people. If you agree with the opinion of our friend Van der Flier, in particular with regards to the presentation on a Curriculum Vitae, I think that we will not be able to escape to the quality of these technical commissions if we do not vote this Curriculum Vitae for each, furthermore the equivalences are quite easy to find in the different nations. In that case, we have to admit that each Commission could recruit within his commission and at the expenses of the FIE, then it will bring to the FIE competent experts. I think that if we want to move forward, we need experts or people in commissions, who have a Curriculum Vitae enough important to give quality in the commission in all aspects, we are not engineers on material, we are not specialized doctor in traumatology of sport or physiotherapist, we can be an excellent legist doctor, to give only one example, but I think it is important that the commissions be more and more operational, more and more competent in modern sports.

Edoardo Correia Dos Santos (POR) : I have just spoken with Mr. Baiocco, I am going to give our opinion. According to the interpretation of page 17, this SEMI Commission : 60 % of the elected members should have an engineering degree or an equivalence. It means that the 7th member could be engineer, we agree, this is the interpretation of the rule. Otherwise, we propose to add "at least 60 % of the elected members should have a degree or an equivalence". Thank you.

Alejandro Bleyer (BOL) : The person in the technical commission does not have to be a professional, what is it for, if he does not understand anything in fencing ? We must establish norms in respect of our knowledges in fencing and ask the technicians to apply them, not ask directly the technicians to do it. Each commission should have people who know, who like and who understand fencing.

Mario Favia (ITA, MH) : Following what said Mr. Dieffenbach, I want to say that this is not a third criterium that the Congress has to choose. I think that this is the responsibility of each President of federation, who presents Curriculum, for positions in the commissions, especially for technical commissions, who are qualified people and who have the adequate characteristics according to the job they will have to do, we should not decide at the time of the Congress but before, the Presidents of federations must propose people with technical characteristics and adapted to the commission for which they will be elected. This is my opinion.

René Roch (MH) : Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe that we all agree with the fact that your commission should be more and more technical. That either members of commissions have diploma or that we look somewhere else for someone who does have a diploma, but who can give of course advice, this is also possible. I think what is valid in the proposition of the Legal Commission, is to say what is really desirable, so I agree not to say “have to show” but to say “it would be desirable that he shows a diploma”. Then this is up to each of us in all conscience, he considers himself with tenure, he considers himself as being valid, but we have to draw the attention to the fact that some of the commissions are very technical, such as the Disciplinary Commission. You are aware that the Disciplinary Commission judged two cases last year, the case of Laura Flessel and the one of Attely, and it took two completely different decisions in respect of the beginning of the sanction. In consequence, The Court of Arbitration for Sport did not give us reason, they told us, Gentlemen, what you are doing is not serious. You did something to arrange the fencers but you did not do something which is legally defensible. And this is the kind of problem that we are going to face more and more often and I think that we should be attentive to it. I agree to say that he does not need to have tenure but I believe this is still desirable. Actually, I do not understand how otherwise, because personally, I often receive memos from my friend George Van Dugteren regarding doping. I do not give my advice, because I am unable to give such advice because this is really a speciality. So, I do not understand how some people who do not have the right diplomas or a more or less equivalence, can give advice, can work on the presented problems. I believe that we really have to be careful, even if we do not accept this article, I agree, that at least it has brought your attention to this subject. Then, the only thing I am proposing, is to take back the said article, but instead to write that the candidates must justify, we can say that it would be desirable that the candidates have a diploma, etc.

Do you agree to modify the said article in saying “it is desirable that he be holder of some diplomas”. For specific cases, this is clear, you see, we have not asked for diploma for the promotion commission, those are much more general things, the same for refereeing and rules. We can not require a diploma for the Rules Commission, I agree that it is just the handling of the rules of our sport, then this is specific to our sport. This is not because we are going to put a lawyer that he will be better, here I fully agree, however for the Legal, Disciplinary, SEMI and Medical Commissions, I do not see how people, who are not doctors, be able to present themselves to the Medical Commission, Doctors, Kine, or equivalent diploma. It is absurd, and if you think this is valid, personally, I do not want to be treated by someone who is not a doctor. This has never happened to me and it is not going to happen because I will never be treated, so I am quiet, but whatever, you have to reason as if you would be personally involved and tell to yourself : would I personally consult this person if I had a legal problem ? Would I personally consult this person if I were ill ? I think that here, we must take time to think about it. So I am suggesting one thing, to keep the article in adding “would be desirable”.

George Van Dugteren (RSA) : Mr. President, I think this is advisable to have qualified people, this is a good idea. But I believe that we should understand that candidates to the commissions do not have clear ideas of the requested criteria, and I therefore recommend to the concerned commissions to establish a list of ideal criteria to enable national federations to use a model to guide them, and you will also have a better chance to have the appropriate person for their required tasks, once elected in their commission. Thank you.

Victor S. Grouppier (ARG) : We should take example on the professional organisations such as doctors, architects or engineers, who have disciplinary commissions made up with professional in this field and have legal assessors they can consult in case of a legal problem. But I think this is very restrictive to say that sport managers do not have the capacity to solve statutory questions. Being a lawyer does not mean being able to understand sport Statutes. Anybody amongst us is able to establish Statutes for his federation and make the appropriate amendments. With regards to the management of

discipline based on subjects related to our sport, advices of a lawyer should be sufficient and there is no need that all members be lawyers.

René Roch (MH) : The only problem is that once you have taken sanctions, you might have to present yourself in front of a professional court and you take the risk to look ridiculous in front of this professional court. This is embarrassing for the international federation and this is what has happened, I think that we really have to be careful. That is why, I agree with the fact that there can be valid person who did not practice those professions, but in general, this is preferable to be holders of some diplomas, it can only be an asset, I don't say that this is a universal panacea but this is better. So listen, we could still discuss this for very long, this is obvious, but I think we should take a decision, we simply say that this is preferable and it gives you all the possibility to vote or not to vote for those people, this is just preferable, in any case, it deserves careful thought. That is what we are proposing.

Julius Kralik (SVK) : Just a few words, I would like to get back to the proposition of Mr. George Van Dugteren, and here, I am talking about my experience of two mandates in the SEMI Commission as well as other experience, for example with the introduction of wireless and really, I deeply think that this is high time to sort the most competent fencing people as it was the case several years ago, already with what we have seen with Mr. Mangiarotti, who presented us some new and high technologies, precisely, we are going in this direction, in order to have a good idea and to be able to evaluate this development in sport and in our sport, this is obvious that there are a lot of techniques, it became very sophisticated with all that we can see during the World Championships. I think this is important, that it would be desirable, but I think that for the federations themselves it might be useful, or a good indicator, a support to make a choice, maybe we should not see the problem as big, this is sometimes just internal political problems, but if it is clearly written in the Rules, it will allow us to make a better choice for the candidates as we wish. Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : Besides, Mr. Groupierre spoke earlier on the IOC and I inform you that within the IOC, commissions are not elected, they are designated, furthermore in your confederations, you do not elect your commissions, you are designating the members of your commissions. I have never seen you organising elections for the members of commissions, and we are, this is evident, in the international federation, much more democratic but we wish in this democracy to have some guards, simply have competent people. This is why I am saying "this is preferable". Do you agree to change this article in simply saying "this is preferable that candidates be holder of some diplomas". We are not forced to limit these diplomas, but simply say to be holder of some diplomas in legal knowledges, some diplomas in mechanical knowledges, etc. I believe that this is not a bad thing to indicate to the Congress before voting, to think about the capacity of the people to solve some problems. Who is against ? Any abstention ? **I believe, that we are in favour of this article.** One vote against. We will then use this article in simply saying "this is preferable".

Nathalie Rodriguez : « This is preferable that candidates to the commissions be holder of ».

René Roch (MH) : In that case, I believe that we should cancel the percentages, we delete the percentages and put « it is preferable ». That is it.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We move on now to the **proposition nr 12, Article 4.4.4**, which gets back to the **quotas of women in the commissions**. Do you wish to apply the decision taken for the Executive Committee for the commissions, which means to have two women in the commissions ?

René Roch (MH) : I suppose that we will start over the discussion of earlier.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Then, we automatically apply the same decision than for the Executive Committee, which is in favour ?

René Roch (MH) : Do you agree ? **Then, this is voted.**

Nathalie Rodriguez : **Proposition nr 13 : article 5.4.1**, to delete : « The Executive Committee of the FIE meets in plenary session. The number and the place of the plenary sessions of the Executive Committee is determined every year by the Executive Committee. Special meetings may be requested by the President, the majority of the Central Office or the majority of the Executive Committee». The rest remains without any change, there is one sentence to be deleted : the expenses of attending two of these meetings are the responsibility of the federations of the members of the Executive Committee, all the other meetings are the financial responsibility of the FIE.

René Roch (MH) : We have to delete it because they are all now the responsibility of the FIE.

Nathalie Rodriguez : So, there is no more restrictions. The meetings during the year are the full financial responsibility of the FIE. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposal ?

George Van Dugteren (RSA) : I am sorry that you have jumped so quickly over the proposition nr 12, but by the time to hear the full translation, you had moved on to the next one. I just would like to add one comment. If we wish to have professional and qualified people in our commissions, it is not guaranteed to have the right number of qualified women for these positions. I am not sure this is safe, I surely support the movement of women, but I am not sure that we can expect to have lawyers, doctors, technical-experts in each of these commissions, I am therefore wondering how we could put it in order to say that it is just preferable and not an absolute necessity.

Nathalie Rodriguez : But George, that is what we have just decided, to modify the proposition by putting this is preferable.

René Roch (MH) : The problem is as follows, this is an obligation from the IOC to have 20 % of women in the commissions. Then, there is no question to be raised, this is neat and clear. We must have, if possible, 20 % of women, if there are no women candidates, they will of course not be elected, but if they are women candidates, we should give 20 % of the seats to the women. This is a decision of the IOC.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Furthermore that their designation or election must be based on the same criteria, it means that if we are requiring diplomas for the men, this is the same for the women. So the question is not here.

René Roch (MH) : Let's say that it is preferable that they have diplomas and this is preferable to have women.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : With regards to the criteria of the IOC, as the commissions are made up of ten members, we are up today respecting the criteria of the IOC.

René Roch (MH) : From 2005, we will need 2 women per Commission. We have to take the decision now as the elections are scheduled for the end of 2004, this is precisely for 2005. So do we agree ? **We do the same ? Thank you.**

Nathalie Rodriguez : We were at the proposition 13.

René Roch (MH) : In the proposition 13 related to the Executive Committee, we have deleted « plenary » because it does not mean anything, we can well not mention all these and the meeting is still valid, but if you wish, we have deleted it and we meet at least twice a year and we can be met upon request of the President, the Central Office and the majority of the Executive Board, that is what is currently happening, this is the old Rules.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : President, this is an information on the vote of the proposition 12, we also take into account the opinion of the legal proposition. You did not precise it.

René Roch (MH) : Yes, we vote in the same way as we did for the proposition nr 10. So, do you agree with the proposition nr 13 ? Any abstention ? **Approved.**

Nathalie Rodriguez : **Proposition nr 14, article 5.5.7** : « The Executive Committee is responsible for planning, modifying and drafting the text of the Internal Rules ». The modifications you are seeing are underlined. « It approves the drafting of the texts prepared by the Rules Commission, the Legal Commission and the Special Rules for World Championships and Olympic Games Commission, either for submission to the Congress or in their final version in the case of proposals modified by the Congress without approving a precise text». The opinion of the Legal Commission : the proposed change was rejected. The Legal Commission does not wish to amend the wording “administrative rules” with “ internal rules”, it wishes to keep “administrative rules”.

René Roch (MH) : As the administrative rules is wider than the internal rules, we fully agree to keep the wording administrative rules. Do you agree ? **We fully agree.**

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : We keep the written proposition without precisising the text.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Because it was a grammatical mistake. **Proposition nr 15, article 5.5.11** : « The Executive Committee appoints the Directoire Technique and its President, technical officials and referees for the Olympic Games and World Championships. He also appoints the referees for the Grand Prix Arbitres and the observers for World Cup Competitions». The Legal Commission is in favour but with this modification : he also appoints the referee for the Grand Prix and the observers for World Cup competitions. It just took out “Abitres” to “Grand Prix Arbitres”.

René Roch (MH) : Yes, as there are no more Grand Prix Arbitres but Grand Prix where we designate referees, so it is not worth to write Grand Prix Arbitres, I fully agree.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Is anyone against ? Any abstention ? **Then, the proposal is unanimously approved.**

Proposition nr 16, article 5.5.14 : « The Executive Committee presents the detailed annual report of the activity of the FIE. This report is submitted for approval by the General Assembly». Here as well, this is a slight modification as the old text was mentioning the Congress, the annual report is now submitted for approval to the General Assembly and not the Congress anymore. The Legal Commission is in favour of this change. Nobody is against ? Any abstention ? **The proposal is unanimously approved.**

Proposition nr 17, article 5.7.1 : « In the course of the financial year the Bureau informs the members of the FIE of urgent measures which may concern them, by way of any official publication of the FIE ». The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposition. Actually, the original proposition was “in the course of the financial year the Bureau informs the affiliated groups”, we have therefore changed “affiliated groups” for “members of the FIE” or « national federations ». The circulars of the FIE have been replaced by letters of the FIE, so it seemed easier to say « any official publication of the FIE ».

René Roch (MH) : We now have e-mails, there are all kinds of communication, which did not exist when this rules were made.

Nathalie Rodriguez : So, those are more up-dates rather than modifications. Is anybody against ? Any abstention ? **The proposition is unanimously approved.**

Proposition nr 18, article 6.1.1 : « The permanent commissions of the FIE are the following : ... » So here, this is just a correction of name “Promotion, Publicity and Marketing Commission” as in the old text it was written “Propaganda Commission”. The Legal Commission was in favour as this is the current name of the Commission. Nobody is against ? **The proposal is unanimously approved.**

Proposition nr 19, article 6.4.1 : Here in fact, this is not « the year », the Executive Committee made a slight modification which is « the day after the elections, the commissions meet to elect their president. During the years including an Ordinary Congress, commissions meet to study the proposals made to the Congress, at least three months before the Congress. The Executive Committee can, in case of necessity motivated by the Commission, determine one or several additional meetings ». The Legal Commission was in favour of this proposal and modified the text in writing “the day after the elections”, instead of “the year after the elections”. Is anybody against this proposal ? Any abstention ? **The proposition is unanimously approved.**

Proposition nr 20, new article 6.4.6 : Work of the Commissions. « The members of Commissions must and may speak in one of the three languages of the FIE ; on the other hand, the report of the meeting has to be, either established in French, or in the three working languages. It is up to the President of every commission to appoint a commission secretary who will establish the report of the meeting of the Commission». The opinion of the Legal Commission towards the administrative rules is favourable as modified : « The members of Commissions must and may speak in one of the three languages of the FIE ; on the other hand, the report of the meeting has to be established in one of the three working languages». The rest of the proposal does not change.

René Roch (MH) : Of course, this report will be established in one of the three languages and the FIE will take care of the translation into the two other languages and send it to those interested.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Is anybody against this proposal ? We are talking about the proposition of the Legal Commission.

René Roch (MH) : Then, we establish this report in one of the three languages, this report will be sent to the office and the office will translate it into the two other languages to enable everybody get acquainted with it.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Nobody is against ?

Marcello Baiocco (ITA) : In this respect, we should, in my opinion, change the text, to say that the report will be written in French by the Commission and then the office will translate it into the two other languages, is that correct ?

René Roch (MH) : Mr. Baiocco, we are having three working languages, we choose one of the three working languages to establish the report and we send it to the FIE office, which will take care of the translation for each. I think this is a good solution because you do not have in each commission a person who speaks fluently French, fluently English or fluently Spanish. You have to choose someone able to establish it in one of the three languages and

then we sent it to all members. Do you agree with this solution which seems to be the most rational ? Does everybody agree ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : Proposition nr 21, article 6.5.3 b) : This is about the Refereeing Commission. « This Commission establishes the list of referees recognized by the FIE. The note awarded to the referee during every competition GP-Arbitres is given by the member of the Refereeing Commission appointed by the Executive Committee for the competition». The opinion of the Legal Commission : this proposal should go to the administrative rules and we should delete "C" as this classification has been eliminated by the Arbitrage Commission. The proposed modification is : this Commission establishes the list of the referee recognized by the FIE and then, during every competition Grand Prix, not Grand Prix Arbitres. Is anybody against this proposition ? Any abstention ? **Unanimously approved.**

Proposition 22, Article 6.5.6 (titre) : It goes with the previous proposition, to delete the word propaganda in the title of the Commission of the article 6.5.6, I suppose that as we have already approved the other one, this one is consequently **approved.**

Proposition 23, article 7.1.4 d) f) : Article 7.1.4 : Fines. Here we have just changed the old rates, which were still in French Francs, we have converted them into Swiss Francs as the French Franc does not exist anymore. We have simply made an exchange conversion, the texts are not modified, just the amounts were put in Swiss Francs. The Legal Commission is in favour and indicated that the level of the fine can be more than CHF 12'500 in the case where multiple sentences of a fine are pronounced simultaneously, in which case they are additive. This is in respect of the sanctions of the disciplinary part. Is anyone against this proposal, which is just giving the rate of exchange ?

Victor S. Grouppier (ARG) : There is a mistake in Spanish because the price can not be less than CHF 125 and not more than CHF 12'500. The word "not" is missing.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Okay, the Spanish translation will be corrected. Is anybody against this proposal ? No, **then unanimously approved.**

Proposition 25, Article 9.1.2 : « This licence is compulsory for all fencers taking part in any official competition of the FIE. No entry will be valid if a competitor does not have a valid licence for the current year». Here as well, this is an adaptation of the text. The Legal Commission was in favour and indicated to delete, at the last line, "C" as this classification has been eliminated by the Refereeing Commission.

Claus Janka (GER) : (speech in German, not translated by the interpreters).

Nathalie Rodriguez : Mr. Janka, we have already discussed this problem, which was brought up during the Executive Committee, concerning pre-tournaments which are taking place before the World Cup tournaments. It happens that your Federation is not the only one to organise these pre-tournaments before the World Cup, and this is obvious, that we can not accept that fencers participate in competitions without a licence, even if they have participated in a competition for pre-selection. Some other federations are organising tournaments for pre-selection and they do their best to make sure that at the end of the pre-selection, the licences of the athletes have been ordered by the national federation, which allow the fencer to enter the competitions without any problems. You can easily understand that we can not make different rules according to the country and can not apply the rules differently, because how can we check for the organisers of competitions the licences of fencers ? It is not feasible, so I think that you must find a solution that once the pre-competitions are terminated, licences should be ordered to make sure that fencers are in line with the rules.

René Roch (MH) : I believe that licences can be ordered via Internet, it is then sufficient to have a credit with the International Federation.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Exactly, licenses can be ordered at any time, during the week-end, the night or the day by anyone who has the password of your national federation. I know that this is already practiced by some other federations, which are organising pre-tournaments. It is sufficient to have a credit in favour of the FIE.

René Roch (MH) : In other words, it is a question of organisation. It is very difficult to manage a competition if we do not have the exact name of the fencer. We have the exact name of the fencer once we have his licence number. This is indispensable because otherwise we would need an additional specialised person for this problem of licences, and we do not have money to spend for that kind of administrative tasks, as everybody can make an effort to order licences as soon as the qualified fencers for the tournament are known. It is possible to order licences between the pre-tournament and the tournament and to receive them immediately.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : Especially that the pre-tournament is up to qualify between 4 and 8 fencers of a nation and this is true that since Internet, it takes very little time to order the licences on the website, that is what we are doing and it does not create any problem as it used to do in the past.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Is anybody against this proposal ? One. Any abstention ? **So, the proposition is voted.**

Proposition 26, article 9.1.4 : « Every application for a licence or licence renewal can be handled in after the payment of a fee which is set for the following season by the Executive Committee and approved by the General Assembly for the next season ». In effect, as any financial aspects have to be approved by the General Assembly and not the Congress anymore, the text had to be modified in consequence. The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposal. Is anyone against ?

Alejandro Bleyer (BOL) : The problem faced by the other south countries is that we do not need many licences and have to pay a lot of bank charges due to the banking transfer. We should find a cheaper way to enable federations which are ordering only one licence to be able to pay cash at the competition.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Mr. Bleyer, I wanted to inform you that we have found a solution to this problem, because we have suggested national federations to pay us the credit for the licences for the year during the Congress for example, or the Junior/Cadet World Championships, the World Championships or General Assemblies. Thus for 1, 2 or 50 licences, during one of these four events, we can meet at least four times during the year. Many federations came to me and said “ I am going to pay you a credit for 10 licences”. This is an opportunity to pay cash during these Congresses or World Championships, which does not cost you anything and we automatically put the credit for the licences on Internet. This is obvious that paying a licence by banking transfer is extremely expensive, reason why we have found this solution.

Alejandro Vergara (ARG) : You are right but some countries such as mine do not have cash to pay in advance. We already have difficulties to pay the annual membership fee, we are countries with not a lot of money for our federations, this is the problem.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Excuse me Mr. Vergara, but the only thing I wanted to answer to Mr. Bleyer, is that many national federations do not pay licences for their athletes, they are collecting the money to their athletes and then buy the licences for their fencers. We are not

asking a national federation to pay for its fencers, we are asking a national federation to pay for the FIE licences, now it is up to it to collect the money for its athletes and when we see each other four or five times in the year, it can give us a credit, even if it is five times in the year.

Alejandro Vergara (ARG) : In reality, the International Federation is not giving us a credit, but is asking us to pay in advance that small federations will not use. I am wondering if it is not possible to have a real credit and to give us a deadline to pay it back. Otherwise, it is not possible to pay in advance.

René Roch (MH) : We could well propose a credit which will be automatically given to the federations, with the agreement that the federation will make a transfer for the ordered licences once there will be a debit. We are coming back to the starting point, it seems difficult to me. Why not ? I agree to issue licences in advance. I agree that you pay later but I want to know when because some countries participated last year in competitions and had said exactly what you just said and have never paid.

Nathalie Rodriguez : By the way, I recently had to send reminders to about 40 Federations with either a balance of zero or very big arrears.

Alejandro Vergara (ARG) : In one of these four suggested propositions you are talking about, the first one is to pay at the event. Of course, we are not asking for a gift, but just the FIE to trust us concerning the payment of this debt. Then, they are four opportunities per year to pay these debts : the two World Championships, the General Assembly and the Congress. We are required to pay a credit during one of these events. Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : This is a problem for our Treasurer, I am therefore asking our Treasurer.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : President, this is not only a problem for me, this is a problem for all those who are helping me to check the financial resources, because as of today, 40 Federations are in arrears for the licences, and we know this because we have made a large audit during the previous financial year and checked all federations in arrears. This is a huge administrative task for the staff of the FIE, who has to follow-up, and follow-up the federations in debit, not only for membership fees and organisation fees for A-grade competitions but also for all these licences and this is a very difficult task to do and to check little by little. And frankly speaking, we have a quite small administrative team which is working very hard, and here, we are going to give them an important task just to ensure that federations fulfil their obligations. I would prefer see the tasks of the FIE be directed towards something more constructive, if you allow me. Especially that our electronic system to order licences is automatic, everything has been organised to make sure that it works automatically. I understand very well the difficulties of the federations to pay in advance, but in fact, this is not up to the federations to pay in advance but up to the fencers who are going to fence. Nevertheless, we have to require those federations to have a permanent credit of three or four licences, that they would fulfil each time we meet each other in order to avoid a huge task. Thank you.

Victor S. Groupierre (ARG) : Mr. President, we are showing us that the treatment is not equal. The Treasurer is saying that 40 Federations are in arrears towards the FIE, I am therefore asking this : federations which paid licenses on time and which are now asking for a credit, such as our, are not treated in the same way as the one which received a credit, otherwise there would not be 40 federations in arrears. We need a credit because of the high amount of bank charges and in addition very few of our fencers are participating to international competitions. We are just asking for a credit between 2 or 5 licences. Regarding Cuba, we made an effort in spite of the economical situation and I saw countries paying on the site. We have to establish rules equivalent for everybody.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Mr. Grouppierre, I want to indicate that the 40 Federations we have talked about earlier have not ordered any licences during the entire year and also had a positive credit towards the FIE, but did not use this positive credit. The second thing is that you all know that the FIE is doing its maximum to help you even if you have not paid, and that there are people present here who have asked us to put a credit on the Website and indicated us that they were going to pay during the Congress in Leipzig. We are therefore extremely flexible with the accounts. We do not force you to make a bank transfer. We do not force you to make a credit for 20 licences per year. We are proposing you, four or five times per year, to pay for one or two licences, and if this is not possible, we are telling you “very well, you will pay next time”, even if this forces us to hold very tight accounts and not to forget to chase a certain number of licences to some countries. We do not force you to spend money on banking transfers, I am sure that many of you can testify.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Most of those debits are for people who fenced in A-grade competitions without licence, because the organisation had not verified all the licences. With our new programme, it will not be possible in the future.

Melik Chahnazarian (ARM) : Could we allow some of the fencers to pay at the event ? And in case of non-payment, they could not participate ? I am proposing that the one who comes to the competition and does not pay, will not be accepted. After having paid his licence, he will be able to participate. This is just a proposal.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Mr. Chahnazarian, starting from January 2004, the software for competitions will be modified in such a way that a fencer without a licence will not be able to enter the competition. We will solve the problem and will not ignore anymore the fencers without licence. We do not wish to keep money of national federations during one year in order to get rich and that they pay us to have credit for licences. We are proposing deadlines for payments until two or three months.

Alejandro Bleyer (BOL) : I believe that the solution should be that each federation could order the licences and that fencers could pay them at the venue of the competition. If the fencer does not pay, he will not be able to participate. If he did manage to pay an expensive trip, he will be able to pay for the licence, but do not ask us to make a transfer of 25 dollars only.

Nathalie Rodriguez : The problem is not here. If we look at the proposition 27, it is said that we need personal information on the fencer, such as date of birth, personal address, etc., which should be provided by national federations. The national federations are the one to order the licences and they should be the one to pay for them. Can you imagine each athlete coming individually to the FIE to pay for the licence ? The 5000 ordered licences per year ? We should hire three persons to take care of this.

Julius Kralik (SVK) : May I make a concrete proposal after all what we have just heard ? Because this is obvious that not all federations realise the technical problems raised by Nathalie. She clearly described that starting from 1st January 2004, there is a real concrete problem if we do not have a licence, the software will not allow us to participate. And I see that the solution consists in what was already said and I am a witness, I can say it here and now. There is a possibility to get in touch with the FIE office in Lausanne and to say “Listen, we are in this position and sending money by banking transfer is very bad and at the next opportunity, we agree on this moment, it can be Trapani or Havana, we are saying - yes, here we are, I am paying you what I owe you”. Lausanne made me a credit and effectively, we could access via internet to get our licences. This is the first thing. In this sense, I think that we could also do it for small nations which will present themselves here, this is not

Trapani, Havana or the Championships, and the Federation can get in touch with someone or with the organisers to ensure that they will be able to eventually give money to the FIE.

René Roch (MH) : Listen, stop complicating things. What do we want ? Either we have a credit for licences and federations can take its licence and there is no problem, or there is no credit and it can not take its licence. Does our software allow us to take a licence without having paid before ? In that case we could for example every three months send a statement to the federations in saying “here is the amount due in respect of licences”. This could be the solution otherwise we could discuss this issue all day long and not solve anything. Either we can take a licence because it was prepaid, or we can not take it. If we can take it and that it was prepaid, this is okay, and if it was not paid, and there is no money, no credit for licence, can we still take the licence ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : As explained, a credit is necessary to order the licence, however some federations can not send the money and are asking us to put a credit on the Website, that is what I am doing and then they come to pay me 2-3 months even 4 months later. We are holding up-dated accounts and they are telling me “we will see us in Trapani, we will see us in Havana, we will see us in Leipzig” and I have here a list of federations, which have ordered licences and which have to pay. This is the case of Cuba, and other countries are in the same situation. We are already functioning like this, we are not forcing anyone to do it differently.

René Roch (MH) : The problem is solved as you will have a credit although you have not paid anything, and you will pay later.

Nathalie Rodriguez : This is what we are doing when required. This is upon request.

René Roch (MH) : Of course, you still have to ask because we can not guess that you will try to fence without having paid and without having asked us.

Nathalie Rodriguez : And for this, this is sufficient to send a fax, an e-mail or to make a phone call. We are not asking for more. I don't know how many times I had to make credit for licences for federations on Friday at 18h00.

René Roch (MH) : I think that with this reserve to be able to take a licence although we have not paid for it, by simply asking for a credit to the FIE Office, the article is valid and all this does not create anymore problem. You all agree ? We all fully agree ?

Victor S. Grouppierre (ARG) : I think it would be interesting to be able to pay by credit card to the International Federation.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We can use credit cards. The only problem is that it is going to cost the same price as for a banking transfer because a commission is taken by Visa, Eurocard or any other credit card on the amount of the licence.

René Roch (MH) : Yes, I believe, if you allow me, that this is just pushing away the problem. The problem is simple : either we have paid in advance and we can take the licence, or we have not paid in advance, and we inform the International Federation and we can take the licence, then in any case, there is no problem. Mr. Kolombatovich is asking for the floor, but after this, this is over.

George Kolombatovich (USA) : I am still going to speak about licences. We have a situation in my federation and I suppose this is the same in some others. We have recent immigrants in our country, who are official FIE referees. They are not allowed to have licence, because my federation can not pay for them as they still belong to the other

federation. We would like to have the authorisation to order licences for these persons living now in our country in order to enable them be referee for us.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Excuse-me Sir, but the problem is totally different. We are here talking about credit for licences. The fact that your referees or fencers are from another nationality implicates a change in the Statutes of the FIE, it means the rules on nationality, this has nothing to do with the order of licences.

George Kolombatovich (USA) : I am not talking about the change of nationality, I am just talking about the possibility to allow referees to get their licences.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Yes, but he will get a licence from the country of his nationality and you can not order licences for a French or German referee, because in this case it means that you would be able to access the account of Germany or France, and this is not possible. In this case, you have to find an arrangement with the country of his nationality and have his country order the licence. That is what is being done, actually many countries go through me to make these orders.

George Kolombatovich (USA) : Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : I think that we have enough discussed this problem, we all agree, there is no opposition to obtain a licence, even if you have not paid to the FIE. It is sufficient to ask for a credit at the FIE office. Do we agree on the proposition 27 ? Does everybody agree ? **Here we are**, we will deal with the proposition 28 and then we take a coffee break.

Nathalie Rodriguez : **Proposition 28, article 10.1.1** : « The Official Competitions of the FIE include the Olympic Games, the Open, Junior, Cadet and Veteran World Championships, the individual and team Open World Cups, candidate to category A, category A and Grand Prix and Grand Prix Arbitres, the Junior World Cups, as well as the Masters, Super Masters and any competitions designated by the Congress of the FIE». Here it was just a question of drafting the text, adding Grand Prix and change a little bit the sentence. The Legal Commission is favourable as modified, in simply not writing "Grand Prix Arbitres" but " Grand Prix".

René Roch (MH) : As all Grand Prix Arbitres are Grand Prix. **I suppose that you all agree.** Then, we take the coffee break and then we rapidly come back otherwise we will be late. We are taking back in 10 minutes.

Victor S. Groupierre (ARG) : There is one point which was not clarified at the proposition 27 regarding the licence, which must specify the weapon of the fencer. This is not valid anymore, besides, I think this is restricted because each fencer can be active in two weapons. We should cancel the question related to the weapons on the licence.

Nathalie Rodriguez : But, don't worry Mr. Groupierre, you have the possibility while ordering the licence to specify that he will participate at all weapons. Then, the information on this fencer will just go the respective ranking. You will not be forced to order a licence per weapon, you will have the possibility to indicate that he fences at three weapons. There will be no problem.

COFFEE BREAK

René Roch (MH) : We are taking back the Congress, I give the floor to Peter Jacobs.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Article 8.1.2, medical rule, a), b) et c) 1st paragraph. The proposition is to delete a part concerning doping in the Statutes. And the observation of the Legal Commission is that we can easily delete the entire section concerning doping in the Statutes, but it is necessary to add two paragraphs to the current anti-doping rules because there are two paragraphs in the Statutes which are not in the rules. And you will find on the first page, next to the introduction of the report of the Legal Commission, it is proposed to add “ each fencer participating in the official competitions of the FIE or at the Olympic Games must submit himself to the anti-doping controls performed according to the Anti-doping code of the FIE or, when at the Olympic Games, the IOC/WADA Anti-Doping Code. The anti-doping controls must be carried out in an IOC/WADA-accredited laboratory. The observer must make sure of this and point it out in his report». If there is no remark, I propose to accept, in effect, we are taking out from the Statutes and we put these two paragraphs in the rules to complete it. Any remarks ? Thank you. The second suppression concerns the Directoire Technique at a World Championship, this is not to modify what is in the rules. I propose to accept it if there is no remark. I am at page 21, **article 10.2.2 of the Statutes**. We can delete all this part because I believe that this understood in the rules. However, the part related to the gender test prescribed by the IOC for the women competitors, has to go in the rules in a new article.

Steve Higginson (GBR) : The text here is more accentuated than the one in the current rules. That is why we are proposing to replace it.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : We move it in article, we replace it.

Steve Higginson (GBR) : Yes, it is replacing the article o.57.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We have well indicated “to be moved in article o.57”.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Yes, sorry, I did not repeat it properly.

Page 22 : in **article 10.2.3 of the Statutes**, to be deleted because duplicated at article 0.63 of the Rules. The President and one member of the Central Office of the FIE have the right to attend all meetings of the Directoire Technique in order to ensure that the Rules are observed, the Directoire Technique is obliged to give them notice of such meetings. The opinion of the Legal Commission is to delete it because it is duplicated with the article of the rules, but the article of the rules must be modified, instead of saying “the President and one member of the Central Office of the FIE have the right”, we say “ members of the Central Office”, at plural. It means that 5 members of the Central Office can assist the Directoire Technique ? Very good, there is the majority.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : We modify the rules and accept the proposition of modification ? Any other remarks ?

René Roch (MH) : Do you agree to accept the modification proposed by the Legal Commission ? Nobody is against ? **Adopted.**

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : **Article 10.2.5**, to be deleted since double placed at article o.52 and ss of the Rules. “ The member federations who wish to send their fencers to participate in a World Championships, in either individual or team events, must so advise the national federation which undertakes the organisation of the Championships, three months before they are due to begin. At least one month before the World Championships, the organisers will have to inform the administrative office of the FIE, which countries are taking part in each event.”. The recommendation of the Legal Commission is not to delete it but to include it in the administrative rules. **Accepted.**

Article 10.2.6 : « The organisers must submit the program of events to the Executive Committee for its approval ». This is already in the Rules. I believe that everybody has the same text. We delete it from the Statutes.

Article o.6 : « Referees must be appointed in accordance with the provisions of Article t.37-t.39. they must possess current referring licences, national and international », we have already modified this, because I believe that they must hold a licence and this is in the Rules. The Rules is doubled at another part of the Rules, we are then also deleting it because it is in article t.37 in order to avoid duplicate.

Article o.94 of the rules, to be deleted in the Rules since doubled at article 10.3.4 of the Statutes. This is the definition of the fencing competitions at the Games and the applicable rules. The opinion of the Legal Commission is in favour as modified “The fencing competitions on the program of the Olympic Games under the direction of the FIE constitute for them the World Championships for the year in which they are held. The rules applicable to the World Championships are applicable to the Olympic games, except where they are in conflict with the Olympic Rules”. A World Championship will be organised for the events non contained in the Olympic program, which is necessary following the limitation of 10 medals with our program of 12 events. I believe that this text is quite evident. Any remark on the text or the cancellation of the rules because this is in the Statutes ? Okay, **adopted**, thanks.

I am at page 23 : **moving of articles from the Statutes and vice-versa**

Article o.65, moved to the Statutes : The Open World Championships are held every year, except in the years when the Olympic Games take place. Any observation ? **Thank you.**

Article o.66 concerning the candidature. Moved to the Statutes, article 10.2.1, so everything related to the candidatures and the course of the World Championships will be in the Statutes. **Is it approved ? Thank you.**

Article o.73, this is the same as for the Junior and Cadet World Championships as well as for the Veterans, it will be moved to the Statutes, but to modify the text drafted several years ago, in saying « during the first two weeks of April » instead of Easter. I believe that this decision was approved by the Congress 2 or 3 years ago, this is then the realisation of the text, of what was already approved.

Candidatures for the Junior World Championships, this is a repetition of what we have already seen concerning the Competitions for Veterans at the previous page. This is **article o.74**, then, we will move it. But the second paragraph “ furthermore, the Congress will give priority to candidates proposing to organise combined Junior and Cadet Championships”, I believe that we should modify it in line with our decision of today, not to accept candidatures if they are not both combined, we had this modification in the rules of the Statutes.

Article o.87 b, moved at article o.54, third paragraph, here, the Legal Commission did not give its opinion because this is a move of a part of the rules to another part of the rules. The article will need to be re-drafted.

Nathalie Rodriguez : However, the Rules Commission was in favour of all the propositions.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : And, as this is just a move of an article to another position in the rules, I think this is normal to accept it. So, suppression of article to integrate the administrative rules, which means that we want to get out from the rules and the Statutes and send it to the administrative rules.

Article 10.2.4 a) The proposition is withdrawn by Mr. Roch and the Executive Board.

Article 10.2.6 The proposition is also withdrawn as we included it in the rules several minutes ago.

Chapter 7 of the discipline, from article 7.2 to article 7.2.12, to send back the second part of our administrative rules concerning Disciplinary Rules, this is what is related to the whole process of a court, to send it back to the Administrative Rules. The opinion of the Legal Commission is to leave it in the Statutes. I suppose that we accept the opinion of the Legal Commission unless there are observations of someone ?

Article o.81 and article o.82, page 25 : If all these articles are concerning the establishment of the calendar, the changes of venues and dates of the calendar. There are two things : first of all, it has, for the future, to be part of the Administrative Rules and not the Rules themselves. Does anyone wish to say something about the place of these articles in the Administrative Rules ? No. Modifications are also in italic.

Then, in the first **article o.80** of the calendar, « The calendar of the next season is approved definitively during the Executive Committee meeting that follows the calendar meeting. Except in cases of force majeure, any change of date or place after this meeting will result in the cancellation of the competition for the following year.». « Force majeure » means « natural catastrophies, civil war, national economic crisis». There was previously no definition. And more, in reinforcing the problems dealt with this morning in respect of the cancellation of competitions « except in cases of force majeure », defined as « any cancellation of a competition less than 3 months before its date in the calendar will result in the cancellation of the competition for the following year ». This is new.

Abdelaziz Zouari (TUN) : I have noted in the last paragraph of the article o.80 « natural catastrophies, civil war, national economic crisis» , I would prefer cancel civil war and replace it by security or something similar.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : In both cases, we are replacing civil war by something less fighting.

Steve Higginson (GBR) : A detail, which could be significant, I see in the text on the left hand side, there is “natural catastrophies” etc. The Legal Commission is saying that we should include the letters “eg”, which means for example. Do you want to put them or you are satisfied that the 3 described cases are the final definition ?

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : I suggest to take the opinion of the Legal Commission, the list of force majeure is not exclusive, but this is to show the gravity of the situation.

Steve Higginson (GBR) : May I kindly ask you when the Administrative Rules will be ready ? And at what stage do I cancel the 10 articles from the Rules ?

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : I can answer but I thought that President Roch would also intervene. I am replying to the question, there is a draft of the Administrative Rules, which is now on hold, we will try to publish it for the General Assembly.

René Roch (MH) : I agree, it depends on the availability of the Bureau.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : The remark is correct, as we are sending things to the Administrative Rules, members federations must have access to this Rules. And we take note to accelerate our work on this Rules to make it available.

René Roch (MH) : I want to say for the cases of force majeure that we should leave the suspension points, it is not restrictive, civil war, national economic crisis. We should not write “or”, we must write national economic crisis, suspension points.

Bert Van der Flier (NED) : It may also be an idea to take out the word « natural » from the expression « natural catastrophes ». To give an example, let's suppose that for the next week-end, the Junior World Championships in Istanbul, there is no natural catastrophes neither civil war, but in view of the current situation, we could apply the cancellation of the term “catastrophe” and it would sound strange to say to the Turks that they will be sanctioned for not having organised it. So, we just say “catastrophe” and take out “natural”.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : I think that the proposal of the Tunisian representative was not to include civil war, but take a definition on the problems of security.

René Roch (MH) : Gentlemen, I just said that it was not restrictive, we should put suspension points, we have just said in the beginning of the afternoon that cases of force majeure will be examined by the Executive Committee. So, I think that the problem is already solved.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Do we also have to add « except in cases of force majeure duly examined by the Executive Committee » ?

René Roch (MH) : No, as we said that the Executive Committee was the one to decide of the force majeure.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : I carry on, article o.81 : If a federation wishes to change the venue of a competition already accepted as a World Cup competition, they must submit this change to the Executive Committee. Honestly, I do not recall the exact current text, this is ambiguous, I do not recall whether this is the administrative office or the FIE office and at the present time, what we are doing now, is to present these requests for approval to the Executive Committee, therefore, I propose to accept it.

René Roch (MH) : In general, we are now putting the Executive Committee because it is much easier to communicate between us via e-mail, this is therefore not necessary to restrict as much as before the interventions of the Executive Committee.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Article o.82, which specifies the choice of the Grand Prix with the modification proposed by the Legal Commission to the original text, we take out Grand Prix Arbitres because all Grand Prix Arbitres are in effect Grand Prix. Any remark on this text, article o.82, which will be sent to the Administrative Rules ?

Page 26, article o.84 : paragraph deleted in the Rules and replaced in the Internal and Administrative Rules by the following text concerning the tasks of the observer. With the opinion of the Legal Commission to send it to the Administrative Rules and to add « besides, the observer will assist with the selection of referees during the competition and send photos of the venues », we are adding in parenthesis « observer to coordinate with the organisers to have a digital camera available ». Any remark on the sending back to the Administrative Rules ?

René Roch (MH) : When we say « assist with the selection of referees », this is in reality to make sure that the drawing of lot be effected, I think that this is the real task of the observer.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Any remark on the drafting of the text ? No, thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Spanish Federation. I am going to read the proposal and then the motivation.

Proposition nr 1 concerning Team World Cup events. « For all World Cup tournaments, the composition of the direct elimination table will be fixed for teams from 1 to 4 and the rest of the positions will be draw in blocks of 4 teams, those qualified from 5 to 8, from 9 to 12 and from 13 to 16 ». The Executive Committee was not favourable to his change, The Rules Commission as indeed noted that there was a problem, but is in favour only in case of drawing in blocks of two starting from the third place.

René Roch (MH) : Does anyone wish to speak ? I think that the proposition from the Spanish Federation is a good proposal in spite of the fact that we have to take into account some facts which are currently arising, this is that with our system, the teams systematically know against who they are going to fence, besides there are very little changes, which means that it can happen that some teams meet all the year long the same teams. This is true that the current system does not mix very much the teams. This is also true that this is abnormal to make lose places at those who won them, I think that the drawing in blocks of 4 teams is maybe a little bit exaggerated. I think that the first part of the proposal, which says that for Team World Cup events the composition of the direct elimination table will be fixed for teams from 1 to 4, seems good to me and I think that afterwards, we could maybe draw in blocks of 2, between the teams ranked from 5 to 8 or from 9 to 12 and from 13 to 16 between themselves. In other words, I would replace the second part of the proposition by a drawing of lot in blocks of 2. I believe that this is good to keep the position of the first 4 because they won it. I am talking about the World Cup, we keep the teams from 1 to 4 in place, and we draw by blocks of 2 to replace the people in the table. It seems a good solution to me. Now you can have the floor, in particular the President of the Spanish Federation.

Marco A. Rioja Perez (ESP) : I think that this is very well explained in the sent report, this modification seems important to avoid manipulation of some of the teams in losing or winning matches on purpose according to their wish in going or not to the competitions. This is true that the drawing in blocks of 4 might be excessive, but we should at least make a drawing two by two.

Giorgio Scarso (ITA) : Italy agrees to adopt the drawing, but in blocks of 2 and not 4 because this is too much.

René Roch (MH) : Well, I think that we have discussed this issue, do you agree to accept the proposition as presented at the beginning « For all World Cup tournaments, the composition of the direct elimination table will be fixed for teams from 1 to 4 and the rest of the positions will be draw in blocks of 4 teams, those qualified from 5 to 8, from 9 to 12 and from 13 to 16 » and the rest of course. Does everybody agree ? **So, n this is adopted. Application I suppose after the Olympic Games.**

Nathalie Rodriguez : Next proposition concerning Team World Championships. The proposition is : there should be no draw in the table of the World Championships and the Olympic Games, each team will take the number which corresponds to its position in the team FIE ranking. The Rules Commission is in favour of this proposal. Does anyone wish to take the floor ?

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : I do not know the regulations for the Games, is it direct or a draw ? Because in individual, if I remember this is a draw in blocks of 2 for the team, what is the rule for Athens ? Is it already by two ? Then, can we change it for the Games or not ?

René Roch (MH) : This is a proposal for the Olympic Games but not necessary for the Athens Olympic Games.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Is anyone against the proposal, which should be applicable after the Athens Olympic Games, therefore for the season 2004/2005.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : For the World Championships competitions, women's foil and women's sabre, what do we do next ?

Nathalie Rodriguez (MH) : Season 2004/2005. Nobody is against ? Any abstention ? **The proposition is unanimously approved.**

Next proposition, matches to be fought in the Team World Championships. « In the Team World Championships only places until 8 will be fenced and the rest of the teams from the 9th will be qualified using their entry number in the FIE tableau as is done now for place 16th ». The Executive Committee is in favour of this proposition and the Rules Commission as well. Does anyone wish to speak on this proposition ?

Kovacic Sanjin (CRO) : There are young teams and federations should better try their fencers. We do not come to a Championship to win a gold medal but we try the fencers. I believe that this is important that we do not loose too much time with the qualification matches.

Normann Joergensen (DEN) : I am completely against this proposition as well as the next one for a certain number of reasons. First of all, several small nations will have no hope to be qualified amongst the 8, but the teams are maybe still interested in winning a place such as the 10th or the 11th . For some nations, to have a team ranked at place 10th in a World Championship is a big victory, which could even allow them win some money. There are therefore several reasons, even sporting reasons to maintain the matches for secondary places.

For some big nations, a match for the 9th or 11th place is not very important. But this is not necessary the case for the majority of other federations.

We say that athletes or fencers are not interested in taking secondary places. I remind you that one of the argument used some years ago, was that fencing all places would attract more and more nations. In fact, if a nation sees very little chances to reach the top, it will simply not participate to the Team World Cup. And with this, you are going to decrease the number of teams participating to the World Cup and prevent the universality of fencing because you will have less and less participating nations.

This additional argument should make that the Status Quo is maintained for the World Cups and World Championships.

Samuel Cheris (USA, MH) : Mr. President, I believe that during the Executive Committee meeting, we have changed this proposition : we fence until the 16th place but not from the 17th to the 32nd place.

René Roch (MH) : This is exact, during the last meeting of the Executive Committee yesterday, we have modified in saying until the 16th place for the World Championships, and I first found that it was a very good solution because we can not have different rules for the World Championships and the World Cups. I think that we have to unify a little bit our rules to avoid asking us always questions and this is not normal to have different rules for the Team World Championships and Team World Cups. We do not have this problem in Individual, this is the same. So, I believe that anyway, for the World Championships, we should fence until the 16th place. Now, if you wish to fence for more than the 16th place, this is possible but I am not sure that we have the possibility to organise it, this is our problem, the rest is related to

an organisational problem, and furthermore to give to those who are fencing for a place, that they can give a certain spectacle, that is well organised. This is very difficult when we make the teams fence until the end, we do not know who is fencing anymore, and where, and the result. This is always the same problem, this is an organisational problem and I fully agree with you that we go until place 16 either in World Cups or in World Championships. But we can modify it, this is not vital, this is a question of organisation. I would eventually say that this is an obligation to fence for the 16th first places and depending on the possibilities of the organiser to fence for the rest of the ranking.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : Mr. President, I agree with you that this organisational problem is important, but on the contrary of what our colleague just said for some nations which are ranking in the first, I believe that this is extremely important to rank until the place 16th, in the sense that the FIE ranking is valid for the following season and we have just lived the World Championships in Cuba which are important for the Olympic Games, this is not the same if you rank 9th because you won it, that if you end at the indice 12th, this is also a performance if you are 12th at the FIE indice and you end 9th, it gives you additional points for the Olympic Games for example, but also for the next season. So, I believe that we should let the sport go and we should fight for each place, at least, until the 16th place, because this is extremely important in the point of view of the sporting justice for the rankings and there are not only big nations. We could seek at the level of the Olympic Games, how many are ranked, amongst those who will go to the Games, from some of the continents, I believe that this is important to leave at least until the 16th place.

René Roch (MH) : Besides, even big nations are happy to fence a place between 1 and 16, in case of elimination at the quarter finals.

Alexandru Mironov (ROM) : If you allow me, and this is in the interest of the International Fencing Federation and this is your policy Mr. Roch, to develop fencing in the world. For example, for a team going to Cuba for the first time, this is essential to fence more than one match. So let the race go until the end. I was myself a fencer, to still have 3 bouts, still 2 matches, is very important, then this is for everybody, I think that we have to go until the end.

René Roch (MH) : I agree but it should be the same for the World Championships and the World Cups.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : So, President, you are still suggesting that the World Cup be limited to 16 as well, because in the current Rules for the World Championships, this is 16, if I remember correctly. And for the World Cups, this is currently until the end. If I can give my opinion, I don't think that we can give the decision to the organisers to fence until the end or until 16, because the participating countries must know before the competition if it is fenced until the end or if they stop at 16. So, for the second proposition, Team World Cups, we still have to decide whether this is 16 or until the end.

René Roch (MH) : I believe that we have two solutions : either we fence until 16, or we fence until the end. These are the two possibilities either for the World Championships or the World Cups. I believe that we can ask the Congress what he wishes, until 16 or until the end.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : Mr. President, if we fence for the places until the end, there will be a big incidence at the level of Team Grand Prix Arbitres, we will not need 8 referees but many more, because much more referees will be necessary to referee a competition until the end. This is a worry which should not be neglected, this is clear that not only more referees will be needed, the piste will still be here, however the 6 or 8 designated referees by the International Federation will not be sufficient at this level. This is just something to take into account.

René Roch (MH) : This is true that we will have a problem of refereeing.

Ioan Pop : When we established the Rules for the Team World Cups, we have taken into account what said our friend Joergensen, which is that, in effect, we have to motivate the teams to fence until the end. We had agreed on a different scale of points for each place, this was our objective, but unfortunately during the two seasons, we have had a big number of cases where once they had lost, they left, or they even arrived to the team competition, having a plane ticket for 13h00, even if they wanted to fence, they were forced to give up the competition. Because of this, we have changed a little bit the Rules for the Team World Cups in saying that the team, which does not show up for the match, is eliminated. We wanted to be more tough and force the teams to fence but many teams told us that they were not interested, there is a big division of attitude towards this problem. We really have to cut this problem and afterwards strictly apply the Rules, this is what you are going to decide.

René Roch (MH) : There are currently rarely more than 16 teams, this problem only arise with the epee or men's foil. I think that we have to choose between a good organisation, a good refereeing, and a challenge in the number of participants, which is not necessary the problem of the International Federation. I understand what you want to say, to maybe fence until the end, but what do we do if the teams leave before having finished the competition ? We had a big number of teams, which left this year before the end of the competition and did not fence until the end.

Normann Joergensen (DEN) : This is very simple, you do what you have to do : if an individual leaves in the middle of an individual competition, he or she will be sanctioned. If a team leaves in the middle of a competition, it will be sanctioned, this is very simple.

René Roch (MH) : This is also what has been done, we did not rank them, it means that they did not even keep their ranking. But this is maybe not sufficient because it does not bother them at all.

Giorgio Scarso (ITA) : For Italy, the number 16 is ideal, it can improve the inspiration of our team. In that way, the competition will not last too long and at the same time, allow the teams which are not going to win, to fight for their place between the 9th and 16th place.

René Roch (MH) : Then Gentlemen, as we do not have anymore speaker, we are voting in order to find out your opinion. Do we only go with a classification until 16 or do we go until the end for all the teams ? First of all, who is in favour of going until 16 ? 64 to go until the classification of 16. Who is against ? **So, I believe that we adopt the classification until 16 for the Team World Cup and Team World Championship.**

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Following this result, there is another decision to take. For the time being, the points for the Team World Cups are different. We are fighting for the places until 16, after this, we use the position of the classification of the competition. Do we have to follow the same procedure as for Individual World Cup, in which everybody from the place 16 until 32 has the same number of points and everybody from 33 to 64 has the same number of points ? The proposition would be that from 16 to 32 and from 17 to 37, each team should have the same number of points which will be 8 points, because the points for the Team Word Cups are doubled to the one of the Individual World Cup. Systematically, for 64 points for the team, it will become 32 points for the individual. And in the Individual World Cup, 17 to 32 brings 4 points, and in the Team World Cup, from 17 to 32, it makes 2 points, but the average will be of 8 for all the teams classified from 17 to 32, which will make less discrimination in the classification but could be considered as a failure. This was the idea of the Executive Committee the day before. Do we have to accept it or leave it with the individual points ? Is anyone against that all the points from 17 to 32 with 8 points, be equalized ? **Okay.**

Nathalie Rodriguez : Next proposition : sanctions in the team events of the World Championships, and Team World Cup. « The black card will cause the exclusion of the concerned fencer but not of the team, it will be replaced by the reserve fencer ». The Disciplinary Commission of the FIE will study and sanction with personal character the temporal sanction to the excluded fencer. The Executive Committee was not favourable to this proposition and the Rules Commission is unanimously against this proposal. Does anyone wish to speak ?

Marco A. Rioja Perez (ESP) : The team competition as we have done it until today with a system of relay is spectacular for everybody because it is transmitting a lot of emotion, which is profitable to the development of our sport. This is very important for fencing to maintain this competition by relay in the Olympic program, in showing the IOC the difference with the Individual competitions and its originality, which means that this is a team sport. We have to take into account that in any team sport, the expulsion of a member of the team, leads to the expulsion of the entire team of the competition. Public and media could not understand this just because of one fencer. Of course, we have to sanction the fencer, who did not have a sporting attitude, but sanction all the team would create prejudice to our sport.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, and first of all, our dear friend, there are sport teams, in which the team is disqualified. I am going to take the example of football. This is not 1, they are 11 on the field, there is one expulsion, 10 are remaining, there is a second expulsion and if the team ends with 8, the team is excluded. They are not allowed to end the competition and this is also, by the way, a relay. This is an interesting proposition, which is true is very prejudicial for the team, which has to pay for one fencer who made a brutal gesture. Then I believe Mr. President, that for the time being, we should study again this question for later. If for example a team was leading 20-15 at the fourth match, we could say that one of the fencer be excluded, but how are we going to re-establish to carry on with the reserve ? Zero point given by the fencer, are we going to give the points ? I believe that this is an interesting question, but forgive me to say that it deserves a much more deeper study that we are not able to do today.

René Roch (MH) : This is true, that the sanction is a little bit too strong for the team. We should maybe find another solution in order to avoid that other fencers pay for the animosity of one of their team mate, who has been excluded. I think that this is an idea to cancel all the points gained by the fencer in question and we should maybe make a deeper study and make a new proposition for the future in 2005. In these cases, it is better not to take too quick decisions.

Alexandru Mironov (ROM) : Just one example, we must think that a dishonest referee could do anything to give a black card to a fencer and the classification is upside down. Then, I believe that the Spanish proposition is correct.

Giorgio Scarso (ITA) : The Spanish proposition merits our respect, however we are suggesting to study it more in details for the next Congress in order to know the consequences. For Italy, the Spanish proposition is good, but it should be better regulated.

René Roch (MH) : I agree that the Spanish proposition is interesting, however I think that there are no sanction at all if we exclude the fencer and replace him immediately. In other sports, if one player is excluded, we are totally sustaining the consequences and in particular, we have relay matches. In a relay, if one of the runner put his foot on the next line or next lane, the entire relay is disqualified. We have to think that we are in the frame of a relay. I think that we should study it more and maybe present at that time a proposition, which could urgently pass for the next season. For now, we should keep the status quo because we are in an Olympic year and we can not change the Rules now, we have to wait

for the next season 2004/2005. So, let's leave it with the current Rules, we are studying the possibility to modulate this exclusion for a fencer and will try to propose something for the next Congress. Do you agree to leave it as it is and we study it the soonest in order to find a solution. Very well. We have to stay here especially that the next Spanish proposal is not uninteresting and will take us a lot of time. Thank you for your attention and see you tonight for the dinner and we will carry on with the Congress tomorrow morning at 9h00. This is an invitation of Leipzig.

2nd DAY OF THE CONGRESS

Speech of Mr. Thomas Bach

René Roch (MH) : Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen, Messrs Presidents, Members of Honour, we are going to get back to our work of this Congress in Leipzig, and we have the pleasure and honour to have amongst us Mr. Thomas Bach who is going to make a speech and I am giving him the floor immediately.

Thomas Bach (GER, MH) : Dear President and dear friend René Roch, this is again a great pleasure to be with my fencing family. Even if the circumstances of my last presence in Antalya were a little bit special, maybe this is a new beginning of discussion within the International Fencing Federation and this is a great pleasure and honour for me to be with you and hear your opinions on the future of fencing. For the future, you have an excellent basis reinforced by the World Championship in Havana in Cuba, because with 85 participating nations, you have reached a new record in the world of fencing, which shows the big success of your development's program and I would like to encourage you to carry on with this development program to still improve the presence of fencing in the world, because if people in the entire world do not understand our sport, they will not follow it and the future of our sport will be in danger. We have noticed it in other sports, and we all believe in this room that our sport, that fencing is the most beautiful sport in the world.

We have to think that in future, people will enjoy our sport, and we will do what is necessary to expand this sport throughout the world. In order to do it, we have to adapt to the needs of television because nowadays, children in the world are choosing their sport according to the television, and if they do not see their heroes on television, that they can not watch the sport on television, they will move on to another sport. We can appreciate it or not, but this is the role today and I really want to encourage you in your decision.

What you have showed in Havana in Cuba, with this great image on television, is first of all a good step but now, the other steps must follow. I do not mean to intervene in your discussions, but even with the reform of the foil, I want to encourage you to modernise fencing. Some people amongst us in this room had agreed, or they are maybe still agreeing, that according to the Olympic program, the movement of fencing could be major in the future. I must tell you what I already said in Antalya, that our sport was already a big success and we must be grateful to your President who had fought very hard. It was a big success to maintain the number of fencers. If you look at the other sports, there are 27 other sports in the summer Olympic program and many of them have lost their number of medals, many of them have lost their disciplines, you can therefore be very happy to have kept those 10 medals and that the other discussions held in the past on the fencing program will not come back.

Consequently, I would like to recommend you, according to the Olympic program, to rely on this program because to start changes, you have to start discussions with the IOC, which could change in a way, that none in this room would like it. Therefore, it would be better to consider the Olympic program in compiling with the disciplines that we have and without doing any major changes.

The IOC is going to revise all the Olympic Games program, it means that it will verify all the sports after the Games in Athens, and I would not like to see fencing in a position of transition. We must see that the Games in Athens are a great success for fencing, as well as for the entire Olympic movement. I believe that we will have beautiful Olympic Games. For fencing, this is important to make a good performance in order to work on it, and not to go to

the IOC with an artificial innovation and try to apply it after the Games, because it could give a term to the situation that we would not like. We are in a good position, for the future, fencing will be in security in the program, you have worked hard for this and you must be proud of it. Proud to have secured this present and have reached this realisation.

Finally, I would like to congratulate you for the agreement you have reached in respect of the venues of the 2005 and 2006 World Championships. This is a very elegant solution of the fencers, and even if we like the fight, from time to time, it is better to find an agreement and if we find it with two winners, this is the best solution. I congratulate you on this decision and I wish you good luck for the deliberations of today, thank you very much.

Applause.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We are now going to give the floor to Mr. Makis Assimakopoulos of ATHOC.

René Roch (MH) : Who is going to make a presentation on Athens 2004.

5. Presentation for the 2004 Athens O.G.

Makis Assimakopoulos (GRE) : Good morning Mister President, Dr. Bach, Members of the Executive Committee, Delegates, Mr. President of the Hellenic Fencing Federation.

On behalf of the Organisation of the 2004 Games in Athens, I am here with the manager of the fencing competitions, Mr. Kontos. My name is Makis Assimakopoulos and I am going to brief you on the progress made with the organisation of the Athens Games and on fencing. I do not have a lot of time, so I will try to be brief.

As you know, in each city, the Olympic Organising Committee is open to all with the sport experience, and culture. In Athens, we hope to offer you a unique historical experience, for the opening to the world, you need the Games. Athens is ready for that, and that is what I am going to show you in a few minutes. Athens is currently changing, we are doing our best to organise the Olympic Games and prepare the city for the thousands of athletes, officials and visitors of our city. In the first part of my introduction, I will show you the infrastructure projects and in the second part, I will talk about fencing.

Presentation with slides.

Then, the infrastructure projects, this is in the old part of Athens that the Games will be organised, here is the bottom of Athens, the Olympic village, which is located at the north of Attica and the airport is there. The Olympic villages are ready and will be delivered in February, they will be delivered almost one month in advance to the Organising Committee for the final preparations of the Olympic Games. The Olympic village has been inspected two month ago and has been well recommended by the Olympic National Committee and the experts in respect of the quality of the houses, because people will live in those houses after the O.G., and it has been built by Greeks.

We are having a new opportunity in Athens, a new national airport in operation since one year and a half, built by the Germans with the agreement of the Government, the airport is ready to welcome the organisation of the Games. It makes the connection between the airport and the bottom of Athens through the city, joins the national air line connecting the North and South of Greece. The security is the most important project of infrastructure, we are now using 80 % of it. At the same time, in the middle, we are building a new line for the tube, which is connecting the bottom of the city with the airport. This is the system of subway, Athens is an old city and we are developing a wider system for the tube, this is already in operation and new lines will be built for the Games. This is the metro station at the bottom of Athens, if you have time to visit this place, you will see stratum of the ancient town, built year after year, you can still see the ancient town which is a good project for the tube. Also, we are connecting the bottom of Athens with the lines and the zones and thus will be completed in May 2004.

Something else on the infrastructures, this is what we are going to use for the Games in Athens. 50 % of their installations are meant for the 3 major Olympic venues, here the North of the city, the South and the old airport of Athens. The rest will be spread in the Attica where we will have 38 competitions. I just want to show you some pictures of the design main venue for the competitions and I will then talk about fencing.

The main complex that I have here, in the North of the bottom of Athens, is the Olympic sport venue of Athens, we have the Olympic stadium, racecourse, all water sports, biking, tennis

courts and then we will have national television for the 2000 personalities and for the 10'000 or more media. In total, Athens will take 20'000 media people.

The next picture is the one of the Pantheon, this is in the south of the bottom of Athens. Acropolis is there, at the Pantheon. This is the venue for the beach volley-ball, taekwondo, hand-ball and volley-ball, and the easiest venue to access for you is here, we have all the ways to the airport. We have transformed them in sporting venues, this is the map where you have the main square, the base-ball field, soft-ball, hockey, sailing, and we have here two fields, one for basket-ball and hand-ball and this one for fencing, which I am going to talk about.

Fencing, the best venue for fencing is the Olympic village, next to the village there is a training field for the competitions I have talked about, in the bottom part of Athens we have hotels, and here for national federations and here where the official technicians will stay. So you can see that from the village, you can go straight to the Olympic venues. For fencing, all fitting-out for your team will be near. This is the development area for the venue, it will be the centre for base-ball and hockey and what will be there for handball and basket-ball next to this building which will be soon finished, we will have fencing. Then all this area is after the main venue, the second major venue in which people will be able to experiment the Olympic Games.

Fencing will take place here, this is a view taken in 2003, 10 months ago, this is how it will look like during the Games, the VIP side will be here as the final square will be on this side. This is the foreground of the area for the spectators. The delay of construction : the construction of the stadium has started in 2003 to be ready for the sporting event in March 2004. We have one part of the constructions for the competition venues, the areas for technology and a small part for the public, and this will be ready in February 2004, all the preparation for the venue will be ready in May 2004.

This is the main map, the preliminary room has a capacity for 3005 places with 4 pistes and the final square is in yellow, all the blue surface is the competition area for the athletes, for the officials, all people of sport. This is the appearance of the preliminary room, the piste. And this is the appearance of the final piste with the spectators from outside.

The program of the competitions will start on Saturday, the day after the opening ceremony, from 13th to 24th August 2004, nine days of competition. In the morning, competitions will start at 10.00 am, finals will start each evening at 6 pm. This is the program of the competitions that you all have in your file. I will not linger over more because we do not have much time.

We are having a good development for the training centre. Athletes will be able to train in the hall of the competition and also next to the Olympic village. In this training centre, 50 % of the athletes will be trained during the Olympic Games, 50 % of the athletes will be able to go the door of the Olympic village to train, and the training camp for fencing is here, less than 10 minutes from the training venue. We can see the surface here, here the Olympic village and here, the venue for trainings and there, the area for fencing. The training program will start on 30 July 2004 and end on 22 August 2004. We will have 6 sessions per day, 2 hours per session. The accommodation of the official technicians, near the coast, this is a typical room, a double room.

Communication with International Federations. I must tell you that we are having an excellent collaboration with International Federations. The President visited us with Mr. Katsiadakis, we are now checking the entire project in order that fencing gets the best trip to the Games in Athens, because as said by Dr Bach, we need to show the best way to the Olympic Games, you have to keep it in order to carry on with your sport for the Olympic Games. I would like to

thank Mister President and Mr. Katsiadakis for what we carry on to do. In effect, Mr. Katsiadakis is a partner in this organisation of the Games.

Sporting events. We have organised sporting events in August and have received excellent comments from the National Olympic Committee and all the athletes. We have had in October the Marathon, in December we will have a list for the Pentathlon and for fencing, we will have World Cup and Grand Prix in March, we shall use this organisation made by national federations with the Organising Committee of Athens 2004, in order to test it. So, for all these sports and especially for your sport, we are going to have the event in test, inside the Olympic reception, with the same format as for the Olympic Games, then we are able to test the technology, the management of the competition, the arrival management and all what is planned for that. You will be lucky to see this in March.

I am through with my presentation, I would like to thank you for your attention and time. Mister President, thanks again, you can see here our logo and fencing mascot for the Olympic Games. Once again, thank you, thanks to Mr. Katsiadakis and to all the fencing family. We are very happy to have presented the best organisation for the Olympic Games. Thank you very much.

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : Thank you very much Mr. Assimakopoulos, we are certain that fencing will receive a great reception.

Makis Assimakopoulos (GRE) : Should the Executive Committee have questions, we remain at disposal.

René Roch (MH) : I thank you Mr. Assimakopoulos. Then, we carry on with the point left yesterday, the problem of World Cups and Grand-Prix.

Nathalie Rodriguez : To start, I would like to announce that we are having two supplementary countries, Ukraine and Aruba, and India which had to leave this morning gave its proxy to the Federation of Malta. We have now 88 countries present or represented.

Then, we go back to page 29, page 30, the **propositions from the Spanish Federation, World Cup and Grand Prix.** You will find the proposition at page 31. Organisation of World Cup events with coefficient of 1 and the actual organization rules and a maximal participation of 8 fencers per country and 15 from the organising country. Organisation of 4 Grand Prix Tournaments coefficient 3, individual and teams, to be celebrated 2 in Europe, 1 in America, and 1 in Asia-Oceania per weapon, with a maximal participation of 6 fencers per country, 10 of the organising country. Limit of 8 World Cup tournaments, plus the World Championships for a fencer during the season. Coefficient 5 for the individual and World Cup championships. You have on page 29, 30 and 31, the opinions of the different commissions. This proposition has also to be put together with the proposition from the French Federation, World Cup Competition in individual, situated on page 33 of your propositions book. I must remind you that we have already taken a decision in respect of coefficient for competitions, as there was a proposition from the Executive Committee, 1 for the World Cup, 2 for the Grand-Prix and 3 for the World Championships.

The Promotion Commission has the objective to reduce the overall number of official FIE competitions starting in the 2004/2005 season. It will take into account the following criteria : to maintain the concept of universality, therefore representation on all continents. To retain those countries currently hosting no more than 1-2 events a year and use qualitative criteria to eliminate events occurring in countries that currently host more than 2 events. The Commission is therefore proposing the following for the 2004/2005 World Cup season, a

circuit of 14 events per weapon, divided into 9 World Cup events : 4 in Europe, 2 in America, 2 in Asia, 1 in Africa and 5 Grand-Prix events : 2 in Europe and 1 in the three other continents, where the Grand Prix must necessarily include a team event. World Cup events will receive a coefficient of 1, Grand-prix 2 and World Championships 3. For ranking purposes, only 6 results will be retained, plus the World Championship result, with a maximum of 3 World Cup or Grand-Prix events by continent.

Participation in the Grand Prix events will be limited to a maximum of 8 fencers per weapon per nation, and, for the organising nation, any other fencer(s) they may have in the top 32 of that weapon, based on the final World Cup ranking established following the last World Championships. Participation in World Cup events will remain the same as currently practiced.

It was agreed that using top 32 fencers from the ranking as a criteria for selection would not be either conclusive or determining, and a major criteria must be the quality of the technical organisation of a competition, including the mandatory production of a cassette of the event for the media in the case of the Grand Prix. The Commission proposes that for the next Olympic cycle, the responsibility for observing Grand prix events be shared equally between the Refereeing Commission and the promotion and Publicity Commission.

The Rules Commission, page 31, made the following remarks : it is in favour of the point i of the proposition from the Spanish Federation. For the point double i, we can not in the long term exclude Africa, it may be a good idea to limit the number of Grand-Prix but 4 is too few, especially if we look ahead to have a Grand Prix in Africa. And it would be unwise to limit too severely the number of entries into what will be more expensive competitions to run. In principle, the Commission is in favour to limit the number of events per fencer in a season, but suggests 12 or 14 as a limit. The coefficient of 5 for the World Championships seems too high, the Commission agrees rather with the coefficients suggested by the Executive Committee.

René Roch (MH) : I believe that the conclusions we have reached are first of all that coefficients must be 1, 2 and 3. And this was voted yesterday, we are not going back. Besides, we think that we should effectively limit the number of competitions, this is the position of the Executive Committee. It has agreed with 12 or 14 events. I believe that if we limit it to 12, this is too few for the time being because it will be very difficult to eliminate so many competitions. In a first time, it seems that 14 would be preferable, furthermore that it will allow automatically to have an event in Africa, it is a necessity to develop our sport on this continent. I believe that the proposition from the Spanish Federation is very interesting. It forced us to think over these little problems and the proposition of the Promotion Commission is good, but maybe the last part is not very useful and does not correspond to what we are looking for. We have held long discussions in the Executive Committee, and think that we should not limit the fencers amongst the 32, we should grant to the organising nation a supplementary number of fencers, for example, we have thought of 12 supplementary fencers, I believe that it would be preferable, because to limit to 32, in some organising countries, there will be nobody, there will be very few in the 32. And we still want some advantages for the country organising the competition.

The point, on which we are agreeing, is to take practically the proposition of the Promotion Commission and simply change the end of this proposition in saying that we take maximum 8 fencers per country and add 12 fencers for the organising country if necessary. Do you agree with this proposal ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : For Grand Prix only, there are no more quota. Quotas are kept for the World Cup events but not for the Grand Prix as we fix it to 8 per each nation.

René Roch (MH) : Two things should be taken into account. First of all for the World Cup events, there are no changes, it remains as it is, no quota. Regarding Grand Prix events, which are the main events of our Federation, we want to have a perfect organisation and if you wish to attract the best fencers to this competition, it would not be with quotas anymore, it would simply be 8 per country and 12 supplementary for the organising country, but only for Grand-Prix, it does not affect A-grade competitions.

Alexandru Mironov (ROM) : I just want to underline how reasonable is the proposition from the Spanish Federation. There are at least two reasons : the more competitions we have, the more we are transforming the sportsmen in nomad moving from one country to the other and this is expensive, then little powers of fencing can not afford it. And you know that in the World Championships, there are always surprises. The moment of truth is the World Championship. There are very often surprises. The other argument, is that sportsmen still need training. If we are sending an athlete to 20 competitions, we will never have time to give him what is needed. In that case, the quality of fencing is decreasing. I think that we should not organise compulsory competitions. Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : Thank you Mr. Mironov. Mr. Higginson.

Steve Higginson (GBR) : There is a point in the proposition of the Promotion Commission which says that only Refereeing and Promotion Commissions should go as observers. Of course, I am a little bit disappointed as I am not a member of one of those commissions but this is not personal. I think that depriving the majority of commissions to see competitions, which are the headlights of our Federation, is depriving them of a quite important experience to do their job as members of commissions. They will not see the best level of international competition, except from the World Championship. I think this is a weakness of this proposition.

René Roch (MH) : I think that it is a point of the proposition to be discussed now, I give the floor to Mister President of the Spanish Federation.

Marco A. Rioja Perez (ESP) : Whatever happen with these propositions, the Spanish Federation is happy as they have been analysed by the Executive Committee and Commissions, which is fundamental for the development of our sport. We have talked a lot about the objectives of the proposition and we simply want to enumerate them now. This is obvious that the FIE calendar of events has a lot of competitions, which makes, in addition to the current qualification and scoring system, that only countries with economical resources have the possibility to reach sporting successes, because they can participate in many competitions with many fencers, who will choose the best results amongst a large number of tournaments. But the majority of countries with less resources do not have the same conditions to participate in competitions. All this makes that our sport has practically no time for technical development with training in rooms. Then the quality of fencing is decreasing, reason why the Spanish Federation would like to rationalise the calendar of competitions in reducing the number of competitions, in which a fencer can participate, in reducing the number of Grand Prix events, and the number of participants per country, in order to give the same opportunities to all countries.

René Roch (MH) : If you allow me Mr. President, we have read your speech already and know it, and this is the reason why we had proposed what you have heard before. I do not think this is necessary to read it over again as we have all been in possession of it since two months. I believe that everybody knows that if some propositions are made, this is because we have taken into account what you said and it effectively appears necessary to do what you have suggested. So, the only thing I am asking for, do you agree with the propositions made by the Executive Committee, Promotion and Rules Commissions ? Do you find it insufficient ? Do you want to remain with your propositions ? This is our purpose today.

Everybody knows your argumentation and we agree, by the way, this is also our's. I do not think that we should lose too much time today as we have a lot to do.

Marco A. Rioja Perez (ESP) : I wanted to say that any modification made in this sense, even if this is not exactly as suggested, will be accepted by our Federation. We agree to include Africa, because it was a mistake from our proposition not to mention it, and we accept that coefficients given by our Federation were maybe too high and we agree with the coefficients 1, 2 and 3.

René Roch (MH) : Mister President we can applaud you and thank you for your collaboration.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : Messrs Presidents, in order not to lose time, in the French proposition we simply fully agree with the modifications proposed by the Executive Committee, we think that this is a very good resolution, but I want to say to our Spanish friend that there are not only big nations, those which are supposed to have money, I believe that if we have asked for a modification, a reduction of the number of competitions to 12, we have noticed that there are currently for example 14 events at women's foil, 17 at men's foil, this is why we have reduced it a little bit, but 12 or 14, we fully agree. I would like to say that the main point you all have raised and which is very important, is simply that this reduction of number of events well spread throughout the world and in trusting the Executive and those who will determine, will allow to raise the level of fencing, being nations moving or not, we know that some people are participating in all competitions and we are wondering when do they have time to train, to improve, but also what nobody noted so far, I think that we should not forget the social and professional becoming of our champions. And here as well, our athletes must be able to simply prepare their life of men and women in a serene way, Mister the Vice-President of the IOC, this is in the Olympic spirit that I am talking, to have a good spirit in a healthy body.

Giorgio Scarso (ITA) : We all agree that the proposition deserves our respect. We agree that it is better to make some modifications in the World Cup circuit, but what would be better, would be to nominate a Study Commission in order to officially decide at the next Congress or General Assembly. This proposal needs deeper studies by a commission, which will analyse the consequences.

Victor S. Grouppierre (ARG) : I want to clarify something regarding the Promotion Commission. Last year, it was decided that observers for Grand-Prix should be members of the Refereeing Commission. In the Promotion Commission, we believe that the most important is the image of our sport that we are giving to the sporting world. The observation should not be exclusively for the Refereeing Commission, because our Commission has the responsibility to promote our sport to the international level. We are therefore proposing that observers be divided between the members of the Refereeing and Promotion Commissions.

René Roch (MH) : Sirs, effectively I think that if we want to bury a proposition, we have to nominate a commission. But we do not intend to bury this proposition, this is an excellent one and I am congratulating the President of the Spanish Federation for his proposal, by the way, we have been discussing it together for several months. I believe that this is a good proposition and if further study must be undertaken, it should be done by the Promotion Commission in order to give criteria to eliminate some competitions, it has to be done following some criteria, I believe that the Promotion Commission is able to choose these criteria, this is a good Commission, it works and I do not see why we should nominate another commission. I have already requested the Promotion Commission to meet in January to study criteria to be presented to the Executive Committee. And only after having seen the criteria given by the Promotion Commission, will the Executive take a decision. I think there is time for work, there is time for decision, we can not always say " we postpone,

we postpone, we postpone". As just said by Mr. Abric, this is very difficult for fencers to train and at the same time participate in competitions. They can not have a good training if they are constantly in competition. I believe that there is here an urgent measure to take for the next season, we are in an Olympic year, this is evident that we can not apply what is proposed here for this year. But I think that the principle to have 14 competitions, is good, this is already a lot. I think that on this point we could already vote, it means that we will have 9 World Cup events with the principle of 4 in Europe, 2 in America, 2 in Asia and 1 in Africa and 5 Grand-Prix events, 2 in Europe and 1 in each of the three other continents. Do you already agree with this proposal ? Who is against ? Nobody is against, **so the proposal is adopted.**

Concerning the second issue related to the coefficients, this is already voted, we do not have to come back. So, for ranking purposes, only 6 results will be retained, plus the World Championship result, and out of these 6, a maximum of 3 can be gained on the same continent. I believe that this is a good proposal, which also forces the fencers to participate in competitions in the different continents and not only in one or two continents. The fact that only 3 can be taken into account on a continent is a good thing. Is someone against this proposition ? Nobody is against, **then this is adopted.**

For Grand-Prix events : participation will be limited to a maximum of 8 fencers per weapon, per nation, and the organising nation will eventually allow to enter a maximum of 12 supplementary fencers from its country. Then a total of 20. Some can think that this is effectively a lot, but I believe that this is good for the development of our sport. Is someone against this proposition ? Nobody, **then we adopt it.**

Finally, no modification will be made to the modality of participation in the World Cup events. I believe that all these propositions that we have just voted, will be applicable starting from the next season, which is the season 2004/2005.

The last remaining point is more delicate as it consists in saying that some commissions will have more privileges than some others. This is what has happened for Grand-Prix events, we had only observers from the Refereeing Commission. This is desirable that the Promotion Commission takes a more important part in our sport and for its development. I believe that this is a good thing, but of course, it does not mean that other commissions will not have the possibility to be observer, but what is of primordial importance in Grand-Prix, because this is only for Grand-Prix, is the aspect of our competitions, to first have a good refereeing, secondly to have a competition taking place in good conditions with equipment in accordance with our request. I believe that the Promotion Commission is the most appropriate to have a good notion. Now the discussion is open, this is evident, this is not a question which has to be discussed today, because this is not very important, but I believe that anyway we should consider to always have a member of the Refereeing Commission and a member from another Commission present. We could simply say that the Executive Committee when designating the Grand-Prix events, should also designate a member of the Refereeing Commission and a member of another Commission. Then, it will be up to the Executive Committee, as it will be the one to designate observers, to know whether for this competition this is preferable to send someone from the Promotion Commission, or from another Commission. This is clear that for some competitions, we want to know exactly what is happening and in that case, we should send someone for the Promotion Commission, who in principle as the necessary knowledges to appreciate the value of the competition. Do you agree with this proposition ? It means that we will designate 2 observers for the Grand-Prix, one from the Refereeing Commission and one from another Commission. Do you all agree ? Who is against ? Nobody, so I think that **this is adopted** and the discussion is therefore over. We move on to the next point. Thank you for your collaboration.

Florindo Morais (POR): I would like to know who is going to pay for the second observer ? Will it be the FIE or the organising country ?

René Roch (MH) : You are raising a question related to the season 2004/2005. We do not have the budget for the time being because we still do not know how much will be received from the television by the IOC. I am looking at Mr. Bach.

Thomas Bach (GER, MH): Before receiving money from the IOC, we first need to have great Games in Athens, but if the Games in Athens are running smoothly, you will receive more money than in the past.

René Roch (MH) : I take note of the proposition of Mr. Morais, and we shall of course study this problem and it could well be that we find a budget for this second observer.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : I believe that this is necessary to have a recommendation on this at the time of the General Assembly, which takes place at the same time as the calendar meeting, in order to enable those invited for the Grand-Prix to know their obligations before accepting them.

René Roch (MH) : We are, anyway, going to present a budget 2004/2005 at the General Assembly scheduled to hold in April and we will know at this time the amount of the rights that we will receive from the IOC. We will be able to establish a budget and we will take into account your proposition.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Let's move on to the **next proposition** from the Spanish Federation. The proposition is : **blocking of sabre hits in defensive actions**. If the contact between the blade and the opposite target occurs through the iron, the apparatus gives the signal of the hit between 0 and 4 milliseconds, will prevent the scoring of the hit between 4 and 15 milliseconds in case a "whip" would not be indicated. Whatever can be the method used to prevent the scoring, after 15 milliseconds from the contact of the iron, and although there is another hit, the device will have to allow the regular scoring of the whips which will be given afterwards. I give the floor to Ioan Pop.

Ioan Pop : On this occasion, I would like to thank the Spanish Federation, because as you are aware, in the ad hoc Commission for foil and sabre, we have organised tests in 4 different countries, but this is the Spanish Federation itself, which invited me to a test organised by them, where amongst other problems, it means amongst other achieved tests on the blocking time and the contact time, they have mentioned their researches in respect of preventing and effecting changes in order to prevent the scoring of the whipping touches. This is a very important question, you have seen the opinion of the SEMI Commission, because this is a very specific and technical problem, which really requires knowledges and professional competences, the SEMI, which did not take part to these tests, decided therefore to give a reserve. For me, sincerely, it is difficult to see on the piste whether the whips are scored or not, in view of the importance of this question with sabre, even the Executive Committee and Rules Commission have decided to carry on tests with the presence of a member of the SEMI Commission, who should obviously be Mr. Baiocco, who knows this problem very well. And our problem, we used to have an ideal device, in which there was some time to prevent scoring those whips, but it did not work out very well, and lately, Mr. Baiocco informed me that in most machines used in simple competitions, these devices do not exist anymore. Then concerning this proposition, we consider it very important because the aim of international fencing is to raise the possible defensive actions at sabre, to raise the possibilities of execution of parades-ripostes, and then, the possibility to equilibrate the connections between offensive and defensive actions, which now are clearly swinging towards 80 % towards the attacks towards the offensives actions, this is much more difficult to effect a parade-riposte in a certain a way, due to the flexibility of the blade. We had

already taken measures to equilibrate this at the time the Congress had decided to use more rigid weapons than previously at sabre. Anyway, we carry on the tests and this problem is in our testing program.

René Roch (MH) : Thanks to Ioan Pop. Mr. Baiocco, you have the floor.

Marcello Baiocco (ITA) : The proposition of the Spanish Fencing Federation concerns the ban on whipping touches at sabre. There are two things. The first one is to take out the sentence "provided that the contact between both blades is not interrupted more than 2 times maximum meanwhile", our Commission agrees to take out this sentence because it is referring to the old scoring system at sabre, it means that the sabre was using the captor. Nowadays, the captor does not exist anymore, therefore the sentence can be taken out without any problem. The second part is to raise or decrease the sensibility of the apparatus, which means decrease the tolerance between two things, the more expensive the apparatus will be, it will be possible to do it, but we have to be careful as we must change several things in the apparatus. This is all.

René Roch (MH) : Thank you very much Mr. Baiocco, I think that we have to think again about this problem. We should not do things which implicate big expenses for a relative interest. I agree to carry on with the tests and that we get in touch with I think the SEMI Commission and the Spanish technician in order to see again this problem with him. So, I believe that we do not take decision, we just say that we are carrying on with the tests and will get back later. Do you agree ? **Agreed.**

Nathalie Rodriguez : We are now at page 33 of the propositions book. We are going to deal with the proposition from the French Federation together with the one from Spain and **the French Federation indicated that all the other propositions have been withdrawn.**

Then, we move on to the propositions from **Mr. Max Geuter**. We are at page 34. **Incompatibility between Executive Committee and Commission.** " I propose to change the decision of the 82nd Congress in Havana in 2001 and not to apply this decision at the next Elective Congress in 2004. This means to remain with the status quo. We have discussed this matter many years ago when a member of the Armenian Federation demanded this change and it was rejected at a big majority. This is still not democratic to keep candidates away from election who are proposed for two different positions in the FIE by their federation. They should be elected or not for their ability, talents and experience in order to serve the FIE in the best way". The Legal Commission did not give its opinion.

Melik Chahnazarian (ARM) : I would like to thank Mr. Geuter who mentioned the name of the Armenian Federation in his proposal, we are honoured. He mentioned our Federation in connection with the right proposition, democratic and progressive, which is to push back, as are always pushed back new progressive ideas, in the beginning, but which finally are a success. He did not mention that the proposition made 6 or 5 years ago, was taken back by a Federation with a lot of authority and lot of experience, the Italian Federation and which was adopted, but has not been implemented because it has to be effective starting from the Elective Congress in 2005. I think that it is not a good thing not to allow the analysis of a proposition and to try to deny it before it is realised. I want to say that this proposition is democratic, because it allows members from different federations to have representatives in these commissions and also in a wider and democratic way, take part to the decisions. I want to remind to those who maybe do not know that there are with us many young people and this is very good, that some time when big countries had 6 or 7 votes at the beginning of the Congress, and thanks to the International Olympic Committee, which supported this proposition, little by little, this inequality has been abolished. In the beginning, we had few votes for critical questions and nowadays we are all equal and have each one vote at the Congress. This is in the frame of development of democracy, that this proposition was done.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the Italian Federation, which in my absence due to my diplomatic obligations, which did not allow me to participate in all Congresses, but this proposition managed to convince the Congress, so let's leave this decision and see what will come next, it will of course be good because it is a democratic proposition. Thank you.

Max Geuter (GER, MH) : Dear President, dear friends, I expected this reaction after my speech. You must be surprised that I have once again raised this issue, I have also been asked to withdraw it and I have also been encouraged by many people to include it in the agenda and to propose once again the secret vote. Let me explain you something. We have discussed this issue twice. About 7 years ago, when Mr. Melik was at that time President of the Armenian Federation, he was insisting on taking out Mr. Valérian Bazarevitch from the Executive Committee or the Rules Commission. His request has not been accepted as Mr. Bazarevitch was a precious member at both positions and the Congress rejected this request. In Havana, we have widely discussed this proposition, which was this time brought by the Italian Federation. Arthur Cramer, who could not be present today due to a tragic family event, had clearly explained why it was essential that members of the Executive Committee be also members of Commissions, providing that they are proposed by their federation and elected by the Congress. He can not support me today, but I believe that you have to listen to the words said in Havana.

Arthur Cramer mentioned it two years ago in Havana, I have a completely different opinion and I would like to explain why. At the last Congress, the same members of the Executive Committee or members of the Commissions, in my opinion, was a good thing, I am explaining why. The first decision of the Congress, which was a wise decision, was a proposition voted in 1988. Why was this decision good ? Because in the past, we used to have an Executive Committee, which was completely out of the reality. We had members, who had never seen competitions, who were making propositions without having heard referees, trainers, team captains, fencers, etc. The reality is that members of Commissions must have a real contact with the piste in order to know the truth and report it to the Executive Committee.

Fencing can not be what it used to be, nowadays, fencing is international thanks to the politic and FIE President's program. For the time being, we have to think fervently, we can take decisions, which might change the future of fencing and would put in the Executive Committee people isolated and completely out of the reality of what is happening on the pistes. Sincerely, I am kindly asking you to think properly on this decision taken 10 years ago, which was confirmed last year. I believe this is a little warm. The surprise is that the Italian Federation came back again with the same proposition, but they have all democratic rights to propose it and the Congress, as well, has all the rights to change this proposition. I work for international sport and I do not want to see in Commissions only people coming from big countries or members from the Executive Committee, who are isolated from the reality because they have never been to a competition. You all know the expression "do not change a wining team", which could be used in our debate today because I am sure that we will still have discussions.

I just want to draw your attention to the Refereeing Commission. If we have to implement the decision taken in Havana at the next Elective Congress, we will see that four members will not be able to be re-elected, always providing that they have been proposed in opposition to their federations for this Commission or for Comex. These four persons are : Ms Ana Pascu, Emmanuel Katsiadakis, Arthur Cramer and myself. Then, we will have to elect four new members and also two women. We have discussed it the day before the presentation of Nathalie. In looking at the list of women referees, I do not see any woman ready for this position. The Refereeing Commission must work in order to succeed and I believe that under the pressure of our President, with our past program, we should not still remain here and move forward.

With 4 new members out of 10, it seems difficult and it is not an advantage for the FIE, always providing that the 4 members continue to be in Comex. Never stop a winning team, I hope that you have all understood what I intended to say with that and this is the same for some other commissions. Peter Jacobs and Sam Chervis for the Legal Commission, Jenö Kamuti for the Medical Commission and Ali Hussain for the Promotion Commission.

If we look at the list of candidates of the last election, there were very few candidates for some of the commissions, for some others, we had many. But also many that we had never seen at competitions or at World Championships. This is also what had been underlined by Arthur Cramer in Havana. How many athletes wish to join a Commission after their careers? Very very few. But we nevertheless need them to carry on with the FIE tasks and this is our responsibility to encourage them as well as women to join the FIE Commissions and also the Executive Committee. We need to fill up our tank with capable people, dedicated to our sport and not only fill in the Commissions with candidates just willing to be in Commissions.

Kindly think about that while voting, I know that many will be against these arguments in order to justify why it is not possible that one has two positions in the FIE, but I have to ask for a secret vote, as Mr. Di Blasi did it in Havana. Thank you very much.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Mr. Pierre Abric.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : Listen, we are going to try to be positive after the brief of our friend Max. To be positive in the sense that anyway, I would like to thank the International Federation. If we are asking us this question, it means that we have grown up as well as the Federations, and Max, I want to tell you in respect of your remark made on the French, that we are one of the Federation with probably the highest number of elected women. You probably all know Ms Dumont. And I will tell you for example, a little French adage « chacun pour soi et les poules seront bien gardées ». This is a little bit humoristic. So I believe that we have grown up. And at some time, as much in National Federations than in International Federation or Confederations, we needed, as we did, to be at two, three or fours positions at the same time in order to be able to simply function. Nowadays, we have fortunately grown up, and we have to train our managers for the universality, we have to admit that we could have one position and maybe simply limit the number of mandates as told by our politicians.

I believe that one of the argument, the Executive : 11 members. Those are our fathers, they are the one who are going to decide, the Executive. The Commissions are below the authority of the Executive, either if we want it or not. And when we are in the Executive and President of Commissions, except for the past, because we could not do differently, it is preferable not be judge and party. That we can implicate a proposition and we all know, because we are all a little bit crafty, that when we are in a national Executive or another, and we can defend our point of view, this is true we can maybe defend it but surely with less objectivity.

Then, I honestly believe that in view of the development of our sport, we should open ourselves to leaders, people, and this is true what Max is saying, I agree with you, it must be competent people. You spoke about the Refereeing Committee, an example came back to me, we have today spoken a lot about our Spanish friends due to their excellent propositions. I have now twenty years of experience as President of Federation, several FIE Congresses and I remember an election of the Refereeing Committee, for which were excellent candidates, okay let's give one name, he will certainly blush, this is not important as he is not here, this is when Villapalos, the Spanish, excellent referee, could not be elected. So, let's stop, let's be positive. I think that this measure, instead of being a polemic, is a position, which will simply allow us to move a little bit more forward, and at least, us, France, we are in favour of maintaining this decision. Thank you.

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to take back the floor and say one thing. This has been voted two years ago. Are we going to come back every two years on something already voted ? This is stupefying. It has been voted two years ago, it has even not been implemented and we are already against without knowing what will happen once we will implement what has been voted. Is it really reasonable as we are always saying, let's try and we shall see. I think that this is even not worth to be controversial, it has been voted two years ago, it has not been implemented yet, and someone is against. This is not possible. This is totally illogical. I believe that we should leave it here and vote for or against Max's proposition, but I still suggest to vote against.

Applause.

Stacey Johnson (USA) : I deeply respect Max Geuter, his work and the years spent at the service of our sport. But we have to precise that we should be very clear on our strategy and leading policy.

The President and the Executive spoke about speeding up the universality, representation and inclusion. This proposition clearly goes against the inclusion. Our Executive Committee must make sure that there is a good balance of the powers inside the FIE. This is clear that this proposition is going against the balance of powers and allow big influence and concentration of power in less hands.

As for leadership, I think that the Executive Committee will listen to the majority, which is the Congress, and will satisfy its requests.

I am kindly asking those who voted before not to allow the modification of this proposition, which has already been voted.

Omar Vergara (ARG) : I would like to underline the importance of the question. We are talking about a question of incompatibility and power. The Commissions are here to advise the Executive Committee and the President. We can not advise ourselves, there are people with power in this Federation, especially the Refereeing Committee designating the Referees for the World Championships. The proposition implicates an accumulation of power for some of the members, who are also friends, but we differ on this. We voted on this at the last meeting of the Legal Commission, where two members were really implicated. I therefore propose to reject Max Geuter's proposition in order to enable anyone in the future to accomplish his function, as already decided. Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : Well, Mr. Di Blasi and then we move on to the vote. We stop discussing this issue. I think that this is not even worth that Mr. Di Blasi takes the floor because Mr. Max Geuter is withdrawing his proposal.

Antonio Di Blasi (ITA) : I am very surprised of Max Geuter's proposal because in Havana, it had already been discussed and people had already voted. I do not agree that some people have the power to manage the world of fencing which is wide and international. Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : Well, I believe that Max Geuter is **withdrawing his proposition**, we applaud him and do not vote on this proposition.

Applause.

COFFEE BREAK

Nathalie Rodriguez : We now move on the propositions from the Hungarian Fencing Federation.

Proposition n°1, article 3.6, : The Hungarian Fencing Federation proposes a modified Rule, article 3.6, to the Elective Congress. « Everyone who votes must use all their votes ; 11 for members of the Executive Committee and 10 for members of the permanent commissions. In case of non-compliance, voting slips that do not contain 11 or 10 names of candidates will not be valid ». Reference : Mr. Peter Jacobs's proposal at the 2001 Congress. Motivations : During the last Elective Congress a great many people voted for a reduced number of people – often only one or two. This is neither equitable nor sporting. The voting system is clearer and more democratic when the electors utilise all their options. The Legal Commission as well as the Executive Committee were not in favour. Does anyone wish to speak ? Yes, Mr. Felkay.

Andras Felkay (HUN) : Mr. President, this is in our Statutes. In the Executive Committee, 11 members and the other permanent commissions have 10 members. We have noted during the last Elective Congress, that many federations designated only two or three names on the voting slip. If all federations do this, only two or three members will be elected in all the commissions and commissions will not function. This is why we are suggesting to modify the Statutes, that voting slips should be valid only if they contain 10 or 12 names. The next Hungarian proposition in respect of the creation of a Women Commission is withdrawn.

René Roch (MH) : Thank you. Well, I think that the Executive Committee was not in favour for the following reason : we think that everyone is free of his vote, and if he thinks that candidates are not good, we do not see why we should force him to give names that he does not consider as people being enough competent to be elected in a commission. I think this is effectively a democratic problem. We do not have compulsory vote here, it does not exist, and I believe that we do not have it in many countries. And I think that this is abnormal to force someone to write down 11 names, if he thinks that only 8 are good. Why to force him to put 11 ? This is not possible, you can not vote for someone that you think is incompetent for the commission. This is why I believe that the Executive Committee was not in favour of this proposition, the same for the Legal Commission. Now, does anyone wish to say something more about this ?

Serge Plasterie (FRA) : Mister President, we agree with the Executive Committee, but for another reason, a strategic reason, which is that there could be in the case you decide to imperatively put candidates on the lists, there could be fallacious manipulations, federations could put names, who would never be elected and it could also give prejudice to the future Executive of the FIE and commissions as well.

René Roch (MH) : I believe that our position is the following one : we want to leave total freedom to everyone to vote or not for a candidate. It seems natural to me. Who is in favour of the Hungarian proposition to force to have 10 or 11 names ? Two votes. I believe, that **this proposition is rejected**. Thank you. Then, the one of Mr. Peter Jacobs as well.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Proposition nr 4 from the Hungarian Federation : as there was already a vote on the number of competitions per weapon, this proposition has already been dealt with the Spanish proposition.

Proposition nr 6 : « the Senior Fencing World Championships should be organised with money prizes, as is usual in the practices of other international federations. After the Athens Olympic Games, the IOC significantly increased the financial support to the FIE. During the World Championships of other international federations, the champions medallists generally receive a money prize ». Rules Commission considers that this is a matter for the Publicity and Propaganda Commission, the Executive Committee was in favour but in the same conditions as in other International Federations, at the expense of the organisers. And the Promotion Commission agrees in principle, but supports the Executive Committee to the effect that organising National Federations are responsible for providing the prize money. Does anyone wish to speak about this proposition ?

René Roch (MH) : I believe that this is difficult to accept this proposal because now, we would wish, of course, that organisers provide prize money, and in some competitions, prize money are given to fencers, for example, I have in mind Kuwait, when it will organise its competition, is going to provide an important prize fund of CHF 12'000, I believe, to the competitors. I believe that this is excellent and we can only support this. But in respect of the International Federation, I agree to accept this proposition if the person who made this proposal, tells me on which budget I take this. I think that for the time being, we do not have a budget for this, we could think about it after 2004. But for the time being, this proposal is not valid because there is no possibility in our budget to systematically grant such important amounts to the fencers. We can do it occasionally, this is what we have done, by the way, for the World Championship for those who had transparent masks. We wish to do it for other weapons, but for this, we have to start to look for sponsors. And once I have sponsors, believe me, there will be prize monies for the fencers and I will be glad to be able to give money to the fencers. I can only encourage organisers to find sponsors to give prizes to the fencers so they can earn some money when participating in competitions. I do not believe that this proposition can be accepted. Is anyone for this proposition ? Nobody is for, so, **this is rejected.**

Nathalie Rodriguez : **Proposition nr 7,** replace **the article t.29 :** « A competitor who crosses one of the boundaries of the piste because of a push from his adversary or following an accidental cause incurs no penalty whatever ». Motivation : the word « involuntarily » is ambiguous in the current text. A fencer penalised by the referee applying the rule could argue that he has involuntarily crossed the limit. The Rules Commission finds it absolutely reasonable that a fencer should not be penalised for a fault for which he is not himself responsible. It therefore approves this proposal. Does anyone wish to speak about this proposal ?

René Roch (MH) : I think that this proposal is good. The only problem is to define what is the accidental cause. Personally, I find it very difficult to define. But we can keep it. It will be up to the appreciation of the referee, of course. It seems to me that “involuntarily” is better.

Nathalie Rodriguez : The current text is article t.29, accidental crossing, “the fencer who crosses involuntarily one of the boundaries of the piste following an accidental cause”. We speak about the word “involuntarily” which should be taken out, “such as a jostle from his adversary, incurs no penalty”. The proposition intends, in fact, to take out the word involuntarily.

Jozsef Meszaros (HUN) : We have given this proposition because involuntarily is a word, which could have different meaning. When a fencer crosses the boundaries of the piste involuntarily, he can tell the referee that he crossed the border involuntarily. The accidental cause, could be a jostle from his adversary or something else, when the fencer himself is not responsible for having crossed the limit, and this is why, in our opinion, it could be a better wording of the rule through our proposition. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Mr. Plasterie.

Serge Plasterie (FRA) : The word involuntarily clearly means not voluntary. Then, we could well write in a non voluntary way, if you wish. But involuntarily means that the fencer is not guilty, and it goes in the right sense, that we penalise the one who commits the fault, but in no way, the fencer who did not commit a fault should be penalised. And the word involuntarily in the French dictionary means “ in a non voluntary way”. So if you wish to put in a non voluntary way, this is less French than involuntarily. That is all.

René Roch (MH) : I believe that the current article with involuntarily is excellent. This is very explicit, because an accidental cause, is extremely vague, it does not implicate as well that this is involuntarily. The accidental cause could be that someone bothered him or that there was a problem. But what we are looking for is that the fencer be not penalised, if of course, he did it involuntarily, without trying to take advantage of this possibility. So, I do not think that this is very good to change something in an article for something less clear and less easy to understand. But you can have a different opinion, I do not see any inconvenient. But in French, involuntarily is better than accidental cause. Do you agree ? We keep the current text. Who is against keeping the current text ? Everybody is in favour of keeping the current text, **then we keep the text.**

Nathalie Rodriguez : We now move on to the proposition from the Indonesian Federation, page 37, which goes with the similar proposition from Singapore. « As discussed in the South East Asian Games in Kuala Lumpur, we would like to propose to make English as the Official FIE language worldwide, while French and Spanish continue to stay as working languages. I believe this will raise motivation to participate in fencing since English is a second language for Indonesian that it would be easier to understand ». The Legal Commission is not in favour of this proposition. Does anyone wish to speak about this proposal ?

Helen Smith (AUS) : I believe that it is becoming more and more evident that more and more countries of our Federation feel better to operate in English rather than in the other official languages. I think that if this is happening today, the change should be made gradually. It will not happen in one night. We already have all the existing official documents in three languages, in any case, it would bring fencing in a modern world and in the future. I think that it would be a good thing. Thank you.

Melik Chahnazarian (ARM) : The world of tomorrow would be rich if there would be many languages and it would be sad to accept one common language such as Armenian for example or English or another and all the other languages would disappear. This is, if we can say it like this, the emotional side. With regards to the proposition, if we would have proposed three official languages, I understand, but now, to change all our Statutes, all French wordings, all English documents that we have found, it would be a huge work for nothing. We already have all the documents in three languages, understandable and if some languages are called working languages, it does not change too much. This is why I do not think that this is a good proposition. Still, I would understand, I repeat, if we would propose to have three official languages, but as the documents need one version to be referred to, we have one reliable language in case of controversy. I think that this proposition is not valid. Thank you.

Pierre Abric (FRA) : Excuse me, but I think that you would not have understood a non intervention from the president of the French Federation. Madam, you said modernity. To the expression modernity, I would say tradition. And simply because our sport is also a tradition and our sport is connected to the Olympic Games. The Olympic Games since Pierre de Coubertin in 1896, French is the language of reference. But there are also working languages, there is also an official language, which is English. So I believe that some years

ago, during the plenary Congress, the issue had already been discussed. There was a friend, this is not France, which saved the French language, this was our Arab friends, who said "listen, if you want to have working languages, you have three European languages". This is true that tradition, the past made that when we were colonizers, just as well the Spanish, as the English and the French, have been spread out in the world.

I am then asking this question. The IOC is currently keeping French as a language of reference. I think this is a tie related to our Olympic connection. I think we made the effort and the FIE did it well, to have two working languages. So to put everything back in discussion, also in connection to our fencing culture, in which we speak French, in which our referees must know 200 French words for refereeing, I am simply drawing your attention. We recognise, of course, that English is more and more spoken in the world. But I believe that we have today a balance with the official language of reference in our texts and I would say three working languages and today we clearly see it thanks to the simultaneous translations. Each one can give his opinion. Personally I would prefer remaining on the status quo. I thank you. All those who fenced can simply think that we still consider some tradition in our sport while moving towards modernity. Thank you.

Applause.

Alexandru Mironov (ROM) : The United Nations have several languages. Then, we could have one and settle an opening for our competitions of Monday morning to speak English « in position, ready, play ». On Tuesday, it could be French « get on guard, ready, play ». On Wednesday in Chinese, why not ? Then, this is a bad example of what we should not do. I think that we should stay with what we have. I do not think that this is annoying the principle of people in the entire world, whenever they come from Singapore, Australia or Malaysia, to learn 200 French words.

René Roch (MH) : Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that this is a fake problem because this is true that today our Statutes and Rules are in French, but they are also in Spanish and English, but French is the reference and this is the official language. I believe that this is a good thing not to have three official languages because it would cost a lot to the International Federation. Furthermore, we currently have three working languages, I think that we can speak to each other, we have, by the way, seen it today, in the three languages as we are working together, this is normal, and it does not create us too many difficulties, who ever writes to the International Federation in English or Spanish, we reply in English or Spanish each time. We are publishing a magazine in the three languages, then I do not think that this is creating problems of understanding for those who know these three languages. The only people who could claim for something could be the Arabs, this is true. There are more Arab speaking countries than English speaking countries because a country such as Indonesia who says to me " Sir, we would understand better if you would speak English", because he speaks English but the language of his country is not English, the language in Singapore is not English. You can speak English, but this is not the official language. So I believe that many people speak English in different countries but this is however not the language of the country. Then effectively, I believe that the Arabs could claim for something and maybe the Chinese as they are even more than everybody else to speak Chinese. It seems to me a little bit abnormal, and I do not think that this is desirable for the savings of our Treasurer, I have, by the way, already collected information from him. If we would have three official languages, why not, but it would be at exorbitant costs, and it would bring nothing more. I will also add that there are also extremely many Spanish countries, I mean countries in which we speak Spanish, in which Spanish is official. This is the problem. Then, Spanish could also ask to be an official FIE language. I think that we are currently functioning properly. I do not record having had difficulties in the different countries I have been. I think that we said, yesterday, that it was not necessary for the President to speak several languages, if he already speaks one currently, this is good. And then, if he speaks one of the two others, this is desirable.

Then I would say that this is desirable that we speak one of the three languages, but I do not see the necessity and I do not see what it would bring to have the official language of each of us including English speaking people, as Statutes and Rules are currently in French. This is true, they are most of the time translated. If we want an official translation, it would be extremely expensive and it seems very difficult to me. So, I believe that the status quo is not a bad thing. We have taken commitment, you know, and I remember, as it was under my presidency in 1994, to have three working languages. We did not use to have those three working languages before. I believe that this is running smoothly and that the FIE office is making its utmost to ensure a good run. I do not think that this is necessary to have an additional official language. Now, we can simply vote. Who is in favour of the proposition from Indonesia to have English as official language ? 15 votes. Who is against ?

Nathalie Rodriguez : There are 15 votes, the **proposition is rejected** at the majority, as well as the one from Singapore. We now move on to the propositions from Israel.

Arthur Bar-Joseph (ISR) : Excuse-me, kindly withdraw all the propositions from Israel.

Nathalie Rodriguez : All the propositions from the Federation of Israel have been withdrawn by Mr. Bar Joseph. For the propositions from Mr. Peter Jacobs, I give the floor to Mr. Peter Jacobs.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : As they are official propositions and that the official language is French, I suppose that I have to present them in French. The first proposition from t.43 to t.45 is that modern technology allows the installation and the possible use of earphones or any other electronic communication device in masks to give to the fencers the advice of their trainers/accompanying persons during the fight. This is in order to avoid problems in the future and not in the past because we have never found this until today. But, I found that doing that to help one of the fencer on the piste is totally against our rules, this is not permitted to coach during the fight. So, the proposal is that if we find a fencer with such equipment, he be sanctioned with a black card. In effect, this is a fault against sportsmanship. You have the texts in your hands, this is a little bit complicated because I took two different variations slightly different and the commissions did not make any distinction between them. Finally, I will make a slight modification in replacing the words “earphones or any other device” for a wider definition suggested by the SEMI Commission “equipped with headphones or any device permitting a person outside the piste to communicate with the fencer during the bout”. This is a proposition in order to maintain sportsmanship following our Rules, in respect of coaching during the fights. This is the version B, the second but in replacing the words “headphones or any device” by “material equipped in such a way to receive communication”. The paragraphs are related to the tasks of the referee to check all this, this is from t.43 to t.45.

Julius Kralik (SVK) : I believe that we should put it at a more general level. Simply that fencer’s equipment can not be changed or modified, without being approved by the SEMI Commission. Then, if I buy a mask, which corresponds to the requirements of the Rules, we can not modify anything either with headphones or what so ever, I can not do anything on my mask because this mask is in conformity with the Rules as made today with the FIE label and each mask are being checked.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We do not speak about equipment on the material, but about an eventual earphone for example.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : I think that the way I have modified it is as wide as what your are looking for. It means, in effect, by any mean, nobody can be helped in a hidden electronic way, in receiving information from outside the piste. I believe that it covers everything.

René Roch : Ladies, Gentlemen, I think that this is a good text, as a preventive. I hope that it will not give ideas to fencers. We agree to adopt this text, which is a good thing. Who is against ? Do you agree ? **This is adopted.**

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : **The second proposition is withdrawn**, it was in the Statutes in respect of the elections because it has been rejected like the Hungarian proposition.

At page 40 in French, **proposition 2 of the Statutes**, the Executive Committee be allowed to modify the Disciplinary Rules and Procedures of the FIE. **I have withdrawn it** during the Congress.

Proposition 3, Disciplinary Statutes : Process for doping cases follow the rules for competitions, which will be part of the Administrative Rules, in order to have the flexibility to comply with the requests from WADA. In brief, what is taken out : the Legal Commission prepared a text to modify the last part of our Disciplinary Code to take into account the specific requests of doping cases. In February, we are going to determine at meetings of the Medical Commission assisted by members of the Legal Commission and Executive Committee, the up-date of our anti-doping code in compliance with WADA. I think that we have to postpone an eventual decision to deal with special doping cases in our anti-doping code to join it to the global discussions on anti-doping in February. If you agree.

René Roch (MH) : So, this is **postponed**.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : This **proposition** is still valid, **anti-doping code, rules, article t.129, appendix A**. The section 3 is ambiguous. The anti-doping code says when an official, member of the athlete entourage or member of the medical is involved in a doping case, but this is not evident in this case, that penalty does not apply to the athlete, but to the official or member of the entourage, etc. who is involved in that case. I propose to modify this sentence to clarify in saying that penalties apply to the officials or guilty persons, and not to the fencer. Any remarks ?

George Van Dugteren (RSA) : Mister President, I think that we should temporarily modify our rules because starting from next year, we will have to adopt a new code, which is directly connected to WADA recommendations. Then, in practice, it will probably make a little difference if we change it now, but may be would it be better to change it in the interval.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Nobody is against ? **Then, adopted**. Regarding sanctions for the absence of name on back, it has already been dealt with. Number 5. It has already been approved yesterday with the proposition of the Executive Committee. Proposition nr 6 regarding fencers not presenting themselves on the piste during a pool etc. It has already been dealt with and approved yesterday. Proposition nr 7 concerning the salute, which was also connected to the proposition from Mr. Arthur Cramer, has already been dealt with and approved yesterday. This is all. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We now move on to the **proposition from the Rules Commission : Article t.120**, move the fault « deliberate hit not on opponent » from the 1st to the 2nd group of faults, so that any offence is penalised immediately, without a warning, thereby eliminating the possibility, especially at epee, of the use of an unsporting tactic. The Executive Committee was in favour of this proposition. Does anyone wish to speak ?

Serge Plasterie (FRA) : This goes exactly in the same direction as the proposition of yesterday, which is that we can not win a match or a title in committing a fault, this is the reason why France is totally in favour of this proposition.

René Roch (MH) : Well, I think that nobody is against. **We adopt this proposition** from the Rules Commission. **Application 1 January 2004.**

Nathalie Rodriguez : Then, the next proposition, the one from Singapore had been rejected. We move on to the one from Mr. Tibor Szekely. The proposition is withdrawn.

We move on now to the propositions from the Disciplinary Commission. These propositions are meant to change the articles of the Disciplinary Code, it means Chapter 7 of the Statutes. Does Mr. Cheris wish to speak about these propositions ?

Sam Cheris (USA, MH) : The Legal Commission went through the requested modifications. We think that the Disciplinary Commission should receive directly the complaints from the persons without being filtered by the Bureau of the FIE to decide whether the complaint should be heard by the Disciplinary Commission or not. The reason to have a Disciplinary Commission is to keep the political aspect of the Executive Committee outside from any conflicts, which would drag it to a process of appeal towards the CAS. The CAS revised our developed procedure, and their recommendations were not to involve the Executive Committee or the Bureau in political decisions.

We are having problems with the complaints going through the Bureau. The exact problem is that decisions were not taken on a legal basis, but were based on emotions between members of the Bureau and the type of the complaints involved. We are therefore against this change of the article 7.2.1, which says that complaints should be done on an official FIE form, but no official form has been created, no official form could be created as each complaint is different and to try to unify them on one sole form, would be impossible. There is no coded system having such a form. It would generate a lot of work for no reason and this paragraph can not be done now because no complaint could be deposited because the form does not exist. Subsequently, the Disciplinary Commission could have no work in the coming two years, until next Congress, unless a form is being created.

The next point in 7.2.3, to add a paragraph, which says that the President has the right to appoint himself as the President of the Tribunal. The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposition.

The modifications of paragraph 5 related to the members of the Disciplinary Tribunal, who should preferably be able to communicate in the three official languages of the FIE. The Legal Commission was in favour. In effect, we would like to modify it to say that they should be able to communicate in the three languages. We believe that this is not in the interest of the complainant and defendant to have members not able to understand the grounds, on which their arguments are based. Do you want to vote on this one by one or in one block ? How do you want to proceed ?

René Roch (MH) : I think that we are having some difficulties with our Disciplinary Tribunal. Some things need to be clarified. This is clear that now, it does not work very well, the procedure is extremely heavy and it does not allow all the problems to be solved. In particular, we do not know in the case of a sanction with a black card in competitions, if we have to present the case to the Disciplinary Tribunal, who is supposed to sue him, who is going to send the complaint to the Tribunal. Is the Bureau the one to send the complaint to the Tribunal ? Does the Bureau give a sanction ? I think that many things need to be revised and defined. I propose, in my respect, to keep the situation as it is, and to have a meeting with the Legal Commission and members of the Disciplinary Commission in order to clarify different points, then to propose them to the Executive Committee, and present them back to the Congress. I think that we can wait for 2005, we had problems with the Disciplinary Commission, this is not well defined, some things are really too heavy, too difficult, and I propose a postponement of the modifications related to the Disciplinary Commission and

Disciplinary Code, to the 2005 Congress. Do you agree to postpone it to 2005 and to receive documents in advance, because here, you have not received the documents. We have ourselves received these propositions very late, but I believe that this is preferable to postpone all this in order to take a valid decision after having received the final WADA code. Nobody is against ? **Everything is reported to 2005** and we will get in touch with the Disciplinary and Legal Commissions in order to do something.

Nathalie Rodriguez : We move on now to the last proposition from the Refereeing Commission, which proposes that all existing referees in the FIE official list pass from the category C to the category B directly. There will no longer be a category C. I have to add that this is already applied as in our list of referee, there is no category C, they have all been moved to the category B. Two categories are left, category A and category B. Is someone against the proposition ? Any abstention ? So, this is **unanimously approved**.

René Roch (MH) : There is one proposition, which was left aside yesterday, the one related to the mixed team for juniors. I believe that after having heard the speech of Mr. Thomas Bach, it would not be serious to start with a new team system, even with juniors. I believe that this is extremely dangerous, it would be showing the IOC Executive Committee that our teams are created following our wish, and I believe that we have to demonstrate to the IOC Executive Committee that our teams are serious teams, that teams are very important and essential in our sport. I think that we should seriously work and try to obtain, if possible, two additional medals and additional places because we will need them. Do you agree to withdraw the proposition on mixed teams ? Everybody agree, so, **we withdraw the proposition and remain with the status quo**.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : One small detail. In these texts related to the World Junior Championships. It is always said that tournaments are scheduled on two days with the qualification match on the first day and the final on the second day. I would ask the Congress to technically approve to take out this, because it has never been applied in the Junior World Championships. Each team event takes only one day.

René Roch (MH) : This is exact, it was in the old text, it has to be taken out.

Nathalie Rodriguez : This is on page 8, proposition nr 2 of the Executive Committee, article o.48, last paragraph. In fact, we are just keeping « the program of the Junior and Cadet World Championships begin with the Cadet events, then the individual Junior events and lastly the team events ». The next following sentence has been deleted « These last take place over two days, the first for the eliminating rounds, the second for the semi-finals and finals ». The next sentence is being kept.

René Roch (MH) : This is a decision, which has already been taken yesterday. Then, this is not a new decision. Yesterday, we decided to take out the second sentence and for the first paragraph, to wait for Mr. Bach.

Nathalie Rodriguez : As we have discussed about Grand Prix and World Cups, I would like to add that the calendar for the current season has been studied by the Executive Committee, and that we have to give a precision on the Team World Cup events, connected to an Individual competition, which is not a Grand Prix. You know that for the current season, the FIE will designate the referees for the Team World Cup events, as well as for the Grand-Prix. But many federations have asked what would happen in case, the Team World Cup event was connected to an Individual competition, which is not a Grand-Prix, which means A Grade category. This is clear that we are not going to ask Federations to bring referee for A Grade competitions, and then use them for the Team World Cup. So, it was decided that referees working for the Team event, connected to an Individual World Cup event, will also work for the Individual competition. So, national federations will not have to bring referees

for the World Cup events of A grade category, which are connected to a Team World Cup event.

René Roch (MH) : Well, and finally, there is one last remaining proposition, which is the presentation of the work of the Special Commission concerning the improvement of foil and sabre and I give the floor to our Technical Director, Mr. Ioan Pop. I want to add that after this, we are going to have lunch, but I would like that all Members of Honour and Presidents from the Italian, French, Tunisian and Swedish Federations remain in this room, in order to have an honour meeting to nominate one new member of honour. Thank you.

Ioan Pop : Ladies and Gentlemen, dear participants at the Congress, before talking about the results obtained by this Special Commission, I want to present some pictures from our World Championship in Havana. These pictures were not taken by the Special Commission, they were taken by our photographer, who took a great many for us, from which I intended to choose some to present to you. It was not very difficult as all of them were quite characteristic enough.

May I remind you that our Rules define the attack as with the extension of the arm constantly threatening the valid surface, so the arm must be extended before the final attack. We have noted for several years already, that the practice of foil on the piste in competitions is in total contradiction with the Rules and with the definition of the attack. So refereeing no longer has any point of reference and as for the referees, even if we contest a lot, even if we are often angry with the refereeing, we can understand them because they do not have criteria to evaluate the attacks anymore. I believe that this was the major argument. Why did the International Fencing Federation look into this problem ? It was really important to solve this problem and harmonise this rule, the definition of the attack, with what is practiced on the piste because otherwise, foil, which is essentially a thrusting weapon, a weapon using the point, becomes a kind of hybrid weapon, something which is perhaps modern, but is not foil anymore. All this has a huge influence on refereeing and what is worrying me the most, and I am not the only one, there are all the fencing masters, is that training has changed and we have started to teach foil as it is currently practiced. I do not know where it is leading us but anyway, I believe that this is a road whose end we do not know. This is the reason why a Special Commission has been constituted. We have made tests in France, Italy, China and Spain and this Commission was charged with establishing the details of a methodology in order to try to straighten out this situation a bit.

I think that you should not take into account the nationality of the fencer in all these pictures, we deeply respect our champions because they are exactly the same champions as at other weapons. But, when I looked at the pictures of the eliminating rounds, we found the exact same situations. Then, let me present you the following recommendations from our commission :

- The blocking times for the lights have been set at 200 milliseconds for foil and 120 milliseconds for sabre.
- Duration of contact time at foil is set at 14-16 milliseconds, with additional changes.
- The maximum bend in the curve of the blade is reduced to 1 cm.
- Increase of the pressure on the pointe d'arrêt to 750 grams, at this time, we will effectively be able to include the use of the Mangiarotti point, which will effectively support the effectiveness of the result,
- Opinions differ on the matter of the removal of the flèche at foil, therefore no recommendation have been made.
- Inversion of the line of the shoulders is considered as a fault, and to be cancelled because of double use with the covering.

- The use of the electric sabre mask at foil is a proposal with controversial opinions, but on the contrary, there is a unanimous consent on making the bib of the mask part of the valid target.
- With respect to the scoring apparatus no longer registering non-valid hits, the Commission recommends that further tests be carried out during official junior competitions.

The Special Commission's final opinion and recommendation are to apply the proposed changes universally at all foil and sabre Junior World Cup competitions of the 2004-2005 season.

After one year experience, we can effectively conclude, because I repeat, the tests achieved lasted 2-3 hours because we could not keep fencers much more longer. They have fenced, they have tried, but it was not an assault in real competition. I still consider them as it was laboratory tests. What is important, if we are going, following your opinion to organise these competitions with all the proposed modifications, we will have time, conclusions and consequences, that effectively now, we can not anticipate. We know well that fencers and coaches are extremely skilful on a tactical point of view, and they will try to adapt and speculate all those possibilities. We have, in effect, to see what will happen in future, what are the actions and effectively see if this contact time will manage to bring the fencers in line. We have often heard that this is modern fencing, what we see here, could be modern and I admit that this is spectacular, but I am really worried about the control of the weapon because this is not foil anymore, this is another weapon and we will then be forced to change the Rule and create a new Rule for this new weapon, either to come back, to force the fencers to respect the Rule and also give some indicators to our referees. I have also heard that this is enough with the improvement of refereeing. This is not enough because this is easy to referee when one of the fencer has a bent arm and the other fencer an extended arm. For this, he can easily decide who is right. But currently, 95 % of the fencers are fencing with bent arm, then which criteria is the referee going to use to decide the priority and who is right ? I will sanction the one who took back his arm a little bit more.

Even in final attack, the distances are very short, there is no more extension of the arm, with a few exceptions, but now the exception is becoming the Rule, this is the normality of a technical execution made with the Rule, which is becoming an exception. I suggest you to take the floor and eventually ask me questions.

René Roch (MH) : I think that we should ask for the opinion of the Rules Commission.

Ioan Pop : Then, the Rules Commission, in respect of the final recommendation of the Special Commission, with only one vote against, is in favour of the proposed measures. The Refereeing Committee was already in the past in favour of what we were recommending.

René Roch (MH) : The Rules Commission was a little bit worried about the way to make the bib of the mask valid. Maybe Mr. Baiocco could speak about this and explain us how it could be done.

Marcello Baiocco (ITA) : In respect of the valid bib, which means plating the bib of the mask, this is neither a too big practical problem, nor a financial one, as we have three different ways of plating the bib. The first one is to change the entire bib and to exchange it against a metallic one. The second one, is to cover the existing bib with a metallic cap. The third one, is to sew a metallic fabric directly on the existing bib, and all three possibilities are not too expensive. Then, I believe that electrifying the bib is neither a practical, nor a financial problem.

René Roch (MH) : We still have to add that the Rules Commission was in favour of all the propositions except for the one related to the removal of the flèche. It wanted to maintain the flèche. I think that we have to take a decision, this is not a decision with a lot of undertakings, but it will allow us to test the proposed changes from the Special Commission with Juniors during the next season 2004-2005. It seems to be a wise decision, which will then allow us to take a final decision, which will for sure improve foil and also improve the refereeing, because all these propositions have been made in order to improve, on one hand, the foil, and on the other hand, some decisions are also taken in favour of the improvement of the refereeing in order to make it more objective, and not as subjective as it is now, in reducing the blocking times for the lights. Two aims are targeted : first of all, the improvement of the weapon and secondly, a more objective refereeing with less controversy. This is clear that this is inconvenient to receive so many contesting as we are receiving now. It is annoying to see a country losing its title because of a mistake of the referee, a mistake, which is sometimes incomprehensible and seems abnormal, and this is not possible to continue like this because this is very bad perceived by the public and televisions. Our sport has changed. We want now to be recognised in the entire world. We also want to be broadcasted by televisions. We used to be a small confidential sport, but this is not the case anymore. From the time we have opened up ourselves to the public, we can not allow us to make the same mistakes, as we did in the past. We need more rigour and to use modern means to reach a more objective refereeing. Mr. Van Dugteren can speak.

George Van Dugteren (RSA) : Mister President, I have a little comment to make. I think that we should not think anymore about the bib at foil, because if it becomes a valid surface, it will increase the risk of injury. The nape is a very vulnerable part of the body, a dangerous point in case of accident, and I think that we should think about that before taking a decision.

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : Mr. Bleyer.

Alejandro Bleyer (BOL) : The Bolivian Fencing Federation agrees to improve the changes at foil, but a big problem faced by the countries, is that you want to change four machines. Every year, the International Fencing Federation is changing all the time, is changing this and that. We could sufficiently change with this money to be up to date. We have changed the way of fencing, but we have not changed the teams. I know that fencing is a spectacular sport, but if we want to make a spectacle, we have to do it slowly because otherwise the public will not understand what is fencing. Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : Mr. Plasterie.

Serge Plasterie (FRA) : Mister President, Members of the Executive Committee, first of all, France would prefer to see these dispositions not in a global way, but separately because France, of course, as well as many other countries, is in favour of modernity and the lead of our sport world-wide, but not at any cost. This is the reason why some propositions are effectively really valid and this for the lead of fencing that they were proposed and France agrees, but not for all these propositions. This is the reason why we would not want to vote in a global way but rather separately. To be more precise, in respect of the blocking times, France is not in favour of 200 milliseconds but rather 300 milliseconds. Different tests have been made much more in the time, much more elaborated at the INSEP in different training centres, and the 300 milliseconds, which are already a great step forward, as it makes approximately 50 % of more than now, are acceptable in the sense that technically, if you want, the parade-riposte can be done before the remise, even a little bit after the remise. This is the first thing.

The second thing, in respect of the passing-forward because the pictures we have seen so far on the screen were often taken by fencers doing a passing-forward, we fully agree to eventually cancel the passing forward at foil. Effectively, it would develop the spectacular side not to see anymore run on the pistes, why not, there is no problem. The big problem consists in the cancellation of the white light, the non-valid light. For us, this is a question of tradition. The white light is a full part of the handling of the foil, of the study of the foil, we are therefore against the cancellation of the white light.

In respect of the dispositions regarding offences, to cancel the shoulders offence, there is no problem of course, it is simplifying the Rules, we fully agree. Concerning the blocking times, we have made several experiences. This is evident that we agree with the content, we agree with the proposition of the Special Commission, but however, we have made tests with longer blocking times. And what has happened ? Our coaches simply told us "then we are going to do muscle-development exercises with our fencers, we will do many muscle-development exercises, and with the whipping hit, the impact, even if it is long, will switch on the light". And, in these cases, it will become dangerous, because we will have accidents. People will do a lot of muscle-development exercises and will give a very strong hit, which will finally switch on the light, because the strength will generate the light. Then, if you want, we agree with the content but not the form, we do not agree because it is dangerous for the fencers.

Concerning the flèche, this is the same at sabre. The flèche is an integral part of fencing. Now, whether for some mediatic reasons or promotional reasons, you absolutely want to cancel the flèche, be aware that the flèche, when well executed, is magnificent and makes a good effect on television screens. Now, if you want to cancel it as well as for sabre, why not.

In respect of the bib, our coaches are not necessary in favour as well because it was an integral part of the non-valid surfaces. Nowadays, bib are more and more longer, then effectively, coaches are saying that there are very few valid surfaces between the bib and the shoulder. To make it valid, in effect, we are not necessary against. The two main things, on which French do not agree are : small 1, the cancellation of the white light and small 2, the blocking time, to raise it from 200 milliseconds to 300 milliseconds, which will allow as I would say, the respect of the mentality of the foil. Thank you Mister President.

René Roch (MH) : Mexico is asking for the floor.

José Antonio Cisneros (MEX) : I am coming back to what was said by the President of the Bolivian Fencing Federation. Each change of apparatus and each modification in the electronic system of the apparatus represent more or less from 50 to 100 dollars for each apparatus to change the micro-processor, in other word, the unique winner is the manufacturer of those apparatus. If a wealthy country has 1000 or 2000 apparatus, it has to be multiplied by this quantity. This is why, in my country, we have realised and manufactured cheap apparatus, on which we have settled prices, which we have tried to reduce without scope, to be up to date with those changes made every year. Anyway, if I have 50 dollars to change each apparatus to pay the manufacturer, I have to pay him 5 dollars. I am talking about 500 out of 1000 apparatus because this is an amount of money that my country does not have and it costs a lot. On the other hand, if this is possible to change all that can be changed, or all that can bring a change to the electric part, as showed yesterday for the mechanical part, I do not agree with the fact that everything should be revised in a book, in one word, we want to modernise, we want to be spectacular, we want to be attractive for televisions, what has been done for the last 10 years. But on the other hand, we have to write a book, I think that it should be better to define in an ordinary way, what can be done at lower cost, and then at higher cost, and associate all this.

Ioan Pop : Anyway, according to my information, the change of a micro-processor and the change of the program in a micro-processor cost rather 20 dollars than between 50 and 100. I respect the position of France in respect of the blocking time. If you have made experiences in this respect, I can not contest them, but in respect of the duration of contact time, this does not comply with the rules of physic at all, that if we hit strongly, we remain longer in contact with the blade. This is not true. We hit strongly, but the duration of the contact time between the point and the vest is shorter. Then, this is exactly the other way round.

René Roch (MH) : Mr. Scarso has the floor.

Giorgio Scarso (ITA) : I would like to read a document, which was prepared after having studied all the possible consequences of the application of this modification. National federations are required to effect modifications at foil and sabre. The International Federation has worked in collaboration with fencing masters and coaches to study this problem. We also have to take into account the methodology of the training. We have found an alternative proposition, which was approved by the Special Commission. The work of the Special Commission does not show the negative aspects of these studies. According to our general opinion, the FIE should maintain separately the identity of each weapon, facilitate and make the work of the referee more objective and improve the comprehension and spectacle of fencing. But we believe that this proposition will take us away from all this in causing an irreversible prejudice. Fencing as it is today distinguishes itself from what it used to be. As the other sports, it has also had big developments. To take away whips would take away the spectacular side of fencing, furthermore that we can not be injured with the current equipment. All the fencing actions make it nice because they are different.

We have only one part of the speech of Mr. Scarso because interpreters could not follow his rapid delivery.

René Roch (MH) : Sir, you have one more minute but not more.

Nathalie Rodriguez : And, I am kindly asking the next speakers to speak slower in order to give time to the interpreters to translate.

René Roch (MH) : We remind you that the quantity of words is not important but the quality.

Stacey Johnson (USA) : I promise to be brief. First of all, we just want to say that philosophically, we are in favour of the tests to increase the improvement of the sport. Secondly, we would agree with a duration of 300 milliseconds for the blocking time. We think that this is a very good suggestion, but we are worried for the time being, and may be it would help the group to include the changes, as we are worried for these juniors. These new suggestions could be used to make the transition between juniors and seniors easier. But I am wondering if we could rather apply this decision to the Cadets for the tests. It would be there that people would feel at better ease to do testing. We are suggesting to consider these tests at the Cadet level, which would put everybody at better ease

Benny Wendt (AUT) : I thank you very much for having thought at what could be done with fencing and how it is developing. In general, I think that I can say that I am the one who remained the longest active. Officially, I am still a fencer at foil until the end of the year, and I am going to end my career at the end of the year but this is not important. The most important, is that it leads to a good development and in the right direction and today, we have seen nice pictures, which are saying that foil did not develop itself very well and is not very transparent. For the public, this is sometimes spectacular, but there is no sense because we do not see clearly how actions are handled. It does not really transport us and the problem is generally the leader. I do not think that this is a problem of blocking time, but valid surface. In my opinion, we should keep it as it is today. What would be the sense to cut

the blocking time ? We agree to keep the level of foil, that we can say “okay”, the parade-riposte must be kept and not the one who fences at first because otherwise we go in the direction of sabre and we do not want this. The three different weapons must remain. We could see that at sabre, there was a good development and it does not mean that we are stepping back.

René Roch (MH) : Nobody else is asking for the floor ? Yes, Mr. Dieffenbach.

Wolf Dieffenbach takes the floor to contest the validity of the proposed tests, then Peter Jacobs is questioning himself on the results which will be obtained. Finally, Steve Higginson considers that this is good to achieve these tests. Pierre Abric proposes to limit the tests to some tournaments.

Ioan Pop : Regarding the blocking time, we have set it to 200 milliseconds for foil and 120 milliseconds for sabre.

René Roch (MH) : Who is favourable to try these blocking times, which have been tested by the commission ? Who is against ? We have already discussed Mr. Di Blasi, you have taken the floor for a long time, we can speak only once, you know it perfectly. Well, take the floor but 3 minutes maximum.

Antonio Di Blasi considers that we should train the referees and ask to vote by secret ballot.

René Roch (MH) : Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, a vote by secret ballot has been required, we will then do it. In respect of the modifications, we are forced to consider the modifications one by one, those who do not agree will say no. And if we do not conclude to anything, we will say that we do not agree with the foil, but we do not want to change whatsoever. It will be our decision, it sounds a little bit contradictory. I think that we will come back to this after lunch. We go for lunch and will move to the vote after the meal. Thank you.

Lunch

6. Award of the Challenge Chevalier Feyerick

René Roch (MH) : Before proceeding to the vote, I would like to say that the Commission of Honour has met and has decided to award the Challenge Feyerick to Denmark.

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : This challenge Feyerick is awarded to Denmark for the sporting and knightly attitude they had during the World Championships in Lisbon, where they have agreed to fence against a team which had been delayed and should have been normally disqualified. It is changing us from the attitude of some federations in Cuba and we thank them for this knightly spirit.

Applause.

7. Nomination of Members of Honour

René Roch (MH) : The Honour Commission has decided to nominate Mr. Laszlo Nedeczski from Hungary, as Member of Honour.

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : This decision was taken following the very important activity of Mr. Nedeczski in our sport, he has always organised competitions in an exceptional way and he is a model for all the organisers.

Laszlo Nedeczski (HUN) : Mister President, dear friends, I thank you for my nomination as Member of Honour. I am very happy that you have recognised my work, what I have been doing for 70 years in the life of international fencing. I intend to say some more words tonight. I thank you for everything, my dear President, my dear friends.

Applause.

Vote in respect of the propositions on foil an sabre

Nathalie Rodriguez : We are now moving to the votes on the propositions on foil and sabre. You will receive a voting slip concerning all the propositions. If there is something that you do not understand, do not hesitate to ask us question. I am going to call the countries four by four in order to save some time. We have Algeria also voting for Burkina Faso. Argentine voting also for Uruguay, Algeria, please. Armenia and Aruba. Aruba is not here. Australia voting also for New Zealand, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia, Algeria voting for Burkina Faso, Bulgaria, Canada, China voting also for Hong Kong, Croatia, Cuba voting also for Brazil, Czech Republic, Denmark also voting for Estonia. As Kuwait is about to leave, I am calling Kuwait before the others. Kuwait, which is also voting for the Philippines, Ecuador also voting for the Dominican Republic, Egypt also voting for the Republic of San Marino, El Salvador, Spain, Finland, France also voting for Monaco, Great Britain and Georgia, Germany, Greece also voting for Cyprus, Guatemala and Hungary. Ireland, Iraq, Iceland and Israel. Italy also voting for Peru, Jordan also voting for Palestine, Korea also voting for Malaysia, Moldova, Mexico, Malta also voting for India, the Netherlands, Japan also voting for Vietnam, Panama representing Colombia, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal also voting for Belgium, Puerto Rico is not present. Qatar also voting for Mali, Romania also voting for Serbia and Montenegro, South Africa, Russia, Senegal also voting for Guinea, Switzerland, Slovakia, Sweden also voting for Norway, Thailand, Taipei also voting for Singapore, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, USA. Did I call all the countries ? Max Geuter for Indonesia and René Roch for Macao. Rafaela Gonzalez for Costa Rica. Did I call all the countries ? Kindly insert your voting slip in the ballot box in front of you please.

René Roch (MH) : Well, I think that we need scrutineers, we could take Mr. Mangiarotti, if he agrees, Jean-Claude Blondeau, Mr. Illueca as he is also present and also Mr. Sam Chervis.

Nathalie Rodriguez : I am kindly asking those who have not inserted yet their voting slips to proceed as we are going to terminate with the vote.

8. Attribution of the World Championships

Leipzig Presentation

Dear President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am very pleased to welcome you once again in the Congress Centre, thank you very much for coming. Thank you for giving us the opportunity of being here today and present you the candidacy of the City of Leipzig to welcome the 2005 World Fencing Championships. We have worked hard to get all the propositions required by the FIE. This is our desire to see the fencing family reunified in Leipzig. A hearty city for sport in general. We are certain that you will live a good experience during these World Championships, symbolised by a big sport through friendship, excellent conditions for the sport for women and men, and whatever could expect a World Championship. Leipzig, as you have seen, has an history of almost one thousand years. Its university is one of the oldest from Germany, founded in 1409. Today, one of the most modern installations. Leipzig is also a city of culture, with big names such as Jean-Sébastien Bach, the famous Gewandhaus Orchestra, the Thomas square centre, etc. But in a more recent history, Leipzig is principally known for being the cradle of the pacific revolution in 1989, which changed the dramatic world in a better world. Athletes from Saxony have more than 500 Olympic medals, including 300 gold medals. In Leipzig, many sport associations, clubs and teams have been created. Leipzig has 1.5 million of inhabitants and is one of the most dynamic region of Europe. It means the continuity with success of fencing in Leipzig and Saxony, which already started in the 14th century. Many successful athletes, such as Jorg Friedler or Katia Vester, are from Leipzig. The city of Leipzig will do its utmost to provide excellent sporting conditions for the 2005 World Championships. Leipzig is providing optimal conditions for all aspects, accommodation, restaurants in order to create an attractive social and cultural program. Now we are delighted to invite the international fencing family to come to Leipzig. Leipzig is impatient to welcome the 2005 World Championships. Please, kindly give us your votes. Thank you very much.

Applause.

Video presentation.

Fencing is action and movement. I still remember in 1993 in Essen. It was the first World Championship of my life and it was a fantastic experience for me. I have always hoped that the World Fencing Championship would come back one day to Germany. Since the reunification of Germany, I work full time in Leipzig. I have learnt a lot during these 10 years. I have learnt on the dreams of people. I have learnt on the energy of people to see their dreams coming true and reach their aims. People are very enthusiastic. This same fact is also noticed with our 25'000 fencers from Germany. Each of them is enthusiast for the competitions every week-end. The German Fencing Clubs are welcoming several FIE World Cups per year. This is up to you to judge and I hope as a guest, you will always receive a warm welcome in Germany. I hope that you have always been satisfied with the organisations in Germany. I was very impressed by the sport centre in Leipzig, not only by the physical education of the university, but by all the equipment. Leipzig has one of the most modern centre of Europe, ready for a modern representation of our sports, ready for the best media, ready for a lot of emotion. This is our vision, a vision of an excellent 2005 World Championship in the Arena of Leipzig. This is a pleasure for me to talk to the fencers and invite the athletes from the entire world. Thank you for these World Championships. Welcome to Leipzig in 2005.

Applause.

Turin Presentation

Mister President of the International Fencing Federation, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Executive Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen Members of Honour of the FIE, Ladies and Gentlemen Presidents and Chiefs of Delegation from all the countries, dear friends, it is an honour for me to present you the candidacy of Turin. During the ten minutes at disposal, the Promotional Committee of the candidacy of Turin will show you a video on the city and some pictures of the installations, which are currently in renovation or in construction and which will be used to organise either the Olympic event, or the fencing competitions.

Video presentation.

Thank you. You will be able to watch again this presentation by using the CD, which is in the brochure prepared for our 2005 candidacy, with an improvised adhesive for 2006.

Applause.

What you are seeing above my shoulders, is a map showing some of the sporting installations in Turin starting from 2005. « **Torinos positioni** » will be the venue for the eliminating pools with a capacity of 8'000 spectators around the 20 pistes for the competition and 8 pistes for the warm up. Finals will take place in **Palasuavela**, fully restored by the architect **Gaia Olimpi**, in condition of having 10'000 spectators. Journalist will have 2 villages for the media with 900 seats and a centre for radio and TV transmission with 400 studios. Finally, the city has ensured the availability of the Olympic village of Turin with 2'500 places for the athletes, coaches and accompanying persons, next to the competition venue.

I also remind you about the assets of our candidacy, which have been illustrated several times during the past three years. Turin will organise in 2006 the Winter Olympic Games. This event will allow us to draw the attention of the international medias and to use very high technical installations, as presented to you earlier. We wanted to reunify with the absolute competitions, the World Fencing Championships for disabled, for the first time in the same city with the desire to start a cycle in favour of the athletes less lucky but as dignified as the others. Turin intends to do its utmost to allow the participation of a high number of delegations, as never reached so far. The objective is to welcome 100 countries, and in order to reach this result, we are ready to do anything, countries will have the necessity of a concrete help. This is our big motivation without considering the large offer of Turin for the visitors, with all kinds of interest. From music to museum, guided tours, regional gastronomic specialities with no comparison. You have been invited to the Congress to choose the venue for the absolute 2005 and 2006 World Championships and we have presented you a high level choice. Rarely recorded in the past, the demonstration of the vitality of our sport and the interest leading it towards a discipline, which has normally less audience. Nations such as Russia, Italy and Germany, which have a big tradition in fencing, have suggested for 2005-2006, St-Petersburg, Turin and Leipzig, each of them being prestigious venue for world competitions.

During these last days of November, we have watched an event, which should be considered as exceptional. We have to testify to our Russian friends, the initiative to have created the basis for a large understanding in avoiding you to have to make a choice, which could have penalised a country. The Russian Federation has informed the International Federation its intention to propose the candidacy of St Petersburg for 2007. Well aware of the possibility of being in concurrence with some countries, which could present candidacies for the same year. The Italian Federation and the Province of Turin, represented here by the Deputy Mayor Renato Montagone and the Vice President of the Province of Turin, Silvana Cosato, sensitive to the possible declaration of Leipzig to organise the World Championship after

2005, also wanted to make a sporting sign in accepting to present its candidacy for 2006, conscious of the difficulty to obtain the same sponsorships after the Olympic Games.

We believe that during a worldwide moment, such as now, in which there are every day demonstration of incomprehension and reciprocal intolerance, these modest signs of common willingness to go over the regionalism and personal interests, can be an example for everybody and underline one more time that fencing is able to positively lead the holly spirit of usual elimination on the pistes.

I am thanking all the members of the Committee, President of the Italian Federation, who was the main supporter of our candidacy and all the leaders of the Italian Federation, sporting friends in the world, who have been working for the past three years to bring the World Championships to Turin, and that all together we will be able to organise once an unforgettable edition of a world competition in 2006, being able to give back to fencing its merited role in sport and an elegance in the time.

Mister President of the International Federation, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Executive Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen Members of Honour of the Federation, Ladies and Gentlemen Presidents and Chief of Delegation from all the countries, and dear friends, I thank you for your kind attention.

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : Ladies and Gentlemen, we have watched an excellent presentation of two candidates. I think that we are sure to obtain excellent championships either in Leipzig or in Turin. I thank the one who prepared these presentations, I congratulate them, I congratulate all their team and I can unveil now the secret, which is not a secret anymore, that Leipzig will organise the World Championships in 2005 and Turin will organise the 2006 World Championships.

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : I thank the two cities for having found an agreement because otherwise we would have lost an excellent organiser. Thanks to everybody, thanks for your kind attention and I think that we will meet in Leipzig in 2005, where we will have exceptional World Championships. Thank you very much.

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : Well, we also have the attribution of the 2005 and 2006 Junior and Cadet World Championships. We have one candidate for the 2005 Junior/Cadet World Championships, which is Linz, Austria, and I believe that they have excellent venues. Anyway, we have only one candidate so I think that we can give the 2005 Junior and Cadet World Championships to Linz.

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : We do not have bids for the year 2006. We hope to receive some before the end of the Congress or General Assembly. The 2004 Veteran World Championships will take place in Krems in 2004 and for 2005 we have Tampa as candidate. I think that there are both good candidates, we already know Tampa. Krems and Tampa, it seems excellent for the 2004 and 2005 Veteran World Championships. Do you agree ?

Applause.

9. Urgent decisions

René Roch (MH) : Furthermore, we have the urgent decisions. Qualifications of zones. We have received propositions from each zone. Concerning the European zone, the Executive Committee has decided to do the qualification with 6 competitions at the same time and for this, Ghent presented its candidacy. By the way, Ghent had contacted us earlier and had already been chosen by the European Confederation. Championships will take place on next April, we will give later the exact dates. This is for the European zone. For the Asian zone, the qualification championships will take place in the Philippines during the Asian Fencing Championships. This has been decided at the Congress of the Asian Confederation in Thailand. Regarding Americas : it was decided that one part of the championships would take place in Bolivia and another part in Mexico. Is it still okay for Bolivia and Mexico ? Mr. Illueca, could you give us some details in this respect.

Anibal Illueca (PAN) : Mister President, as of today the agreement remains the same, but we will let you know next week whether there are changes or whether it remains as it is. Thank you.

René Roch (MH) : Very good. I thought that there would be some modifications. Regarding the African Zone, we have no problem, it will take place during the African Championships in Tunisia in April, and Mr. Zouari can confirm it now. I take this opportunity to thank Mr. Zouari because he was the one to provide us with the biro you are currently using. He was the one to order biro with the name of the International Federation and we must thank him for this.

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : As women teams at sabre and foil will not be part of the Olympic Games, we have to organise next year a Women World Championships at sabre and foil. We have requested the United States of America Fencing Federation to organise them, which has agreed, then the Women World Championships at sabre and foil are scheduled to hold from 12 to 14 June 2004 in New-York, at the same time as the New York tournament, which will not occur additional expenses. Does everybody agree ?

Applause.

Carl Borack (USA) : This is in June for the World Championships, next to the World Cup. You said September.

René Roch (MH) : Yes, in June, that is what I said.

Nathalie Rodriguez : It was said after the New York tournaments in June. This could be a problem of translation.

10. Candidacies for the 2004 and 2005 Congresses

René Roch (MH) : We do not have other urgent decisions to report. Then, we come to the point 7 of the agenda and in particular, the candidacies for the 2004 and 2005 Congresses. For 2004, I think that this is an Elective Congress and it is the custom to organise it in Paris, I think that it will be Paris in the middle of December. We shall give you further details, the Executive Committee will very soon take a decision in the beginning of the year. Concerning the 2005 Congress, we have received the proposition from the Federation of Qatar, which is proposing to organise the 2005 Congress in exceptional conditions. You have by the way the documents in front of you. I think that you all agree to go to Qatar for the 2005 Congress, which will be very important. This is one of the most important Congress, which starts the Olympic year. I believe that it will be in October 2005. Do you all agree with Qatar ? So, **this is voted.**

Applause.

René Roch (MH) : You have, in your agenda, the Olympic Games of Athens and the presentation was done this morning. Then, I believe that we have to give the results of our vote concerning the **propositions on foil and sabre.**

Results of the vote in respect of the propositions on foil and sabre

- Agreement on the reduction of the blocking times : 56 votes for, 28 votes against. Blocking times at 200 milliseconds : 19 votes, at 300 milliseconds : 32 votes. So, we will take the blocking time for foil at 300 milliseconds.
- Increase of the duration of contact time at foil : 48 are for, 33 are against, so we will increase the contact time at foil to 15 milliseconds.
- Adoption of the Mangiarotti point : 49 votes for, 39 votes against. We adopt the Mangiarotti point.
- Maximum bend in the curve of the blade reduced to 1 cm : 57 votes for, 27 votes against. So, we agree 1 cm for the bend.
- Increase of the pressure on the pointe d'arrêt to 750 gr : 43 votes for, 37 votes against, we increase the pressure on the pointe to 750 gr.
- Removal of the flèche at foil : 59 votes against and 18 for, so we do not remove the flèche at foil.
- Inversion of the line of the shoulders no longer considered as an offence : 51 votes for, 30 against, so we annul the inversion of the line of the shoulders as an offence.
- Use of a sabre mask at foil : 65 against, 18 for, so of course, we do not change anything.
- Make the bib of the mask a valid surface, 56 are against, 29 are for, so we do not modified either the mask or the bib
- No longer registering non-valid hits, removal of the white light : 38 are for, 44 are against, so we do not cancel the registering of non-valid hits, we keep this famous white light, which gives us a bit more lighting during competitions.

At sabre, 51 votes are in favour of the reduction of the blocking times as proposed, this is a majority against 33 for the blocking times for the lights at 120 milliseconds : 50 for and 32 against. So, at sabre, the duration of the blocking time is adopted at 120 milliseconds.

I believe that all this is only applicable from next year starting from the month of October and I think, as it was agreed, for junior competitions. Unless until there we can make another proposition at the General Assembly in Plovdiv, in proposing some of the tournaments and world championships only. We will see if we can modulate in order not to put all junior competitions at the same time. Here we are, I do not think that there is something to be added, is someone asking for the floor ?

Kovacic Sanjin (CRO) : I have a question concerning the elimination of the organiser candidates for the tournament of the Olympic qualification of the European zone. I know that there were several candidates, is it true that Ghent was proposed by the European Confederation ? Because we know that Prague and Zagreb were also candidates.

René Roch (MH) : The tournament for the European zone, as there were several candidates, the Executive Committee has chosen Ghent, the 6 events will take place in Ghent and we will provide the referees for this tournament, this is obviously cheaper to organise everything in one place than doing it in three different places, it was the position of the Executive Committee.

Kovacic Sanjin (CRO) : But would not it be possible to make an announcement for a candidature ?

René Roch (MH) : No, everything is over now, we have taken a decision, this is final. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez : A request of candidatures had already been made to all the Presidents of Confederation.

11. Referees admitted in A category

Emmanuel Katsiadakis (GRE) : Mister President, our commission is requiring the approval of the Congress to move to category A the following referees : Mr. Chu Shisheng (CHN) at foil, Mr. D'Aure Vega Jorge (CUB) at foil, Mr. Joergensen Norman (DEN) at epee, Mr. El Araby Tamer (EGY) at foil, Mr. Guenet Jean-Marc (FRA) at foil, Mr. Rousseau Gérard (FRA) at sabre, Mr. Siesto Marco (ITA) at foil and sabre, Mr. Virgilio Lucio (ITA) at foil and sabre, Mr. Kim Chang Gon (KOR) at foil and sabre, Mr. Kliouchine Andrey (RUS) at foil and Mr. Golubytsky Sergei (UKR) at foil.

Nathalie Rodriguez : Does the Congress agree to move these referees to the A category ? Anybody against ? Abstention ? **This is unanimously approved.**

12. Rules modifications according to the report of the SEMI Commission

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : Ladies and Gentlemen, in the minutes of the meetings of the SEMI Commission, there are many important modifications of the part “m”, material and the attached documents of the part “m” of our Rules, must technically be approved by the Congress. I have spoken with Mr. Baiocco, the President of the Commission, who confirmed that there was nothing new inside, there is no problem, this is a work in order to update things, which became incorrect with the time and fill in the gaps. And under these conditions, according to our Statutes, the modifications related to the part “m” of the Rules must also be approved by the Congress, I am therefore asking for your kind approval and accept all these modifications to update them, but the problem is to approve them in block, unless there are some questions. Is someone against the approval to update the articles of the part “m” of the Rules, according to the propositions of the SEMI Commission ? Nobody, then I can say that **this is approved**. I thank you.

Wolf Dienffenbach (GER, MH) : I just would like to request the publication of the items in the quick summary of the Congress in order to be clear for everybody.

Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : I am going to ask Nathalie to attach to the decisions all the modifications of the SEMI report and to publish them.

René Roch (MH) : Well, I believe that Mr. Scarso wants to make a personal remark.

Giorgio Scarso (ITA) : I respect very much your person and your position, but I do not accept that anybody, who thinks that he can bring something to fencing, be treated as a demagogue. I think that we are all working in favour of fencing. I admire your work very much, but I believe that you should recognise the merit of all of us for the work done in favour of fencing. We love this sport and sometimes, we have to work with different ideas in its favour.

René Roch (MH) : Dear Sir, I fully agree with you, I think that I am also working in favour of fencing and spend a lot of energy. But it does not come to my mind to tell people “be careful, it will be expensive”, if I perfectly know that it does not cost a lot. This is true that earlier intolerable things were said, we try to make people believe that all apparatus should be changed and even the weapons of the fencers, while this is not true. There is nothing to be changed, this is just the card in the machine, which needs to be changed. So do not tell to all these countries “ be careful, you do not realise, it will be awful, this is an earth quake”. This is not an earth quake, and the proof of it, they have very well voted and I am happy with this vote. This is correct and perfect. And I regret very much that your intervention was that long, you know that in principle you have 3 minutes, we gave you much more time, I believe that you should not abuse. We have rights, we use them, but we should not abuse. That is all, that is all what I wanted to say.

Ladies and Gentlemen, as they are no more declaration, the Congress is over. I am very happy, I think that this is an extremely important Congress, which will later bring modifications in our sport. I hope that the modifications voted will be valid. If they are not, we will go back. We do not want to impose things, which are not favourable to our sport. Thanks to all, I am closing this Leipzig Congress.

Applause.

ANNEXES

