

# **International Fencing Federation**

## **85th Ordinary Congress**

---

**Doha, Qatar  
12 and 13 November 2005**

## SUMMARY

---

Attendance	Page	3
Agenda	Page	8
Speech of the FIE President and speech of Sheikh Al-Thani	Page	9
Ratification of the new federations and validation of proxies	Page	11
Approval of the minutes of the 2004 Elective Congress in Paris (FRA)	Page	12
Proposals submitted to the Congress and reports of Commissions	Page	13
Urgent decisions	Page	80
Candidatures to the 2008 Junior/Cadet World Championships and vote for the awarding of the 2007 World Championships	Page	90
Miscellaneous items	Page	99
- Award of the Challenge Chevalier Feyerick	Page	99
- Candidatures for the 2007 Congress	Page	99
Presentation for the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games	Page	105

## ANNEXES

---

Summary of the Congress decisions	Page	I
Minutes of the Refereeing Commission	Page	XIX
Minutes of the Legal Commission	Page	XXVII
Minutes of the Medical Commission	Page	LIX
Minutes of the Promotion and Publicity Commission	Page	LXV
Minutes of the Rules Commission	Page	LXXV
Minutes of the Special Rules Commission	Page	XCIV
Minutes of the SEMI Commission	Page	C

# PRESENCES

---

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

## Were seated on the tribune :

- |   |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| •Mr René ROCH (MH)                      | President                             |
| •Mr Emmanuel KATSIADAKIS (MH)           | Secretary General                     |
| •Mr Peter JACOBS (MH)                   | Secretary-Treasurer                   |
| •Ms Ana PASCU (MH)                      | Vice-President                        |
| •Mr Saoud Bin Abdulrahman AL-THANI (MH) | Vice-President                        |
| •Ms Nathalie RODRIGUEZ M.-H.            | Administrative and Financial Director |
| •Mr Ioan POP                            | International Technical Director      |

## Members of the Executive Committee present :

- Mr Abdoul Wahab Barka BA (MH) (SEN)
- Mr Arthur CRAMER (MH) (BRA)
- Mr Max GEUTER (MH) (GER)
- Ms Rafaela GONZALEZ (MH) (CUB)
- Mr Victor SANCHEZ (ESP)
- Mr Wei WANG (CHN)

## Member of the Executive Committee excused :

- Mr Ali Youssef HUSAIN (KUW)

## Presidents of Confederations present :

- |                          |                                      |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| •Ms Helen SMITH (AUS)    | President Oceania Confederation      |
| •Mr Anibal ILLUECA (PAN) | President Pan-American Confederation |

## Presidents of Confederations excused :

- |                               |                                  |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| •Mr Abderrahmane LAMARI (ALG) | President African Confederation  |
| •Mr Celso DAYRIT (PHI)        | President Asian Confederation    |
| •Mr Alisher USMANOV (RUS)     | President European Confederation |

## Federations present or represented :

---

<b>NETHERLANDS ANTILLES - AHO</b>	<b>Represented by the Netherlands</b>
<b>ARGENTINA- ARG</b>	<b>Omar VERGARA</b>
	<b>Victor Sergio GROUPIERRE</b>
<b>ARMENIA- ARM</b>	<b>Romen SAHAKYAN</b>
	<b>Samuel ABRAHAMYAN</b>
<b>ARUBA- ARU</b>	<b>Austin THOMAS</b>
<b>AUSTRALIA- AUS</b>	<b>Helen SMITH</b>
<b>AUSTRIA- AUT</b>	<b>Benny WENDT</b>
<b>AZERBAIJAN- AZE</b>	<b>Yashar MAMEDOV</b>
<b>BARBADOS- BAR</b>	<b>William Alexander MCDONALD</b>
<b>BELGIUM- BEL</b>	<b>Alexandre WALNIER</b>
<b>BOLIVIA- BOL</b>	<b>Alejandro BLEYER</b>
<b>BRAZIL- BRA</b>	<b>Gerli SANTOS</b>
<b>BRUNEI DARUSSALAM- BRU</b>	<b>Represented by Bulgaria</b>
<b>BULGARIA- BUL</b>	<b>Velichka HRISTEVA</b>
	<b>Violeta NIKOLOVA</b>
<b>BURKINA FASO- BUR</b>	<b>Represented by Senegal</b>
<b>CANADA- CAN</b>	<b>Stephen SYMONS</b>
	<b>Gabriella MAYER</b>
<b>CHILE- CHI</b>	<b>Represented by Mexico</b>
<b>CHINA- CHN</b>	<b>Cai JIADONG</b>
	<b>Zhao JIANQING</b>
	<b>Xu XIAOTIAN</b>
<b>COSTA RICA- CRC</b>	<b>Represented by Aruba</b>
<b>CROATIA- CRO</b>	<b>Represented by Hungary</b>
<b>CUBA- CUB</b>	<b>Barbara Fernandez ALEGRET</b>
<b>CYPRUS- CYP</b>	<b>Yiannis HADJIARAPIS</b>
	<b>Ourania HADJIARAPIS</b>
<b>CZECH REPUBLIC- CZE</b>	<b>Frantisek JANDA</b>

<b>DENMARK- DEN</b>	<b>Normann JORGENSEN</b>
<b>ECUADOR- ECU</b>	<b>Represented by Germany</b>
<b>EGYPT- EGY</b>	<b>Abd El Moniem EL HOUSSENY</b>
<b>EL SALVADOR- ESA</b>	<b>Ernesto Ramirez VALLADARES</b>
<b>SPAIN- ESP</b>	<b>Marco Rioja PEREZ</b>
	<b>Antonio GARCIA HERNANDEZ</b>
<b>ESTONIA- EST</b>	<b>Tonis KAASIK</b>
<b>FINLAND- FIN</b>	<b>Represented by Estonia</b>
<b>FRANCE- FRA</b>	<b>Frédéric PIETRUSZKA</b>
	<b>Philippe BOISSE</b>
<b>GREAT BRITAIN- GBR</b>	<b>Keith SMITH</b>
	<b>Steve HIGGINSON</b>
<b>GEORGIA- GEO</b>	<b>Zurab TSKITISHVILI</b>
	<b>Moris SAKHVADZE</b>
<b>GERMANY- GER</b>	<b>Gordon RAPP</b>
	<b>Claus JANKA</b>
	<b>Lutz SCHIRRMACHER</b>
<b>GREECE- GRE</b>	<b>Emmanuel KATSIADAKIS</b>
<b>GUATEMALA- GUA</b>	<b>Arnaldo VASQUEZ MARTINEZ</b>
<b>HONG KONG- HKG</b>	<b>Represented by China</b>
<b>HUNGARY- HUN</b>	<b>György GEMESI</b>
	<b>Krisztian KULCSAR</b>
	<b>Jenő KAMUTI</b>
<b>INDONESIA- INA</b>	<b>Represented by Max Geuter (MH)</b>
<b>INDIA- IND</b>	<b>D.D. BORO</b>
<b>IRELAND- IRL</b>	<b>Tom RAFTER</b>
<b>IRAN- IRI</b>	<b>Alireza POURSAJMAN</b>
<b>IRAQ- IRQ</b>	<b>Muhannad OTHMAN</b>
<b>ICELAND- ISL</b>	<b>Gudjon GESTSSON</b>
<b>ITALY- ITA</b>	<b>Giorgio SCARSO</b>
	<b>Giuseppe CAFIERO</b>
<b>JORDAN- JOR</b>	<b>Khaled ATIYAT</b>
	<b>Mahmod KHALAYLA</b>

<b>JAPAN- JPN</b>	<b>Atsushi HARINISHI</b>
	<b>Kazushige HIRANO</b>
	<b>Yoshiko CHIKUBU</b>
<b>KAZAKHSTAN- KAZ</b>	<b>Oleg PESKOV (2<sup>nd</sup> day)</b>
<b>KOREA- KOR</b>	<b>Lee KUN BAE</b>
	<b>Yu-Mi SEO</b>
<b>KUWAIT- KUW</b>	<b>Represented by Arthur Cramer (MH)</b>
<b>LATVIA- LAT</b>	<b>Erika AZE</b>
<b>LITHUANIA- LTU</b>	<b>Represented by Poland</b>
<b>LUXEMBOURG- LUX</b>	<b>Represented by Ana Pascu (MH)</b>
<b>MACAO- MAC</b>	<b>Represented by René Roch (MH)</b>
<b>MALAYSIA- MAS</b>	<b>Represented by Chinese Taipei</b>
<b>MOLDOVA- MDA</b>	<b>Represented by Georgia</b>
<b>MEXICO- MEX</b>	<b>Jorge CASTRO</b>
<b>MALI- MLI</b>	<b>Represented by Palestine</b>
<b>MALTA- MLT</b>	<b>Represented by Italy</b>
<b>MONACO- MON</b>	<b>Represented by France</b>
<b>NETHERLANDS- NED</b>	<b>Alexander HEEREN</b>
	<b>Bert VAN DE FLIER</b>
<b>NIGER- NIG</b>	<b>Represented by Jordan</b>
<b>NORWAY- NOR</b>	<b>Represented by Denmark</b>
<b>NEW ZEALAND- NZL</b>	<b>Represented by Australia</b>
<b>PANAMA- PAN</b>	<b>Anibal ILLUECA</b>
<b>PARAGUAY- PAR</b>	<b>Represented by Brazil</b>
<b>PERU- PER</b>	<b>Represented by Puerto Rico</b>
<b>PHILIPPINES- PHI</b>	<b>Represented by Panama</b>
<b>PALESTINE- PLE</b>	<b>Dawoud MITWALI</b>
	<b>Rana ABUYOUSEF</b>
<b>POLAND- POL</b>	<b>Adam LISEWSKI</b>
	<b>Jacek BIERKOWSKI</b>
<b>PORTUGAL- POR</b>	<b>José Eduardo DOS SANTOS</b>
<b>PUERTO RICO- PUR</b>	<b>Gilberto PENA</b>
<b>QATAR- QAT</b>	<b>Khalid AL-YAZEEDI</b>

<b>ROMANIA- ROM</b>	<b>Saleh Amer AL-HEMAIDI</b>
<b>SOUTH AFRICA- RSA</b>	<b>Laura CARLESCU-BADEA</b>
<b>RUSSIA- RUS</b>	<b>George R. VAN DUGTEREN</b>
	<b>Andrey KOVALENKO</b>
	<b>Youri BYTCHKOV</b>
	<b>Elena NETCHAEVA</b>
	<b>Rodion PLITUKHIN</b>
<b>SENEGAL- SEN</b>	<b>Abdoul Wahab Barka BA</b>
<b>SINGAPORE- SIN</b>	<b>Represented by Korea</b>
<b>SAN MARINO - SMR</b>	<b>Represented by El Salvador</b>
<b>SWITZERLAND- SUI</b>	<b>Antoine CAMPICHE</b>
<b>SLOVAKIA- SVK</b>	<b>Julius KRALIK</b>
<b>SWEDEN- SWE</b>	<b>Lars LILJEGREN</b>
	<b>Per PALMSTROM</b>
	<b>Pierre THULLBERG</b>
<b>TURKMENISTAN- TKM</b>	<b>Represented by Uzbekistan</b>
<b>CHINESE TAIPEI- TPE</b>	<b>Roger HSU</b>
<b>TUNISIA- TUN</b>	<b>Represented by Egypt</b>
<b>TURKEY- TUR</b>	<b>Halim SENER</b>
<b>UKRAINE- UKR</b>	<b>Maxim PARAMONOV</b>
	<b>Represented by the Czech Republic</b>
	<b>(2<sup>nd</sup> day)</b>
<b>URUGUAY- URU</b>	<b>Represented by Bolivia</b>
<b>UNITED STATES- USA</b>	<b>Nancy ANDERSON (2<sup>nd</sup> day)</b>
	<b>Sunil SABHARWAL</b>
	<b>George KOLOMBATOVICH</b>
	<b>Carl BORACK</b>
<b>UZBEKISTAN- UZB</b>	<b>Gulchekhra MAKHMUDOVA</b>
<b>VIETNAM- VIE</b>	<b>Represented by Japan</b>
<b>YEMEN- YEM</b>	<b>Represented by Qatar</b>

## AGENDA

---

1. Address of the FIE President and welcome address of the Qatar Fencing Federation President.
2. Approval of the new federations, validation of proxies and presence.
3. Approval of the minutes of the 2004 Elective Congress in Paris (FRA).
4. Proposals submitted to the Congress and reports of the Commissions.
5. Urgent decisions.
6. Candidatures to the 2008 J/C World Championships and vote for the awarding of the 2007 World Championships.
7. Miscellaneous items.
  - Award of the Challenge Chevalier Feyerick
  - Candidatures for the 2007 Congress



# 1. SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT

---

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Gentlemen Members of Honour, Gentlemen Presidents, Ladies and Gentlemen, dear friends.

May I welcome you on behalf of our Executive Committee and on my behalf.

The Congress which we are going to attend is of a particular importance for the future of our sport. As you noticed it, the IOC proceeds and will proceed, after each Olympiad, to the evaluation of the various sports, in order to determine the program for the following Olympic Games. The future of fencing is in our own hands and it is up to us, leaders, to give to our sport the necessary arguments for its perpetuity. Numerous reforms were already accomplished. The aspect of our discipline got modernized and few things need to be done to make us perfectly comprehensible. It is essential that the public or the TV viewer can himself judge the bout which he attends. We like our sport, we devote a big part of our time to it, we want to contemplate its future with serenity. I wish that this Congress takes place in an atmosphere of friendship and comprehension. We are not here to take advantage of particular interests but to guarantee the future of fencing. This is not a place for controversy and if some people want to take decisions against such or such person, they are to be blamed because they do not work for the future of our sport. We must stay united because fencing needs all of you. The universality is our goal because what would be the future of the technique if it would not be taught in all the countries. There is no big or small countries, as well as there is no big and small federations. Each of us adds his contribution. Our sport needs you. I am convinced that the decisions that will be taken during this Congress will reinforce our sport in the Olympic family. I wish to thank particularly the Sheik Al-Thani for his friendly hospitality and the exceptional infrastructure provided to us. This Congress will undoubtedly stand out in the history of the FIE. I wish you all an excellent Congress.

**Applause.**

**Jochen Faerber** : I just want to inform you that the English Channel is Channel 7. They just changed it to channel 7. French should be channel 6 and Spanish arrives on channel 5.

**Saoud Bin Abdulrahman Al-Thani (QAT, MH)** : *First sentence in Arabic language.*

Dear Mister President, Mister René Roch, dear Members of the Executive Committee, dear Presidents and Secretary Generals, dear Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning. On behalf of the Qatar National Olympic Committee, I sincerely welcome you all to Doha, the capital city of Qatar and the host city of the West Asian Games and Asian Games 2006. We all hope you will have a most enjoyable time with us here in the land of sun and sport and we also hope that your visit will allow you to meet your fencing friends and colleagues in a relax atmosphere full of joy and happiness. Qatar is at the eve of a new era with the organisation of 2 major multi sport events and some 2 weeks from now, we will host the Asian Games as a major test event for the 15<sup>th</sup> Asian Games that will be held in December of 2006 here in Doha. The West Asian Games will see the participation of 1'600 athletes and team officials while the Asian Games will count 10'500 athletes and team officials from all over Asia. The Qatar Fencing Federation has set up an ambitious plan to develop fencing in the country as well as in the Gulf Region. I am glad to inform you that fencing has been selected as a sport among eleven sports on the programme of the 2005 West Asian Games and amongst the 39 sports on the programme of the 2006 Asian Games. For the first time we will have 39 sports and Pusan Asian Games had 38 sports only. Besides this, the Qatar Fencing Federation will organise in the beginning of 2006 the Grand Prix of Doha, in which all of you are welcome to participate. We all hope you will enjoy your stay with us and we wish that

you will be able to visit the sport venues prepared by Qatar. The Sport City with the Aspire Academy is certainly a venue that should be visited by all of you, and which will be officially inaugurated on the 17<sup>th</sup> of this month. It will give me or it will give you a taste of the atmosphere we want to create during the West Asian Games and Asian Games. And then we wish that the Congress will be fruitful and that it will contribute to the development of our beloved sport. Thank you very much for your kind attention.

**Applause.**

**Jochen Faerber :** The President of the Qatar Fencing Federation will handle now a gift to the President of the International Fencing Federation. This is a sabre of honour from the Qatar Fencing Federation.

**Applause.**

**Jochen Faerber :** René Roch presents a personal plate in porcelain of Limoges to His Excellency Sheik Al-Thani.

**Applause.**

## 2. Ratification of new federations, validation of proxies and presence

---

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, we now move on to the ratification of new federations, validation of proxies and presence. As indicated to you in a letter of information, the Executive Committee provisionally affiliated the Federations of Afghanistan, the United Arab Emirates and by consultation, a few days ago, the Democratic Republic of Congo. Do you agree to definitively affiliate these three federations which will bring to 118 the number of FIE affiliated federations ? Do you agree ? **Approved.**

**Applause.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : I am now going to call the roll of the countries present.

Algeria is not present. Argentina, Armenia. Armenia ? Aruba, Aruba? Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belgium, Belgium ? Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Canada ? China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Spain, Estonia, France, Great Britain, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Iran, Ireland, Iraq, Iceland, Italy, Jordan, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kazakhstan ? Kazakhstan is not here. Korea, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Palestine, Poland, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Qatar, Romania, South Africa, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Serbia and Montenegro ? Senegal, Switzerland, Slovakia, Sweden, Taipei, Turkey, USA, Uzbekistan and that is all. Are there some countries that I did not call ? Yes, I called the USA. Sorry ? Ukraine yes. Is there another country that I did not call ? Is Venezuela present ? Venezuela is not present.

We now move on to the validation of proxies : Netherlands Antilles give proxy to the Netherlands, do Netherlands accept ? Brunei gives proxy to Bulgaria, does Bulgaria accept it ? Brunei to Bulgaria. Chile to Mexico, does Mexico accept it ? Costa Rica to Aruba, does Aruba accept it ? does Aruba accept it ? Croatia to Hungary ? Ecuador to Germany, does Germany accept it ? Finland to Estonia, does Estonia accept it ? Hong-Kong to China, does China accept it ? Indonesia to Max Geuter, does Max Geuter accept it ? Kuwait to Arthur Cramer, does Arthur Cramer accept it ? Lithuania to Poland, does Poland accept it ? Luxembourg to Anna Pascu. Macao to René Roch. Malaysia to Taipei, does Taipei accept it ? Moldova to Georgia. Mali to Palestine, does Palestine accept it ? Malta to Italy or Spain, Italy accepts it. Monaco to France. Niger to Jordan, does Jordan accept it ? Norway to Denmark, does Denmark accept it ? New Zealand to Australia. Paraguay to Brazil. Peru to Puerto Rico. Philippines to Panama. Singapore to Korea. San Marino to Italy or El Salvador, El Salvador. Turkmenistan to Uzbekistan. Tunisia to Egypt. Uruguay to Bolivia. Vietnam to Japan. Yemen to Qatar. Ah, I forgot to indicate Burkina Faso to Senegal and Croatia to Hungary.

So we have 59 countries present and 32 countries represented, **which makes a total of 91 countries present or represented.**

### 3. Approval of the Minutes of the 2004 Elective Congress in Paris (FRA)

---

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to item 3 of the agenda : approval of the minutes of the Elective Congress which was held in December 2004 in Paris. As of today, we have not received any comment or remark on these minutes. Do you agree to approve them ? Do you agree ? **The minutes are approved.**

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

---

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Mr Emmanuel Katsiadakis, FIE Secretary-General wants to say a few words on the persons deceased during the current year.

**Emmanuel Katsiadakis (GRE, MH)** : Good morning Ladies and Gentlemen, the International Fencing Federation was hit by the loss of several friends.

Felix Galimi from Argentina, died on 2 January at the age of 84 in Buenos Aires. He was a remarkable fencer of the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, who obtained numerous national and international titles in many competitions.

Dr Eduardo Hay from Mexico, died on 5 January 2005 at the age of 90. He was the Chief of Protocol of the Olympic Games of Mexico City and Director of the Mexican Olympic Sports Centre.

Mister Pawlowski died on 11 January at the age of 72, great sabre fencer, 10 Olympic or world medals. I think that Jerzy Pawlowsky is considered as one of the greatest world sabre fencer of the second half of the XX<sup>th</sup> century.

Ralph Zimmerman, United-States, International Referee, died on 29 January 2005 at the age of 65. He officiated at numerous Senior and Junior World Championships, and three times at Olympic Games.

Robyn Chaplin, Australia, died on 2 February 2005 at the age of 68. A former fencer and national finalist, Director and Founding Director of the Confederation of Australian Sport.

Orlando Azinhais, Portugal, several times national champion, died on 12 March 2005 at the age of 71. He was a cultured man, specialised in sport history and in fencing history in particular.

Béla Rerrich, one of the outstanding figures of the world fencing, died in Stockholm on 25 June 2005 at the age of 88. He resided many years in Sweden and is considered as the founder of Swedish fencing.

Renzo Nostini, Italy, passed away in Roma on 30 September 2005 at the age of 91. He directed the Italian Fencing Federation for 32 years, Vice-President and President of Honour of the Italian National Olympic Committee. He was several times World Champion and twice silver medallist in Olympic Games. He was decorated with the Athletic Gold Medal, the Gold Star of Sport Emeritus and the Silver Olympic Order.

We offer our deepest sympathy to the families and federations of the deceased. I am therefore asking for a minute of silence.

**Minute of silence.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to item 4 of the agenda, which is the study of propositions concerning the Statutes submitted to the Congress that you have in your documents.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : First proposition. **Proposition of the Brazilian Federation / Arthur Cramer (MH), proposition no. 5** : : **the candidates to the Refereeing Commission must be FIE Referees, at least at two weapons.**

The legal commission was in favour of this proposition and re-wrote it as follows : « a candidate to the Refereeing Commission must be an international referee at least at two weapons and must not have been deprived of his licence due to a disciplinary decision ». The Executive Committee is in favour of the proposition and the wording of the Legal Commission except for the last part of the sentence and takes off « and must not have been deprived of his licence due to a disciplinary decision ». The text would remain « a candidate to the Refereeing Commission must be an international referee at least at two weapons ». This proposition also goes together with the proposition no. 4 from Italy. Does anybody want to express himself on this proposition ? Nobody. Do you agree ? Who is in favour ? Raise your cards please ! Nobody against ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Who is against ? Nobody.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **The proposition is approved with the wording of the Legal Commission amended by the Executive Committee.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to **the propositions of the Executive Committee concerning the modifications to the Statutes. Proposition no.1** : **to ensure that the principle of non-discrimination on grounds such as the race, the sex, the ethnical belonging, the religion, the political opinions, the family status or other, is respected.**

The motivation of the Executive Committee was to introduce this notion, which was missing, following the adoption by the FIE of the IOC Code of Ethics. The Legal Commission was in favour. Does anyone wants to take the floor ? No. Who is in favour of the proposition ? Very well. Anybody against ? **The proposition is therefore approved.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition no. 2**: **the FIE recognises the fundamental principles of the Olympic Charter, the application of the Code of Ethics of the International Olympic Committee to the International Fencing Federation and the competence of the Commission of Ethics of the International Olympic Committee.**

This is an update of our Statutes following the adoption by the FIE of the IOC Code of Ethics. Does anyone want to express himself on this proposition ? Who is against the proposition ? Nobody. **The proposition is approved.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition no. 4**: **An extraordinary Congress may be convened if the Executive Committee so proposes, or at the request of at least 50 % of member federations. The expenses incurred by the organisation of this Congress are supported by the one who have required its convocation.**

The Legal Commission made the following proposition : « An extraordinary Congress may be convened, either upon proposal of the Executive Committee, or at the request of 25 % of national member federations ». It is unfavourable to : « the expenses incurred by the organisation of this Congress are supported by the one who have required its

convocation ». The Executive Committee at its meeting of yesterday proposed that a Congress be convened at the request of at least 50 % of national federations and that the FIE takes care of the costs of organisation of the extraordinary Congress. Does anyone want to express himself on this proposition ? Is somebody against ? 23 are against ? Who is in favour ? 32, **then the proposition is adopted**. The approved proposition is the one amended by the Executive Committee, that is an extraordinary Congress must be convened at the request of at least 50 % of federations. Expenses are covered by the FIE.

**Nathalie Rodriguez : Proposition no. 5 : The FIE member federations may be represented at a FIE Congress or General Assembly by two delegates, whose names must be made known to the FIE head-office one month before the Congress or General Assembly. Members of the Executive Committee and Commissions have the right to attend the Congress. The authority to vote for a member Federation is limited to its President or any other person designated by him in writing.**

The Legal Commission was in favour of this proposition but wanted to add « the candidates to the elections » could attend the Congress. The Executive Committee wanted for reasons of organisation, yes ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** There is no translation ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** There is no English ? The Spanish is late, he is on his way, but there is no English now ? Please, Ladies, could you see if there is a technical problem with the translation ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** The questions need to be repeated. Could you sit down please !

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Then, for the proposition no. 5, the Executive Committee did not want to add the candidates to the elections with the right to assist to the Congress for reasons of organisation. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ? Yes.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Please indicate your name and country before speaking and try to speak slowly for the interpreters. Thank you.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA) :** Cafiero from Italy. We are not in favour, because in some cases, it is good to have experts in different fields. And the possibility to have more than two delegates, without voting right of course, is sometimes favourable.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** There is no translation.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA) :** I repeat in English. We are not in favour of this limitation because there are situations in which it might be useful to have more than 2 persons when we have to discuss specific subjects and we can bring at our charge, at our expenses, more than two persons to treat the matters in a proper way.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** I will speak in French and English. The proposition indicates that there are two delegates, plus the members of the Executive Committee, plus the members of the Commissions. We are just talking about adding candidates to the elections. There are not only two delegates, there are two delegates, plus the members of the Executive Committee, plus the members of commissions.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : I repeat in English. The proposition is to have two delegates, plus the members of the Executive Committee, plus the members of commissions. We are just talking about the candidates to elections.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who is in favour of this proposition ? Kindly raise your cards please. Jie, please. Jie, we need two voting cards for Mr. Cramer. 66 are in favour, therefore **the proposition is adopted**.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to **the proposition no. 6**. « **the vote is secret on any point which concerns an individual person or a member federation or at the request of 25% of the national federations present or represented** ».

The Legal Commission is not in favour of this proposition, but this proposition is in fact a lining up to the texts of the Olympic Charter of the International Olympic Committee which is as follows : « Voting is held by secret ballot when so required by the Olympic Charter, or if the Chairman so decides or upon the request of at least a quarter of the members present ». The Executive Committee at its meeting of yesterday proposed to fully adopt the text of the Olympic Charter, the wording of the text of the Olympic Charter. Does anyone want to express himself on this proposition ? Who is in favour of this proposition ? 52. Who is against ? 13. **The proposition is therefore adopted**.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition no. 7** : « **It creates a commission of verification for the candidatures, which comprises the members of the FIE Bureau, the President of the Legal Commission and the administrative and financial Director. This commission is requested to check the candidatures and reject the one which do not comply with the Statutes and the Ethic recommended by the International Olympic Committee** ».

The Legal Commission indicated that there is already a text in the Statutes which is the article 4.1.4 and that it would represent a double with this article and the Commission suggests to add to the article 4.1.4 the candidatures which do not comply with the Statutes « or the IOC Code of Ethics ». So we keep the article 4.1.4 but add « or the IOC Code of Ethics ». Does anyone want to express himself on this proposition ? Who is against ? Sir, do you want to take the floor ?

**Lars Liljegen (SWE)** : Dear friends, once upon a time a good friend of mine said if you are angry, write a letter but don't send it. I think that this proposition was created in the shadow of the Elective Congress of Paris one year ago. In one corner of the ring, we had our President, in the other corner the Challenger the President of the Russian Federation Alisher Usmanov. The campaign was filled with accusations from both sides. The other candidate was blamed for not having followed the Olympic Code. It is not a secret, the Swedish Federation strongly supported our President René Roch. I spent many hours at my computer, mailing arguments about democracy and Olympic spirit. A few days later, those mails came back to me, after having gone around the world, with many comments. I realised that there were a lot of opinions about the Olympic Code of Ethics and the Olympic Spirit. We are talking about an evaluation, not about science. I read many other opinions on the Olympic Spirit but did not change it for the same but I respect that there might be other opinions. When we re-elected our President, a democratic decision gave an end to the discussion. The Congress, not the Committee, took the final decision. The majority having followed the Olympic Rules. I was very satisfied with the result. During the campaign, we could also read a statement from the IOC Ethic Commission. Four months ago, we also had a heavyweight fight in Europe. The champion had decided to resign and we had two challengers : Keith Smith and Alisher Usmanov. The same story started again. Almost the same letters and the same e-mails and we were supporting Keith Smith, but the arguments that were successful in



Paris were not successful in Hungary. It is important to win and to lose with dignity. And every one has to do this, and also do his or her best to heal the wounds. For us the discussion is over and we try to give our contribution both to the International and the European progress and unity. In both cases, different federations nominated candidates, we evaluated them, we argued and we voted but the results were different for us, this is a natural situation in a democratic society. Dear friends, even in the future, let the Congress, not a special Committee, have the right to make one of the most important decisions, that is to whom we want to give our confidence to lead our organisation in the future. Mr. President, don't forget my introduction, if you are angry write a letter or a proposition but do not show it to anyone. We propose that the Congress rejects this proposition.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The proposition is to keep the current text and just add « or the IOC Code of Ethics ». Is someone against ? You do not want to add the IOC Code of Ethics ? The proposition is to keep the Statutes as they are currently, not to change the Statutes, just to add « or the IOC Code of Ethics ». There are therefore no changes, a sentence is just added « the IOC Code of Ethics ». Do you agree ? Who is against ? Against adding « or the IOC Code of Ethics » ? I am saying that the proposition is not dealt. We keep the Statutes as they are. We just add three words “or the Code of Ethics”, that is all. We do not modify. If you prefer, the proposition of the Executive Committee is withdrawn. We just keep the Statutes. Just add “or the Code of Ethics”. Who is in favour ? 59.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to the **proposition no. 8. Elections to the Athletes Commission**. This proposition aims to modify the procedure of election to the Athletes Commission. At the last election, which took place in Leipzig, each federation had the possibility to present six candidates but only one could be elected. Some weapons could not be represented because the proposed candidates were from a nationality which was already represented somewhere else. Instead of having a commission composed of 12 elected athletes, we have only 9. The purpose is to reform, in line with the system used by the International Olympic Committee, the election to the Athletes Commission in such a way that candidates from a same federation be not in competition against each others. Furthermore, we wish to simplify the voting procedure because according to the current Statutes we have to prepare as many ballot papers that are voting athletes in the World Championships, and insert these ballot papers in as many envelopes. For example at the last World Championships, we prepared 1'200 ballot papers, inserted them into 1'200 envelopes, and then inserted them into the envelopes of delegations. We aim at having the athletes go directly to the polling station, where ballot papers will be handled. The Legal Commission was in favour of this modification. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ? Yes.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Please kindly give your name and federation at each time you come to the tribune and speak slowly for the interpreters. Thank you.

**Frédéric Pietruszka (FRA)** : Frédéric Pietruszka from France. I am basically in favour of this modification but I think that we should keep a balance, the balance between the weapons. To permit the election of six fencers at a same weapon would not maintain this balance between the weapons, which, I think, is the representativeness of fencing. We have three weapons, foil, sabre and epee and I believe that if we do not keep this balance, we inevitably risk to go towards a representativeness of only one weapon in this commission and I think that this would be prejudicial to fencing.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Six athletes are elected, and then six others are nominated by the Executive Committee, which has the duty to nominate athletes in such a way that all weapons are represented and also that all confederations are represented. So, we leave

the choice to the athletes to vote for whom they want but the Executive Committee re-establishes the balance if weapons are not represented, or if confederations are not represented and it nominates athletes who will complete all the weapons and the confederations.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : I also wanted to indicate that we have been contacted by Mr Bubka, who is the President of the IOC Athletes Commission, to whom we had by the way submitted the proposition presented to you, because Mr Bubka had requested all international federations to indicate their procedure of election of candidates within the federations, as well as the assignments of this commission, and the activities of this commission. As a reply we sent him the proposition submitted to you, which was fully approved by the IOC as this is the functioning of the athletes commission. Mr Bubka sent back a letter to the FIE and congratulated the International Federation on the functioning of the Athlete Commission as well as the activity of this commission.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who is against this proposition ?

**George van Dugteren (RSA)** : I am George van Dugteren from South Africa. I just wish to comment that we have been asked to vote on six different points with one vote. And if we disagree with only one part, do we vote against or for ? I think for example the last point, point 4.5.14 not only are we asked to vote for the top numbers, but we have no genders specificities. We have a problem if there are all masculine. I agree with you that it is possible for the Executive to add others, or women or men, but I think it is too difficult if we wish to vote against this one point, we are voting against all the other good points. It is not a good way of voting.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : This proposition is not in several parts. This is a whole and I remind you that this is the voting procedure of the IOC. I think that this is not fair to force people to vote for candidates who are possibly not suitable to them. So, we give the athletes the possibility to vote for whom they want. Then, regarding the parity, the representativeness of confederations and the representativeness of weapons, the nomination of six additional athletes by the Executive Committee will compensate for the possible deficiencies. We are now only talking about the vote by the athletes.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : If you want, the major difference between the new and old system, is that now we vote globally for all the athletes, at all the weapons. Only one athlete per country is presented. In the past, we used to vote per weapon and it was creating difficulties because of the necessity to have only one athlete per country in the athletes commission etc. It means that if an athlete was excellent in a country and was elected, other athletes could not be elected. Well, now we keep this system but I believe that it will be easier, we have today an athletes commission which cannot be composed of twelve because we do not have the twelve possible athletes for the athletes commission. It seems abnormal to us. This is just this specific problem. This is not a big modification but a modification which should enable a better election to the athletes commission.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who is against ? 5. **So the proposition is adopted.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition no. 9. Two members of the Executive Committee, fulfilling the roles of Secretary General and Secretary-Treasurer, are chosen by the President of the FIE. Then, the Executive Committee elects three vice presidents among its own members. The President, the Secretary General, the Secretary-Treasurer and the three vice-presidents form the Bureau.**

This proposition does not seek to raise the number of Executive Committee members but to add a vice-president to the members of the Bureau. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who is in favour ? Please raise your hands ! Are you in favour ? Who is in favour please ? 42. Who is against ? 28. **So, the proposition is adopted.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition no. 10**. **Article 5.6.4, replace the last sentence by « The President has the power to carry out jointly with the Secretary-Treasurer, investments on this account, which will be duly reported to the Executive Committee ».**

The Legal Commission modified this proposition but from what we understood, I think that the Legal Commission misunderstood the proposition. After the Olympic Games, you know that the FIE receives television rights in dollars and this money must be invested or sometimes sold extremely quickly because of the increase and decrease of foreign currencies, sometimes within 24 hours. It is therefore not possible to make a consultation or ask in time the advice of the Executive Committee to make these changes. It was suggested that the President jointly with the Treasurer, be able to make investments, which will then be reported to the Executive Committee. This, in order not to lose amounts of money which could be in some cases very important when it comes to change and rate of exchange, or other investments which must be effected within 24 and 48 hours. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : No. Who is in favour ? 46. Who is against ? 21. **So, the proposition is approved.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition no. 11**. **During the Commissions meetings, no new matters will be discussed other than those that are on the agenda.**

The Legal Commission, rather than adding a new sentence, recommends to delete the article 6.4.4 which suppresses any ambiguity. The article 6.4.4 concerns the meetings of commissions before the Congress and therefore the possible study of propositions before the Congress. As the commissions do not meet during the Congress and that propositions are studied at the commissions meetings, which follow the sending of propositions, the article 6.4.4 becomes superfluous.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Is someone against this proposition ? Nobody is against ? Who is against ? To suppress the article 6.4.4 of the Statutes proposed by the Legal Commission. **The proposition of the Legal Commission is therefore adopted.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition no. 13**. **This proposition aims to add the zonal or continental championships in the FIE official events.**

It was also discussed yesterday by the Executive Committee to add the qualification events for the Olympic Games in the FIE official events and indicate that Masters and Supermasters are FIE official events when organised, of course. So, the text would add the continental or zonal championships as well as Masters and Supermasters, if organised, any qualification event for the Olympic Games and any other event designated by the FIE Congress. The Legal Commission indicated that if the proposition is voted, the Statutes would need to be amended. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ? Mr Jorgensen.

**Normann Jorgensen (DEN)** : I am Normann Jorgensen from Denmark. This proposal has to be seen in connection with another proposal, which will be dealt with later on, the

one about the FIE ranking. I am in favour of the organisation of zonal or continental championships but I am against including these championships in the ranking because for the ranking, for the official ranking list, we need tournaments which are open to everybody. If we include these zonal championships in the general ranking of the FIE, it will be a hard blow to the small countries, particularly to the small countries in Europe because it will be very hard for an individual fencer from a small country in Europe to gain points that will be easily awarded in other zones. So for that reason, I propose to reject the part which says « and to incorporate them in the FIE ranking ».

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Mr Jorgensen, we are not dealing with this proposition. I said that the Legal Commission said that if the Congress accepts to add the zonal championships, in this case the text of the Statutes would have to be modified. We are not dealing with the Rules proposition now.

**Normann Jorgensen (DEN)** : Yes, but it says here in the motivation « and to incorporate them in the FIE ranking ».

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Yes, this is only the motivation, this is not the proposition. We are now just dealing with the addition of two words. If later on, the Congress rejects this, and it was said by the Legal Commission, if the proposition « to include the zonal championships » is voted by the Congress, in this case, the text will have to be amended. If it is not the case, we will not add these words. But we are now dealing with the Statutes, not with the Rules.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : I believe that we must wait to first deal with the Rules.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I think that you should know why we made this proposition. We made this proposition for two reasons. The first one is that our regional zonal championships must be very well organised because if they are not organised properly, fencing is responsible. And fencing is the FIE and this is a major problem for us. If someone from the IOC attends a continental championship which is badly organised, it will affect fencing, what will be harmful for our sport. That is what happened several years ago. You know that several years ago, we had a championship in some country, in which we had to wait for three hours for the final because they were three hours late and as nothing was happening and that the television was programmed, they broadcasted the Olympic Games of Barcelona. And the Olympic Games had taken place for more than one year already. It was rather annoying. The IOC informed us about this and strongly reacted at that time. This is one of the reasons. Furthermore, I think that this is in favour of the various continents to give a little bit more importance to their zonal championships. We also wish to have the best fencers fencing in the zonal championship and not to consider it as a sub-championship. This is why we say that it is maybe preferable for the FIE to give more importance to zonal championships. This is the reason why we incorporate them in the FIE events and give them a coefficient similar to the one of Grand Prix . This is it. These are the two reasons : first of all we want a good organisation and secondly we wish that the zonal championship be really an important championship for the fencers, for all the federations and be very well attended.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Listen, we have two things regarding this proposition. First of all we want that zonal or continental championships be FIE official competitions and on the other hand, in a proposition, which concerns the Rules, to attribute them points and include them in the ranking. Technically those are two different propositions. This one just concerns the inclusion in the Statutes of zonal championships as FIE official events which means recognised by the FIE. We are not dealing now with the incorporation in the ranking and the attribution of points.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** I think that they both go together. We cannot vote on the recognition of zonal championships by the FIE and not attribute points. I believe that we should vote on both parts at the same time. It means that if we recognise zonal championships as FIE official events, we attribute them a coefficient of two as for the Grand Prix . Do you agree with this proposition ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Who is in favour ? First, who is in favour? We count again, could you please raise your hands ! 45. Who is against ? 27.

**René Roch (MH) :** **So, this is adopted.** With the points, coefficient of two, as a Grand Prix .

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** 45 in favour and 27 against. What is the date of application ? For the next season 2006-2007. We cannot integrate it in a season which has already started. We must wait for the next season. **So application season 2006-2007.**

**Bert van de Flier (NED) :** Bert van de Flier from the Netherlands. If we apply it already from the next season, you must take into account that tournaments were already awarded to organisers. For the European championships, but I think it is the same in other zones, we start to work ahead of time. We have already for two years fixed the place where the championships will take place. Now, we basically impose new Rules, which constitute the FIE Charter for these championships. I think that it would be fair to first ask those people if they accept because if they do not, it could create a problem because maybe nobody will want to do it because they might say that they cannot guarantee the television or whatever because the FIE rules are different from their own rules. So I would suggest to be indulgent with the start of the implementation for these first two years. At least two years for us in Europe. I do not know the situation in the other continents, but it would be fair towards the organisers that have already committed themselves. Because they did not know what was going to happen.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Sirs, if some organisers face difficulties to ensure a good organisation of the competition with media, the International Federation will be at their disposal to help. Hopefully we will obtain, from the moment that it is an official competition, the television and the Eurovision. This is our goal. We are just trying to improve the competition and we are at disposal to help you to improve it.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Next proposition, **proposition no. 14**. This is a modification of the article 10.2.1 item g). **Furthermore, the Congress will accept the candidatures proposing to organise separate Junior and Cadet Championships.**

The current Statutes do not provide the possibility to accept separate candidatures for the organisation of Junior and Cadet Championships. In the future, it will be possible to have an organiser for the cadet championships and an organiser for the junior championships. And it would be unfortunate to have to refuse a candidature just because the Statutes do not provide the possibility to have a separate organisation. This separate organisation could considerably decrease the costs for the organisers of the world championships because the junior/cadet world championships are very heavy with cadet, junior and team events. Does anyone wish to express himself ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** This is just to avoid being bothered if one day someone tells us « we would like to organise the junior championships but not the junior/cadet together ». It leaves us the possibility to say that we want to organise together junior and cadet. But, if we do not have an organiser, maybe it is possible to find an organiser for the junior and an organiser for the cadet because the junior/cadet championships are very important championships, which are really successful and have now a large number of

fencers. Important means are requested for the organisation of the junior/cadet championships, often more means than for the senior championships. So, I believe that this is the possibility, we give us the opportunity not to organise them together. Of course, it will always be decided by the Congress. So, it does not change much.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Do you agree with the possibility to split up the junior and the cadet ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Do you want to take the floor ? Yes ?

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : Cafiero, Italy. We do not agree with the separate organisation of the championships because of the increase of cost of participation. I understand that the organisation is bulky but at the same time each country must pay twice to send two groups in two different championships. So either they remain together or we are in favour of local or regional cadet championships, which is enough for this category and take junior championship as a single competition.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Does anybody else want to express himself on this proposition? No. So we move on to the vote. Who is in favour ? That is the possibility to accept separate candidatures. 52 votes in favour. **The proposition is therefore approved.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : As we have a little bit exceeded in time, I suggest you to have a coffee-break of 10 minutes. Thank you.

## COFFEE-BREAK

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : So we continue with the **proposition no. 15**. **Suppression of the articles 10.2.4 and 10.2.5 as doubled.**

Anybody against ? No, **this is adopted.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition of the Fencing Federation of the Czech Republic**. **The latter proposes a modification of the Statutes concerning the vote, that is a further condition for the eligibility to vote, whether directly or by proxy. In order for a federation to be eligible to vote, the latter should at least have one fencer who participated in the World Championship in any category in the given year.**

Who is in favour of this proposition ? 5 in favour. The proposition is therefore rejected, as well as the proposition no. 3 from Hungary. Who is against this proposition ? There is a majority, **the proposition is therefore rejected as well as the proposition no. 3 from Hungary.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition of the German Fencing Federation**. **« In an emergency the Executive Committee can take decisions that are immediately binding, which must first be approved by the competent commission(s). In no case, such decision can modify or be contrary to a decision adopted by the Congress or General Assembly and is submitted to the next General Assembly or Congress for confirmation. This procedure is not applicable to a modification of Statutes »**

The Legal Commission proposed the following text: in case of emergency, the Executive Committee can take immediate binding decisions after having first requested the opinion (by e-mail or fax) of the competent commission(s). The Executive Committee at its meeting of yesterday wished to add « after having first requested the opinion by fax

or e-mail of members of the competent commission(s). Such a decision can, in no case, modify or be opposite to a decision adopted by the last Congress or General Assembly and be submitted to the next meeting of the General Assembly or Congress for confirmation. This procedure cannot be applied to a modification of Statutes ». Does anyone want to express himself on this proposition ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** So, who is in favour of the text of the Legal Commission, amended by the Executive Committee with « members of the competent commission(s) » ? Who is in favour ? There is a majority, **the proposition is therefore adopted**, it is the text of the Legal Commission which is adopted with « members of the competent commission(s) ». **The application is of course as of 1 January 2006.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Proposition no. 2. **All proposals submitted by the FIE member federations must be presented to the Congress. Competent commissions and the Executive Committee will take position on the proposals (cf. art 3.2.3 of the Statutes).**

The Executive Committee was not in favour of this proposition, neither the Legal Commission. The current text in the Statutes indicates that member federations have the right to formulate propositions, they are prerogatives which can be submitted to the Congress. Who wants to express himself on this proposition ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** So, we move on to the vote. Who is in favour of the German proposition ? 36 are in favour. Who is against the proposition ? Could you raise your hands please ! 39 against the proposition. **The proposition is rejected.** It was 36 in favour and 39 against.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Proposition no. 3. **Suppress the article « Proxies » (the article 3.3.3. b).**

In the majority of legal texts (of association, federation or state) at elections and rules or statutory decisions, the right to vote can only be validated by a mandated representative. In no case, the propositions can be modified during the discussions in the course of the Congress without having first obtained a favourable advice from the concerned commissions. This second part has in fact nothing to do with the proposition, which is to suppress the proxies. This proposition goes together with the proposition no. 1 of the Hungarian Federation. The Executive Committee was not in favour and the Legal Commission was not in favour. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** So we move on to the vote. Who is in favour of this proposition ? Who is in favour of the proposition, that is to suppress the proxies ? 15 in favour. Who is against this proposition ? 50 against. **The proposition is rejected.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Proposition no. 4. **All the candidates to the elections for the commissions must have the knowledge and necessary experience for the position they are applying for.**

The Executive Committee was not in favour of this proposition and neither the Legal Commission. I remind you that this proposition had already been presented in a previous Congress and that it had been rejected. Does anyone wish to express himself ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** So we move on to the vote. Who is against this proposition ? 45 against, **so the proposition is rejected.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Next proposition of Mr Max Geuter, proposition A was withdrawn by Mr Max Geuter.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Proposition B. The Congress should vote that for every position for the Executive Committee and the different Commissions every present federation must vote for the requested number of seats (11 votes for the Executive Committee and 10 votes for the commission members).

Experience from past Congresses show that our current system is not satisfying and gives the possibility to manipulate. The IOC e.g. demanded in Athens from all athletes to vote for 4 candidates, not more and not less, any other voting sheet is not valid. Also other federations handle this more democratic procedure. The Executive Committee was not in favour of this proposition, neither the Legal Commission. It also goes together with the Hungarian proposition no. 2 and I remind you that this proposition was presented at least twice in the past and was rejected at each Congress. Does anyone wish to express himself ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** So we move on to the vote. Who is in favour of this proposition ? 19 in favour. Who is against this proposition ? 50. **The proposition is therefore rejected.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Proposition of the Hungarian Fencing Federation. The proposition no. 1 has already been dealt with the proposition 3 of Germany. The proposition no. 2 was also dealt with the one of Max Geuter no. B. And the proposition no. 3 has already been dealt with the proposition of the Federation of the Republic Czech.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** We now move on to the propositions of the Italian Federation. The proposition no. 1 has already been dealt with the one of the Executive Committee no. 6. Proposition no. 2. To add «each candidate can apply for one position only». This concerns the general rules for the application of candidatures, it means that it concerns all the candidates. The Executive Committee was not in favour and neither the Legal Commission. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ? **The proposition is withdrawn by the Italian Federation.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Proposition no. 3 concerning the article 4.3.1. To add «and having been President or leader for four years within his Federation or his zonal confederation». This article concerns the candidatures to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee was not in favour of this proposition, and neither the Legal Commission. **The proposition is withdrawn by the Italian Federation.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** The proposition no. 4 was already dealt with the one of Brazil no. 1. That is one part of this proposition was already dealt with the one of Brazil no. 1. **We decided that in order to be in the refereeing commission, it was necessary to have at least two weapons. The rest of the proposition is to replace the word « desirable » which states in this article by « necessary » and this concerns all the commissions.**

I also remind you that this text has already been discussed at previous Congresses. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition, that is on the first part to replace « desirable » by « necessary » ? Who is in favour of replacing « desirable » by « necessary » in this article ? Could you please raise your hands so we can see who is in favour ?



**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : It concerns professional qualifications for all commissions and not just the refereeing. Therefore for the legal, the disciplinary, the SEMI etc. This is a proposal which has been submitted in two parts, to add the word « obligatory » to the general close in the Statutes, which is what we are now discussing, which concerns making mandatory all the qualifying recommendations. And what we have been talking about previously was making necessary experience only for the refereeing commission.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The current article of the Statutes concern the election to all the commissions. The current text is « it is desirable that the candidates for various commissions have specific professional knowledge or credentials as follows », and then there is a list. The Italian federation wants to replace « it is desirable » by « it is necessary that the candidates for various commissions ...». So do you want to replace in this text « desirable » by « necessary ». Who is in favour ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I will add that at the last Congress, in 2003, we voted to replace « necessary » by « desirable ». But we can come back and do the opposite now, never mind, but this was already a proposition of the Italian Federation.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who is in favour of this proposition ? Nobody ? 20 in favour. Who is against the proposition ? 46. **The proposition is therefore rejected.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition no. 5.** To be nominated as Member of Honour it is requested to... Sorry ? **The proposition is withdrawn by the Italian Federation.**

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : Just one second. Do not be surprised by the withdrawal of most of our proposals. Actually our board changed deeply and the present group does not agree with the proposals, which were submitted by the precedent group. Sorry.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to **the propositions of Peter Jacobs**, I will give him the floor for his propositions.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : **1st proposal**. I will explain the technical point of view why I am proposing two pages of **changes to the Statutes regarding licenses**. The Statutes as they currently stand are completely out of date regarding licenses. They go back to the days when FIE licenses were distributed by national federations and had no relevance to the current fencing life of the FIE. A license could be issued for any person under some circumstances from any country. Our present Rules for entering into official FIE competitions require, as they are arranged through the FIE computer for example, require that the license of a fencer be issued by the federation of whose nationality he possesses and of which he is a member whether he lives physically in that country or abroad. And therefore this proposal is aimed at making our Statutes realistic in line with our current requirements. It therefore means that fencers living abroad must obtain their license through the federation of which they have nationality, that nobody can get a license from anywhere else, except for fencers without an FIE membership. It removes the right of appeal of a fencer to come to the FIE and say that his national federation will not give him a license. The only exception is for referees living abroad who may by the Federation of the country in which they live, contact the FIE and obtain their license. But that license must still identify him as a referee of his country of origin. So it makes really tight and strict and precise the Rules on licenses and nationalities. Any questions ? Any observations ?

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : Yes, the reference to the referees is on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page, 9.1.7. In fact 9.1.8. Add a new article 9.1.8. A referee can obtain from the FIE either through his own national federation or the national federation in which he is living for at least three years, an international license, which must identify the nationality of the referee.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Mr Jorgensen, do you want to take the floor ?

**Normann Jorgensen (DEN)** : I am Normann Jorgensen from Denmark. Peter, in this proposal have you taken into account the fact that we have actually had a number of cases of refugees who had fled from one country to another and the FIE has been very good in allowing these fencers to continue their sport, either with a temporary licence from another country or with an FIE licence. I think we should continue that policy which is very good.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Mr Jorgensen, we have a special statute for the refugees. I think that these fencers should now apply for a refugee license. They should apply to the FIE to get a FIE license if they are refugees because it is an official status.

**Normann Jorgensen (DEN)** : That is exactly my question.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : If they remain of their former nationality, they are of their former nationality. But they cannot have a license for a country for which they do not have the nationality.

**Normann Jorgensen (DEN)** : Exactly, that is my question. Peter said that the rules will be very strict, I just want to make sure that it is not so strict that it does not allow the refugee status anymore.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : Well, it allows for stateless people. Nathalie says those who by being refugees have lost their original nationality. It does not allow for people whose status is unclear and have gone for refugee or other personal reasons to live in another country.

**Bert van de Flier (NED)** : Bert van de Flier from Netherlands. I do not know if this is the case for many countries here but for instance, I know that some people live in some countries, have even functions, and even as Presidents of federation, and who actually only possess the Dutch nationality. Would that mean in the future that those people are basically no longer existing, that they have to apply for a license through my federation even if they have their own federation ?

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : Yes, I mean they have to apply to the country of which they are strictly of nationality. Yes.

**Bert van de Flier (NED)** : And would that also mean in that case that they could no longer be a representative of their country ? Let's say if you are in a commission, this somebody that is basically from another country, or let me give you a simple example, could I be with somebody from the Netherlands in a commission ?

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : We have already had this situation at the last elective Congress where a person who was thought to be, who was a member of a commission under one flag, the situation was clarified that he was not a national of that country and he was a national of another country and he was required to present himself as a candidate and has been elected for the country of which he is a true national. That is part of the Rules in fact of our statutes concerning nationality and eligibility for post within the FIE, already. The situation is covered already in equally strict form by the Statutes in another part.

**Bert van de Flier (NED)** : Thank you.

**George van Dugteren (RSA) :** George van Dugteren. I am President of the Medical Commission and I am a permanent resident in South Africa. But because of international rules I may not take a South African passport because I live there, I have lived there all my life but I have to give up my birth right as a Dutch citizen. So I travel on a Dutch passport and that is my only link with my home country, my originally home country the Netherlands. I live in South Africa, I work in South Africa, my family lives in South Africa and I have a permanent resident in South Africa, and I am by South African law allowed to be elected as President of the South African amateur fencing association, which brings me here. However, if these Rules do apply strictly, then it means I have to withdraw as President of the Medical Commission, withdraw as President of the South African Amateur Fencing Association, because I am no longer legal ? Now, I think that we must all bear in mind that there may be others who have this situation and I am not so sure that we should not re-look at this whether or not we need the nationality or the legitimate membership of the federation and of course must avoid double activity in two fields. I just want to draw your attention to this and suggest that maybe this situation should be looked at by a special committee or that we take this further without jumping into it with boots and door. Thank you.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** But the Statutes are strict, you must be of the nationality you represent. The current Statutes are already like this. I am sorry, this is the case.

**George van Dugteren (RSA) :** In that case, I might have to say good-bye to all of you.

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH) :** I would like to present the situation of referees for example. There are many very good referees who leave their country and who are in different countries. But they keep their nationality of origin. The Refereeing Commission has problems, why ? If we have very good referees in a country and some referees from this country are living in other countries, I do not think we can consider these persons as having licenses for the new country. Because it would become difficult to choose the referees. Can you imagine if we have four excellent referees in the same country, who are living in other countries, should we take all these referees for the World Championships ? I do not think so, because in that case we would have five referees from a same country but living in other countries. These referees are not designated. We will have five referees in this country. So, I believe that the proposition is good because we have to respect the license of the referee. For a person, in order to have a licence, or for example be part of the Italian team of football, must be holder of the Italian nationality. In Spain, this is the same. A football player from another country, who arrives in Spain must be holder of the Spanish nationality to be member of the national Spanish team. This is the same in all the sports. I do not think that fencing can be different in this situation. So in order to have a licence or participate as representative of a national federation, the person must be holder of the nationality of the federation he is going to represent. I think that the proposition is good.

**George Kolombatovich (USA) :** George Kolombatovich, I am the President of the Refereeing Commission. The article 9.1.8 does not deal with the nationality of the referee, it only deals with the ability of a referee living in other countries to obtain a licence from the FIE. If there is for example a referee from one country living in another for many years, that person may now have the licence obtained by the Federation where she or he lives but that person will be on the list continuously by the nationality of the fencer. Thank you.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) :** Nathalie is pointing out one further thing in this proposal, as the result of the Executive Committee meeting of yesterday, if you look at 9.1.7., which is that in 9.1.7 where a member federation refuses to grant an international licence to somebody, they must inform the Bureau of the FIE in order to avoid a duplication of

appeal. So this is an administrative requirement when a national federation refuses to give a licence to a fencer, they must advise the FIE so that there is not a duplicate of appeal by some other means. And going down to the paragraph below, as I said, the Executive also proposes to remove the opportunity of a fencer to appeal to the FIE over the head of their national federation.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We do not want that a fencer to whom a licence was refused by a national federation, be able to appeal to the FIE. If a national federation refuses a licence to a fencer, it is its right and its concerns. So, we want to suppress from the Statutes the possibility for a fencer to appeal to the FIE against his national federation.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : You will remember that this is consistent with one of the basic principle of the FIE, which is that it does not interfere in the internal activities of a national federation.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : There is in fact not possibility of appeal if his national federation refuses to order him a licence for a reason X, that it judges valid, it does not order him any licence, that is all. And this is currently the case. We do not want a fencer be able to appeal afterwards to the FIE against his own national federation, while his national federation has certainly reasons not to grant a licence to a fencer. An international licence, let's be clear, not a national licence. Licences are ordered directly by national federations via the Internet website without any intervention from the FIE.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : The FIE has no right to reject a request of a national federation for a licence of one of his national members.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : So, the national federation is totally free to order or not a licence. We do not intervene in this order.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Excuse me Sir, but we do not hear you !

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : He can probably appeal to his federation, that is all.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Of course, towards you, but not towards the FIE. We do not want to intervene in the affairs of the national federations. We indicate that there is no appeal to the FIE. A national appeal is something different. The national federation is free to decide and the fencer cannot appeal to the FIE against his national federation. The national federation decides.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : This is normal as the members of the International Federation are the federations. We do not have fencers, who are members of the International Federation, the federations are therefore the ones to deliver the licences.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : Okay, I think no more questions. May we pass please to the vote. Who is against the proposal on the table ? Who is against the proposal ? Nobody is against the proposal, **the proposal is approved.**

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : The second proposal. **Proposal 2** is purely a technicality in the **Disciplinary Code of the FIE**. Taking drugs is listed amongst the offences dealt with by the normal disciplinary process of the FIE but we now have a separate anti-doping disciplinary procedure, a separate anti-doping code and therefore these words have to be taken out of the normal list of offences because they are dealt with elsewhere by different disciplinary processes which were approved last year as our anti-doping code. Has anybody got any problems about this ? Anybody against ? **Thank you, this is approved.**

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : The 3<sup>rd</sup> proposal, in case of a resignation or death of the President, the Secretary General takes charge until the next Congress or General Assembly.**

This is purely again a technicality because now that we do not have a Congress every year, we need a technical procedure in our Statutes to replace a President in less than two years possibly should a President be not available in that period. When in the old days we had a Congress every year, it was possible to say that we waited until the next Congress. Now that we have a Congress with a two years gap, we need to include the General Assemblies in the process. Has anybody got any comments or objections ? **Thank you very much, this is approved.**

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) : The 4<sup>th</sup> proposition**, once again, is a small technicality that at the moment the list of people who must be kept informed of FIE decisions consists basically of national federations, but members of Honours are also effectively individual FIE members and sometimes at a certain point, they are no longer in close contact with their own national federations and therefore to add the words Members of Honours to the list of people who must be kept informed of FIE decisions. Has anybody got any comments or objections ? **So, this is approved.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The last item concerns **the proposition of the Executive Committee to revise completely the FIE Disciplinary Code.**

The Legal Commission re-drafted the whole text of the Disciplinary Code. This new text could not be studied by the Executive Committee because it was delivered quite late. Consequently, **it was decided to postpone both the proposition of the Executive Committee and the proposition of the Legal Commission to the next Congress.** This Disciplinary Code will therefore not be studied here.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to the propositions **concerning the modifications to the Rules**, which is the second document that you received.

**Proposition of the Brazilian Federation/Arthur Cramer (MH) no. 2.** You have to go directly to the second page as the first one is an explanation, a motivation of the proposition, which is actually on the second page, that is « **The Referee must sentence all the offences starting with the most severe offence, which is, the most severe penalty, even after the order “Halt”** ».

The Executive Committee indicated that « when a referee has to sanction one fencer who has committed several faults at the same time, he must penalise the less serious fault first ». Mr Arthur Cramer at the Executive Committee meeting of yesterday, indicated that he agrees with this opinion of the Executive Committee and that he therefore follows the opinion of the Executive Committee. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : So, if a fencer commits several offences, we first penalise the less severe offence, and then the other offences. We do not start with the most severe offence. Do you agree ? Who is against ? Nobody. **This is adopted.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to **the proposition no. 3 of Mr Arthur Cramer « reincorporate the bib as valid surface at foil »**.

I give the floor to Mr Arthur Cramer.

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH)** : Projector please. Well this proposition was also studied by the Special Commission for foil, that you know well. We certainly know that fencing, and I believe that everybody will agree with the fact that fencing is a sport of combat by excellence. Foil is really spectacular. Especially foil executed by the great foil fencers of the past, with its convention and all its characteristics. Foil, according to the current Rules, is above all a thrusting weapon. Foil as a thrusting weapon was successful in the fifties with the introduction of the electrical judging equipment. At that time, we were facing some problems with judging. The status of break of current, that everybody calls the impact time was until two years ago fixed at 1 millisecond, it means that hit not with a thrust, but just hitting the fabric like this very quickly, with 1 millisecond was not a hit with a thrust. For that reason, we started to see foil fencing, which was a little bit different from the one of the time of great foil fencers that you know well. Foil was more similar to fishing. Actions in the past few years were actions without fencing phrases, very quick and similar to fishing or use of a hatchet. Either in the final of the Olympic Games that you saw or in the Central American Championships. It is everywhere like this. Why ? Because the apparatus allows it. So, I think that foil changed a little bit. But now, we have experimented new contact time, blocking time, that could be discussed later on. For technical reasons, the mask at foil received a bib, which was not there before. But we continue to see extraordinary actions. And all these things are transferred on the referees. If the referee penalises the offence, he is sometimes criticized and if he does not penalise he is also criticized. It started at the Olympic Games of Paris in 1900 until the Olympic Games of Athens. The referee is always at fault. This assertion is correct. The referee is the sole authority on the piste, he is the one to decide. A decision can change the whole life of a well-trained person, his trainers, his family, his federation. I know for sure, and you too, that at the time of the musketeers there was no doubt : hit-hit and dead-dead. Maybe in the future, with robots, we will be able to make conclusion without doubt, but for the time being, things are confused. And the confusion started at the time of the Olympic Games in 1900 where there was no bib. The neck, the collar was a valid surface up to 6 cm high. You look at around 10 bouts, no bib, and the hit was valid. If we talk again about the Rules of 1922, which are available as we prepared copies for you, it is clearly stated : the collar is a valid surface. You can look at the different masks here. The first mask, then the introduction of the bib. And foil got electrified and the hits are recorded by an electrical apparatus. A smart boy will naturally try to win. We must now look where we can hit ? Here ? This is a little bit difficult. Really. Where can we hit ? This is not easy. Now we have here the sword arm and the bib. And what ? I am not talking about hair, this is not important. If you look at the fencer in front, we could maybe hit him here ? Or maybe here ? No. We can hit down here ? No, this is almost impossible, there will be the white light, and this is not comfortable. You will see many times hits on the bib and the white lights will always be on, again and always. Fencers are sometimes forced to do fantastic things to be able to hit but they hit the bib because it is impossible to hit. So in order to come back to real foil, why not reincorporate the surface which was in the past the surface at foil, as valid surface at foil ? It would be something good, I am personally convinced. Look, where can we hit ? Everything is covered. It would rehabilitate foil, rehabilitate the fencing phrase and the valid surface that foil used to have. Furthermore, foil fencers are using the non-sword arm in front of the valid surface. So sword arm, non-sword arm, bib and mask, where can we hit ? In the back ? No, I don't think so. These images were sent by friends and they really illustrate the reality of my purpose. The poor referee must decide now. He will then be criticized. There is a hit on the non-valid surface, with a cover, there is a crocodile clip, which is not on the right side, there will be a foot-shot, which will result in a corps à corps which will hurt a lot. This is an illustration but you will watch the video later. So, did you see 3 or 4 offences at the same time ? Today, we have a new technology, which allows us to reincorporate the bib as a valid surface. And I think it will really decrease the number of non-valid hits. It will give foil fencer the opportunity to execute nice fencing phrases, to fence foil, real good foil. This is why we proposed this and we

can also present videos expressing the opinion of the commission later. Thank you very much for your attention.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Does anyone want to express himself on this proposition ? Nobody wants to speak about this proposition ? So we suggest you to pass to the vote. I have already asked if someone wanted to express himself on the proposition. Sorry I do not hear you, you are too far away.

**Krisztian Kulcsar (HUN)** : Christian Kuczar, Hungary. I think that these issues regarding changes of rules at foil are very important. I would like to propose a secret vote for all the proposals.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : On the current proposal ?

**Krisztian Kulcsar (HUN)** : On the proposals 3, 4 and 5.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : There is no. proposal 5, you mean 6, this one ? The 3, 4 and 6. Mr van Dugteren and then Mr Carl Borack.

**George van Dugteren (RSA)** : George van Dugteren from South Africa. I wish to address the bib a proposal. I believe in principle it is correct, the bib should be part of the target, but have we defined what is bib ? Because as I see it this self-protective element is right round and up the sides of the mask. So if we say the bib, then we are including target higher than the shoulders to the side of the mask. I am concerned medically and safety speaking, that if we now start increasing target up here, we are going to have a lot of attacks at the side of the neck and I believe this adds to the insecurity and danger of safety. So I think we must define and limit the height above which the bib is no longer target. In other words, if it is electrically conducting that must perhaps be a horizontal strip. Thank you.

**Carl Borack (USA)** : Good afternoon, I am Carl Borack, President of the Publicity and Promotion Commission. I have to correct something here, it says here that the Publicity and Promotion Commission is in favour of the arm. That is not correct. The commission was not in favour, we are in favour of a bib, we are not in favour of changing the arm. This proposition 3 is incorrect for my commission. Thank you.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : Cafiero, Italy. We want to emphasise what has already been pointed out by our friend from South Africa or France. The problem of safety, to encourage people to hit in the area of the neck is not a minor problem. And obviously we do not agree on this point. There is another reason against this increase of target, we would oblige all the federations and all the clubs to change the masks, and this would represent an enormous cost versus a little advantage. In any case I think we cannot just deal with one single point of the problem of foil but examine the whole together as a culture, as pointed it out before.

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH)** : We made a presentation but we did not enter into the details. This is good that you raised this question. First of all, the bib is certainly, and you saw it, a little bib and it could not be loose, but the hit on the neck was valid. Nowadays, we still have many hits on the bib below the neck and there is no incident. Why ? Because the material is much more stronger. This is the bib, that is the area of the body, which is covered by the bib, not the whole bib. If it is reincorporated to foil, we could have very large and strong bibs. It will be safe. Furthermore, we have to see if we have a problem with the valid surface, with the non-valid hits. We also have to pay attention to that. Maybe safety is the most important issue, my friend from Italy. And it will be much more safer with larger and stronger bibs, which will be valid. This is my opinion, I prefer

a larger bib. Of course, there is a cost. We must pay something to make the bib. But there will be another cost if we do not do it and you certainly know the price. Foil degenerated, everybody is saying that. What we want is going back to foil as it used to be in the past. And for that reason, and I reply to my friend George, you are right, the area is not above, this is the part of the bib covering the valid surface. Regarding the safety, I believe it will be better with this bib. And you also have to take into account what was requested by the television and the IOC. Do not forget this. This is the future of foil, good foil. We want to get back foil.

**Antoine Campiche (SUI)** : Antoine Campiche of the Swiss Fencing Federation. Just one or two little questions to make sure that we understand each other correctly. Excuse me if I am insisting, do we agree on the fact that we are going to vote item by item and not globally ? Furthermore, do we first vote on the principle before knowing how it will be implemented ? What is the date of application ? Then, at what level will the possible changes be implemented ? Immediately, even in "under eleven" regional competitions ? Do we first decide on the principle or do we decide at the same time on the level of application, and if the case arises during a period of test ?

**Ioan Pop** : I am wondering if the fact of having white lamps often on because of the bib being a non-valid surface, is not as much dangerous as a real target. Furthermore, I doubt that foil fencing masters will specifically teach attacks and parade-riposte to the bib. The bib and the whole mask at sabre and epee are valid surfaces but we do not teach it, we are not trying to reach a very little surface while we have the entire body at disposal. So, we are not trying to hit the bib in particular. Furthermore, I will add that with the effected modifications, and we saw the results at the Leipzig World Championships, we noticed that foil became splendid, took a lot of technical and tactical consistence and gained back its specific identity. However with the suppression of the possibility of hitting with the coups-lancés, it became a little bit more difficult to hit, especially when fencers take positions and try to defend themselves by things forbidden by the rules, but always subjects to discussion of the refereeing, which is with the head, the mask and the sword arm. So the increase of the valid surface can only have positive consequences. Thank you.

**Julius Kralik (SVK)** : Kralik, Slovak Federation. Concerning the safety, I have the same opinion than Mr Pop, being a trainer for more than 20 years, I can tell you that I will never have the idea to train my students to specifically try to find a place on the bib. However, talking about the interest of foil, I find important that the current status of apparatus which reversed the scale between the defence and the attacks, in favour of defence. We clearly saw it in numerous competitions, notably recently at the Leipzig World Championships and the extension of the valid surface will hold the scales even between attack and defence. This is the reason why I effectively think that the extension of the bib as a valid surface would be a good thing. Thirdly, regarding the technology, and maybe Mr Dos Santos could express himself on this, but I remember that already at the time I was member of the SEMI, this problem was already settled, not with a change of the mask, so it is not necessary to buy new masks, but just the addition of a pocket on the bib, which can be fixed properly. Manufacturers expressed themselves already 5 or 6 years ago, this is possible and can work properly, this is not a problem of technology. But here, I think it is not up to me but rather the SEMI, which is competent and could maybe say a few words on this point.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I would like to speak about safety as you spoke about safety. I want to draw your attention on two thoughts. First of all at epee, have you already thought of making the bib non-valid at epee, because we can hit the bib at epee, we should maybe make the bib non-valid in order not to hit at this place ? I do not think this is reasonable. The second thing is that if we make the bib valid, we can enlarge the



surface of the bib for a better protection of the fencer. We had in France a serious accident because of the bib, as we are currently forced to limit the surface of the bib because it is not valid. Now, we could increase this surface and have a better protection of the fencer. You know that we had an accident with Mr Omnes, whose blade entered between the bib and the collar. This is obviously because the bib was smaller. If we have a larger bib, it will allow a better protection for the fencer. I just tell you to think about it.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Mr Vergara. Mr Lisewski.

**Adam Lisewski (POL)** : Lisewski, Poland. Mr Cramer, I also saw many hits on the legs. I am asking you to change later also the rules to make the legs valid target. Because this is the same. There are many hits on the legs. Thank you.

**Omar Vergara (ARG)** : My name is Omar Vergara. I am President of the Fencing Federation of Argentina. I will speak in Spanish, I can repeat in French but I will speak in Spanish because I want to be understood very well. The Rules Commission indicates that these propositions 3, 4 and 6 must be treated together. This change of the bib means that our federations, not so strong, will have to change the masks. Concerning the change of the non-valid surface, our federations, which have not yet paid for the changes of the apparatuses of the year before, will have to change again these apparatuses. So, I wish to ask the author of this proposition whether a calculation was made regarding costs involved for each federation, for each equipment.

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH)** : Well, the help of the ad hoc commission at foil, which was settled to study the break of current, that is the impact time and the problem of non-valid hits, was aimed to propose a technical solution to improve foil. The cost of a bib should be asked to the SEMI. But only the bib needs to be changed, not the mask. We should also make sure that manufacturers do not ask for an absurd sum to change this, because the only thing to do is changing a chip in the apparatus, to take the chip and insert it in the software. One moment, I am giving a reply, I listened to you, so you listen to me please. So, if the manufacturer asks for another price, this is another thing, the technical solution that we propose is to change the bib. I let you watch a video concerning the different themes discussed for your analysis. Leipzig World Championships. Final, in individual, last minute of the last period. Only this Patrice. Final of the World Championships, women's foil, last minute of the last period. The score is 9-8. 2 minutes 30. A non-valid hit. I am not saying mask, I said non-valid hit, everybody is able to see, you also Adam, even if your glasses are not good. I am talking about non-valid hits. I thought that Poland proposed to make the mask a valid surface. This is the proposition of Poland. Valid surface. This is a problem for all. What are we going to do with this ? Yes, yes, leg, yes this is what I want you to see, this is it exactly. Again. 5. 6. The referee said non-valid, also. 7. 8. I interrupt to say something. If the bib would have been valid, he would maybe not have hit the leg. He could hit the upper part, he did not have to hit down. This is the reason why we have this. And this large number of non-valid hits is not good for women's foil. I think that everybody agrees, at least most of you. And I repeat, if the bib would be larger, the fencer would have probably tried to hit the upper part, not below.

**Claus Janka (GER)** : Janka, German Federation. I am thinking at what is left on our agenda. We are now discussing the incorporation of the bib as valid surface. But in general, how many times was the bib of a fencer hit during a match ? In my opinion, these last words of Arthur are out of topic because the discussion is the bib, not the valid surfaces in general. Thank you.

**Julius Kralik (SVK)** : I am sorry to intervene a second time but Mr Cramer, you did not show what I expected. We know this and this is typical at women's foil. Yes, I am sorry,

this is true. I personally expected you, as President of the Commission, that you show us the test undertaken with the valid bib, in order to see that there will not be so many white lights. To present a supposition with a valid bib is different. I am with you, but I really expected you to show us point by point. Point 3 is like this with the valid bib etc, etc. Thank you very much.

**Max Geuter (GER, MH)** : I just want to point out one thing on the video we just saw. You all know that this was the last match of women's foil. All the fencers were tired, especially the ones in the final. Nobody shows us all the matches, the good matches, which have few non-valid hits. So this is one point. The other point is that some years ago, we introduced the transparent mask and it was said that it will be the same price as the normal mask. It is now three times higher than a normal mask. I think that before taking a decision on the bib, the mask or anything else, we should know how much it costs and not find out afterwards that it is an immense amount for all the federations. We know that we have a lot of young federations which need the help of the FIE, and which get the help, but also for all the other federations, which already have this material. How are they going to change it and who is going to invest in this ? You know that money is everywhere decreasing more and more and we have to look at our budget. So I propose that this discussion about the bib, about the arm and non-valid hit, be held once we know the details. What generates cost should be discussed on a further Congress and not here today. Thank you.

**Applause.**

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH)** : Mr Kralik, about the video that you asked me, we are going to project this video that we made in Shanghai with this bib. I just want to tell you that we tried to find the best solution for foil. And this is clear that it is up to all of you to decide. Our duty is to show you things which were undertaken. But this is your decision. Look. Here sometimes only, it is possible, flat hits are switched on because of one millisecond. This is the reason why we proposed 1 cm. No, do not consider the position of the arm but just the mask, please. Here we fixed the blocking time at 180 milliseconds. The break time, the impact time at 14.65 milliseconds. Those are two devices, the old one and the new one. The referee will start refereeing with the old device. Attack, parade-riposte, remise. This is clear everybody knows it. The two devices are on. Slow-motion. Look, the fishing hit is not signalled on this new device.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that this is not enough studied, it needs a deeper preparation. We need replies to the details that you requested and I believe that these three propositions must be reviewed. We must be able to speak together without difficulties, and report this to 2007. **We will see this again at the next Congress in 2007**, with many tests, but real tests, not tests as presented here. I think that everybody must think, think it over and it will be the result of dialogues between all of you that we will have in 2007 and we will see the decision that we can take for the next Olympiad. This is it. Thank you.

**Applause.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We shall now have lunch break, preceded of the photo of the Congress. I have been requested to inform you that the lunch will take place downstairs. You have to go down, as for the restaurant, but this is in front of the pool. So, hostesses will guide you until there.

**Jochen Faerber** : The official photo of the Congress will be done before lunch. The meal will take place under the tent, which is on your left side, when going out, in the direction of the pool. We will take the photo just before entering, next to the pool. Okay.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We shall start again at 14h15.

## **LUNCH BREAK**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We continue with the additional propositions of Arthur Cramer, you have a motivation at the beginning of the page, on the first left half page, and down, you have a proposition which goes until the middle of the following page 5. This is a list of things not to be done, the Rules Commission prefer to indicate things to do. Let's say instead of having a proposition written in a negative form, it is written in a positive form, in order to rather indicate how the fencer should present himself on the piste, than how he should not present himself. Actually these texts were taken from the Publicity Code. The Executive Committee wants by the way to suppress these texts from the Publicity Code and incorporate them in the article t.45 of the Rules. The proposed texts would be applicable to the Individual and Team World Championships. You have a motivation at the beginning of the proposition, then a proposed text article 45 at the end. Page 4. These texts are not changes, they already exist in the Publicity Code. But Arthur Cramer wanted to incorporate them in the t.45 of the Rules, where these texts do not exist. The fencer must present himself on the piste with clothing with his name and nationality, as specified in the rules, on the back of the jacket. Then there is a list of competitions for which these rules are applicable. The Executive Committee indicated that he wished these rules be applicable to Individual and Team World Championships, in Team World Cups competitions. But if you look at the urgent decision of the Executive Committee which was sent by letter of information 12-05, the fencers presenting themselves on the piste without wearing the national clothing will be scratched from the competition and not allowed to fence. The current text indicates that in case of irregularities in the presentation, the fencer at fault will receive a red card. Then, the Executive Committee proposes that in Individual World Cup competitions, in case of irregularities in the presentation with clothing with name and nationality on the back, the fencer at fault will receive a red card but in Individual and Team World Championships, and in Team World Cups, the fencers cannot participate in the competition. They are scratched because of material non-conform. This is the proposition.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : What we want is that the fencers of a team have all the same clothing. This is a fact that in all team sports, whether it is football or any championship or any sport, when we belong to a national team, we wear the clothing of the national team. This is thus applicable to all the team events and also to the Individual World Championships as the individuals are selected by the Federation to which they belong. So this is up to the federations to give them all the same equipment.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Is someone against this proposition ? Nobody is against ? We are talking about the text of the Rules Commission. Yes.

*Non audible remark.*

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : No, this is not compulsory in the Individual World Cup but compulsory in the Team World Cup.

*Non audible remark.*

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Yes, this is what I just said, we keep the red card for the fencer at fault in the Individual World Cups. It was like this before.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : It was like this before, there is nothing new. However, we want everybody with the same clothing in Team World Cups as well as World Championships. That is all. I think this is the same in all the sports.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We keep the current rule for the Individual World Cups. That is a red card.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Is there any objection ?

**Steve Higginson (GBR)** : I would like to ask for a practical precision. Are we going to scratch juniors wearing clothing without national abbreviation or national colour in the rounds of elimination ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We are not talking about juniors now, we are just talking about seniors.

**Steve Higginson (GBR)** : If we are going to scratch people not wearing the logo or the national colours etc. etc. are we going to apply it strictly to junior competitions ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Listen, this is in the text, we do not modify the text. You have to wake up. The senior individual World Cup competitions, all the bouts of direct elimination, from the table of 64. This is clearly stated. Besides, as President of the Rules Commission, I supposed that you knew the text. Well, nobody is against ? **This is adopted.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : then the **proposition no. 2**. « **Fencers' clothing may be of different colours, apart from black and grey** ».

The Executive Committee revised this proposition yesterday. The Rules Commission was also in favour but the Executive Committee thinks that it would be better that fencer's clothing be of different colours, apart from black and not to add grey because grey is a not well-defined colour.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Grey is not defined, furthermore all our vests, all the plastrons are grey, they are not white in reality. This is therefore very difficult to define and in order to avoid any difficulty, we say that it cannot be black. This is not much, but it simplifies. Do you agree ? Nobody is against ? **So we agree.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The **next proposition** is a definition of the national clothing. «**the national clothing shall include the socks, the breeches, the jacket and the conductive jacket at foil and sabre** ».

The Rules Commission was in favour of this proposition but wanted to add the mask. However, the Executive Committee indicated yesterday that it was not possible to impose a same mask to all the fencers, so the national clothing does not include the mask. We remain with the proposition of Mr Arthur Cramer. Is anybody against ? The socks, the breeches, the jacket and the conductive jacket at foil and sabre. Nobody is against ? **This is approved.**

*Non audible remark.*

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : I think this is a mistranslation into the English, I don't have the English in front of me but from memory I think that I noticed the same problem. The letters of the national federation in the French have been translated into the logo in the English, which is a confusion with the national flag design on the trousers.

**Normann Jorgensen (DEN)** : Yes, so we agree that on the backside the fencer should have her or his name plus the three letters symbolising the nation.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : In French, this is name and nationality. So, this is the abbreviation, not the logo.

**Jose Eduardo Dos Santos (POR)** : Dos Santos Portugal. Please note that in the English translation, I think in the English version, it is not specified that the socks are also part of the national clothing. And the socks should be controlled by the referees on the piste. *Very brief remark non audible*. Of course not, you are not going to show me socks in the weapons control room. So in 5.9.1 it is clearly defined that all the fencers should have now the same socks. Okay. Thank you.

*Non audible remark.*

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : No, the socks do not have to be unique.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : If they are part of the clothing, they must be the same. At least on both legs !

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : They must be unique on both legs yes !

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : They should normally be the same for the entire team. This is now maybe a little bit difficult. But theoretically speaking, it should be like this. Listen, in all the other sports, members of a same team wear the same socks. So we hope that the SEMI will check everything. Listen, the socks are not a problem for me, but I believe that it is preferable for the public that members of a same team wear the same clothing while fencing in team. And obviously at World Championships as they are dressed by the Federation.

**Claus Janka (GER)** : Excuse me, I noticed that shoes were not included in the contracts of federation, it means that all members of a team can possibly have them of different colours. I imagine that in some cases, the shoes are not included in the contract of a federation, this is up to the fencer.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Claus, we are not talking about the shoes but the socks.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : So, socks are in principle part of the clothing, that is it. They must therefore be checked together with the clothing. Very well, next.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition** : « the national clothing shall be unique and must be identical for all the fencers representing a national Federation in the official FIE events ».

The Rules Commission was in favour as well as the Executive Committee, but the Executive Committee indicated, as well as the Rules Commission, that it was applicable to FIE team events. Furthermore, this text is already stated in the Publicity Code. So we modify by « team ». Do you agree ?

And the **next proposition** : « the national clothing shall be approved by the FIE Executive Committee at least 30 days before it is used for the first time in an official FIE competition ».

The Rules Commission was in favour but wanted to replace 30 days by 15 days however the Executive Committee does not agree because 15 days is very very short to approve and then announce and use, so the Executive Committee remains at 30 days.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Listen, in reality this is not the national clothing that will be verified. The Executive Committee will verify the logo worn on the national clothing. So, I believe that we must modify the text, we must state the logos worn on the national clothing must be verified 30 days before. This is only the logo.

*Non audible remark.*

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Listen, it is impossible for federations to send their national clothing to the FIE for verification. Not the clothing but the logos are verified.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : This is inevitably the logos on the clothing, not the entire clothing. No, it was not clear here. The national clothing is stated, it has to be modified by the logos on the national clothing must be approved by the Executive Committee at least 30 days ...

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : ... before, okay ? Do you agree ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Mr Dos Santos wishes to express himself.

**Jose Eduardo Dos Santos (POR)** : This involves the SEMI Commission. I am kindly asking for your cooperation because the countries do not apply the rules. We never have all the logos before the World Championships, many nations do not care at all. So I am kindly asking the federations, whose logos have not been already published on the FIE website, to send their designs to the FIE. And for that reason, I think that even 30 days is not enough because many nations do not respect this. I am asking for your cooperation in the future. Thank you.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Yes.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : I note that this matter is fascinating us but I must keep in mind the practical aspect. If we have a new sponsor, which gives us a new vest, we send it 30 days or 15 days before to the FIE. If the FIE does not have a meeting scheduled during this time, what do we do ? We do not go to the championship ? Or do we have to immediately ask for a meeting within this limited time and if it is not approved what do we do ? Reject the sponsor and change our clothing ? I think that having a uniform aspect is reasonable but go through approval within 30 days and have the Committee to meet just for this etc., I think that we are going to far. Let's be more realistic please.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : Excuse me, when you talk about sponsors, what we are talking about are the national designs, which are on for example the leg with the three colours, would that change ?

*Non audible remark.*

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Listen, we are talking about a national clothing, you are the one to decide on the logo so I believe that you can decide 30 days before. If you are not ready 30 days before, it surprises me for a national team.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : Yes but here you write that it must be approved, not just shown.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : But if you send it 30 days before, we approve it immediately, we are not moody concerning the logos. We just want to transmit these logos to the SEMI Commission to enable it verify them at the verification of clothing. It is obvious that it takes some time, we cannot change the logo daily. If you tell me that in Italy logos must be changed everyday, I agree but this is obviously not the case.

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH)** : Sorry, may I say a few words ? My friends, the situation is the following. While I was at the World Championships of Nîmes, I heard the IOC President, Jacques Rogge saying this : are there teams ? But they do not have the same uniform ? So I believe, and you also know it very well, that in all team competitions, the team members have the same clothing. So I propose to approve the designs. My proposition is maybe not properly drafted, this is to approve the designs of the logos of uniforms because Italy and Hungary have the same national colours, and they could by chance make the same designs, with the same colours. This is the reason why the FIE must give its approval. But a federation, which is well organised, can send its designs six months in advance, this is not necessary to wait until 30 days before, this is the absolute deadline to verify the designs. It is not necessary to send the clothing, you must send the logo drawn on paper or by e-mail. One of the reason is that at Olympic Games the fencers on the piste have completely different clothing while they are in a team competition. You are not listening ? So, my proposition is as follows : that designs of uniform, clothing and logos be sent to the FIE for approval and that everybody wear the same clothing in team competitions, this is very simple.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : Sending is different from approving.

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH)** : Sent to be approved, because you understand that if the uniform coincides with the one of another country, we must refuse it, your uniform must be different and you have to change it, okay.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We decided that we do not send uniforms to the FIE. We send the designs of the logos, that is all. And we want to receive the designs of the logos 30 days before in order to transmit them to the SEMI Commission. That is all, we do not ask you to show us your uniforms, there is no interest for the FIE. It will then be examined by the SEMI Commission on the site. Do you agree ? Does everybody agree ? **This is over.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : So **next proposition** : **designs and colours of national clothing. « the fencers must have the logos of the National Federation on the two thighs at least ».**

This is an urgent decision taken by the Executive Committee. The material may be of different colours. We saw it earlier apart from black. Must have the name of the fencer on the shoulder blade on the back of the jacket with the abbreviation of the national federation below. The letters shall be printed directly on the jacket or on a cloth carefully sewn on the jacket. The letter shall be in dark blue capital, between 8 cm and 10 cm high, and between 1 cm and 1,5 cm wide, according to the length of the name, in conformity with the figure below. The text is not modified compared to the one, which is already in the Publicity Code except that we added the width of the letters, that is 1 cm to 1,5 cm wide. This is the unique modification. We just specify the width of letters. Is anybody against ? So, **this is approved.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition 4.** **« The mask might have coloured designs subject to the approval of the FIE Executive Committee at least 30 days before it is used for the first time in an official FIE competition ».**

So, this is the same, we keep in fact 30 days and not 15 days as proposed by the Rules Commission. So, the coloured designs on the masks must be approved by the Rules Commission. This is not a modification but just an indication of time, the date at which the approval must be given.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : There is again a slight translation problem in the English where it says the mask might have coloured drawings. "Dessin" means that drawing does not imply necessary that you could have your national flag. "Dessin" is more general. Design on the mask need not be a picture, it can be a national flag or something. So just the English translation is a little misleading I don't think that there is a problem there.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Do you agree with the approval of these designs at least 30 days before they are used for the first time ? Nobody is against ? **This is approved.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Then, next **proposition no. 5**. This proposition goes actually with the proposition no. 12 of the Executive Committee and in particular with the urgent decision published in a letter of information. So, the urgent decision is the correct one. The urgent decision concerns the article m 25.4 and indicates : « **the use of breast/chest protectors (made of metal or some rigid material) is compulsory for women and optional for men. At foil, this breast/chest protector must be worn directly on the skin for the men and below the protective under-jacket for the women** ».

Do you agree with this text ? Yes.

*Non audible remark.*

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Ask the Medical Commission !

**George van Dugteren (RSA)** : I have no idea, this is not a medical proposal. I believe that there was a story that stiff protective breast plates under the lame jacket could cause blade to slide off and therefore it should be under the jacket but why it must be against the skin, I do not know, I think if you say it is under the jacket, this is sufficient, I do not have other reason.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Would you prefer to have the same thing for both the men and the women ? So, this is worn directly against the skin ? Over the T-Shirt ?

*Non audible remark.*

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : In that case, this is worn as you prefer, as mentioned by Rafaela, because you can have it against the skin, or you can have it over the T-Shirt. Sorry ?

*Non audible remark.*

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Yes, it must be worn simply under the jacket anyway. We could then say that the breast/chest protector must be worn under the jacket and not between the jacket and the plastron. That's all. I believe that we have to take back the text we find a little bit further, because there is a second text. At foil, the use of breast/chest protector is authorised for men and women if it is worn, so we wrote directly against the skin, that is under the under-jacket, if it is worn under the jacket and that is all. Under the protective jacket. Okay. We will then adopt this text as the Medical Commission is giving its approval. **Okay.**



**Nathalie Rodriguez : Next proposition.** A few words were added or taken away in the next proposition. The Executive Committee reviewed it yesterday and proposes the following text : instead of « **the order and discipline of competitions is the responsibility, in varying degrees and depending on the competitions, etc, etc** », **the Executive Committee proposes : the competent disciplinary authorities are the following : the referee, the Directoire Technique because the Executive Committee does not agree to take out the Directoire Technique, the Delegate(s) of the Refereeing Commission or the supervisor if there is no delegate.**

The other items remain the same, the IOC Executive Committee, the FIE Bureau, the FIE Executive Committee, the FIE Disciplinary Commission and instead of the Sports Arbitration Commission, this is the Court of Arbitration for Sports and the Sports Arbitration Tribunal. So the text is re-drafted, there is no modification. The proposition suppressed the Directoire Technique and the Executive Committee does not suppress it and just redrafted the phrase of introduction. This is then « the competent disciplinary authorities are the following » and then the list, including the Directoire Technique.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** So, we took the previous text with a new wording, that is all. Do you agree ? **Everybody agrees.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** So next page. **The Refereeing Commission Delegate or the Supervisor (if no Delegate) is the authority of appeal to the referee's decisions.**

Instead of Directoire Technique, there is « The Refereeing Commission Delegate or the Supervisor », who is the authority of appeal to the referee's decisions.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** We think that this is better to have in the first place the intervention of the Refereeing Delegate than the one of the Directoire Technique, who most of the time did not attend the bout. I believe that this is preferable. Do you agree ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** It concerns the article t.96.5. So instead of having the Directoire Technique as authority of appeal to the referee's decisions, we have the Delegate of the Refereeing Commission.

**George Kolombatovich (USA) :** George Kolombatovich. Question please. It says the word supervisor if there is no delegate. The referee's commission is in favour of this but what is the position of a supervisor ? I don't know, is this the observer ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** This is the observer.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Actually it is indicated in the current texts that the observer acts as supervisor. So, instead of indicating the observer who acts as supervisor, we say directly supervisor to avoid two terminologies. So, we are going to replace everywhere « observer » by « supervisor » in order to avoid two different titles for the same person and same function. Do you agree with this proposition ? Well, **it is adopted.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** So, next text, which starts with « **the FIE Disciplinary Commission is the juridical body etc, etc** ». **There is no modification until « all appeals against decisions taken by the Directoire Technique ».**

Here, the Executive Committee did not agree with the suppression of the Directoire Technique and wishes to keep it. So this is « and judges all appeals against decisions taken by the Directoire Technique, the Refereeing Commission Delegate or the Supervisor if no Delegate ». We do not accept the suppression of the Directoire

Technique, we keep the Directoire Technique, the Refereeing Commission Delegate or Supervisor if no Delegate.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : This refers to a more general problem. This is not the refereeing. This is for example for the discipline and order on the piste in general, so this is normal to keep the Directoire Technique.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The Directoire Technique, the delegate or supervisor.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Do you agree ? **This is agreed, Okay.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Next proposition** : if the Referee persists in his opinion, the Refereeing Commission Delegate or the Supervisor if no Delegate has authority to settle in appeal. If such an appeal (complaint) is deemed to be unjustified, the fencer shall receive the penalties settled in the articles etc, etc.

So here, the Directoire Technique was suppressed and replaced by the Refereeing Commission Delegate.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Because we are coming back to a refereeing problem, not a general problem.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : As this is a referee's decision. Do you agree ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : So there is no real modification in the **proposition 7**, words were just added to make the sentences more comprehensible. For example, you had in the current text « the materiality of hit », the added words are just « **to judge the materiality of hit** ».

In the next paragraph, the current text was « the Referee cannot award a hit unless it has been properly registered by the apparatus ». The proposition is to add « in no case may the Referee award a hit ». But the Executive Committee said that if we indicate exceptions in the rest of the sentence, we cannot write « in no case » at the beginning of the sentence, if we indicate exceptions at the end. So, we keep the sentence as it is. The unique modification is « to judge the materiality of hit ». These are precisions. Do you agree ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Actually, we suppressed in no case because there is no interest.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : No, it was not there.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** :. Then, we move on to **the propositions of the Executive Committee. Proposition no. 1. Team events. In the article o.44.3 suppress « If this order is altered, intentionally or unintentionally, the team making the alteration loses the match ».**

The motivation of the Executive Committee is that this is not logical to disqualify a team in case of an inversion of fencers because this is the duty of the referee to check that both fencers on the piste are really the ones he called for the bout. This is therefore the referee's responsibility. The Rules Commission was in favour of the text as follows « Should the order be changed, all hits after the change to be annulled and the match to be resumed in the correct order ». And the Refereeing Commission was in favour of this proposition. Mr Vergara.

**Omar Vergara (ARG)** : I do not agree to add responsibilities to the referees. At the time I started fencing, the referee had just to referee what was to be refereed : the priority of the action and define it. Nowadays the referee is required to accomplish many tasks, which are purely administrative : he must verify the table, etc.. In brief, a whole range of things, which did not exist before. If we continue to add tasks, it will become more important to know the administrative part than the judgement of the fencing phrases. Furthermore, I find absurd that the fencer at fault, who replaces another one during a team match, be released and that the responsible person becomes the referee, this is as if the criminal would be released and the judge penalised. So, I do not agree to transfer the responsibility on the referee. Thank you.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Mr Vergara, we did not say that we are going to hang the referee for this. We just said that nobody would be disqualified. We explain that the referee should have verified but the referee will not be penalised in case of modification of the order.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : The referee is not penalised but we request the referees to also verify the sheets of pools, to verify the order of the bouts. It seems more natural to us rather than disqualify a team for a fault which was maybe committed by inadvertence, and not necessarily made intentionally. I believe that this is unthinkable to have in a final of a World Championship an inversion of fencers, and say well this is over, the team is disqualified. This is unthinkable for the public, for the media, etc. The penalty is disproportioned compared to the offence. Especially that the offence is the offence of the referee, he is the one who must verify. He is not here just to look at the apparatus. He is also here to verify the fencers, see if they are properly dressed, that the socks are not falling, etc. And he must verify that both fencers present are really the expected fencers according to the sheet of pools. Or if he cannot verify himself, he can ask one of his assessor to verify it. It is necessary to stop penalising things, when we can avoid the penalty.

**Philippe Boisse (FRA)** : Philippe Boisse, French Fencing Federation. I agree with the fact that this is the fault of the referee, the referee has a part of responsibility but the fencer or the team has also a part of responsibility. We require the athletes to be professional athletes, we ask for a professional environment, in my opinion, there should be a penalty. That the penalty be not the expulsion of the team seems correct to me for the reasons given by Mister President. But to have at least a hit of penalty because the team made an offence, could be in my opinion thought of.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Yes, the one that should be penalised is the team captain. And this is very difficult to give a hit to the team captain. Well listen, if you want, we can keep the text as it is and see how it goes. Furthermore, there are not many faults like this. And we always have to presume the innocence of people. We presume they did not do it intentionally.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Mr Jorgensen.

**Normann Jorgensen (DEN)** : I am Jorgensen from Denmark. I am a referee, I have refereed several of the last World Championships and I do not want another administrative task for the referees. I do not agree. I think that this is the responsibility of the team to make sure that the right fencers are on the piste. If you take other sports, we often refer to soccer, if a wrong player is put on by the trainer, the team is punished. The game will not start all over again from the 20<sup>th</sup> minute when the wrong player was put on the team. Everybody agrees that in most other sports, this is the responsibility of the team to present the right persons. And I honestly think that this is the same for fencing

and I would rather not see this responsibility on the referee. We have enough administrative tasks and other stuffs to do.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I have always seen in team matches, for example at soccer, I have always seen the referees checking the players before entering on the field. I therefore believe that it can also be done at fencing. I am surprised to see that we are less advanced than soccer players. Personally I do not mind punishing all the time and always have penalties but the public does not understand anymore with all our penalties. If we always penalise, there are no more matches, there is nothing, this is not possible. There must be a minimum of responsibility for the referee, to have a sheet of pools and verify the names on it. He can let his assistant do it, as most of the time there are two assistants.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : We agree with the principle of no penalty but we should distinguish one situation from the other. The referee normally calls the fencers, if he makes a mistake this is not the fault of the team, however if he calls correctly and the team sends the wrong fencer on the piste, then it should be punished. But it depends, because the teams are not in possession of the sheets, they might have a copy, but in principle, the referee is the one to call and there is no additional work for him, as my friend is afraid of.

**Ioan Pop** : This is not quite exact. All the teams receive the sheets of pools. All for sure. You have three sheets of bouts in each championship and each team receives them. This is to ensure that everybody knows who must be on the piste. I fully agree with the explanations of Mister President, as all the duties of the referees are described in the Rules. So, the Rules need to be changed, if we want to change this. I prefer to leave it here, where we are. This is true that we had very few cases with this problem, and this is logical that the referee verifies, as well as his other duties, and the teams have all relevant information to comply with the rules on the pistes.

**George Kolombatovich (USA)** : George Kolombatovich, President of the Refereeing Commission. The fact is that there is a referee at every competition who must make sure that the correct fencers are present on the piste. The referee does this in the pool, the referee should be doing this also in the team competition, and I don't think this is an addition worth for the discussion. Frankly this is not such a big thing, it is a very simple thing to do and I think that we should approve this.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Listen, do you agree to adopt this text ? Does everybody agree ? No, so who is in favour ? Or rather, who is against, it will maybe go faster ? Who is against ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who is against ? 5. So **the proposition is approved**.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We move on to the **proposition no. 3 concerning the Junior/Cadet World Championships**. We go back to this proposition because many questions were raised earlier. « **The programme of the Junior World Championships comprises 6 individual events and 6 team events : the list of weapons – which begins with the junior individual events and ends with the team events. The programme of the Cadet World Championships comprises 6 individual events. The organisers must submit the programme of events to the FIE Executive Committee for its approval** ».

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Well, at the request of some of you, I would like to come back on what was voted this morning. This morning we said that we could separate the cadets from the juniors. Well, this is clear that we can have a Cadet World Championship and a

Junior World Championship, and we can also have a Cadet/Junior World Championship. It looks like that some people, and we spoke about that earlier, do not want to have the Cadet championships as a World Championship anymore, but as a zonal championship, a continental championship. Therefore I would like to have your opinion on this and if someone has something to say, I would like to hear him because it is time to say that maybe we went a little bit too fast this morning in saying that we separate both and keep two World Championships, one Cadet and one Junior and if there is a majority in favour of having just one zonal championship for the Cadets, be aware that I am not against. Does anyone wish to take the floor ?

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : I can only repeat what I said this morning that the World Championship is for Juniors only, and the Cadets have a continental championship in each area, in each zone. If we want this, we could keep this article and just add the word « if the world championship » etc. etc. or suppress it completely.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Well, are all the congress participants in favour of having just one Continental Championship for the Cadet, and therefore no more World Championship. Of course, what has already been decided regarding the World Championships of next year and the one of 2007 is maintained, it will be Junior/Cadet World Championships. It could only be implemented in 2008. I think that as no proposition was made on this and that it was not discussed in the Rules Commission, it seems difficult to impose this if someone here is against. If there is an unanimous vote, I think that we can do it. But I do not think we can do it if there is not an unanimous vote. Is someone against ? So, two are against, I think that we are going to study the problem again and we shall make a new proposition in this direction in 2007. Anyway, as it could not be implemented before 2008, it will not change a lot. But I believe that we must anyway respect our Statutes, respect the Congress and respect the Rules Commission, so I believe that this is preferable to postpone it. For 2007, we will make a proposition in such a way that the 2008 World Championship be a Junior Championship and that the Cadet be only a continental championships.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : So the proposition 3 is reported.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : Sorry, one question. Do we add, as seen in the proposed schedule for the Junior/Cadet World Championships of this year, for team competitions three days instead of two. Because it has to be eventually approved to be implemented.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Yes, I think this is necessary. If we have championships, we want these championships be well organised and comprehensible for the public. With three events on the same day, we do not see anything, there is no interest, it deprives interest of our championships. I believe that this is better to have two events per day and in this case we can have finals in the evening which are valid for the public, and possibly the television. Do you agree ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Therefore, the teams would be scheduled on three days, rather than on two days.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Okay ? **Everybody agrees.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Talking about the Junior/Cadet World Championships, the Korean Fencing Federation has just indicated that for reasons beyond its will, it cannot organise the World Championships at the scheduled dates, which were from 1 to 9 April but from 9 to 16 April. The meetings would be on 8 April.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Please note that this is arranging some persons because there is a meeting of the ANOC at the same period in the beginning of April and all those who are Secretary-Generals or even Presidents of Olympic Committee will be at the ANOC meeting. This is on 3 and 4 April. This is therefore maybe a good thing for all these persons, who will be busy with this important meeting of National Olympic Committees. This is it.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** :. We move on the proposition no. 4 concerning the entries and procedure of replacement for the entries on the FIE website. Sorry ?

*Non audible remark.*

**Nathalie Rodriguez** :. We will study the proposition. Ah, the date of Taebaek . Does Korea definitively confirm the date of Taebaek City from 9 to 16 ? Okay. Yes, Okay. The date is final.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** :. As we have just approved that team competitions will be held on three days instead of two, an additional day must be added. Therefore, from 9 to 17 and not to 16, if we add a day for the team events. 9 to 17 April 2006.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** :. **Proposition no. 4.** The proposition is « **for A Category, Grand Prix and team competitions and the World Championships, the entry of the name of the fencers and all possible replacements, and the entry of teams, must be made 15 days before the first event of the Championships or competitions at the latest. The entries of the fencers and teams are to be made via the FIE website** ».

The purpose is that entries to FIE competitions must be made via the FIE Internet website, not only the Grand Prix and World Championships, but all the competitions, 15 days before the event, for the World Championships of course. However, the Rules Commission re-drafted the following paragraph and added « After the cut-off date for entries indicated on the FIE website and before the Tuesday preceding the competition, we are talking here about the World Cups, not the World Championships, there can be no further additional entries nor the withdrawal of a name except in cases of properly authenticated injury or force majeure, however, a fencer may be replaced by another. To do this, the national federations should send to the FIE, in writing (fax or e-mail), a request for a fencer to be replaced. In cases of injury, the rules for World Championships will apply ».

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We wanted to unify the system of entries to competitions because this is true, it is misleading to have Grand Prix functioning in a way and A Categories in another way. Some federations were trapped with this, and we are not here to trap the federations. I therefore believe that this is better to do the same thing for all our championships.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We made this proposition because many problems arose the last season with federations which wanted to make entries for World Cup competitions via the website while they were supposed to make the entries by the organisers, and therefore they happened to have passed the deadline. Or on the contrary, they thought they had to enter by the organiser and did not enter on the FIE website and also happened to have passed the deadline. We thought that it would be much more easier to have the same procedure of entries for all the FIE competitions, either for a World Cup, a Grand Prix or a World Championship and that it has to be done via the Internet website instead of once by the organiser, another time by the FIE. Or sometimes even twice as they must enter by the organiser and by the FIE. This is therefore an harmonisation and standardisation of the procedure for the entries.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : We must object because 15 days for juniors and cadets are too much. We should make the time shorter because at national level, it is sometimes not easy to have the teams completed in such a short period of time.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : But the current deadline for Junior World Championships is of 8 days but 8 days, this is extremely short to organise a World Championship.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : We can fix the number but leave the names open up to 8 days.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Are you talking about Junior World Cups or Junior World Championships ?

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : I am talking about juniors and cadets.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Yes, but World Cups or World Championships ?

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : Junior World Championships and World Cups.

**Julius Kralik (SVK)** : I think we must make a clear distinction between both cases. For World Cups, we understand that there are no changes, some World Cups are next to each others and this is therefore logical to remain with the Tuesday preceding etc. However, for the World Championships, it was very, very difficult. I can tell you with 5 years of experience, in Trapani, as well as all the other championships, this is very difficult. For junior/cadet World Championships, these days are really the minimum to enable a good management. Thank you so much.

**Per Palmstrom (SWE)** : I have a question regarding the organising country. Will this rule also apply for the organising country to enter additional fencers. Because we have this rule whereby you can increase the pools to seven and so on, and I find difficult to fit in together with this rule. Maybe, we could make an exception for the organising country regarding this rule. We would find that very good. Thank you.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : That is the subject of a proposal, which we are coming to, which suggests that the quotas and the filling up of places for the host country will no longer be the case. So assuming that the next proposal relating to that is approved, the problem goes away. If the proposal relating to that is not approved, we probably have to come back to this.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Well, we therefore propose that entries be made on the Internet website for the World Championships 15 days before the first event of the championships. For the teams, the names of fencers of the team can be modified by the organiser until the day preceding the competition, midday. And finally, for the other events, we indicate that after the cut-off date indicated on the FIE Internet website, there can be no further additional entries nor the withdrawal of a name except in cases of properly authenticated injury or force majeure. However, before the Tuesday preceding the competition, a fencer may be replaced by another. Do you agree with this proposition ? Is someone against ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Nobody is against ? Okay, **approved**.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition no. 5**. « The Directoire Technique consists of persons being used to organise competitions ».

The Promotion Commission was in favour of the proposition. The Rules Commission slightly modified the text in indicating that the Directoire Technique is composed of people having competence to organise these competitions. The Executive Committee noted that the expression « having competence » was a little bit subjective and that it would prefer keep « being used to organise competitions ». Anybody against ? **This is approved.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** We keep the proposition of the Executive Committee « being used ».

Nathalie Rodriguez : **Proposition no. 6.** This is just an addition to the article o.62. Rather a suppression and an addition to the article o.62. We indicate « **For questions of rules, the delegate(s) to the refereeing are the only one competent to judge the value of a referee's decision. In the competitions in which there is no delegate to the refereeing, the supervisor becomes the one to take this competence. The supervisor is requested to settle all the disputes during A Category and Grand Prix competitions. This is up to the FIE Bureau or one of its representative to settle disputes which arise during World Championships** ».

Is someone against ? Nobody is against, **this is therefore approved.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez : Proposition no. 7. o.67 :** The Open World Championships are open to all FIE member federations. Entries are limited to four fencers per weapon per nation for the individual events and one team per weapon per nation for the team events. The number of qualified teams is limited to 16 teams, according to the FIE Official Ranking, plus 16 teams allocated between the different zones according to, and here, the Executive Committee came back on its initial proposition which was « Zonal Championship » and changed it by « between the different zones according to the official ranking » and not according to the Zonal Championship.

Therefore the end is « plus 16 teams allocated between the different zones according to the official ranking ». The Rules Commission agrees with the proposition and indicates for the 16 zonal teams as follows : 6 from Europe, 4 from America, 4 from Asia and 2 from Africa. It also indicates that as we limit the entries, we cannot keep the beginning of the sentence, which says « the World Championships are open to all federations affiliated to the FIE » as we indicate farther that we limit the entries. The text would only be « At the Open World Championships, entries are limited etc.. ». We just modify the first sentence.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** I think that the organiser can be automatically qualified, it seems normal to me. It will be qualified in its zone. The zonal qualification in its zone.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** The qualification will be made amongst its own zone, if it is not automatically in.

**Antoine Campiche (SUI) :** Antoine Campiche from the Swiss Fencing Federation. Could someone explain us why this rule was proposed ? Have we had so often more than 32 teams and does it really create problems to have an incomplete table of 64 ? This is already hard enough, and we will come back on this, there are only 8 teams at the Olympic Games. Why are we limiting like this and prevent small countries from participating in a team World Championship ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** There are two reasons. The first reason is a question of organisation. Over 32 teams, it becomes very difficult to run a championship in one day.



This is not easy. And secondly, we think that if teams are qualified, it will be easier for them to come to the World Championships. Because if we leave the World Championships open to anyone, it has for the National Olympic Committee for example, or the Ministry, a much lower value than if we say that we are qualified. If you are qualified, it gives you much more strength to come to the World Championships. It was done a little bit for that reason.

**Julius Kralik (SVK) :** May I point out a practical question. In the Junior and Senior World Championships of the last 5 years, only one weapon exceeded 32, it was men's epee. If we already define here the zonal allotment, what will happen if we have already 8 teams but that the composition is not this one ? You see, I can perfectly imagine that there are 7 teams interested in Europe and only 3 in America. How do we settle this problem ? This is really a practical question.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) :** I think that we said yesterday that we take the next one in the total world ranking.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** We take the next one, in principle, in the total world ranking. We automatically take the next one.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) :** There are therefore not the first, this is a turnover up to 16.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Yes, until we reach the 16 teams.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** The redaction of this article needs to be improved anyway. I fully agree. And this is therefore the proposition of the Rules Commission. Nathalie will contact the President to improve the redaction. And precise it.

**Normann Jorgensen (DEN) :** I am Normann Jorgensen from Denmark. I am sorry to have again to say that this is another proposal which goes against the small European nations. Two years ago, the majority abolished the matches for second places in the World Cups, thereby making the motivation for small nations to go to World Cups much harder. Now if we pass this proposal, we make it even harder to motivate our fencers to try to qualify for the World Championships individually, because it is going to be very hard for them to qualify for the teams. This morning we made it very hard for our fencers to qualify individually because we gave a great advantage to non-European fencers. I mean a whole range of proposals are not favourable to the small European nations. And this is just another example and I cannot vote for it for that reason.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** You could be right, but this is not sure. Because this is certain that some small countries do not go to the World Championships because they were not qualified. I know some small countries which do not receive credit from the Sports Ministry to go to the World Championships, because there is no qualification. And also big countries by the way, we have a problem concerning the qualification to the World Championships. I believe that if a team wins its qualification, it is a kind of obligation for its Ministry to send it to these Championships. Well, it can work for some small countries, but you know, you have a large number of teams at epee, in fact this is just for epee, this is not the case for the other weapons, the men's epee. But I believe that men's epee, if one day the World Championships take place outside Europe, you will not send as many teams. We will see this year already with the junior and cadet World Championships in Korea, how many teams will be sent by European federations to Korea for the World Championships. And I agree with you, we also try to be favourable to small countries, but I believe that we are, as in many other sports, the other sports have criteria of qualification. We cannot do everything without criteria of qualification. We

have to start one day to have criteria. And this is not bad for you neither. It will maybe force your Governments to send you to these World Championships.

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH) :** I will maybe speak in the name of my federation. Brazil is not a strong federation at fencing, but I believe that for us, I am actually certain, that this is a good thing. Why ? Because when we are at the Team World Championships and do not make good results, this is bad for us. At the same time, we did not go to the Zonal Championships. Now, if the points at the Zonal Championships are taken into account for the World Cup, it will be very good for my country, my Federation. We will then be able to go to the World Championships if we are qualified. And this will be a reason to ask for money to the Olympic Committee and the Government to send teams to Team World Cup competitions, in which we are always absent, because the Olympic Committee and Government always ask if there are criteria of qualification and when we say no, fencing is badly seen. On the other hand, we will always have the possibility to be represented by individual fencers, so our participation is guaranteed. So, I believe that this proposition will give us much more possibilities for a participation in the future. To me this is the best solution.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Well, do you agree to accept this proposition, which will not fundamentally change our World Championships ? Do you agree ? So we agree.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** With the addition that the organising country, if it has no team qualified, will be qualified by zone.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Yes, will be qualified by its zone.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Sorry ? yes, the application ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Some people disagree, we will write it down.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Who is against ? Please raise your hand to enable us count. 21 against. Who is in favour ? 37 in favour. **The proposition is adopted.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Date of application ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** The next season 2006-2007.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** **Proposition no. 8.** « The Technical delegate of the FIE, who represents the FIE in accordance with the Olympic Rules for Regional Games, will be chosen by the President of the FIE, after consultation of the Executive Committee, according to criteria of recognized technical abilities ».

The Rules Commission was in favour of this proposition. Is anyone against ? Criteria of recognized technical abilities. Is anyone against ? 2. **Then, the proposition is adopted.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** We have a coffee break of 10 minutes, 15 minutes maximum.

## **COFFEE-BREAK**

**Jochen Faerber :** Ladies and Gentlemen, please get back to your seat to go on with the Congress.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We start again, we continue our effort. To persevere in the effort, is to succeed.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We take back, please !

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Please, we start again ! Come on !

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We want to give a small precision concerning the proposition no. 7, the number of qualified teams. Obviously if there are less than 32 teams in the ranking, the proposition is not applied, it means that all the teams are qualified.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : If there is a total of less than 32 teams, everybody participates. There is no more ranking, this is over.

*Non audible remark.*

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : This is true, this is like that. There are many teams which did not participate in the World Cups and which participated in the World Championships but we come back to this system. While in the past, if we effectively followed our system, they could not participate. But they will be able to participate anyway as they are teams which have maybe fenced in the Zonal Championship, this is therefore less embarrassing. I think that if there are less than 32 teams, everybody is qualified. If there are over 32 teams, we follow the system, which was voted. Okay. And we move on to the next question.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Yes, the Federation of Qatar requested me to precise that all the participants of the Congress are invited to the dinner of tonight, for which you received an invitation. All the participants.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to **the proposition no. 9**. « **Competitors in the World Junior Championships, Individual and Team, must be less than 20 years of age on 15 April of the year in which the World Championship is held. Competitors in the World Cadet Championships must be less than 17 years of age on 15 April of the year in which the World Cadet Championship is held** ».

If this proposition is voted, it will be applicable for the season 2007-2008. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ? Mr Geuter.

**Max Geuter (GER, MH)** : This rule would have fit nicely, if we would have the next championships for instance from the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 9<sup>th</sup> of April. Now we changed from the 9<sup>th</sup> to the 17<sup>th</sup> of April, that could be the same maybe next year and the following years. So fencers, who can fence in the individual event on the 14<sup>th</sup> and they are on the team, because the teams are after the individuals, they cannot fence anymore in the team if they are born on that date. So why we do not leave it for all the weapons as it is January 1<sup>st</sup> as in the past ? So that it is clear for everybody and easy to apply. This is my proposition.

**Applause.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : This proposition was made because it was a little bit weird to have fencers in the cadet/junior World Championships, who were neither cadet, nor junior anymore at the time of the championships.

**Antoine Campiche (SUI)** : Campiche from the Swiss Federation. I wanted to make the same remark as Mr Geuter. There is an hazardous side as the championships will not

exactly take place on the 15<sup>th</sup> of April. One year it will be on the 1<sup>st</sup>, one year it will be on the 20<sup>th</sup>, there is no reason to make a rule on the 15<sup>th</sup> of April because of this change. While the date of 1<sup>st</sup> of January has the merit to be coherent. The other thing is that all the categories will change and from the month of September, October the cadet-junior born before the 30<sup>th</sup> of March or 15<sup>th</sup> of April, will not be motivated or able to fence in junior World Cups, respectively cadet, which start during that season. I therefore believe that we must keep the date of 1<sup>st</sup> of January.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Do you want to keep the date of 1<sup>st</sup> of January ? Do you agree ? Nobody is against ? Do we keep the date of 1<sup>st</sup> of January ? Yes. Thank you. This is very good.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** We therefore keep the current text. That is all. **The proposition is rejected.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Proposition no. 10. « For junior and senior individual A Category competitions, for each weapon, federations may enter a maximum of 12 fencers. The organising country may enter a maximum of 18 fencers ».

The Executive Committee at its meeting of yesterday specified that the organising country may enter 18 fencers including the number of fencers needed to make up the pools. This proposition also goes together with the Hungarian proposition, nr. 4. It enables the suppression of the quota because if we enter the athletes on the Internet website, it is extremely difficult, every year, entries are different at each weapon and in each country. It means that with the quotas we will have France 8 fencers plus 6 in a weapon, in another weapon it will be 8 fencers plus 2. It is rigorously impossible to make the entries like this. It also enables a standardisation of the number of fencers that each federation can enter. Currently, in a junior individual A category competition, we can enter 8 plus the quotas, and the organiser 24 plus the quotas. For the competitions outside Europe, this is currently unlimited for the organisers. So here, we have a number which is the same for each federation and which includes more or less the quotas of each federation as it is rare that each federation enter more than 12 fencers in a World Cup, even with the quotas. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ?

**Per Palmstrom (SWE) :** Hello, this is Per Palmstrom from Sweden. So, now we have come to the other proposition that is connected to the one I spoke about before, o.54. I first want to say that I like very much the system of being able to register the fencers on the Internet site. I had a great experience during the Bernadote competition that we had in Stockholm and I liked it very much. However, it is difficult to apply this system with the system in which you can make up the pools and I think we have to remember to give something to the organising countries, especially perhaps outside Europe when it comes to the amount of fencers they are allowed to put into the competition. I either propose that we vote in favour of the Rules Commission's suggestion but in the first section, we put a full stop after 20 fencers. So we cut out the rest, which says « plus the number needed to make up the pools ». And we also, in the third section, put the organising country may enter 20 fencers, full stop, and we cut out the rest.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Does it mean including the number of fencers required for the pools ? Is it a maximum ?

**Per Palmstrom (SWE) :** It is a maximum. It is a maximum, yes. No matter if it is 6 or 7 in the pools. It is a very easy system to apply, and I think the organising countries outside Europe will be happy because they have 30 fencers to put in and within Europe we have 20 fencers.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : But are you asking for 20 fencers for the organising committee for competitions outside Europe only, or for all the competitions ?

**Per Palmstrom (SWE)** : No, I am saying that we should take the Rules Commission's suggestion and put a full stop in the first section after 20 fencers. We should keep the second section, which says 30 fencers for outside Europe. And in the last section, last sentence, we should say the organising country might enter 20 fencers and put a full stop. It would be even clearer and easier than the first system and the other proposition that we had this afternoon.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : You mean that for junior and senior, you would like 12 for federations and 20 for the organisers maximum. For competitions outside Europe, you want 30 fencers maximum and for the last one, 8 fencers and 12 fencers.

**Per Palmstrom (SWE)** : No, 8 fencers and 20 fencers maximum.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : For the Grand Prix ?

**Per Palmstrom (SWE)** : Yes.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Yes, it is 8 plus 12. So it will be 20.

**Per Palmstrom (SWE)** : Yes. It will be 20. And you are right, I made a mistake in the second section it has to be 30 fencers and not the things regarding « plus the number needed to make up the pool ». It is just 30 fencers, full stop.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Maximum ?

**Per Palmstrom (SWE)** : Yes, maximum. Thank you.

**George Kolombatovich (USA)** : George Kolombatovich. I would like to point out that frankly in the Pan American zone, to limit the number of entries, will practically make it financially impossible to conduct a World Cup competition. We frequently have in the United States or in Canada, World Cups with numerous people from those countries and those entry fees make it possible to host the competitions. To change the current Rules would be a major financial problem for our zone.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : There are two propositions. The one of the Executive Committee proposes maximum 12 fencers entered by the federations, the organising country may enter 18 fencers maximum. At each time we say maximum, it includes the number of fencers needed to make up the pools. This is the proposition of the Executive Committee for all the competitions and in all the countries. The Rules Commission proposed for the junior and senior individual A categories competitions that federations may enter 12 fencers maximum and the organising country 20 fencers maximum, and it includes the number of fencers needed to make up the pools. This is therefore 12 and 20 for the organiser. For the competitions outside Europe, the organising country may enter 30 fencers maximum. And for the Grand Prix competitions, the federations may enter 8 fencers and the organiser 20 fencers maximum. So, we maybe move on to the vote, first on the proposition of the Executive Committee and then on the proposition that I just read. We are therefore going to vote first on the last proposition, which is not exactly the one of the Rules Commission, as this is always the maximum number of athletes. Who is in favour of the proposition of the Rules Commission amended as just indicated. Who is in favour ? I repeat : junior and senior individual competitions, the federations enter 12 fencers maximum. The organising country may enter 20 fencers maximum. For competitions outside Europe, the organiser 30 fencers maximum and for the Grand Prix

competitions, the federations maximum 8 fencers and the organising country 20 fencers maximum. Mr Janka.

**Claus Janka (GER)** : Sorry I have a question before the vote. We limited the number of participants in the Grand Prix in favour of the organisation. But I cannot understand why we cut it one more time. Step by step we limited the number of participants in the great events. And at the same time we reduce the motivation of many fencers, whose target is to participate in great events. I cannot see why we limit the number to 20, 90 or 8 whatever. What is the next step ? This is our question. Next year we limit one more time ? I regret.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : May I just correct a point made by Mr Janka. We are cutting out the quotas mainly as Nathalie explained for technical reasons. But in fact, otherwise for ordinary A grade competitions, we are increasing the participation, not diminishing it. At the moment the restriction is to 8 fencers for any country unless you have extra fencers from the quotas. The proposal is a compensation for removing the quotas, you can have up to 12 fencers, full stop. And at the moment it is true that you are reducing the host number from 24 to 20. But it is not all reduction. On the host country, there is a reduction of 4 but on the foreign countries, the result is probably about the same. Just to clarify. I am not saying good or bad. I am just clarifying.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : It is not a diminution, just a standardisation of the number of fencers that each federation may enter. Indeed, for A category competitions, the number was increased and not reduced. For the Grand Prix, we do not touch anything. Instead of saying 8 plus 12, we say 20, this is the same. And this is only for the competitions outside Europe that we passed, for the organiser, from an unlimited number to 30 fencers.

**George Kolombatovich (USA)** : Excuse me, I just would like to point out that what Peter Jacobs said is absolutely true for Europe but for the rest of the World, it is a different situation. Right now our Rules outside of Europe allow unlimited number of entries and to change that, again, is a major financial thing for most of our federations.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : I look at the results of competitions and the rankings and the competitions, for which I saw more than 30 fencers entered by a same federation, is very rare. We certainly pass from an unlimited number to a limited number, but nobody entered an unlimited number. 30 fencers from a same federation, it is not seen in all the results of competitions. Even in the competitions organised by big nations, even in the countries outside Europe. I doubt that in Australia you enter more than 30 fencers in your competition.

**Philippe Boisse (FRA)** : I take back what was said a little bit by our American friend, for having seen it several times in Montreal. For competitions outside Europe, I believe that this is important, as we are all looking for the universality of fencing, it is important, and I do not speak for Europe, I speak for the countries outside Europe, to maintain, outside Europe, the possibility not to have restriction for the persons of the continent, because they have less opportunities to come to competitions in Europe. I do not speak here for Europe, I am talking in favour of the countries from the African continent, American continent and Asian continent.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Technically, if we want to effect the entries on the Internet website, we need a number. It can be 10, 20, 200 or 3, a number is required. We cannot leave open the possibility of entries. You agree that we cannot leave the word unlimited, nobody is going to enter an unlimited number of fencers. We must therefore define a number. 30 is maybe not suitable, but we have to indicate a number.

**Gabriela Mayer (CAN)** : Gabriela Mayer for Canada. This is it Nathalie, exactly, the thing is that, for us, it is not sufficient to have 30 persons only for the organising country. When I organise a World Cup in Canada, I would like to have the Americans coming with 30 persons, I would like to have the Mexican coming with 30 persons, etc. Having a limit is therefore a little bit problematic. Already that the participation of European countries is almost inexistent, it creates above all financial difficulties for us. And as you just said, we do not have in the unlimited countries more than 30-35 persons.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Listen, for outside Europe, we just need to put a high number, that is all, as this is an administrative problem. Put 100 persons, 100 fencers. We cannot enter more than 100 fencers. I have never seen 100 fencers entered.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : But listen, this is not ridiculous as we have an unlimited number for the moment. Technically, I need a number. So let's define this number.

**Philippe Boisse (FRA)** : What I wanted to say, maybe I did not express myself clearly, is for example, in taking the example of the Montreal tournament, that they have the right to have 50 Canadians but also to have the right and that there is no restriction for the Americans, the Mexicans, the Brazilians, the Argentineans, the Puerto Ricans, for all the countries from the continent.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : In that case, there is no more the possibility of making the entries on a website if there is no restriction. Because this is technically impossible or it will cost us such a fortune that it is not worth to effect the entries on the website. Can you imagine that for each competition, which is going to take place outside Europe, that is the Asian/Oceanian zone, American and somewhere else, we will have to leave the participation open for the countries of a same zone, as currently done. And in that case, there is no standardisation. And especially technically, we do not effect the entries on the Internet website as the number is unlimited. This is as there would be no entry.

**Gabriela Mayer (CAN)** : May I give a number, which is not really real today, if it is absolutely necessary to have a number : 50. For each country of the zone : 50. It makes a figure.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : But would you agree for the competitions outside Europe, that the organising country be able to enter 50 fencers ? And also each country from the continent of the organiser ? This is very simple, we have two solutions : we have 50 for the organising country, this is one proposition. And 50 for the organising country and the countries from the same zone as the organiser, this is a second proposition. We can vote on the first proposition if you agree : outside Europe, instead of 30 fencers, we indicate 50 fencers. The second would be 50 for the organising country and the other countries from the zone of the organiser. We are therefore going to vote on the first : 50 for the competitions outside Europe for the organising country, who is in favour ? Is the proposition clear ? So, nobody is in favour of 50 for the organising country for the competitions outside Europe. Anybody. Anybody is in favour. I asked in favour, I did not ask against. I said who is in favour of the first proposition, 50 for the organising country for the competitions outside Europe.

**Rafaela Gonzalez Ferrer (CUB, MH)** : Rafaela Gonzalez from Cuba. I think that before taking such a decision, studied so few, as this is the case of propositions, it is preferable to stay where we are and make an analysis for the next Congress. I believe that it is not possible to vote for 50 participants, neither for the organising country nor the participating countries. You just need to organise competitions to realise that this is impossible. I think that we are not ready now to take a decision of that kind. We stay

where we are and we make an analysis to see the best proposition to solve this problem, but not in these conditions.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Frankly, I do not see at all what needs to be prepared for this proposition. We take a current text, in which there are numbers. And we have a current text, which says that for junior and senior competitions, 8 fencers may be entered by the federations plus the quotas, which are different depending on the weapon and the countries. That for competitions outside Europe, for the moment, there is an unlimited number of fencers to be entered for the countries of the same zone and for the Grand Prix, we also have figures. We simply propose to standardise and indicate that instead of having 8 fencers, plus the quotas, there will be 12 for everybody. This is an increase not a diminution. For the Grand Prix, we do not touch anything, except that instead of saying 8 plus 12 for the organiser, we say directly 20 for the organiser. The unique thing that we indicate is that for the competitions outside Europe, instead of having an unlimited number, we propose that the organising country may enter 30 fencers. You said that it was not sufficient, we therefore proposed 50 fencers.

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH)** : Sorry. Rafaela, I fully agree with you. I would like to draw the attention of all my friends, who are here, that the Statutes indicate that no new proposition can be presented at the Congress. We must vote on the propositions which were already presented and studied. This is clear and neat in the Statutes. It means that we have to vote on the propositions as presented. We can reject or approve, but we cannot present here new propositions. These are the Statutes.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : A while ago I said concerning the cadet that in order to respect our Rules and Statutes, I was not going to make a new proposition, unless everybody would agree. I want the same thing now. If you want to make a new proposition Okay. But everybody must agree. There should not be even one person against. Because we cannot make proposition at the Congress. We do not make anymore propositions at the Congress because they are in that case not studied by the Rules Commission, and this is abnormal. Those are propositions which were not studied. So listen, I propose you something, you vote on the proposition of the Executive Committee, you reject it and we will make a proposition for 2007. And we leave it here now. We will not use Internet, we shall continue to do odd jobs as we made until now.

**Julius Kralik (SVK)** : Is a modification not possible ? Because Mr Kolombatovich brought a modification. Also Gabriela, this is a modification for outside Europe.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : But this is what we just proposed. We read the proposition of the Rules with a modification as it was said, that for countries outside Europe, there was a need for a higher participation. Mr Geuter and then Mr Groupierre.

**Max Geuter (GER, MH)** : Excuse me that I am here again but you, the Congress, have elected the members of the Rules Commission. And you thought that those persons were competent to make propositions for the Congress. They made propositions and now we are trying to change them completely. So why can we not follow the propositions made to the Congress, by the Commission that, we have, you have elected ?

**Applause.**

**Victor Sergio Groupierre (ARG)** : I believe that we are doing an analysis, which is not real. We based ourselves on a proposition which is not logical, we put figures, which are not real. And I am wondering in which World Cup outside Europe can an organising country bring 50 fencers, and who can say that a participating country will bring 50 fencers ? This is not real. I believe that a number of 30 fencers is adequate for the



organising country and then we have to adapt to the quota, because this is not true that there are so many participants. We have been organising World Cups for more than 15 years and a country has never brought more than 10 fencers.

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Well listen, I think that we have to stop the discussions. Anyway, we cannot make again a proposition during the Congress. We therefore vote. The Executive Committee approved the proposition of the Rules Commission and we vote on the proposition of the Rules Commission, as it is. If you do not agree, this is no and we shall see this later. We do not make new proposition. So we are voting now.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** So, who is in favour of the proposition as exactly drafted by the Rules Commission ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** 51. **The proposition is therefore adopted**, the proposition of the Rules, as currently drafted, is approved.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** **Proposition no. 11. Article o.90. Suppression of the World Cup ranking. The winner of the World Cup is the first ranked in the official ranking of the FIE.**

Actually, you know that we have two rankings, the FIE official ranking and the World Cup ranking, which is actually the official ranking without the World Championships. As nobody understands exactly the need of this ranking and that besides we noted a big confusion of the medias on the two rankings, we therefore propose to suppress this ranking and keep one FIE official ranking.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Especially the journalists do not understand anything. We must admit that we must be fencer to be able to understand this difference.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Well, do you agree to adopt this proposition to have only one ranking, which is the FIE ranking ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** The FIE official ranking. Is anybody against ? Nobody is against ?

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA) :** We think that eliminating the title of champion of the World Cup would take off a lot of appeal to these competitions and those are very important for the promotion of fencing in each country. So, if it is just a technical question of having two rankings, I think that the penalty for the World Cup is too heavy for that. We are against this elimination.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Sir, we are not eliminating the winner, we say that instead of having a winner for the World Cup ranking, we shall have a winner for the FIE official ranking. There will therefore always be a winner, but he will not be the winner of the World Cup ranking, he will be the winner of the FIE official ranking.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Which includes all the World Cup competitions plus the World Championships. This is the unique difference between the World Cup ranking and the FIE ranking. And I think that in all sports, there is only one ranking, not two rankings. The World Cup ranking has no interest. We must have only one ranking, I believe that this is the FIE ranking, which comprises the World Championships. That is it, do you agree ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** At World Championships, there will always be an award of medals for the winner of the FIE official ranking. This is a simple technical question.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Does everybody agree ? No, who does not agree ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who is against ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : 2. Very good. Anyway, I fully understand your disagreement as this proposition of World Cup ranking, was an Italian proposition about ten years ago.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **The proposition is therefore accepted.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Article o.91**. As you saw it a while ago, the Zonal Championships became official. **We therefore propose that the FIE official ranking takes into account the best six results of an athlete, the results of the World Championship or Olympic Games and of the Zonal or Continental Championship, depending on how it will be called.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I think it goes without saying as we say that it is similar to a Grand Prix, it will therefore automatically be included.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Then, we indicated farther below that the zonal championships will be multiplied by a factor of two.

**Philippe Boisse (FRA)** : Just one question. Are the World Championships compulsory in the world ranking.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : 6 + 1.

**Philippe Boisse (FRA)** : Mister President just said « as a Grand Prix ». Is the Continental Championship automatically taken into account or is it part of the best results as the Grand Prix or World Cups ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : No, this is 6, plus the Zonal Championship, plus the World Championship. We will therefore take into account a maximum of eight results. 6 + 1 + 1.

**Philippe Boisse (FRA)** : Is it 6 + 1 + 1, could the proposition not be 7 including the Continental Championships, plus the World Championships ? This is 6 +1+1.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : This is 6 + 1 + 1.

**Philippe Boisse (FRA)** : Thanks for the precision.

**Abd El Moniem El Houssieny (EGY)** : It is not clear, is this going to be for juniors and seniors or only for seniors ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : This is for both, the juniors and the seniors. As there are junior zonal championships and senior zonal championships. We therefore adapt this to the junior ranking and the senior ranking. We will therefore take into account the junior and senior Zonal Championships.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : The paragraph referring to the juniors is the next paragraph we are going to come to.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Here we are, in the next paragraph we say that the official junior ranking of the FIE will take into account the best six results of an athlete with a limit of no

more than three from any one continent and the Zonal Championship, if organised. Plus of course, the World Championships.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Mr Jorgensen ?

**Normann Jorgensen (DEN)** : I want to repeat my arguments that this is going to give a very screwed world-ranking list because the Zonal Championships do not have the same strength. And if all the Zonal Championships are given World Cup points at the level of Grand Prix, we will have fencers with 50 or 60 World Cup points, who will then be directly in the top 16 of certain A grade, without being able to win many matches in these competitions. Again it is a rule that hits the small European nations very hard. And I urge that since we have already decided to enter this, I urge that the last paragraph not be adopted so that we do not multiply by two, but we multiply by a lower factor than two.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I believe that we have to look at the whole. We must not look at Europe only, we must think at fencing in general. This is certain that the current Junior World Cup is not a World Cup, this is practically a European Cup. This is true, it is called World Cup but how many cups are taken place outside Europe ? Very few, very few. And how many European juniors are going to participate in the Junior World Cups outside Europe ? Also very few. This is therefore for that reason that we thought at limiting to three, because otherwise fencers will only fence in Europe, they will not fence outside Europe. What we are also trying to do is to mix everybody, that everybody takes advantage of each other, that the experience of Europeans be also worth for the countries outside Europe. If we finally say that the World Cup is completely organised in Europe and we choose only European Championships, that are taken place on the European continent, there is no more interest. What we would like and it begins to be made, it was very long, but we begin to have Junior World Cup competitions outside Europe and we would like to develop them. But this is a wish, this is honestly not easy. But you know that it was not easy at the beginning even for the seniors, to have Europeans going to Senior World Cups outside Europe. On this point, we are at the beginning. You find maybe that three on the same continent is not sufficient but if we indicate four, it leaves almost no possibility for the non-European to qualify and have some opportunities of ranking. This is actually our problem. We must of course take into account the wishes of the Europeans, this is absolutely normal but this is a continent, which has a good fencing development, which is very strong and we must also take into account the other continents, which are less strong and which would like to be possibly incorporated in the world ranking.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : I just wanted to point out that the current text concerning the juniors indicates that we take into account the best six results for the juniors, with a limit of no more than five from any one continent. This is really a little bit exaggerated.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : Excuse me, before going to the juniors, we should finish the previous item and I see that when we propose only two against a reduction of the value of the World Cup, what was said by our Danish friend, is clearly a motivation for this. If we put a lot of points with a high coefficient for Continental Championships, we have only one classification including the Zonal Championships and the World Cups, and we will have a distortion of the classification in any cases, and this should at least be corrected with a minor coefficient, I think this is a quite reasonable proposal. As far as the junior World Cup is concerned, I think that this limitation is going to be too severe now. We should compromise on that. If now, we must either accept or reject the proposal without amendments, we should restart all over from this morning because we amended a lot of things in a way that is probably not officially correct.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I think when you say « not officially correct », this is simply that they do not suit you. This is not the same, isn't it ? Well.

**Krisztian Kulcsar (HUN)** : I just would like to say that we are hundred per cent against this proposal because, in general, making a good result in any of the Continental Championships has nothing to do with a world ranking. So, this is what I wanted to add.

**Julius Kralik (SVK)** : I suggest that we go in the direction brought up by Normann. Really, we made a great progress in accepting the Zonal Championships, I believe this is a very good thing. But I think that to give already at the same time a factor of two, which was by the way not in the initial proposition, and if we follow what you just said before, either we accept as it is or we reject, I therefore say that this compromise is not acceptable. Therefore the Zonal Championships are approved because the Congress unanimously approved them, but the factor remains one and not two, because this has never been proposed before. Because we are really going to devalue the World Cups.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The factor of two has always been proposed. The proposition exists. Yes, it does.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : If you want a diminution of the factor for the Zonal Championship, I personally do not see any inconvenient. I think that it will be less attractive for the fencers, that is all. I think that this is the unique problem. We now see in the Zonal Championships and particularly in Europe, that the best fencers do not fence most of the time. It will continue, we will continue to have people not coming. But if you wish to have a factor of one, I also agree with you. Personally, I will ask for a vote on this, between one and two, and that is it. We can vote.

**Carl Borack (USA)** : Our Danish friend constantly talks about the small European nations. I would like to mention that the Asian nations, Pan-American nations and African nations have a far greater economic burden of travelling with time change. You can go within an hour or two hours anywhere, in any World Cups in Europe while the South American nations and Asian nations have to fly on a 9 to 11 hours time change. And I think, Normann, that what you just did is pretty rude, you are only speaking for the small European nations. We have a lot of nations here, and Europe has a far greater number of European World Cups than Asia or Pan America or Africa. I think that everyone must think over the fact that we are trying to get a globalisation. But globalisation does not mean that you have to fly here, fly to Europe or fly all around the world, this is an economical hardship and this is a physical hardship, with time change, hotels and transportation.

**Jose Eduardo Dos Santos (POR)** : Dear friends, Portugal made this proposition to include the Zonal Championship in the official ranking of the FIE and we said with a coefficient of one or two according to the study of the Executive Committee and the decision of the Congress, because we anticipated this discussion. This is indeed what was just said by Mr. Roch. Thank you.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Listen, I think it is necessary to take things one after the other. We speak a little about everything. I would like to first have a vote on the first item : the official ranking of the FIE will take into account the best six results and the continental championship. Do you agree ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The best six results, the World Championships and the Continental Championship. Yes for the seniors.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We shall see later for the coefficient.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who is in favour ? So 61 are in favour. **This is therefore voted.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Secondly, what coefficient do we give to this championship ? Those who are for the coefficient of two, raise the hand. Coefficient of two.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who is for **the coefficient of two for these Zonal Championships ? 46 in favour.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : The last item is remaining. Well, the Rules Commission proposed not to take into account the best six but the best four and in that case with a limit of no more than two from any one continent. The Executive Committee proposed to take into account the best six with a limit of no more than three from any one continent...

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : ... plus the Continental Championship if organised. Plus the World Championships, plus the Continental Championship. We therefore have on one side the Executive Committee, which proposes the best six results, among them three on the same continent ...

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : ... we propose six, plus two, it makes practically eight all together. Eight championships ...

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : ... yes but this was already voted. This is therefore six with three on the same continent and the Rules proposes four with two on the same continent. We are talking about the official junior ranking. So, Executive Committee : six competitions, three on the same continent. Rules : four competitions, two on the same continent. We are going to vote on the Executive Committee's proposal.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Here we are, who agrees ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who agrees with the proposition of the Executive Committee that the official junior ranking takes into account the best six results with a limit of no more than three on the same continent ? Who is for ? 52 in favour. 52. **So, the proposition which is voted is the one of the Executive Committee and the official junior ranking will take into account the best six results of a fencer with a limit of no more than three from any one continent, plus the World Championships, plus the Continental Championship.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : The breast/chest protector is settled.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We already saw it with the urgent decisions a while ago. **The proposition 13** is the same proposition as the one we have just seen right now. This is the same as the proposition 1 of the Executive Committee, which was voted a while ago. **Thus, this one is already dealt with.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **The proposition 14.** The purpose is to suppress in the article t.87 « Immediately after the end of a pool, the fencers must sign the pool score sheet, under the responsibility of the Referee who must check the accuracy of the results on this score sheet. Before the score sheet is returned to the Directoire Technique, the Referee must indicate in writing if a fencer refuses to sign it. No subsequent appeal relating to the results will be allowed. » and to add at the end of the paragraph « The Referee meets with both fencers, at the end of a bout, to announce clearly the score, which will be transmitted to the Directoire Technique. He must clearly say : « Mister X won against Mister Y with the following score .... »

Thus the purpose is to cancel the signature of the pool score sheet by the fencers.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I think this is true, referees must always run after the fencers to get their signatures, this is not really convenient. We lose a lot of time with that. And it is useless as mistakes still remain, and in case of mistakes we come back to ask the fencers, the referees, etc. Therefore I think it does not help much, it rather complicates and slows down our competitions. Who is against ? Nobody is against, thus **this is adopted**. Yes, **immediate application** of course.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition no. 15** concerning the Directoire Technique. Taking into account the decisions taken previously, we had to add that **the Directoire Technique must also ensure the maintenance of order and discipline during the competition**.

Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ? No. So who is against ? Nobody, **it is therefore adopted**.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Then the **proposition no. 16** is just a small technical modification in the Rules **as we deleted in the t.86 the intentional or unintentional modification of the order of the match, it is necessary to cancel this reference to t.86 in the article t.120, which is « the offences and penalties »**.

This is a simple technical adaptation following the decisions taken just now. Nobody is against ? **This is voted**.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Proposition no. 17**. **« A fencer or a team receiving a black card is excluded from the event, suspended for the rest of the tournament and for the next FIE official tournament at the concerned weapon. They will also be sanctioned by the loss of 50 points in the FIE official ranking »**.

This proposition was reviewed yesterday by the Executive Committee and cancelled in favour of the proposition of the Rules Commission. The Rules Commission proposed penalties for the black card but indicated that currently the non-presentation on the piste 10 minutes before the match was penalised with a black card and that this penalty would be a little too severe. It was decided not to inflict a black card anymore in case of non-presentation on the piste but to simply exclude the fencer from the tournament and not to inflict him a black card, the fencer is just excluded. Excluded from the event, sorry, not from the tournament. There are therefore no black card for the non-presentation on the piste. The purpose of this proposition was not to inflict black cards systematically and permanently. The purpose of this proposition is to have a penalty, which is severe enough to act as a deterrent, that is so that fencers be less tempted to commit offences, which would result in a black card and at the same time to make that the application of the black card be not totally impossible. Thus the penalty is dissuasive, we would like to apply it the least possible. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ? Mr Kolombatovich.

**George Kolombatovich (USA)** : Just one point. The black card is currently given for the fencer that has not shown up on time.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : That is what I just said. The Rules Commission decided that if a fencer does not come on time, he will no longer receive a black card, he will just be excluded from the tournament.

**George Kolombatovich (USA)** : What I am asking is by accepting this proposal, then we are accepting this change in that rule also ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Yes, of course.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : I think we should be more precise about the loss of these 50 points, when the ...

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : It was cancelled by the Executive Committee.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : Not for the delays, for the other cases as indicated in the beginning of the modification, whether this just applies to the fencer or to each fencer.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Sir, the proposition was withdrawn by the Executive Committee. I started by saying this. The 50 points have been withdrawn. We are talking about the Rules Commission proposition.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : Sorry, I understood just for the delays.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : No, we are now speaking exclusively about the text proposed by the Rules Commission, not at all about the text of the Executive Committee, which was withdrawn. The 50 points are not in question anymore, but only the proposition of the Rules Commission, which indicates that the non-presentation on the piste does not result any more in a black card but just in the exclusion from the event.

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH)** : One question, is it the non-presentation 10 minutes before or the non-presentation in the pool with one, two or three minutes ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The non-presentation on time. The non-presentation on time does not result anymore in a black card.

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH)** : Thank you.

**Alexander Heeren (NED)** : I have a little question. The rule does not address the Olympic Games. Is it not applicable for the Olympic Games in that case ? When you receive a black card, you are punished for the tournaments and for the World Championships but the Olympic Games are not mentioned. For example in 2008 ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Actually the proposition does not deal with the Olympic Games. This was not, I think, even considered.

**Alexander Heeren (NED)** : So I assume that if you receive a black card on the 30<sup>th</sup> of June, you can go to the Olympic Games ?

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : Do you mean that the two months could include the Olympic Games, is that what you are saying ? Or do you mean that this penalty is applicable at the Olympic Games ?

**Alexander Heeren (NED)** : Well, it is more a question, because you say that it is applicable at the World Championships, which are normally later than the Olympic Games. But the Olympic Games are not dealt with in the Rules, so I was thinking is there something else ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : But, you can receive a black card in the Olympic Games.

**Alexander Heeren (NED)** : Yes, but I mean, before ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : It could happen at the Olympic Games. In 2008, this will not be including the World Championships but including the Olympic Games. Yes.

**Alexander Heeren (NED)** : So, it will be changed at the Congress in 2007 to make it applicable for the Olympic Games ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : I do not understand what you mean ?

**Alexander Heeren (NED)** : The current Rules do not deal with the Olympic Games.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : If a fencer receives a black card and is suspended from all the competitions for a period of two months, it can include the World Championships or the Olympic Games. We should say here the next World Championships or Olympic Games, the year of the Olympic Games.

**Alexander Heeren (NED)** : Okay.

**Philippe Boisse (FRA)** : Just a little question. The opinion of the Legal Commission because you are going to have two different penalties for the same offence. If the World Championships take place in October and you commit the offence on the 15<sup>th</sup> of May, you are suspended from the 15<sup>th</sup> of May to the 15<sup>th</sup> of October, that is June, July, August, September, October, five months. If you commit the offence in November, you are suspended November, December, two months. I would like to have the opinion of the Legal Commission as there will be a same offence and two possible penalties. Does it stand in front of the CAS, I do not know, I am asking the question.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We asked the question to the Refereeing Commission and the Rules Commission.

**Helen Smith (AUS)** : The intention of this change, is that, if you are given a black card in May, it is possible that if your suspension was only for two months then you would not be suspended from any competitions, there would be no punishment. So we wrote it this way so that the suspension would include the following World Championships or Olympic Games, which we forgot to add, so that the punishment is in fact a real punishment, not an empty punishment. Okay.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : It is in fact technically not necessary to add the Olympic Games, because in our Rules it says the fencing events at the Olympic Games constitute the World Championships of the Olympic year. Therefore the Olympic Games are a World Championship.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : The only problem which arises is that maybe the 1<sup>st</sup> of May is a little too early. We should say : if the suspension intervenes from the 1<sup>st</sup> of June, it would be more rational, if you want. Because, this is true, 1<sup>st</sup> of May, if he is suspended for two months, it makes May, June, then theoretically, he should be able to start again for the next World Championships. This is true, there is maybe here a little problem and I would suggest to indicate from the 1<sup>st</sup> of June rather than 1<sup>st</sup> of May. Because if he is suspended on the 1<sup>st</sup> of May, he is really suspended for two months as our competitions end on the 30<sup>th</sup> of June. It is maybe a little too rigorous. What happens, we say that the fencer is suspended two months during the active season, the active season being from 1<sup>st</sup> of January to 30<sup>th</sup> of June for our championships, plus the World Championship, it is true. If he is suspended two months during the active season and he was able to accomplish his punishment before the World Championships, he is not suspended for the World Championships. What we wanted is that if there was a suspension for example from the 1<sup>st</sup> of June, that he is suspended during 30 days, and in addition for



the World Championships. That is to make a distinction between the active season during which he can totally accomplish his punishment and the other one, during which he cannot accomplish his punishment. Because really, it has no importance to him to be suspended, if he is suspended for example on the 30<sup>th</sup> of June because the championships are over. If he is suspended on the 30<sup>th</sup> of June, he makes July-August, this is not a suspension and he can quietly participate in the World Championships. It means that there is no punishment. And this is the reason why we indicated a starting date of 1<sup>st</sup> of May but I believe that this is a little too severe, I think we must say 1<sup>st</sup> of June. If he is suspended from the 1<sup>st</sup> of June, he is suspended including the World Championships.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : I remind that the purpose of the proposition is not to punish the fencers but to make the punishment so dissuasive that offences be not committed anymore. That the fencer be afraid to receive a black card, because the black card will represent a real punishment, and not just the exclusion from the tournament without further consequence.

**Frédéric Pietruszka (FRA)** : What we just wanted to say was not a question of value of the punishment, it was just a legal aspect, that is if the drafted text as it is, would stand in front of a Court ? I do not think so because the effective penalty compared to before the 1<sup>st</sup> of May, if we include the World Championship, will not be of two months but four months. What we are therefore contesting is the draft of the text itself. This is not the value of the punishment.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We can say that he will be suspended during two months of the active season. That is the end of the season, plus the beginning of the next season.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : So, two months of the active season. We do not want to prevent him from going to the World Championships.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We do not try to prevent him from participating in the World Championships. Simply to have a real punishment and that there are two months of suspension. Two months of suspension of the active season.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : And not two months of holiday season.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Do we agree with this text, which seems more judicious ? We therefore say two months of the active season, it means that if there is one month left in the active season after his suspension, he is therefore suspended for one month, and then one month at the beginning of the next season. Do you agree with the penalty ? Does everybody agree ? Everything is okay.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **This is therefore two months of the active season. And I repeat clearly that the non-presentation on time does not result in a black card anymore but the exclusion from the event.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Simply excluded from the competition.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : The next one does not need to be discussed.

**Gabriela Mayer (CAN)** : Just a clarification, does everybody agree to change the date of 1<sup>st</sup> of May to 1<sup>st</sup> of June, as presented ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : No, there is no date anymore, we say that the fencer is suspended for two months of the active season.

**Gabriela Mayer (CAN)** : This is good.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Well, concerning the hit to the non-sword arm, we said that we would suspend it until 2007. We shall make studies until there. Thus, it is seen.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Then, we move on to the propositions of the **Spanish Federation**, which told me that **the proposition no. 1 is withdrawn**. We now move on to the **proposition no. 2** and I think that the President of the Spanish Federation has a question to raise.

**Marco Antonio Rioja Perez (ESP)** : Yes, the purpose, the aim of the proposition was to discuss it together with a possible proposition concerning the refereeing checked with the video. As I did not see any specific proposition concerning the video, I do not know if we are going to deal with it during this Congress, I believe it is not necessary to deal with it. If we are going to analyse it, I would like to take this proposition together with the other one.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Yes, I fully agree. We are going to present later a proposition on the video, which will be more complete. For the moment, we are making tests with the video, we are going to continue the tests. A priori, it seems satisfactory because we noticed that when there was a video, the referees were making much fewer faults. It is rather surprising but the refereeing is much better when there is a video, even if they do not consult the video. Thus, we are going to continue the tests and we shall present again a proposition for the video, more complete, because I also believe that the IOC is very attentive to it and wishes that the video be developed in all the sports. It is really the policy of the International Olympic Committee.

**Marco Antonio Rioja Perez (ESP)** : Does it mean that there will be in the future a proposition concerning the rule of the refereeing ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Here you are, for a next Congress, there will be a very complete proposition concerning this theme and we do not deal with yours for the moment. We therefore do not deal now with the proposition no. 2 from Spain and **the proposition no. 3 was withdrawn** by the Spanish Federation.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **Propositions from the Hungarian Federation. The proposition no. 4** cancels the quotas and replaces them by the fencers ranked from 1 to 128. **This proposition was already dealt** with the propositions of the Executive Committee and we already determined the number of athletes to be entered in each competition and how.

**Proposition no. 5.** Modification of the formula of Team Competitions for the World Cups, World Championships and Olympic Games. **The proposition is withdrawn.**

**Proposition no. 6.** The best referees must be designated for the World Championships and Olympic Games, upon proposition of the Refereeing Commission. A maximum of 2 referees per nation. I would like to remind you that the designation of referees is not up to the Congress but is made upon proposition of the Refereeing Commission to the Executive Committee, which designates the referees. The Executive Committee decided long time ago to designate only one referee per nation and thus to allow the biggest number of referees possible or biggest number of nations to participate in the World Championships and to referee at World Championships. The Executive Committee was therefore not in favour of this proposition and neither was the Refereeing Commission. And **this proposition should not be among the Congress propositions as it is not**

**incumbent upon the Congress but upon the Executive Committee.** We then move on to the next proposition.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** I think that the blocking time will be studied with the confirmation of urgent decisions taken by the Executive Committee. We will therefore postpone it with the application of urgent decisions which will be submitted to the Congress.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** It will be discussed with the urgent decisions. **Proposition of the Polish Federation.** I will maybe not read the entire paragraph, as you received the proposition. I can tell you that the Executive Committee was not in favour of the proposition, neither the Rules Commission. Does anyone wish to express himself on this proposition ? So who is in favour of the proposition ? 2. Who is against ? **The proposition is rejected.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** **Portuguese Fencing Federation.** For Grand Prix competitions, one of the three members of the DT will be designated by the FIE.

The Rules Commission proposed the text below « For Grand Prix competitions, one of the three members of the Directoire Technique is designated by the Executive Committee of the FIE, taking into account the principle of geographic proximity. If the organising country has an appropriate person, the FIE will nominate that person ». Is someone against this proposition ? That is the text of the Rules Commission. 2 against. **The proposition is therefore adopted.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** **The next proposition no. 2** was already dealt with as it indicates that the official FIE ranking shall take into account Zonal Championships. **We already voted it.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** The **propositions of the Federation of Qatar.** The same, **the propositions were already dealt** with the previous propositions. The transparent mask is part of the urgent decisions of the Congress, that is urgent decisions published by the Executive Committee for ratification by the Congress. We will therefore deal with this proposition together with the urgent decisions of the Executive Committee.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** The **propositions of the SEMI Commission.** It is not about modifications of texts of material but rather about adaptations or corrections or precisions to these texts. There are no major changes but rather changes of presentation or precisions. As well for **the proposition 1** as for **the proposition 2.** There are only modifications of texts. Is anybody against these modifications, these adaptations of text ? Nobody is against ? **Thus, it is adopted.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** The **propositions of the Slovak Federation.** Two things are in this proposition. One regarding the entries by name in all official events, but this has already been dealt with the previous propositions and then, **the article 0.53 concerning the participation entries that federations must send to the organising committee.**

The Slovak Federation proposes that the federations which sent their entries receive from the Organising Committee two and half months before the start of the event, an entry form by number, which must be returned to the organisers two months before the start of the events. The current text is of three months and one month. The Rules Commission proposed three months rather than two months and a half and two months. Does everybody agree that these entries be received three months before and be sent two months before ? Nobody is against ? **This is therefore dealt.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The proposition no. 3 consists of bringing together the Zonal Championships with the World Championships at a determined period of the year.

The Executive Committee did determine dates for the Zonal Championships according to the scheduled dates of the World Championships. This is part of the Administrative Rules and not of a text of the Rules or Statutes.

**Julius Kralik (SVK)** : I withdraw this proposition because in view of the approved changes, I think it is better now to have it treated by a commission. I do not think that what is proposed is unreasonable, that is to bring together as much as possible, but I do not think this is the right time now. I therefore propose to withdraw this proposition.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Listen, it is 6.00 p.m., we promised the organisers to end at 6.00 p.m. I believe we can stop here and we shall continue tomorrow morning at 9.00 a.m. Buses will be available at 7.30 p.m. in front of the hotel to drive us to the dinner venue tonight. And I would like on behalf of all the participants to thank the Sheik Al-Thani for the gift presented to all of us. This is very kind of him. Thank you very much.

**Applause.**

**END OF THE 1<sup>ST</sup> DAY OF THE CONGRESS**

## 2<sup>ND</sup> DAY OF THE CONGRESS

---

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The Federation of Ukraine had to leave and I inform you that Ukraine gave its proxy to the Czech Republic.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : I am also pleased to announce today the birthday of Mr Claus Janka.

**Applause.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who is celebrating his 24<sup>th</sup>.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Well, we are now going to discuss the propositions presented by the Special Rules Commission for the Olympic Games. I would like before this discussion to say that I wish that we do not spread too many lies. The President of the International Federation asked long time ago for twelve medals and has again asked for them recently. I requested them once again, more than one month ago, that is before that new lies be spread again. I have the IOC letter which was written on the 7<sup>th</sup> of November.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Could you please verify, there is a problem with the translation booths. Does the translation work ? Yes.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : « Following the Olympic Programme Commission and the meeting of the Executive Committee of the IOC, which was held in Lausanne from 26 to 28 October 2005, I wish to inform you of all the most recent decisions relating to the programme for the Olympic Games in Beijing in 2008. The Executive Committee decided not to accept your request to increase the number of events from ten to twelve to include Women's Foil and Women's Sabre Team events. Please note that your request for twelve additional athletes for the individual events remains on the table for study. Thanking you in advance, etc. etc. ». Gentlemen, I therefore think that those who say that I did not ask for twelve medals can raise the finger and tell me how they could assert such a thing.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The letter will be translated into English.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : The President René Roch pointed out that he wished to be absolutely clear what the facts were and that we should not be misled by misrepresentations of the truth. And that on the 7<sup>th</sup> of November 2005, the Director of Sports of the International Olympic Committee, Mr. Kelly Fairweather, replied to Mister René Roch, in the following terms. Dear President, following the report of the Olympic Programme Committee and the meeting of the Executive Committee of the IOC, which was held in Lausanne from the 26<sup>th</sup> to the 28<sup>th</sup> of October 2005, I wish to inform you of all the most recent decisions relating to the programme for the 29<sup>th</sup> Olympic Games in Beijing in 2008. The Executive Committee of the IOC decided to not accept your request to increase the number of events from ten to twelve to include Women's Foil and Women's Sabre Team events. Please note that your request for twelve additional athletes for the individual events remains on the table for study. Thanking you in advance, etc.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** However, I would like to tell you that the twelve places for Beijing are obviously possible and seem maybe acquired. But it will be decided at the meeting of the Executive Committee of Turin. A priori, we have good chances to get the twelve additional places for Beijing. That is it.

**Victor Sanchez (ESP) :** I am going to translate the letter into Spanish so that everybody takes knowledge of it. Mr Roch wants to make it clear that he really did contact the International Olympic Committee. This is a letter dated of 7 November 2005, signed by Kelly Fairweather, IOC Sports Director and which says : « Mister President, following the report of the Olympic Programme Committee and the meeting of the Executive Committee of the IOC, which was held in Lausanne from 26 to 28 October 2005, I wish to inform you of all the most recent decisions relating to the programme for the 29<sup>th</sup> Olympic Games in Beijing in 2008. The Executive Committee of the IOC decided not to accept your request ».

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Excuse me, this is just a translation of the letter read by René Roch. It is only a translation into Spanish of the letter in French that was read by René Roch and which was also translated into English. This is just in Spanish.

**Victor Sanchez (ESP) :** « The Executive Committee of the IOC decided not to accept your request to increase the number of events from ten to twelve to include Women's Foil and Women's Sabre Team events. Please note that your request for twelve additional places for the individual events remains on the table for study. Thanking you in advance for your collaboration. Yours sincerely, Kelly Fairweather, IOC Sports Director ».

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Therefore believe that I personally deplore this decision not to accept our request of twelve medals because obviously the President of the International Federation wishes to have twelve medals. I do not see why I would like to have only ten medals. It seems to me unbelievable that some people can tell such things. Finally, having said that, for the future, we have good chances to obtain twelve additional places and I believe that it is a certain advantage. Anyway, I would like to say that if we have twelve medals, we need forty additional places, because it would be stunning that if we have twelve medals and that all teams participate in the Olympic Games, to have thirty-two places for each weapon, among which twenty-four would be already taken by those participating in the teams. Only eight places would therefore remain for the universality at each weapon, which seems not sufficient and impossible. We therefore not only need twelve medals, but at least forty additional places in order to have approximately forty places at each weapon. It would leave sixteen places for the universality of our sport and I think this is necessary. We cannot have Olympic Games with only fourteen countries participating in the Olympic Games. This is not possible and that is what I wanted to say in preamble.

Believe that we make the maximum to obtain all this. Moreover, I met with Mr Felli in Lausanne three days before coming here. I spoke with him, I believe we have good chances for the places. For the medals, it seems really very difficult. Why is it difficult for the medals ? It is difficult because the IOC has one principle, it does not want more than 300 medals. We must therefore increase the number of medals if we want to obtain some. I had insisted for these medals because Baseball and Softball were suppressed from the Olympic programme in Singapore. I visited Mr Rogge to tell him that as you have two sports in less, you have medals, which are available. And he told me, but Mr Roch who told you that we are going to make these medals available. We have for the time being not taken any decision and we maybe have new sports to be entered to the Olympic Games. We remained there. What do you want ? I was surprised because there was also a vote in Singapore concerning new sports and the IOC members voted

definitively against any new sports. But we are tributary of the IOC, we cannot do anything else than listening to what it says and accept what it says regarding the Olympic programme because it is the master of the Olympic programme. You know that we are invited the Olympic Games. This is therefore very difficult. We will try to have twelve medals but we will not have them for Beijing. A priori, it seems impossible now. However, I would like to have them for London, and we shall do our utmost to have them and this is the reason why, I always say, that we should modernise our sport, that we should be more media-attractive because the IOC is very sensitive to the mediatisation of the sports participating in the Olympic Games. It means that it would like that sports coming to the Olympic Games bring an additional audience to the Games and do not only take advantage of the audience of the Games. Maybe, it is up to us to make an effort, and we are making it. We already made it. I believe that we are on the right way and I must thank you for that.

Now, regarding the Games of Beijing, if we accidentally have two additional medals, but as I told you, I believe that it will be difficult because it will be necessary to have additional places. I do not think that it will happen, thus I think we can discuss on a basis of ten medals and two hundred places for the moment. According to that, we asked the Special Rules Commission. I asked this commission, if we have ten medals, do we make five teams, five individuals or six individuals and four teams. We even thought at four individuals and six teams. This was immediately refused, obviously. Between the five teams and five individuals and six individuals, four teams, the commission was in favour of four team events and six individuals. This is **the proposition of the Special Rules Commission**. Then, we say very well. But if we have four teams, what do we do ? Two men's teams, two women's teams ? Or do we make a women's team and three men's teams ? Or one men's team and three women's teams ? All this seems obvious, but it was difficult and the Commission proposed three men's teams and one women's team. That is practically the status quo as it was already like this in Athens. I must add to be complete, that in my discussions with the IOC, that the IOC was surprised that we ask for the parity but we do not apply the parity. The IOC said but why are they asking for the parity while they have one women's team and three men's teams ? I am therefore just pointing out that the IOC was surprised that we do not apply ourselves what we would like to be applied to us by the IOC. It is a small problem but we are not obliged to follow, it is up to you to decide anyway. You are the ones to decide. After having decided at the Special Rules Commission that it was therefore one women's team and three men's teams, we said, yes, but which women's team ? I must first say that there were two votes in the Commission, two out of six, which were in favour of two and two, this is therefore not negligible. There were two votes in favour of two men's teams and two women's teams. We then said which women's team do we choose if we have one team ? Discussions took place, but the Commission unanimously decided to propose women's sabre. Why ? Because women's sabre was never represented in teams in the Olympic Games. We had women's teams at foil in Sydney, women's epee in Athens, and it seems therefore natural to make a turn for these teams. It was also said that women's sabre was very media-attractive. This is subjective, I agree, it is not compulsory, everybody can consider this to be true or not true. And also one argument was developed, that is to say that if we do not take women's sabre in teams at the Olympic Games, it could maybe be the death of this weapon. There is certainly some craze for women's sabre. But this craze would maybe fall if there is no possibility for women's sabre to be at the Olympic Games. I am just reporting what was said at this Commission without adding any personal thoughts. Personally, I did not vote at the Commission, I point it out to you. I believe we must discuss this, if some have arguments to prevail. We can start to examine the propositions of other federations.

The Hungarian Federation speaks about the qualification, and says that for the individual it must be the official ranking from 1 to 16. It seems very difficult to me, thus would

considerably limit the other possibilities as you know that in individual, for the weapons that are not represented in team events, only eight places are at our disposal. It means that there are twenty four places in all for those who do not have team competitions. Then if we already take the first sixteen ones, we are left with eight places for the universality, which seems to me a little bit questionable. Then, I did not understand well because the Hungarian Federation proposes a reserve even at the Olympic Games. When we say even, it means that it did not exist before. I think that there is a reserve at the World Championships, this is a first thing, and secondly at the Olympic Games, we have a possibility of a reserve. It means that we benefited, nevertheless, at the Olympic Games, in addition to our two hundred places, from one additional place per team for the reserves. It is not a real place, I agree, but it does considerably increase our contingent, because there is the possibility of having a reserve for every team. We can maybe vote on each proposition and start with the Hungarian Fencing Federation. Who are those who are in favour of the proposition of the Hungarian Fencing Federation : the individual qualification is determined by the FIE ranking from 1 to 16 ? The possibility of a reserve, it is not necessary, as it already exists. I therefore believe that an error occurred. Are there people in favour of the proposition of the Hungarian federation ? If you want to take the floor, I agree.

**Frédéric Pietruszka (FRA)** : Indeed these Olympic Games are effectively a sensitive subject, a sensitive subject which risks to divide the family of fencing and to divide our athletes. I do not deny the steps, which were tempted by our President but the question we can ask ourselves is : did the fencing world mobilize behind his General ? Did the General go alone to the front without his troops ? The final decision will be taken in Turin. I am a young President and as young President I maybe have a certain naivety, and this naivety is also the one of the fencer who thinks that as long as the referee has not called halt, the fight is not over. We have a collective responsibility towards fencing. This collective responsibility is a general mobilization of our sport and when I say our sport, I mean the International Federation, our federations, our leaders and our athletes but also a possible mobilization via the Olympic Committee. I proposed bargaining counters to the IOC for the twelve medals. These bargaining counters were to give back some days. It is obvious that giving back two days of competitions to the IOC would be for us a loss of communication and in particular the television of course. Nevertheless, what are two days of television compared to the respect we owe to our champions ? Do we have to choose today the form we want to give to the Olympic Games or do we still have to give us this chance, even if tiny, to go for the twelve medals ? Voting today implicitly means accepting this decision of ten medals and even if, as I said it to you, the chance seems little to have twelve medals, I think that it deserves to be tempted. As said by my friend Philippe Boisse, do we have to cut ourselves the arm or the leg or do we, rather than injuring ourselves wait to be injured ? The choice today also means, maybe and certainly, because I was already forced within my own federation to calm the athletes, means actions of athletes during the season. We must get ready to live a difficult season because the athletes whose teams will not be chosen for the Olympic Games, are going to mobilize. I propose that this choice be postponed to the Junior World Championships. It will show our athletes our will to fight for them, to act with this respect that we owe them and I also propose that we settle a « task force » to create a complete file to be presented to the IOC, which has, this time, the following form, a file which would summarise the history of fencing, the efforts displayed these last years in order that fencing becomes a much more telegenic and media-attractive sport. The efforts that we made, ourselves, to give the parity as we introduced women's epee and women's sabre. And also show that the equity is also needed in the decisions and that fencing does not have to be the poor relation to sports because some sports saw the parity with additional new disciplines such as 3'000 m. steeplechase in athletics, the hammer throw or even in swimming the creation of a new discipline of 10 km in free water. Here we are, I propose that a final decision be not taken today concerning the



choice of weapons to be presented in the Olympic Games of Beijing. As I said it to you, this chance might be tiny but this mobilization that we would put in place within a very short time because Turin is tomorrow, this mobilization, if not useful for Beijing, will show that this united family claims for these twelve medals for London. Thanks to you.

### **Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I think that the spirit is good, I think that the ideas are good. But unfortunately, I think that the President of the Athletes Commission together with the Olympic Champion went already to see the IOC in Berlin. This was at the beginning of the year, maybe you were not aware of it. But there was a French among them. There were the President of the Athletes Commission, who is German, and the French Olympic Champion at foil. They went, they explained and they came back in saying : well, this is no, that is all. I agree that you continue, but we risk to tire the IOC. But it is necessary to continue, you are right, go on ! But, I also have to tell you that the IOC programme will be over at the end of this year. So if you wait until the month of March, I am afraid that the IOC tells us, Gentlemen, you are not able to take decisions, we shall take decisions for you. This is what might happen, because the steering persons in this case, are neither us, nor all the federations, but the IOC. And it is the one to take decisions. They just took a decision, if we tell them, Gentlemen, we do not take in consideration your decision, this is not true, we shall carry on. We can carry on until Beijing and then in Beijing what do we do ? If you want, I believe that you are right, going on with the request is natural. What surprises me is that up to now, nobody supported my action, except in the meetings of the Congress, and I am very delighted that we now think of mobilizing the National Olympic Committees and maybe the members of the Olympic Committee. To know the result is not easy at all but I believe that it would be reasonable for us to say that we would like twelve medals. To obtain forty places if we have twelve medals seems to me even more difficult now. And then, to say « if we do not have the twelve medals, here is what we are going to do ». It does not commit us towards the IOC. We simply say, if we do not have the twelve medals, this is how we shall distribute the teams, it appears to me to be a useful precaution and it is maybe not necessary to gather a special Congress for that, it is an alternative, or we have the twelve medals, and obviously in that case, we have teams at all the weapons, it seems easy to me. Or we do not have the twelve medals, and if we still have only ten medals, this is how we shall distribute the teams. I believe that it would maybe be more useful to proceed like this.

**Gordon Rapp (GER)** : Gordon Rapp, German Fencing Federation. I want to point out that we support the point of view of the French Federation. I think this is not the time to make a decision for the Olympics now.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : So, who wants to take the floor ? Mr Cramer now. Mr Illueca, Mr Plasterie. Here we are, very good. They shall speak and then we shall vote. Still Mr Bytchkov. Now this is over.

**Arthur Cramer (BRA, MH)** : I fully agree with my friend Frédéric Pietruszka, but I draw your attention to that fact that, as indicated by Mr Roch, we are invited to participate in the Olympic Games. Fencing is the unique sport which has not yet presented its programme for the Pan-American Games. The ANOC President, the Association of National Olympic Committees, Mr Vazquez Raña does not understand how fencing can be so late. I am sure that the action proposed by Mr Pietruszka is very good but it should have been undertaken years ago. I regret that we did not think of that earlier. The International Olympic Committee already sanctioned Boxing. Sailing, which is having its Congress today in Singapore received clearly the message. We cannot continue to be accused of making things always at the last moment. In the current world, we cannot

arrive at the same time, we have to arrive before. Your proposition should have been made for the Olympic Games of Athens. The Athletes Commission has already gone to the IOC and the IOC said no. Why did not they continue to work for the Games of Beijing ? Why to wait until now ? It gives to everybody, and I believe also to the press and the IOC, the impression that fencing is a sport which thinks always afterwards. So, I think that the minimum that we can make here, or rather that we must make here, is to arrive with a proposition. If we do not have twelve medals, this is our proposition. In my opinion, it is not possible to get out from here without having a neat and clear position towards the IOC. It will absolutely not prevent us from continuing to work on the twelve medals. But let's continue, and I repeat it, with the eyes looking at 2012, 2016 and 2020 and why not also at 2008. So my friends, we must take a decision here. Either for one solution or the other, but we must have a solution.

**Anibal Illueca Herrando (PAN) :** President of the Pan-American Fencing Federation. This is good, we agree with the French Federation. But there is also a necessity on our continent to be ready for the regional games, and next year the Olympic cycle will start on our continent. We will have next year the South American Games and the Central America and the Caribbean Games and then the Pan-American Games and we are the sole sport which has not yet presented its programme for the Pan-American Games because we do not know yet the weapons that will be represented at the Olympic Games. The Pan-American organisation requests the same programme for the Olympic Games than for the Pan-Americans. This taking of decision is therefore very important for us. We do agree with the twelve medals because it is important to have twelve medals, but if we cannot have the twelve medals, we must still take a decision on the competitions that we shall present to the Olympic Games of Beijing. Thank you.

**Per Palmstrom (SWE) :** Per Palmstrom from the Swedish Fencing Federation. Well, I would first on behalf of all of us thank His Excellency Al-Thani and the Qatar Fencing Federation for the wonderful evening and wonderful dinner that we had yesterday.

**Applause.**

**Per Palmstrom (SWE) :** We are facing today an Olympic dilemma just as we had four years ago. The Swedish Fencing Federation believes that we have to solve this Olympic dilemma in three steps. First, we have to vote on whether we should decide on the issue today or not. Secondly, we believe that we should vote on the distribution of the medals between the sexes. Shall we have five medals for the women and five medals for men or how shall we divide the medals between both sexes. And thirdly, we have to decide unfortunately if we come to that, what medals and disciplines will not participate in the Games of Beijing. But before continuing, I would like to say that the Swedish Fencing Federation will fight for twelve medals until the opening ceremony of Beijing. Regarding the second decision on the distribution of the medals between the sexes, if we come to that item today, in the second vote, we believe that there is no other option than giving five medals to the men and five medals to the women. Equality between the sexes is a fundamental principle that all our decisions should be based on. May I remind you that earlier yesterday, it was decided to ensure that the principle of non-discrimination on the ground of sex is respected. In my opinion, it would be odd to decide one thing on the 1<sup>st</sup> day and immediately break it on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day. I am married and I have a daughter and the President of the Swedish Fencing Federation is also married and has four daughters. If we decide to give six medals to the men and four medals to the women, all of you with wives and daughters, will have to go home and explain why the FIE Congress in Qatar decided that the women shall have two medals less than the men. According to the Swedish Federation, the IOC requires that the medals be distributed equally between the sexes. The Swedish Fencing Federation strongly recommends that you all vote for

an equal distribution of the medals between both sexes. Five for the men, five for the women. Please make it easier for me to explain our decision to my daughter. Thank you.

### **Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I think that we should first take decisions on the propositions of federations. Because the various federations propose solutions which will may be not be accepted, or may be accepted and in that case, it would modify of course the position of the Special Rules Commission. This is the reason why I would like to know your opinion on **the proposition of the Hungarian Federation**. The Executive Committee is not in favour of this proposition and the Special Rules Commission is not in favour of the item d) and the possibility of a reserve already exists. Who is in favour of the proposition of the Hungarian Federation ? Well, two votes in favour of the Hungarian Fencing Federation, **the proposition is therefore rejected**.

The **proposition of the Portuguese Fencing Federation** was mentioned at our meeting of the Special Rules Commission. Ah, it is withdrawn, so it is not worth.

**The proposition of Qatar** is a proposition to improve our system to allow continent, or regions of a continent, to qualify directly their best fencers for the Olympic Games. This is the same thing as the proposition of the Portuguese Federation, we are therefore not going to discuss it, it was rejected. I mean, what was very important in these propositions, is that the continental champion automatically participate in the Olympic Games, which is not a ridiculous proposition, but it was just withdrawn **therefore we do not vote on this**.

Then, we have the **proposition of the Swiss Fencing Federation**. Here, it is easy, the Swiss are proposing women's epee. The Special Rules Commission is not in favour as it did not propose women's epee. The senior team competitions at women's foil and women's sabre are not retained as the number of competitions and participants in World Cup tournaments is inferior to the ones in the other weapons and categories. I believe that the proposal of the Swiss Federation will be treated globally at the same time we shall deal with the qualification to the Olympic Games.

**Krisztian Kulcsar (HUN)** : Kulcsar from the Hungarian Federation. Is there a chance to follow the proposal of the Swedish Federation, that is to first vote on whether we want to decide now or not, and then going into the details regarding the programme of the Olympic Games ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I personally agree. We can first vote to find out if we make a proposition. But be careful, this is not a proposition, this is an internal decision. For the time being, we only have ten medals, I believe it is interesting to take a decision and say if we have twelve medals, well this is not worth neither to talk about it nor discuss it. But if we still have only ten medals, this is what we are going to do. Of course, this only commits us within the framework of decisions of the IOC. It is not because we are going to decide today on what we shall do if we have ten medals, that it commits us for the future to have only ten medals. Obviously. It is not a decision which commits us to say that we shall ask for no more than ten medals. No, we ask for twelve medals, but we know that if we only have ten medals, we shall do it this way. So do you agree to vote on this ? That is, to say that we are going to vote after on the ten medals, which we currently have for the Olympic Games, or do we want to wait. I am afraid that if we take such a decision, it will be harmful. I warn you personally because I think that it will be extremely harmful for our sport but you will be responsible. If we do not take decision, I think that it will be very harmful for fencing. But you are the sole judge, you are the ones to vote. So, do we vote on this basis of ten medals ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : So, do we vote on the basis of ten medals ? Who is in favour ? 58 in favour.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We are therefore going to take a decision today based on ten medals, it means that if we do not have the twelve medals, we will know what we will do. It does not mean that we agree to have only ten medals.

**Antoine Campiche (SUI)** : As representative of the Federation which made this proposition, I want to go in the same direction as the one just presented by Mister President Roch, I mean that it does not make much sense to vote globally on the Swiss proposition now. As suggested by you, I would prefer that the items of this proposition are resumed in the discussion according to the order of the vote. I would like to go along with the Swedish proposition, which consists to vote first on five men, five women or six and four. I indeed agree to withdraw the Swiss proposition globally now from the vote as far as I can express the Swiss position. That we take the horizontal way rather than the vertical line, as you suggested it.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We are going to take back the discussion in line with the proposition of the Special Rules Commission and of course, we shall first vote to find out if we want five men's events and five women's events. It was part of the requests to the Special Rules Commission. You know that we voted on that in the Commission. The Commission did not choose five and five, it did choose six and four, but it is of course up to the Congress to decide, it is not up to the Commission to decide. This is a proposition. The Commission is just making a proposal, nothing more.

Well, we are going to proceed in order, as I just said it to you some time ago, that is in the order of the Special Rules Commission. **Then do we want the parity men- women in the distribution of medals for the Olympic Games ? That is to have five women's events and five men's events ?** Who wants five men's events and five women's events ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Raise the arm, please ! Raise the arm, please !

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : There is a majority. You noticed that I did not vote because I do not want to influence anyone. Therefore, we wish five men's events and five women's events, we want the full parity.

**Applause.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : **51 votes in favour.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I must tell you that this vote is favourable to the International Federation towards the International Olympic Committee. I said it to the Executive Committee. I did not tell it to you, but this is very favourable. **I think that we will have three individual events and two team events ?** Or do you want three team events and two individuals ? I think that the majority is in favour of three individual events, for the men as for the women, and two team events. Are you in favour of that, three individuals and two teams ? I think that for the universality, this is better.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Therefore, on five events, three individual events and two team events ? Who is in favour ? **Majority.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We shall therefore have three individual events and two team events. **Then, in case we would have only ten medals, what will be the two team**

**events for the men and what will be the two team events for the women ?** This is more difficult here. I believe that we have to vote ... please.

**Keith Smith (GBR) :** Could I just ask everyone to listen for a moment and if we are not careful we are about to do what we did in Antalya. In Antalya, we had votes like this, no one was listening. If you remember there was a drawing of lots in Antalya and then suddenly a few minutes later, everybody realised the decision, which has been taken and we then had to have an extraordinary Congress in Lisbon and for six months everybody in fencing was fighting each other. Arthur Cramer said that we need to be better organised. Of course, I have an interest because in 2012 the Olympic Games will be in London. Of course we want twelve medals. I have supported Frédéric Pietruszka's idea, I have spoken to the President of our Olympic Committee and he will write to the IOC on our behalf and also as the organising country for 2012. Who knows if it is going to make any difference ? We keep talking about we have to look after the athletes and we have to respect them. We always also say that we take the decision at the last minute and now we are about to do it again. In some sports, sailing for example, because they have more disciplines than they have medals, they take the decisions not only for the next Olympic Games but they create a cycle. And so for example they would decide in this case for Beijing, and for London. Because we discuss, I know certainly in the stronger countries, which unfortunately we are not one, but in the stronger countries, I know that the finance for the teams and the fencers is decided on which discipline are on the Olympic programme. And I just wonder whether we should actually consider Beijing and also London. But also obviously with the proviso that we keep working for twelve medals and if twelve medals would come, obviously then we would review our decision. All I am urging us to think, I am not trying to slow the day up, but I remember we went at this speed in Antalya. But I personally think we should think for Beijing but we should also think ahead. But always with the idea in our head that we might get twelve medals by London. Thank you.

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Obviously we must think before voting, we fully agree. I think that it is almost time for the coffee-break. I propose to interrupt the meeting. Anyway, you will not vote by raising the arm as we did in Antalya but it will be a secret vote. I propose the secret vote and you will thus have all the time to think it over and put your ballot paper in the ballot box and know what you decide. I believe that it is a good thing. Therefore, I propose a coffee-break, then upon return from the coffee-break, we distribute ballot papers and you choose quietly. We make a serious vote. See you soon.

## **COFFEE-BREAK**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** We planned a while ago to vote on the weapons to be represented in case we would have only ten medals. I believe that it is maybe a little bit premature. It is premature because I think that considering the important change that we decided by choosing two men's teams and two women's teams, the federations must consult their athletes, their Executive Committee and I think that the decision cannot be taken today. I would prefer to make the choice of weapons at our General Assembly, which is scheduled to hold during the Junior Championships. I do not know if you agree but I think this is preferable. It would be maybe abnormal that federations make decisions without having consulted their athletes and their Executive Committee. **Do you agree to postpone this vote to the General Assembly which will be held in Taebaek City?**

**Applause.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Do you agree to postpone the decision to the General Assembly ? Who is in favour ? **Majority.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Therefore, we postpone the decision to the General Assembly.

**George van Dugteren (RSA)** : Excuse me. Could we consider taking a decision on the proposal that we plan ahead that when we make our decision we are also planning for the next Olympic cycle, that is for 2008 and 2012 ? Should we not discuss or decide on this proposal ? Thank you. In principle.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : So much I believe that it is necessary to make a decision for 2008 because effectively 2008 is very close and there is little chance that we have twelve medals. But I think that for 2012, it is not necessary to make a decision now. Really, it would maybe mean accepting ten medals definitively. I believe that it is not very good. However, what we can say, it is that the teams, and I propose here to decide now on this, that the teams which will be eliminated for 2008, will necessarily be present in 2012. It means that in 2012 if we have only ten medals, these teams will obligatory be present in 2012.

**Antoine Campiche (SUI)** : Antoine Campiche of the Swiss Fencing Federation. If I may be allowed to express myself on this idea, I think that it is premature to vote on this question because the big principle, on which we are going to decide in Korea to choose these disciplines, will be, in fact, either the principle of the cycle and the alternation or the other principle, the one of the universality, which is to say that the most represented discipline is qualified and the less represented discipline is not. Consequently, it seems premature today, to already commit ourselves on the fact that the disciplines which will not be represented in Beijing will automatically be in London, if we choose this principle of universality rather than the one of the cycle.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : May I make an observation on this ? It seems to me that if one takes the argument just offered, we risk creating a vicious circle. That if there is a risk that a weapon is eliminated from more than one Olympics, by definition, that weapon will start to die. And should we continue to be restricted unfortunately to ten weapons ? The best way to maintain the overall health of our sport is to say that a weapon can only be eliminated from team event of the Olympics once every three Olympics.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I think that it is a wiser decision to say that we cannot eliminate one weapon. We cannot constantly eliminate one weapon under the pretext of universality. I have the audience rate on the Internet concerning the weapons in Leipzig and we notice that women's epee, which is very well represented in the world, in which there are many teams, had only 8 % of audience rate while sabre had 11 % and women's foil 12 %. Thus the mediatisation of a discipline has nothing to do with the number of persons practising this discipline. I believe that for us, what we want to preserve, is all our weapons. We do not want to lose one weapon because it will not be in the Olympic Games anymore and I therefore believe that we must alternate so that all the weapons be at the Olympic Games. **Do you agree with this proposition that the weapon which will not be in the Olympic Games of Beijing, be automatically in the Olympic Games of London ?** Who is in favour ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Who is in favour ? Please raise the arms ? **69 in favour.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) : Concerning the qualification, the Special Rules Commission plans to keep the same qualification system as for the Games of Athens.**

Do you agree to keep the same qualification system ? That is on one side concerning the teams, the best teams are automatically qualified, plus the best ones of each continent, plus fencers of all the continents with a special qualification per continent. And concerning the individuals, who do not have teams, we take the best of the World Cup ranking, I believe the eight best, then we take the eight best per continent, plus eight from a special qualification. Do you agree to carry on with this qualification system ? Who are those who are in favour ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez : Who is in favour ? 63 in favour.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Thus, we keep the same qualification system. Of course, if we have twelve medals, first, we will crack open a bottle of Champagne, secondly, we shall proceed to simulations with the IOC to still obtain the additional places for the Olympic Games, and then it will be necessary to make a qualification which is going to be a little bit more difficult to have a certain universality. But, if we have twelve medals, it will anyway deserve a special Congress. Here we are, we do not take decision now. There will be a special Congress if we have the twelve medals.

Well, I think that we have solved the problem of qualifications for the Olympic Games and we postpone the decision concerning the teams to be represented at the Olympic Games to our next General Assembly.

## 5.Urgent decisions

---

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on the item five of the agenda, which is the urgent decisions. No, Arthur, we decided not to vote on the weapons. Therefore, we move on to the item five, urgent decisions.

Sorry ? We are through with the propositions concerning the Statutes, the propositions concerning the Rules, the propositions concerning the Olympic Games. Sorry ? All the propositions were dealt with, including the ones of the SEMI Commission, we approved them yesterday. This is part of the urgent decisions.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : Excuse me, we did not discuss the propositions of the SEMI Commission on sabre.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Are you talking about the propositions which were included in the handbook of Rules ? The propositions of the SEMI Commission, which were included in the document of the Rules propositions ? It was already treated yesterday. Which ones were not treated ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : All the propositions concerning the Rules and the Statues were treated yesterday. Today, we had to deal with the problem of the Olympic Games, and then we have now the decisions taken in the course of last year or the current year, which must be ratified by the Congress. Here we are. So, we start.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We sent you in the course of the year a certain number of urgent letters or letters of information, in which we informed you of the urgent decisions of the Executive Committee. These decisions are in the documents recto-verso that you received and start with the urgent letter no. 11-05 on the obligation of wearing the mask with transparent visor for the 2005/2006 season. **The urgent decision was as follows : at women's and men's foil and epee, the wearing of mask with transparent visor is compulsory at all stages of Grand Prix competitions, Team World Cup competitions, Individual and Team competitions of Senior World Championships. The application was starting after the 2005 Leipzig World Championships.**

The wearing of mask with transparent visor is therefore not compulsory at foil and epee for the 2005 Leipzig World Championships. What was applied. At women's and men's sabre, you already received an information in the letter of information no. 1-05 and in the urgent letter no. 6-05. The wearing is compulsory at all stages of Grand Prix competitions, Team World Cup competitions, Individual and Team Cadet, Junior, Senior and Veteran World Championships. And the application was as from 1 March 2005. Do you agree to ratify this urgent decision ?

**Claus Janka (GER)** : We know the conclusions from Leipzig concerning the transparent mask but in between we have had some problems, technical problems at certain events. It was a problem of mask, with for example a girl from Germany. There was a problem and the blade went inside the mask, close to her eyes. That is why I am asking this question one more time. Can we have a statement from the SEMI Commission concerning this problem, this technical problem ? In our opinion we cannot be sure to really have a mask, which does not present any problem and no technical risk. We could have some problems with the German law. We had great discussions with the fencers about the legal situation. That is why we want to have a statement from the SEMI Commission.



**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Mr Van de Flier, I think that Mr Dos Santos must reply to the question raised to him.

**Jose Eduardo Dos Santos (POR)** : Eduardo Dos Santos for the SEMI. I constantly receive reports on masks which were drilled but never with photos, never with mention of the brand, never with the date of manufacturing. These are rumours which sometimes get to me. All the reports I receive, you are mentioning this, so what was the mask, what was the date, where is the mask. I need this information. What happened with the transparent mask is the following : we started, since Mr Zivkovic made his first mask, to use masks with transparent visors. We agreed with the commission on the mask with transparent visor, on how to produce it in a safe way. We established a standard in 2002. All the masks manufactured after 2002 have a frame inside, which does not allow the blade to enter. They are manufactured with a frame inside, which is welded to the metallic mesh. Then there is the transparent visor whose thickness is of three millimetres and then we have again a frame outside, which fixes the visor. Therefore, the blade can never penetrate inside if the visor is in good condition. And it is stated : in 2004 the commission on European norms established the standards for the masks. All the masks currently homologated by the FIE and which must be used at World Championships and in FIE official competitions, must have a date posterior to 2004. It is published in the list of homologated masks. Some masks are older than that. They must not be used. If you are conscientious, you must have in your World Cups, when we practise fencing at a competition level, masks with transparent visor whose date is posterior to 2004 and with the FIE logo. These masks are from five companies : Allstar, Negrini, PBT, Paul and Gajardoni. The other older masks cannot be used in competitions. I do not guarantee the safety of other masks which are not currently on the list of homologated masks by the SEMI Commission and also by the commission on transparent visor after 2002. And that is it. If you want to provide me with the mask and all this, I can analyse it, without these data, I cannot. Thank you.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Mr Van de Flier and then.

**Bert van de Flier (NED)** : Bert van de Flier from the Netherlands. We discussed the transparent mask in our group, that is the European group, and we came to the conclusion that this is meriting a secret vote when we start to vote about this. Thank you.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : We are not in favour of this decision for various reasons. The first one is that the advantage for the television and the communication is not a real issue because we saw that normally there is no possibility to improve the image, you do not see the face of the person anyway. Most of the images are taken from the side to understand the action and this is therefore not really relevant. The fencers do not have a psychological advantage from this, for many of them, it represents annoyance. Security, well, we got the assurance now from the SEMI Commission but this is probably not better than the previous mask. And there are two additional points. The first one being the very high cost, because the federations introduced it but no action to limit the cost was undertaken. So there is a very heavy burden and we cannot expect that these masks be used only at World Championships. Automatically this is transferred to another level and also because in the national competitions, you have people with and people without, you must have an even system and this represents a very high cost for all the federations and clubs. And last point, the wearing process of this mask is much quicker than the metal mask so this is an additional cost that is charged to fencers, so we don't think we have to emphasize and push this kind of decision. Thank you.

**Applause.**

**Carl Borack (USA)** : Carl Borack, United States. I would like to draw your attention to the NBC which spends 1.5 billion with the IOC. Peter Diamond, the gentleman in charge of NBC in the Olympics, has said specifically to us that they appreciate those masks and that the transparent mask was a great improvement to what we are doing. So I have to disagree with you that it does not help for publicity because the largest broadcaster, the one who pays the most money, has said that they really appreciate this aspect. As to the cost, I think that there should be a lot of pressure put on the manufacturers to keep the cost down, because they benefit by the most and I think President Roch put a lot of pressure on them, to keep cost down and perhaps the FIE wants to consider some kind of way to help those nations that need help to buy those masks. So that is a valid argument but the broadcasting argument is not valid.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I inform you that you spoke already through Mr Janka. But if you wish to speak again, go ahead, this is not bad. Not too long, that is all.

**Gordon Rapp (GER)** : Gordon Rapp, German Fencing Federation. For me, this is essential to have a legal document on the transparent mask. Because we are responsible, if they have an accident, the Presidents of Federations are responsible. So I need to have a look at the legal document, and if this is correct, there is no problem to approve it, let's take the transparent mask.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : May I just make an intervention. I think I am right in saying that the transparent mask has been one of the elements of modernisation of our sport that the International Olympic Committee has urged us to take. Or to put it in another way, that in so far as we are limited to some extent in things we can do to modernise our sport, the transparent mask has been recognised as an area, in which we can improve things to the benefit of our presentation. And that therefore this action contributes to our continuing good image with the IOC. However this is not to say that if it is not safe we should use it, obviously if it is not safe we should not use it. But all things being equal even if the fencers are not so happy with it, we must look at our image with the public and the IOC. I have to admit also a personal involvement as I myself use a transparent mask in competitions, and I am delighted with it.

**Jose Eduardo Dos Santos (POR)** : I discussed yesterday with Mr Gordon Rapp. I had this opportunity during the evening. You have to understand that the standards of European norms of protection for sporting clothing were introduced in 2004. We requested the manufacturers to submit again their masks in order that they fulfil the safety norms. Five manufacturers did this so far : PBT, Gajardoni, Paul, Allstar and in 2005 Negrini. Before, there was only an agreement made by the SEMI. Now, there are some for the institutes with norms and standards. The manufacturers must submit three samples of mask and these institutes send us in return all the results of the tests and impacts. And the institutes are also certified ISO 9000 and they will not lose their statute. Furthermore, when we receive the results of the tests, the SEMI undertakes a more violent shock-test than the one of norms to be absolutely sure, and I personally analyse the mask and can suggest manufacturers to make some changes. So I repeat it, transparent masks after the date of 2004 have all legal documents that I will give you and I will give them directly to Gordon Rapp because in his country there are also big manufacturers and we shall analyse this together. Thank you.

**Jochen Faerber** : I just want to tell you again from the media point of view. We had a meeting with Peter Diamond, the Head of Olympic Sports NBC in New York. And NBC is the host broadcaster for the Olympic Games. So for us a key member of the Olympic Games. And I got some other reactions this year after the fencing World Championships in Leipzig. And that is the same. If we have a close-up of fencers from the left and the right side, you can see, even if there are some reflections, the eyes of the fencer. And

personally, I fully agree with what Peter Diamond told me one day as well in New York : I want to see the eyes of the fencer. So from a media point of view, I really believe that we are going the right way in having transparent masks at competitions, so that we can see on television the eyes of the fencers, the most important communication tool between human beings. And this is a crucial issue, I heard sometimes people saying what does it really bring as there were reflections. I had reactions after the Leipzig World Championships and people said : I could see the eyes of the fencers, I liked it and I would like to continue it this way. Just a remark from my side, from the media side.

### **Applause.**

**Frédéric Pietruszka (FRA) :** We spoke a lot about cost and mediatisation but I believe that we have not spoken about the athletes. I believe that it is still important to speak about the athletes and their feeling about this mask, and in particular the athletes at epee. Epee has nothing to do in its approach with sabre, it is a thrusting weapon, much harder, and for that reason, the athlete has a fear of this new mask, which he does not necessarily have with a cutting weapon. What I propose, as we actually have to move towards the mediatisation, that we go step by step. Instead of wanting epee and foil at the same time, to have a little less hard weapon such as foil, I propose that the transparent mask be adopted at foil but be excluded at epee for the time being.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe that we have to decide now. You know that we carried out many tests with the masks. Many things have been told, which appear, by the way, to be wrong later on. But it is not important, we are used to, it is almost a second nature by us to tell things which are not exact. I believe that there was no problem with the transparent mask. There were problems with the mesh masks, it is true that we deplored really unpleasant things for our sport. First of all, everybody can wear it and it is true that some countries adopted the transparent mask either at foil or epee, and to my knowledge, there has never been any accident. It was used during more than a year at sabre, and there has never been any accident with the transparent mask. We contacted the NBC, as said by Mr Borack. The NBC is favourable and for us it is very important that televisions be favourable to a sport. If the transparent mask is worn, the NBC transmits the signal, otherwise it considers that fencing is not enough attractive to the media. Well. We have the IOC which has been claiming for several years, it has been claiming for ten or twelve years for the transparent mask at all our weapons. It is our problem. If you want, I do not have uncertainties, personally, I have no interest neither in the mesh mask nor in the transparent mask. I am just telling you that the image of wireless sabre and transparent mask is more beautiful. And we try as much as possible to show this image. So if you still want to go by stage, I find the stages very long, but if you want another stage, I am of this opinion, this is good. I remember, I was also like you, I remember of being President of the FIE Propaganda Commission and when the transparent mask was proposed, I said no, there is no interest. And I can tell you, it was in 1990, fifteen years ago. And I admit that I changed my mind when I saw the mask, when I saw the possibilities that it would bring to television. I found that it was not bringing very much, when I was looking at it. But from the moment that I know that the televisions are in favour, that I know that the IOC is in favour and that it does not contain any risk, I say it is a good thing. Then there is a question of price, it is true that it has a price. But that is why we intend to make it compulsory only for the competitions which are broadcasted. It is obvious that we do not request the fencers in clubs to wear the mask, we do not ask juniors to wear the mask. I am interested in the Grand Prix, the World Championships and the Olympic Games. That is all ! Apart from this, for us, it has no interest to have a mask with transparent visor. Thus, I believe that what we ask you, is to extend the mask with transparent visor to Grand Prix at all the weapons, and to the World Championships at all the weapons. But I think that it does not represent an enormous cost. It has a cost for those who will

participate in these championships only, and their number is limited. I do not believe that it represents an excessive cost for the federations. I therefore ask you if we can vote on this point, that is the compulsory transparent mask at Grand Prix and team competitions and Senior World Championships. Jochen Faerber would like to speak again. I give him the floor and then we shall vote.

**Jochen Faerber :** Just a remark on the security and safety issue. When we went to the laboratories to test the security, the goal was to have at least the same standards as for the traditional old fencing masks. That was the goal for the laboratories. Concerning the rumours, I was personally in Las Vegas. Suddenly a German fencer came to say that the weapon went through the mask. I checked the mask and it was not true. The weapon was actually held in the frame, what the frame is made for. This mask is today with the SEMI Commission in Portugal. You see, sometimes people come and say that it went through but when you check the mask, you realise that it is not the case. It was held in the frame so the measures of safety in place worked. For sure the fencer had some fear, but in the Las Vegas case, it did not penetrate the transparent visor. It was kept where it should be. So the laboratories are testing the masks from the manufacturers to the minimum safety standards of the old traditional masks. Maybe one more remark. If there is a problem, if a fencer has a problem with the mask, if that occurs, the most important thing is to give immediately the information to the FIE, which never happened. We had a question at the press conference in Leipzig, where suddenly the case was there. The FIE had never heard about that case before. The Las Vegas mask is with the SEMI Commission, it was given to the SEMI Commission, it was checked by the SEMI Commission, and it did not penetrate it.

**Ana Pascu (ROM, MH) :** I was the observer in Las Vegas and I personally took back the Las Vegas mask. It has never penetrated it. I tried several times at home, I tried in a laboratory in Canada, it never penetrated it. I took back the mask of your fencer, I was in the hall when it happened and I took back the mask with me.

**Julius Kralik (SVK) :** A little proposition as member of the Commission for the transparent mask, the proposition could maybe not be bad. Mr George van Dugteren, who was the President of this Commission, made a report, which might be interesting for all the participants of this Congress and the Federations, in which we can have more details. Apart from questions concerning the SEMI, there are questions seen from a medical point of view, which could reassure. The tests carried out proved that the transparent masks are without danger, that we can use them.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** What is certain, is that many fencers are wearing it now, at least at sabre, they have been wearing them during more than a year, we did not face any difficulties, and to my knowledge, there is no respiratory difficulty. Most of the time, when they wear a transparent mask, they do not even remove the mask during the « Halt ». And to reassure the French, I can tell them that I was present in Bern, when Mr Srecki tried to penetrate a transparent mask. I was there, I saw him and contrary to the spread rumours, he never managed to penetrate it.

I draw your attention to the fact that you have already spoken on this subject.

**Krisztian Kulcsar (HUN) :** What I would like to say is that I was in Montreal in the beginning of 2001, I was fencing the final with Eric Srecki. At that time the transparent mask was not obligatory, however, we were asked by the organisers to wear it in the final. Eric Srecki did not want it, and he put the mask on a chair, took a broken blade from his bag and hit the mask, which got pierced. Then, he went to ask the organiser, would you wear it ? And the issue was over. This is not a rumour, I was there and no one was wearing it afterwards. Thank you.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Listen, we were certainly not at the same competition, it was in 1991.

**Krisztian Kulcsar (HUN)** : It was in 2001.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : In 2001 ? Personally I did not see it pierced. Well you, you saw it pierced, it is another thing. Things being what they are, anyway since, as indicated by the President of the SEMI Commission, measures were undertaken in 2004 and the masks seem safe now. At least, for the moment, I had no accident with the masks. But, to put you comfortable, you vote in favour, you vote against, the FIE President has nothing to see with that. You know what you are doing, you know what the IOC thinks, you know what the medias think, you know what the televisions think, you know the situation, and then you vote either for or against. So, I believe that we can vote now for or against the adoption for the Grand Prix and World championships only. And the Olympic Games, it is very obvious, because it is the most important, to have the transparent mask in the Olympic Games, obviously. It is actually our goal. So I believe that we can vote on this subject, do you agree ? So who is in favour of wearing the mask... Who is for the secret vote ? Who wants a secret vote ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We voted yesterday that we need 25 %.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : This is over, we now need 25 %.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : 25 % are needed. The decisions concerning the Statutes are for immediate application unless otherwise specified. This is statutory Mr Geuter. If you recall, yesterday, we specified the propositions, which would be of a later application. The propositions concerning the Statutes are of immediate application unless otherwise specified. And yesterday, we indicated the season of application for two propositions.

**Bert van de Flier (NED)** : We have not even yet approved the minutes of this meeting. How is it possible to already apply our decisions ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Listen, this is good. Who wants a secret vote ? We make a secret vote.

**Nancy Anderson (USA)** : I would like to know, please, I apologise for not being able to be here yesterday, I would like to know as we now have points in zonal championships, which will be similar to Grand Prix , I would like to know if the transparent mask will be compulsory in these zonal championships ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I think that it is not compulsory for the zonal championships. It is special. You are still the ones to decide on your zonal championships. It is not up to the International Federation to decide on the championships.

**Nancy Anderson (USA)** : Yes, this is just to clarify as there are now points. Thank you.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Mr Vergara scrutineer with Mr Peter Jacobs.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We are therefore going to call the federations, you will receive a ballot paper which indicates « yes », « no », « abstention », for the proposition which is made.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Therefore the proposition is : the use of mask with transparent visor for the Grand Prix and the World Championships. For the seniors, of course.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The Netherlands voting for the Netherlands Antilles. Please go to the back of the room where the polling booths are located, and you will receive a ballot paper. Argentina.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I would like that people do not move during the vote. That we have a vote in serenity.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Armenia. Aruba. Australia. Austria.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Could everyone remain seated so that we can see if people are going to vote or not.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Azerbaijan. Barbados and Belgium. Bolivia. Brazil. Bulgaria voting for Brunei. Bulgaria ...

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Please sit down because it is the most total confusion.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Bulgaria voting for Brunei. Ladies and Gentlemen please, sit down ! Bulgaria voting for itself. Senegal voting for Burkina Faso. Canada. Mexico voting for Chile. China. Aruba voting for Costa Rica. Aruba voting for Costa Rica. Hungary for Croatia. Cuba. Cyprus. Czech Republic. Denmark. Denmark. Germany voting for Ecuador. Egypt.

Gabriela Mayer, please ! Ms Mayer please, I do not see.

El Salvador. Spain. Estonia. Estonia also voting for Finland. And France. Great Britain. Great Britain. Georgia and Germany voting for itself. Greece and Guatemala. China voting for Hong Kong and Hungary voting for itself. Max Geuter voting for Indonesia. India and Iran. India please ! Ireland and Iraq. Iceland. Italy, Italy please ! Jordan and Japan. Korea. Arthur Cramer for Kuwait. Latvia, and Poland voting for Lithuania. Arthur Cramer is requested to go to the polling station. Ana Pascu for Luxembourg. René Roch for Macao. Taipei for Malaysia. Georgia for Moldova. Mexico voting for itself. Palestine for Mali. Italy for Malta. Ladies and Gentlemen, Kazakhstan has just arrived. Kazakhstan will therefore be able to vote. Kazakhstan. France for Monaco. And the Netherlands to vote. Jordan for Niger. Denmark for Norway. Australia for New Zealand. Panama. Panama ! Brazil for Paraguay. Brazil for Paraguay. Puerto Rico for Peru. And Panama for the Philippines, Panama for the Philippines. Palestine, voting for itself. Poland. Portugal. Puerto Rico voting for itself. Qatar. Romania and South Africa. Russia. Senegal. Korea for Singapore. El Salvador for San-Marino. Switzerland. The Slovak Republic. Sweden. Uzbekistan for Turkmenistan. Taipei. Egypt for Tunisia. Egypt for Tunisia. Turkey. Turkey. Turkey please. The Czech Republic for Ukraine. Bolivia for Uruguay. USA. Uzbekistan. Japan for Vietnam. Qatar for Yemen.

Are there countries which were not called? No, the vote is thus over.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Ladies and Gentlemen, please go back to your seats.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Well, please go back to your seats, we continue the Congress !

**Victor Sanchez (ESP)** : The result of the ballot is as follows : votes : 90. Valid votes : 90. **No : 52. Yes : 33. Abstention : 5. The proposition is rejected.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We are therefore refusing the extension of the transparent mask to the other weapons. Well, it is decided, thank you very much. Well, we continue.

We are going to distribute a CD of the finals of the World Championships of Leipzig. Each one will receive a CD of these World Championships of Leipzig, which is presented with the compliments of the FIE, naturally. Here we are.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Then, we carry on with the next urgent decisions.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Could you sit down please to carry on with the Congress. We continue with the confirmations of urgent decisions. It concerns now **the contact time at foil and the blocking time at foil and sabre**. I give the floor to the Technical Director. And then I think we can move on, at the same time, or at least just after, to the DVD that we have in order to show you the difference between the World Championships of Lisbon and the World Championships of Leipzig at foil.

**Ioan Pop** : As you properly recall, the Congress of Leipzig decided to modify the blocking time of the two lights at foil and sabre. 300 milliseconds at foil and 120 milliseconds at sabre. At the same time, it was decided to increase the contact time at foil to 15 milliseconds. It was first decided to apply these changes to Junior World Cups competitions. Following the letters received from a large number of federations, and a written consultation with all the FIE federations, evoking the practical reasons of the modifications and the universal use of these apparatus for juniors and seniors, this decision was also extended to the senior season. In all the events of the 2004/2005 season, including the 2005 World Championships of Leipzig, we had the opportunity to test the consequences of the modifications of the contact time, break time of the current if you prefer, for the scoring of hits on the valid and non-valid surfaces at foil and for the blocking time of the judging apparatus between two consecutive hits at foil and sabre. There were difficulties, of course, in the beginning of the season and a kind of incomprehension from fencers. At foil, it was necessary to learn again the hits with a thrust. The use to hit almost all the time, even in the middle of the chest, in a way similar to the execution of a hit made by the whipping over of the blade, requested long months of adaptation for the fencers. In the beginning, we faced the incomprehension and worries of fencers, but with the time, they adapted themselves. At the Leipzig Championships, we witnessed a total assimilation and a real metamorphosis of foil. I still warn you that it was not a reform or a new thing. It was purely and simply coming back to the specific identity of foil and to the application of the Rules. If you properly recall, in Leipzig, taking into account the difference between the practice and the Rules, the question was raised to choose either to change the Rules, or to try to force the fencers to fence in accordance with the Rules. The dialogue on the pistes came back, we noticed a very important increase of longer fencing phrases with counter-ripostes. And the main point of fencing, especially at foil, is the dialogue. The alternation of the lapse of time of preparation with the actions have a good rhythm and creates a fascinating and spectacular exhibition. Foil fencers executed offensive actions, which were more correct, by stretching out the arm naturally, and by hitting with a thrust. These offensive actions are easier to identify and to follow by the spectators and in addition, easier to referee. The characteristics of foil are re-established. These characteristics need to be more highlighted by the repetitions in slow motion of the TV broadcast meant for the general public, in order to obtain the support of the media and also follow a little bit the indication of the IOC concerning the objectivity of the refereeing. I now propose you to watch selections of actions at foil and see what foil was at the Lisbon World Championships, and then see a selection of actions at the Leipzig World Championships. I think that the difference is huge. I therefore propose you to watch this film.

**Presentation of the film.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : It is foil !

**Ioan Pop :** I think that the pictures speak for themselves. Each person who likes foil, who likes fencing, who likes teaching fencing, because the marks are coming back, even for fencing masters, I think that there is no comparison between both ways to fence foil. Concerning the blocking time at sabre, naturally, at sabre as well, we had various reproaches, various requests, negotiations, give me 5 milliseconds, I give you 20 milliseconds. Sorry, but it was a little painful, because our concern, I repeat it to you once again, for someone spending his life in fencing, we cannot make something, and we do not have the right to make something against our professional credo, as regards the essential of each weapon. In particular at foil and sabre, the respect of the conventions. We established these times in fencing to effectively not give the advantage to a remise against a parade-riposte. Otherwise we could effectively go farther, but we cannot make it because otherwise we lose the identity of the spirit of the weapon. We also heard at sabre, and I attended a small exhibition in Leipzig, which was a little caricatured, where they showed me that on a riposte executed in two times, we could effectively execute a remise. But this is in our Rules, in our fencing spirit, against a direct riposte, it is impossible to execute a remise. It is hundred per cent confirmed and we have never seen any action proving the contrary. Furthermore, in spite of all these difficulties at foil, especially at foil because we had to modify the way of hitting, learn again to come back to the normality, but at sabre as well, the hierarchies of values remain almost the same in spite of the fluctuations, which can exist for different objective reasons. It is not giving the advantage to the non-value, it is not giving the advantage to anti-fencing. It was giving the advantage to the champion, giving the advantage to a complete technico-tactic know-how. This alternation between preparation, you saw it well in Lisbon, there was practically no preparation anymore at foil, it was « go » and effectively immediately after was the action. But this alternation between preparation, which means increase of psychological tension for the spectators and finally the highlight in the action, this alternation had a good rhythm and was very well proportioned. And I am sure that within two years, it is going to be even better, because it is only about experience and an adaptation of about seven or eight months. I therefore propose you to agree with these changes because I think that they are beneficial for our sport.

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe that after this demonstration, we must proceed to the vote. Do we confirm these modifications as it allows us not to modify our apparatuses, which is therefore not costly ? Any modification would become costly otherwise. We agree, thus we proceed to the vote. Who is in favour of extending these modifications, that is the status quo such as it took place this last year ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Who is in favour ? Raise your arm please ? **59 votes for.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Thus **we definitively adopt** the measures, which were tested in the course of last year. Thank you. I give back the floor to our Director.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Then, the next modification, which concerned the article m.25.4 was already dealt with in the precedent propositions. Therefore, we move on to the article t.87 concerning the non-combativity with the text which was adopted by the Executive Committee and of which you were informed by letter of information no. 11-05. The text on **the non-combativity, article t.87**. Does anyone wish to express himself ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Do you agree to confirm the urgent decision which was taken in the course of the year ? Who are those, who are for the confirmation ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** Who is for the confirmation of this text ? Please raise your arm !



**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : What is already applied in all our championships.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Majority. Thus, the text is definitively approved.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The next text of the letter of information no. 12-05 was already dealt with the propositions concerning the Rules. Therefore, we are left with **the article o.13** of the letter of information no. 13-05. « Except where there are contrary provisions in these Rules, the pools are composed taking account of the latest official FIE ranking, and by drawing lots among any fencers who are not in the ranking ». The rest of the article remained unchanged. Yes, the modification was made because the possible non-ranked, in the past, were determined in a very hazardous way and without an adopted precise rule. It could be the opinion of the team captain or the opinion of a person being in the competition. Therefore we standardised the text in such a way that for possible non-ranked fencers, it becomes as currently applied, that is by drawing lots. And as it is applied by the way for the Olympic Games.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Do you agree ? Is somebody against ? Nobody is against. **This is adopted.**

## 6. Candidatures to the 2008 Junior/Cadet World Championships and vote for the awarding of the 2007 World Championships

---

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to the item 6 of the agenda and to its first part : candidatures to the 2008 junior/cadet World Championships. We are therefore here calling for candidatures for the organisation of the 2008 Junior/Cadet World Championships. Are there candidates ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : There can be candidates for the Junior/Cadet World Championships, but there can also be candidates for the junior championships only, in which case the cadet championships would become immediately in 2008 Zonal Championships and not World Championships anymore.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : So, Egypt is candidate for the Junior/Cadet World Championships. Both of them ? Egypt is therefore officially candidate to the organisation of the 2008 Junior/Cadet World Championships.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Is it junior/cadet or just junior ? Both. So we carry on with both.

**Applause.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Any other candidates ? There is no other candidate. Well, we have registered the candidature.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We registered the candidature, we shall vote on the candidature at our next General Assembly in Seoul, in Korea.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : The 2007 Junior/Cadet World Championships were already awarded to Izmir.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : It would be good to see in which conditions these championships are going to take place.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to the second part of this item 6, which is the presentation of candidatures and vote for the award of the 2007 World Championships.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I personally suggest that for the presentation, we draw lots. Who is going to begin then ? We ask both candidates to come and they are going to draw lots for the first one or second. All right. We therefore ask the representatives of Saint-Petersburg and Plovdiv to join us.

**Ioan Pop** : Ms Velichka, Mr Bychkov, I do not know ?

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Who is representing Saint-Petersburg ?

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : So, Plovdiv will make its presentation first.

**Velichka Hristeva (BUL)** : *Beginning of the presentation in Bulgarian language.*

**Ioan Pop** : I am kindly asking you to put your earphones on because Ms Velichka will make the presentation in Bulgarian language. The translators received the text to make

the translation easier. They will translate into three languages. I therefore ask everyone to put the earphone on to listen.

**Velichka Hristeva (BUL) :** *Presentation recorded in Bulgarian language. Transcription of the text given to the translators.*

Ladies, Gentlemen. Now, since very numerous years, I live my passion for fencing with you. My country, Bulgaria, has a long tradition in fencing. Our fencers sometimes mounted the international podium. Today, they are in progress and work to get back to the highest level. From the past years, I recall above all, as President of the Bulgarian Federation, the organisation of the Junior and Cadet World Championships in 2004. On that occasion and I am not the one to tell this, the fencers, trainers and leaders of each delegation got the opportunity to discover the beauties of Plovdiv and remember that we successfully managed to organise perfect World Championships. Since one and a half year, in all the private discussions that I had with most of you, you had the kindness to congratulate the Bulgarian federation on the quality of its organisation and the serenity in which the competitions took place. I was very sensitive to it. I deeply thank you for this. It was a tremendous encouragement to pursue our work in favour of fencing.

With my colleagues and leaders of our Government, we thus thought that these tributes could not remain there. It was necessary to give them more, for Bulgarian fencing but especially for the fencers of the entire world. It is in this sense that I presented the candidature of Plovdiv for the 2007 Senior World Championships. We have chosen 2007 for reasons that cannot be ignored.

On one hand because that year, Bulgaria will live an historic moment, by joining officially the European community, which represents for us a new hope of development, and to which we have always belonged in our soul, in our heart and in our spirit. Furthermore, because 2007 is a pre-Olympic year and you do not ignore that the results of these World Championships are very important for the qualification for the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games.

Plovdiv offers to each delegation an environment, sports installations, an atmosphere of equity and total objectivity. I personally give my word to respect these values which are important to you : honesty, intransigence against doping and all forms of corruption. We are together to defend the sport, and in particular, the one which unifies us against the dangers of the modern world. Fencing must remain faithful to its ethics and be exemplar in all points of view. I commit myself to this, in front of you, for the 2007 World Championships.

**Presentation of a film.**

**Velichka Hristeva (BUL) :** *Brief speech in Bulgarian language.*

**Applause.**

**Violeta Nikolova (Ambassador of Plovdiv, BUL) :** Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning and welcome to Plovdiv. My name is Violeta, I was born in 1980, but we do not speak about this period anymore. I am twenty-five years old, and I am, here, in front of you, the ambassador of the new generation of my beautiful country. Many of you know Bulgaria, some don't. I am talking today to all of you. I came here to tell you why, we, the young people are Plovdiv and why we love you. First of all, Plovdiv did not have to change its name to enter in a new era. Bulgaria gets ready to be part of the European community and Plovdiv inspires only in the modernity. We, the young people, we study and work, we, the young people, we take care of ourselves to lead our fate towards days

always better, economically, culturally, sociologically, sportily. We, the young people, we complain, we sing, we dance, we laugh, we speak, we have passion, we, the young people, we make sport, and I am even going to tell you a secret, we make love. In brief, we live, you see. We are as all the young people of the world. You and we, we reflect mutually the same image. This is dynamism, joy of living. Of our common faith, a better world for all. I propose now that in this room we hold hands to symbolise the hope carried by new generations in the values conveyed by the sport and the support you provide them. It will be our « hola » to you and to us. And of course Plovdiv, I was not going to forget it. Plovdiv symbolizes perfectly Bulgaria in its culture of always. Our Bulgaria ! Plovdiv for example, are painters famous up to Paris, Plovdiv for example, are great sportsmen whom other countries wanted to buy at a high price. I am now talking about the world famous football player Hristo Stoitchkov. Plovdiv, for example, lived tremendous hours with the fabulous Olympic symbol, which was represented by its high jumper Stefka Kostadinova, whose eternal beauty could be appreciated by the entire world, and who is currently the President of the National Olympic Committee of Bulgaria. Plovdiv, for example, is my friend, our friend to all. Velichka Hristeva, the President of the Bulgarian Federation who lives exclusively for the development of Bulgarian fencing. Plovdiv again, this is a determinedly sportsmanlike and human city, to which these 2007 World Championships are a blessing today. Finally, remember, we had abacuses, and all people of Plovdiv are using today these old abacuses to count down the days, which separate us from the day of the opening ceremony of the World Championships on 19 October 2007. And each ball is a lucky charm for you, and for us a sign of friendship to all the fencers of the world. Those who will be in Plovdiv and those who unfortunately will not be there. On behalf of all my young Bulgarian friends, I welcome you to Plovdiv, you will not be disappointed, do not disappoint us. Thank you.

### **Applause.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to the presentation of Saint-Petersburg.

**Youri Bytchkov (RUS)** : Dear colleagues, dear friends. We will first show you two films and then I will speak again.

### **Presentation of films.**

**Youri Bytchkov (RUS)** : *Speech in Russian language, translated as one goes along into English.* We all comprehend that sport and fencing are not only a fight or a conflict on the piste. This is first of all the display of friendly relations striving to cooperation and mutual understanding as well as the respect of interests of our states and federations. We all strive to resolve in the best way any complicated questions.

I would like to point out that during the 2003 Congress and you clearly remember that the President of the FIE Mr René Roch, as well as all the representatives of the world fencing community, had met with applause the decision of the Russian Fencing Federation to postpone the request of candidature of Saint-Petersburg from 2005 to 2007. This normal decision of Russia was profitable to everyone. And the main thing is that it was profitable and good for our beautiful and noble sport of fencing.

Having obtained a general approval and a support, we have launched the preparation for 2007 already in 2003. We would like to conduct these World Championships on a top level. The Organising Committee of Saint-Petersburg 2007 is already functioning. And a resolution was made by the Government of St Petersburg and we obtained a serious subvention for conducting this championship. Being guided exclusively by the desire to make our sport more popular, we are ready to provide brand new TV coverage solutions

that will provide demonstration of the championship on internal Russian channels as well as on international TV channels. We are seriously working on the preparations for 2007.

One month ago we had a regular meeting of the Organising Committee in Saint-Petersburg and the following important decisions were taken : the dates for conducting the World Championship will be settled between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> of October in agreement with the International Fencing Federation. And of course they will be adjusted to the schedule of competitions of any other sports.

Agreements on special rates for the accommodation, for those who will come to Saint-Petersburg to participate in the World Championship are in preparation. The approximate rate for 24 hours, that is one night, in double room will be about 70 USD, not more.

The issue of entry visas for Russia will be resolved and settled at the level of the Foreign Affairs Ministry. The appropriate decisions will be sent out to all Consulates or Representative Missions of the Russian Federation, of all the countries that are going to send participants to Saint-Petersburg.

We guarantee that the security services will work perfectly at the venue of the competitions as well as in the hotels, in which the participants will stay.

The State Committee of the Russian Federation on TV and Radio Broadcasting has already prepared the project of a contract for broadcasting these World Championships competitions in Russia as well as abroad, in European countries and other countries.

Having as primary goal the development and promotion of fencing, we took the decision to invite at the charge of the Organising Committee, representatives of 35-40 countries that have never participated before in the World Championships. This will be founded by the Foundation for the future of fencing. We shall increase the universality and the number of participants to the World Championships and we shall help small fencing nations to really, and not on paper only, join our world fencing community.

The decision was taken by the Organising Committee that no entry fee will be collected from the participants in individual competitions as well as in team competitions. This sum represents approximately EUR 100'000 that we shall provide. For the first time, we decided to provide a prize fund of 100'000 EUR for the winners and medallists as well as their trainers for the World Championships. The decision was also taken to invite the Presidents of 117 national federations as honoured guests at the cost of the Russian Fencing Federation and the Foundation for the future of fencing.

I think that the points listed above clearly show the whole world and all the participants of this Congress that a great work has already been undertaken and we have launched it with your support and approval of 2003. I regret to point out that a certain group of people and countries are conducting a black PR campaign against Saint-Petersburg. And I hope that we have the support of the FIE because our primary goal is the development of world fencing and the conduct of world championships on a very high level, even higher than before. Our faith is to conduct this World Championship on a top level. And if we have good faith, if we have a good reputation, we shall always be part of the Olympic movement.

The persons I already mentioned above are trying to turn our sport into politics and these politics will lead to nothing but dissolution and discrepancies between the countries. This is the reason why the candidature of Plovdiv appeared as an alternative

to the one of Saint-Petersburg. These people do not take into consideration the interests of our countries and federations which are striving for friendship and unity.

And now standing here, I would like to address the President of the Fencing Federation of Bulgaria Madam Hristeva. I would like to propose you to postpone your application as it was done previously by the Russian Federation in a similar situation with the Federations of Germany and Italy. I propose that you postpone your application from 2007 to 2009. This decision of the Bulgarian Federation can be taken in a spirit of fair-play and it will contribute to reinforce and consolidate our friendship and cooperation between countries of the world fencing community. This will be a real good example for the future to solve such complicated international issues. I can now officially declare that we are ready to provide any kind of support to the Bulgarian Federation. And I would like that Ms Hristeva gives her opinion on my proposal. Well, as Ms Hristeva does not react on this request, I would like to have maybe the opinion of representatives of other federations.

**Applause.**

**Velichka Hristeva (BUL) :** Ladies and Gentlemen, my dear friends. As you heard it before, I also have serious motivations. And the serious motivations of the Bulgarian Federation for a candidature in 2007. As you also heard it, I also have the personal support of the President of the Republic of Bulgaria Mr Gueorgui Parvanov. These World Championships will take place with his support. I also have the support of the new President of the National Olympic Committee of Bulgaria Ms Stefka Kostadinova. I do not have the authority to withdraw the candidature of Plovdiv. I beg your decision. Thank you.

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, we had a long speech of Mr Bytchkov and I thank him for his long speech. I would like to keep you informed as I am involved. First of all, the President of the Federation has never awarded World Championships without requiring the opinion of the Congress, it seems absurd. It is maybe done in certain countries, but in my country it is not done. And in any case, it is contrary to my ethics, it is contrary to my ethics to have votes which I do not have. On this subject, I would like to read you the report of the Congress of 2003. In this Congress report, it is said and I am the one to speak by the way : « the Russian Federation has informed the International Federation its intention to propose the candidature of Saint-Petersburg for 2007. Well aware of the possibility of being in concurrence with some countries, which could present their candidatures for the same year ». It was never in question to say, we agree for 2005, 2006 and 2007, it is Saint-Petersburg, you can notice it, this is the 2003 Congress report. Anyway, if a decision is taken today, it will be final only once I have a paper signed by the duly authorized persons. In particular by the President of the Russian Federation, who is unfortunately not here, we regret it, it would have been very interesting for our Congress to have him among us. Any vote made today will not be final. I want a signed paper because I see that we do not always say the truth. This being said, we have no date for the competition of Saint-Petersburg. We have a date for Plovdiv. The date of Plovdiv is fine. We shall wait for the date of Saint-Petersburg. Well, between the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 15<sup>th</sup> of October but it would be desirable to have a final date. We have some questions to raise concerning the television.

**Jochen Faerber :** I would like to ask both candidates for two more details concerning television. As you know, the International Federation has just extended its contract with the European Broadcast Union for Europe and as you noticed it for the World Championship of Leipzig, we increased the number of production hours from about

fifteen hours in the past to almost fifty hours in Leipzig. We will continue in Turin to work with television rights and I would like to know from both candidates if they are aware of the real increase of production hours, which is an increase of cost either for the Organising Committee, or their broadcaster playing the role of host broadcaster, which is in charge to send these images to the European Broadcast Union, and that they will be able to fulfil this requirement according to our contract. And as you saw it in Leipzig, we managed to film the direct eliminations for the first time. That was the reason why we increased the number of production hours. I would like to know from both organising or bidding committees if they can fulfil this requirement, that is to also film direct elimination bouts and offer them to different national televisions. This is for me a key element for the future of the World Championships, to have a wider spread of television production and broadcast of fencing. So those two questions, direct elimination and increasing of hours of production.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Well, the Technical Director would like to say a few words.

**Ioan Pop** : I just want to draw the attention of both candidates on a technical problem. In spite of the fact we had an exceptional World Championship in Leipzig, and I take this opportunity to congratulate them for this one more time, the lay out of the four pistes in the shape of a square is not a new standard which was adopted. It was rather an exception for objective reasons, which were negotiated by the Organisation Committee with the International Fencing Federation. Because from the point of view of transparency and visibility, this is not the best solution. It was resolved more or less suitably, the entire rest counterbalanced this. But it does not become a standard, and we are going to approve the plans. I saw the project of Saint-Petersburg, I know it can be modified. I just draw the attention of the candidates. Thank you very much.

**Youri Bytchkov (RUS)** : I would like to inform the Congress as well as Mr Ioan that we have already established contact with the representatives of TV companies in Russia and as soon as the decision regarding the host city for 2007 is taken, we are ready to send the contracts and arrange a TV coverage that fully meets the requirements of the International Fencing Federation and the standards newly introduced. Thank you.

**Applause.**

**Velichka Hristeva (BUL)** : My dear friends, we saw how the Leipzig World Championships took place and we know very well all the points related to the technique. We even have here in this room a representative of the Bulgarian television Ms Tseleva. If you have questions, you can ask them to this Lady. Thank you.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I think we must stop the discussions. We are therefore going to vote.

**Gordon Rapp (GER)** : Mr. President, dear friends. At the Leipzig Congress in 2003, we had three candidates for the 2005 and 2006 World Championships : Turin, Leipzig and Saint-Petersburg, and as Germany was only able to host the championships in 2005, it was sportingly agreed, and with dignity, that Italy, Turin, moves to the year 2006, and Saint-Petersburg agreed for 2007, what should still be decided at the following Congress. The reasons why Germany, my federation, could only host the Championships in 2005 are various. It was not possible to host the event in 2006 because the Soccer World Championship was already scheduled in 2006 in Germany. And because Leipzig was a candidate city for the 2012 Olympic Games, a financial support, and you saw it in Leipzig by yourself, was guaranteed for 2005, and this was a very important factor. With the help of the FIE and Mr René Roch, Turin generously agreed to move to 2006. And this was the solution for being able to host the

Championships in 2005 in Leipzig, and the Congress approved it. For Germany, and me personally, it is a moral point of view to support Saint-Petersburg for these Championships in 2007. It is also thanks to the support of the Russian Federation, which did not insist to have the championships in 2006. This is why the German Fencing Federation, and we are sorry for Plovdiv, ask now all the FIE members to vote for Saint-Petersburg to organise in 2007 the World Championships. Thank you.

**Applause.**

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA) :** It is always difficult to make choices, because we are disappointing somebody and pleasing somebody else. But we must join the position expressed by the representative of Germany. The agreement, no matter whether it was in writing or honourable words, was clear and could not be open to other interpretations. Germany had the necessity to have the championships in 2005. We had the opportunity to postpone our request and schedule these World Championships in 2006 after the Olympic Games, in also taking advantage of the organisation and infrastructure. And Saint-Petersburg accepted to postpone of two years its request. At this point, morally and technically, I think that we have no other alternative than to accept this position and support it. We regret, because we want to be friends with everybody. We hope that Bulgaria can organise as soon as possible and in the best way another championship, we agree with the idea of having them in 2009, which is the next opportunity but we confirm our wish, our intention of vote, which is only for Saint-Petersburg. Thank you.

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Well, Ladies, Gentlemen. I think that the pressures which are made on the Congress are a little bit unbearable. That certain persons agreed, between themselves, to organise the World Championships, we agree, but it only commits them with themselves. It does not commit the Congress. And it did not commit the President of the International Federation, and he said it at the Congress in 2003. You have it in the minutes of the Congress. Thus it is a commitment between them, it is an association of persons, very honourable of course, but it never was a commitment of the Congress to accept that 2007 would be Saint-Petersburg because if it would be the case, we would not need to have a vote today. We are having a vote today because the Congress is not committed and the Congress is not part of the agreement made between these three persons. They met, they decided. It is their problem between themselves, but it is not our problem and in any case, not my problem. I am anxious to remain neutral in a case like this one. Candidatures were open. Each one presented its city, its possibility of organisation, we are now going to vote on these two possibilities. I still add that it will become definitive only once I will have in writing all the conditions which were given by the candidates and we shall ratify at this moment the candidature. It means that it will be valid only once I have a detailed paper, which indicates all what was proposed at the Congress today. Here we are, we now vote for one or the other. I ask for a secret vote as the President has the right to ask for a secret vote and we are therefore going to vote for the two candidatures.

**Nathalie Rodriguez :** We shall call the roll of the countries. We are going to give you a ballot paper.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** We are not here at the European Union, during which we take back the floor before the vote. It does not exist here at the International Federation. Mr Bytchkov you are not allowed to speak. It is over. It is inadmissible.



**Nathalie Rodriguez** : You are going to receive a ballot paper, which indicates the name of the two candidates cities. You just have to put a cross in the box by the city you wish to elect.

The Netherlands for the Netherlands Antilles. Argentina. Armenia. Aruba. Australia. Austria. Azerbaijan. Barbados. Barbados, Barbados ! Bolivia. Brazil. Brazil ! Bulgaria voting for Brunei. Bulgaria voting for Brunei. And Bulgaria voting for itself. Senegal for Burkina Faso. Canada. Mexico for Chile. China. Aruba voting for Costa Rica. Hungary voting for Croatia. Cuba. Belgium. Cyprus. Czech Republic.

Excuse me Sirs, could you kindly move away so I can see the polling booths !

Denmark. Cyprus. Germany for Ecuador. Egypt. El Salvador. Spain. Estonia and Estonia also voting for Finland. France. Great Britain. Georgia. Germany voting for itself. Greece. Guatemala. China for Hong Kong. Hungary and Max Geuter for Indonesia. India and Iran. Ireland. Is Ireland here ? Iraq. Iceland. Italy, Jordan. Japan. Korea. Arthur Cramer for Kuwait. Latvia. Poland for Lithuania. Ana Pascu for Luxembourg. Ana Pascu for Luxembourg ! Kazakhstan. René Roch for Macao. Taipei for Malaysia. Georgia for Moldova. Excuse me Sirs but I cannot see the back, kindly go there ! Mexico. Palestine for Mali. Palestine for Mali ! Palestine for Mali ! Italy for Malta. France for Monaco. Jordan for Niger and Denmark for Norway. Australia for New Zealand. Panama. Brazil for Paraguay. Puerto Rico for Peru. And Panama for Philippines. Palestine, voting for itself. Poland. Portugal. Puerto Rico voting for itself. Qatar. Romania. South Africa. Russia. Senegal. The Netherlands. Korea for Singapore. El Salvador for San-Marino. Switzerland. Slovak Republic. Sweden. Uzbekistan for Turkmenistan. Taipei. Egypt for Tunisia. Turkey. Czech Republic for Ukraine. Bolivia for Uruguay. USA. Uzbekistan. Japan for Vietnam. And Qatar for Yemen. Were all the countries called ? Yes, the vote is therefore over. I called you M. Geuter, I said Max Geuter for Indonesia.

**Jochen Faerber** : Ladies and Gentlemen, we are kindly asking you to get back to your seats one more time for the result of the vote.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)** : Ladies and Gentlemen, I give you the result of the vote for the 2007 World Championships. 92 voting countries and 92 valid votes. The result is : **Plovdiv : 40 votes. Saint-Petersburg : 52 votes.**

**Applause.**

**Velichka Hristeva (BUL)** : Ladies and Gentlemen, my dear friends. Of course, I regret very much to have lost this battle, but I still want to congratulate Saint-Petersburg. But I believe that there was no fair-play in our relationships. I believe that today we sold our sport. And I have a proposition for the next World Championships : not to decide on them at the FIE Congress but to speak with the Russian Federation and up to them to tell us where the World Championships can take place. Thank you.

**Applause.**

**Youri Bytchkov (RUS)** : Dear friends and colleagues. I would like to thank all those who supported the candidature of Saint-Petersburg and I would like to emphasize once again that we guarantee that this World Championship will be conducted at a top level. And I think that it is going to be a new page in the development of world fencing. Thank you for your comprehension and support.

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** We are going to continue because we will not have for very long. I believe that we shall be over in ten minutes, we are therefore not going to have lunch to then return, if you agree.

Well, listen, contrary to what I said, we effectively still have several items to be discussed, I believe that it is preferable to have lunch and then to come back to finish, because various items still need to be looked at.

## **LUNCH BREAK**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** We take back. I would need the opinion of the Congress. We discussed with the organisers of the Games of Beijing, the BOCOG, and it seems possible that our Team World Championships which will not be part of the Beijing Games, be a test event in Beijing in April 2008. I think that it will not be bad, and with this, all our fencers would have gone to Beijing and we would have the Team World Championships not participating in the Olympic Games, in Beijing, in April 2008. Do you agree that I continue the discussions in this respect ? Who does not agree ? Well, everybody agrees, we therefore continue, okay. I do not promise that we are going to succeed, but I think that it would be a good thing for the fencers to go to Beijing for the teams which will not participate in the Olympic Games.

## 7. Miscellaneous items

---

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : We now move on to the item 7 : miscellaneous items. Award of the Challenge Chevalier Feyerick.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Then, you know that the odd years, there are no honorary members but we award the **Challenge Feyerick**. This Challenge Feyerick is awarded to the persons who had a sportsmanlike gesture, a sportsmanlike attitude towards others and I admit that it is today a refreshing item after what we went through. I suggest to award this Challenge to Fabrice Jeannet, who is a great fencer, a great epee fencer, for the words he had in the press following the World Championships. He expressed the following things : « I had a peaceful childhood, I have only good memories, I am satisfied with the education that my parents gave me, they taught me values, the respect for people, politeness, honesty, and I am rather proud of the result ». We then interrogated him about his winner Kolobkov and he said that for him it was an honour to be beaten by such a great champion. He really spoke in praise of his winner, he recognised that he was the best and that Mr Kolobkov was a man of great value, and I am a little of his opinion. And therefore, **I propose that we award the Challenge Feyerick to Mr Fabrice Jeannet for his statements in the press**. It is rather seldom to have a fencer expressing himself in this way. Do you agree ?

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : We have another item, the **candidatures for the 2007 Congress**. We currently have two candidatures for the 2007 Congress. We have Spain and we also have Istanbul. Istanbul is candidate, for Spain, we do not know the city. But anyway, we do not designate today the city which will organise the 2007 Congress. We will do it in Seoul, or close to, in Taebaek City. Thus today, just the ones who presented their candidatures as we had up to the Congress to present a candidature. In Taebaek City we shall decide between both candidatures for the 2007 Congress.

**Giorgio Scarso (ITA)** : I am going to speak in Spanish, not to make some demagogy, but because it is the only language in which I can express myself, apart from Italian. Italy had asked for the possibility of organising the Congress in 2007 to give possibilities to the national federation and International Federation, not to have a confrontation with Spain, which I would like to thank for its spirit and service provided with this candidature. Italy thus withdraws its candidature for the Congress 2007 in favour of Spain. I just found out that there was also Turkey. I believe that fencing must find a moment of peace and I now invite the President, Mr René Roch, to find a way to organise the meeting scheduled to hold in Korea to decide on the teams which will stay out. It must not be a moment of great fight between the federations. I realise that each federation has its own interests, but I believe that the best thing would be to find a method, in such a way that everybody knows what is the criteria to be adopted to choose the teams which will go to Beijing, and avoid a fight between the countries, because I am sure that each country has its interests. The best thing would be that the Executive Committee personalises the criteria to choose the team, in order to have a collaboration and not a confrontation between the federations. Thank you very much.

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Mr Groupierre.

**Victor Sergio Grouppierre (ARG)** : Mister President, it is indicated in the Congress agenda that the venue of the next Congress must be established, and I noticed that several decisions were postponed to the General Assembly of next year for discussion. According to the Statutes the decisions are not within the competence of the General Assembly, the General Assembly is rather for the approval of the report and the budget, but not for discussions. We were invited to discuss these subjects at the Congress and I do not see why we have to postpone them to the General Assembly.

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I am totally of this opinion, but it seems very difficult or we must consider that the General Assembly will also be an Extraordinary Congress because we are forced to take a decision towards the IOC. I cannot tell the IOC, Sirs, wait until 2007 to know what teams are going to go to the Olympic Games of 2008. Do you imagine to do that ? They will simply suppress us the teams. That is what will happen. We must be reasonable in life. We must take decisions. I say that it is possible to postpone of a few months but we cannot postpone the Olympic programme of several years. It is not possible. So I am for the law, the General Assembly will be at the same time an Extraordinary Congress to decide on the teams, which will go to the Olympic Games, that is all.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : I wanted to indicate to you that the Congress is sovereign and that it has totally the right to exceptionally attribute additional prerogatives to the General Assembly.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Well, furthermore, concerning agreements that can be arranged between you. We are very happy to know that you have agreements but we are not here to say : I agreed with this one to have the General Assembly in my country and then he will have the right to do it somewhere else etc. But do you think that the Congress is committed by you ? It is your problem, not the problem of the Congress. The Congress is sovereign, each one has the right to think what he wants, each one can choose a venue for the General Assembly in such place or in such other place. I think that it is necessary to stop schemes between you. I know that it is a kind of second nature but these schemes are not for us, this is finished. In any case, I personally do not accept it.

I now hand over to the Technical Director, who is going to speak about the possibility of an international fencing centre. I also add that there is no commitment, we did not commit ourselves and you will be the ones to decide whether we do it or whether we do not do it. It is your problem, it is neither a decision of the President, nor the Bureau, nor the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee supports the project but that is all.

**Ioan Pop** : For at least two years, and even more if we take into account propositions of a project which was not carried out in Aigle in Switzerland, we have been discussing in the Executive Committee of the creation of an international fencing centre. So I would like to present the objectives of this programme, the purpose of this purchase, the objectives of its functioning and of course then, the financial part which will be presented by the duly authorised persons for this. So, the FIE felt the necessary needs to enable all the countries to have the ambition of being competitive in the Olympic Games. It noticed that almost all of them were forced to spend the major part of their budget in the travelling of their national senior teams to allow them to still participate in the competitions, what is determining to be able to meet the best fencers and hope to get closed to them. The main objective of our programme, which is part of our development programme, is therefore the creation of a high level world training centre essentially and mainly meant for juniors as well as for the improvement of coaches. The creation of this

structure will give the opportunity to juniors of the entire world to participate in the junior World Cups taking place in Europe, and get trained at the same time. It will allow us to reach effectively several objectives. So the main activity will be that the selected fencers from all the continents benefit from a high-level training and take advantage to participate in the Junior World Cup competitions, taking place in Europe. Five other fields of activities will be concerned. The improvement of technical coaches. Every year several high-level technical improvement trainings will be proposed to federations, notably to the trainers of fencers who participated in the trainings in the previous months. We shall use it for the refereeing and we shall have the opportunity, several times a year, to organise worldwide meetings, which aim at improving the international refereeing. The other objective is the improvement of the organisation of competitions, which will allow all the organisers of international competitions to get acquainted with their obligations and duties in compliance with the very strict handbook of regulations established by the FIE. Also as regards the evolution of the material, the technicians and manufacturers of material will participate every year in conferences to improve the material and will present the state of their works and researches. Furthermore the leaders of national federations, the administrative leaders and the administrative managers who feel the need can be trained for their mission and informed about the tools indispensable to their success. This property is situated in France in the surroundings of Paris, near Fontainebleau, five kilometres away from a village of an impressionist painter Moret-sur-Loing in Seine et Marne. In principle, it will be open all year and can welcome, at the same time, around thirty trainees from all the continents, according to a boarding school formula, two persons per room. Each training can last between one and three months and will be reserved for fencers who are between 15 and 20 years old, for the main activity. These young hopefuls will be proposed to the FIE by their national federation according to a system of rotation which will allow each nation to benefit from these improvement courses in the course of a cycle of two years. An agreement will be made between the FIE and the Federation of the trainee, which specifies that the best conditions must be set for him afterwards so that he can have a successful career in sport. The training will indeed be technical but also physical with a special programme adapted to fencing. Then, we have details on the functioning. Each trainee will pass a medical check-up upon arrival, a follow-up will be suggested, etc, etc. I now propose you to look at some photos of this centre, which is located, as I told you, five kilometres away from Moret-sur-Loing, and fifteen kilometres away from Fontainebleau.

### **Presentation of the photos.**

Here is the situation of this centre, which is seventy kilometres via the motorway A6 and thirty-five minutes by train. The Orly airport is at 45 km, Fontainebleau at 15 km, Moret-sur-Loing at 5 km. This is a property from the XIXth century, of over ten hectares, crossed by two rivers with a pond, a park with trees kept all the year around, an outdoor swimming pool with a pool house and a tennis. Here is the main building, it consists of three buildings next to each others, which offer about twenty-nine rooms. This building was completely restored. Here we have the swimming pool and the pool house. Tennis. Garden and orchard. A pond. Lanes. This is a vast house of 1'200m<sup>2</sup> living space, forty rooms, twenty-seven bedrooms, fifteen bathrooms, two reception halls, sauna and jacuzzi. You are now going to see some pictures of the house. There are two big halls, which could have multi-functional use. We could possibly create our international documentation centre. Here is the big hall from the mezzanine. And several rooms, we have just selected some examples, because it is effectively not necessary to show you each room. Here are some plans. So, it consists of a central building, a building on the right and a building on the left. And actually here are some technical plans of the floor, etc, etc. This is grosso modo the presentation of this centre. There is space for the construction of a fencing hall but we shall first see how it goes as we are fifteen

kilometres away from Fontainebleau and even less kilometres from the Ecole Interarmées des Sports, which has a fencing hall, and where the problem of meals at lunch and dinner can be solved, with a big sport centre and fields. Many possibilities for a complex sport preparation, medical follow-up, etc, etc. I think that it will be a good thing to be able to host, train and send fencers to various Junior World Cup competitions. Thank you for your attention.

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Peter Jacobs is going to take the floor for the financial point of view.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH) :** I am going to speak in English.

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Maybe we should first tell you that this centre cannot be immediately operational. You know that in France, some standards must be respected when buildings are open to the public and we must therefore first bring it up to the standards. And then, I think that in a first stage, up to 2008, it will not be possible to have trainings free of charge. A certain amount will need to be paid. But this will be determined, once we will prepare these trainings, for the moment, it depends on numerous questions, we cannot say today how much it is going to cost exactly. In any case, it will certainly be cheaper than what we pay today for the various trainings. And eventually, at first, we can make trainings in Fontainebleau in the EIS Fontainebleau, which is an important school for fencing and accommodate people in the buildings. But to accommodate them, it is necessary to first bring up the whole to the standards.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH):** I have to explain to you the finances taking into account certain assumptions. The assumption is that we obtain the property for EUR 1.4 million, which requires some negotiation and that we finance it with a down payment of ten percent and a mortgage for fifteen years there after. On this basis until the point at which we would receive the money from Beijing, the purchase, the initial purchase of the property, the bringing it up to standard mentioned by President Roch to satisfy legal requirements and the basic furnishing of the property, plus maintenance of the property to keep it in correct condition rather than full use, is estimated at EUR 1 million. To put that into perspective, and again making certain assumptions, which is at the moment we have a lot of money still in dollars and we sell that money at roughly the current rate of the dollar, the dollar as improved, and that we stick very strictly to our budget through 2008, without allowing and assuming that we have requirements for expenditure, which are not budgeted, we would arrive at the point when we get the Beijing money at basically approximately zero. In other words, the acquisition of this property will cost us until 2008 all our reserves and take us to a zero position when we get to the Beijing money. These calculations do not take account at all of using the property. Therefore any use of the property until Beijing would require full funding by the users of the property. I have also made some calculations taking us through beyond Beijing to 2012, where again, we will have to have a very high level of funding rather than making it for free. This not to say that the funding need cost the Federations, the funding can come from the Olympic Solidarity and other sources that of course we have not been able to make any assumptions on that because we have no commitments to receive revenue. And as you saw from the pictures, the assumption for training, for the moment is that the people doing the courses reside in the centre that the fencing work is done at Fontainebleau and that the food is basically also taken at Fontainebleau or brought in to the centre from outside. I think probably that I would ask for questions rather than trying to explain anything more. So that is my report on the financial implications as we see them of purchasing this property.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Any questions ? Yes.

**Alexander Heeren (NED)** : Heeren from the Netherlands. Normally when I am doing business, and in particular for this kind of purchasing, I make a detailed cost analysis for ten years, or something like that, to be sure that the cash flow will be sufficient to keep the property. In my point of view, not having a cost analysis for over ten or five years is like gambling. Do I understand correctly, you still have no certainties about the figures ? Is that correct ?

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)**: That is correct. I have made certain calculations and I have the results based on certain assumptions for the use of it, but those have not been reviewed by the President or the Executive Committee. All I have done for calculation is to see what use of the centre if the FIE had to pay for all of it, would use our reserves between 2009 and 2012 if you like. I have said that we have no money for the use of it ourselves until 2008, I have made some calculations based on details study we did do, which I could describe but I have to say that they have not been presented to the President nor the Executive Committee in detail.

**Alexander Heeren (NED)** : In that case, even if I think this is a marvellous idea, I would prefer further investigations regarding detailed cost analysis before we make a decision.

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Does anyone else want to express himself ? Yes Sir.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : I am a little bit surprised that such an important subject is at the end of the Congress in the miscellaneous items. I expected it when the letters of the FIE were distributed and the second letter saying that this decision was postponed. The first one was pointing out the urgency of making a decision, and then we were informed that it will be discussed at the Congress. When we received the agenda, we did not see any item on this and now we discover that this is at the end. Frankly we would have brought our papers and analysis. I have nothing with me now, but even without making many calculations, if we have to stand an investment going approximately up to EUR 2.5 million for the purchase and furnishing, even with a mortgage, this means that roughly we should have a politic of cash flow in the area of EUR 300'000 to 500'000 per year to repay this, if I am not wrong.

**Peter Jacobs (GBR, MH)**: No, I think you are doing calculations on my calculations. The purchase of the property if you are including the mortgage repayment over the long term is maybe what you have calculated. But the immediate cost excluding the cost of borrowing the money is 1.4 million for the purchase and 100'000 for legal cost, 120'000 for bringing it up to standard and well I am not going into the details but in fact the initial total cost, first payment, bringing it up to standard, putting some furniture in, paying the lawyers, is EUR 400'000 a year and the annual cost related to the purchase of the property and keeping it in basic condition is EUR 200'000 a year. So we have a down payment of 400'000 and in three years of 200'000, gets me to the million.

**Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA)** : If I am not wrong, roughly, we should be in the area of EUR 300 to 500'000 and you say that this is without the exploitation costs. How is this hole going to be covered by the operations that will be settled there ? How many days, for how many persons, what occupancy and which rate should be achieved to reach a financial balance ? I think that this is vital for not spoiling the finances of the federation. Then there are some practical points, I am not saying that I am in favour or against the decision, I am just pointing out the things which lack to allow us make a conscientious decision. I want to be clear, because the thing is fascinating but there are also other points that we must keep in mind. We should also have some more information about the practical operation. I understand that the fencing venues are far. Normally in this kind

of situation, fencing venues, lodging and meals are at the same place. This is an inconvenient that can reduce the efficiency of the whole project. Then we also have to consider something else, that I would say democratic, but would all this money not be better used for the development of fencing in small countries rather than for the creation of additional places of excellence, for high level fencing, that is more the problem of a national federation rather than the one of the whole organisation ? This is an open question. Thanks.

**Applause.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Carl Borack.

**Carl Borack (USA)** : I would like to analyse this a little differently. Having a training centre is a great idea. But we have heard over many Congresses over the last few years, that we need to improve our image with the IOC, that we need more broadcast, that we need better visibility and I wonder, again, I am not judging the idea of having a training centre, but we have a fine amount of money, wouldn't it be better to hire a marketing firm, wouldn't it be better to hire a publicity firm, and at some places we could even buy broadcast rights in major territories for our World Cups and our World Championships and our Grand Prix ? So we have television visibility and if we bought broadcast rights, you can pay it to USPN or a EuroSport. Then we own that hour and we could include advertising for our sponsors and attract sponsorship. The merit with the training centre is great, whether it should be in France where labour is more expensive, we don't know all the costs, but I don't think this is the best use of our money. We have a fine amount of money and we are committing for so long, let's commit it in the areas where we can improve our visibility with the IOC and with the world and it would be a lot cheaper and it would be a better use of our funds. Thank you.

**Applause.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : Does anyone else want to express himself ?

**Krisztian Kulcsar (HUN)** : Regarding the importance of the issue, I would like to ask for a secret vote for this issue as well.

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : I think that the secret vote is useless, we withdraw the project. I see that there is no unanimity, some people want to use the money differently, the others think that a centre is useless. I believe that the best is to put off this to later, in twenty years or in thirty years. For the moment, it is not worth, we do not make anything. Believe that for us it was a little bit difficult to achieve all this program. It is going to lighten the works of the International Federation, we will be able to undertake propaganda and advertisement actions. We have always made some, and we would wish that everybody make some. That is when people organise Grand Prix, that they also make an action of advertisement even if it is outside Europe, that they try to have the television, they try to have spectators, etc. I therefore believe that we finish the discussion here and close the file. Do you agree ? Do we finish ? So now I just have to thank you for your presence at this Congress and for the decisions which were taken and for the final word, I give the floor to Mister the President of the Federation of Qatar.

**Saoud Bin Abdulrahman Al-Thani (QAT, MH)** : Thank you Mr René Roch.



## 8. Presentation for the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games

---

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Sorry, before this, we have Beijing, who wants to speak. I think that it is interesting as it concerns the Olympic Games.

**Hu Xiaotian (Representative of BOCOG, CHN)** : Mister President, Messrs the Congress participants. First of all, I would like to thank the International Fencing Federation for having invited me to this Congress and I also would like to thank the Fencing Federation of Qatar for having given me in time the visa so that I could come. I am now going to give you some details concerning the preparation of the Beijing Olympic Games on fencing. This page is in English, but I think that it does not need more explanations, this is the structure of BOCOG. BOCOG in French means the Organising Committee of the Olympic Games. In this structure, there is a President, who is the Secretary of the party of the city of Beijing and who is also member of the Bureau of the Central Committee of China. Below, there are several Vice-Presidents, there is a Vice-President who is in charge of sport, this is Mr. Yang Shu'an who comes from the Sport Ministry. Under his management you find the sport department. In his department there are currently nineteen employees working full time and also six divisions taking care of different affairs. Three directors are taking care of the different sections. The first one for the general affairs, and also the relationship with the International Fencing Federation, and the third one takes care of the plans and operations, the fourth one deals with the matters related to the competitions and then there is the publication. The first deputy director takes also care of the paralympic. Three additional divisions will be constituted within the end of the year.

The twenty-eight sport representatives work now full time for BOCOG, including fencing.

The relationships with the International Fencing Federation as well as the communication with the International Fencing Federation is generally good and efficient. The exchanges of information are regular. And also the communication with the International Federation to promote the good comprehension. Mister Yang Shu'an, Vice-President of BOCOG, has met twice with Mr René Roch since the Games of Athens. Important decisions regarding the venue of the competition were already taken. It will be at the national conference centre, the competition hall is located on the first floor with a dimension of 6'400 m<sup>2</sup>. We also decided to have the hall for the eliminations and the finals in a single site of competition. Regarding the set-up of pistes, the piste for the final will be in the middle, and then the four other pistes parallel along both sides of the piste for the final. The capacity of the hall is of 6'000 seats. The training venues measure 4'800 m<sup>2</sup>. They are on the ground floor of the national conference centre. Regarding the finalisation of the halls, Mr Yang Shu'an exchanged opinions on the form of the test-competition. The important points raised by the International Federation held attention of BOCOG. For example, we have already discussed with the press officer. They insist on the light which was very appreciated in Athens. Thus, we spoke in Leipzig of this important matter, which was taken into account. And also regarding the carpets because the carpets of pistes were changed once in Athens. In Beijing we are therefore going to choose the models as soon as possible to avoid this problem. Here is the competition venue, it is a non-detailed plan. You see, the fencing hall is located at the north of Beijing in the Olympic park. Here, next to, on the lines, the Olympic village. And I think that for the first time in the organisation of the Olympic Games, the village is very close to the fencing hall. And here, the centre, the Tien an Men Square which is the centre of Beijing. There is a distance of 500 m. between the fencing hall and the village, this is the closest in the history. And following this way, you can notice the fencing hall. There is

also an architectural identity for the Games of Beijing, there is a national stadium, where the opening ceremony will take place and also an aquatic national centre where swimming competitions will take place. And on this map, you can clearly see the distance between the Olympic village and the fencing hall, it is very close. Yes, next to the hall, we have the NBC and NPC, which are both main media centres for the Olympic Games. It is like on this table, you will see on the right the fencing hall and on the other side the International Broadcasting Centre, and that one means Press Centre.

Construction of the fencing hall : we obtained in December 2004 the authorisation for the construction and then we prepared the beginning of the construction. The works started in April 2005 and will finish in September 2007, it means that the hall will be ready. We are going to make the assemblies inside. Here are the photos showing the beginning of the construction. This is in April, the beginning of the construction, in July already the foundations. The construction is like this in September, and then here in October. You see, month after month, the construction takes shape.

Concerning the dates of the competitions. Fencing is scheduled to hold from 9 to 17 August 2008. It means, one day after the opening ceremony. The daily general programme, by discipline, version 1,1, which was already submitted to the Olympic Committee in May 2005 for comments.

Training of the employees for the competition. This work has already begun and started with the persons in charge of BOCOG for the different sports, at different levels. There are national technicians, assistants, who already started their education in French language.

Technical Delegates of the International Fencing Federation. The nominated Technical Delegates of the International Fencing Federation are Mr Ioan Pop, Technical Director and Mr Dos Santos, President of the SEMI. I am myself, Mr Hu Xiaotian, Director of the Competition. I am pleased to have been designated as Director of the Fencing Competition, with the approval of the International Fencing Federation. I will do the maximum to accomplish my task and my mission in close collaboration with the International Fencing Federation, and also the support of the Chinese Fencing Association. I am since 1979 in charge of international relationships with the Federation and also organiser of all international competitions in China. I started in March to work full time for BOCOG. Since my arrival, BOCOG made inspections of international competitions organised in China, as well as at the Leipzig World Championships. Our participation in all these activities aim at gaining more experience, to better know the staff which is going to work for fencing at the Games of Beijing and also have regular contacts with the official concerned of the International Fencing Federation. We have also established programmes in several fields, in the education of technical officials as well as in a working group dedicated to the organisation of fencing.

We drafted a plan of the material, which is now in consultation with the International Fencing Federation. I think that this is the first time that we work on this, and we must therefore improve as many things as possible to know this material well, in order not have problems during the Olympic Games. We are also drafting a plan to see how to organise the test-competition. We are in discussion with the International Fencing Federation. The test-competition still needs to be determined, the date will probably be in March or April 2008. We agree to host any kind of test-competition proposed to examine its applicability. Concerning all the sport equipment, we observe the IOC guide and also respect the rights of the International Fencing Federation.

Concerning the accommodation. On this map, you can see the fencing hall and the Beijing Grand Hotel, which is recommended for the technical officials, it means the

judges, the referees and also the members of the Directoire Technique. We recommend for the International Fencing Federation, the Grande Muraille Sheraton Hotel. The Grande Muraille has 505 rooms, it is a 5-stars hotel located 14 km away from the site of the competition. The Beijing Grand Hotel, for the technical officials, is over booked with only 130 rooms, which are reserved for two sports : fencing and handball. It is a 3-stars hotel located at 4 km from the site of the competition.

Regarding transportation, the strategic map for the transportation is over. The metro of the Olympic transport still needs to be built. Security. The preliminary strategic plan for the security is already established. The working plan for the appreciation of risk for the 2008 Olympic Games of Beijing is being studied, it means that we give it some more importance according to the evolution of the events occurred in the world. Twenty hospitals are available for medical services. And then we have in Beijing laboratories of anti-doping control accredited by the IOC. Those are all the details I can give you for the time being. I think that next year, I shall be able to give you some more details. Thank you.

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH) :** Does anyone wish to speak ? Nobody wants to speak, then, I believe that this time this is the one, I close the Congress and hand over to Sheik Al-Thani for the last words of this Congress.

**Saoud Bin Abdulrahman Al-Thani (QAT, MH) :** Dear Mister President Mister René Roch, Ladies and Gentlemen. We are now arriving at the end of four days of long meetings and I know that everybody is tired, so I will try to be very short. The Qatar Fencing Federation is happy that ninety-two countries were present or represented at the Congress and that the Congress was able to work through thirty-eight proposals of the Statutes, fifty-seven proposals of the Rules and six proposals of the Rules for the Olympic Games, and besides this, the Congress discussed five urgent matters and twenty-nine reports including the one of the last Elective Congress, which was held in Paris. We are very impressed and happy to see the high level of dedication and commitment of all people present and specially to see the will of all of you to advance the sport of fencing and to help the development of our beloved sport. At the end of the Congress, we feel it is appropriate to thank people for their contribution. We therefore thank the interpreters for their work and difficult task in the three languages and I ask to give them a big hand.

**Applause.**

We do appreciate very much the hard work accomplished by the secretariat of the FIE in the preparation of this Congress. A very large number of items could be discussed thanks to their valuable documents established in several languages. I therefore would like to thank the staff of the International Fencing Federation for their professionalism in the preparation of this Congress and a special thanks goes to Ms Nathalie Rodriguez for her support and very much appreciated help. Please give her applause.

**Applause.**

Excuse me for the bad pronunciation of your name. Finally I would like to say some words to our President. Dear Mister René Roch, I have again been impressed by your knowledge of our sport and by your diplomatic way of presiding the International Federation. Thanks to your leadership, we were able to move forward and discuss on over one hundred and twenty different proposals and items. I thank and congratulate you for that. Thank you very much.

**Applause.**

Dear Delegates, the Qatar Fencing Federation is proud to have you here and we hope that you were able to enjoy Qatar and especially Doha. We hope that you were satisfied with the services provided to you and that you will keep good memories of us and Doha. We wish you all a good and safe trip back home, and we hope to see you all back in a not distant future. Thank you very much for your attention.

**Applause.**

**René Roch (FRA, MH)** : Gentlemen, the Congress is over. Thanks to all for your assistance. Thank you for the decisions you have taken, I think those are good decisions. And then, I think that we shall first see us at the General Assembly in the area of Seoul, and then at the 2007 Congress. We shall by the way decide on the 2007 Congress in Seoul. Thanks to all of you and I wish you a good end of stay in Doha.

**Applause.**

**Nathalie Rodriguez** : I remind you that the gala dinner is at 8.00 pm tonight and that transportation will leave from the hotel at 7.30. I also request those leaving tonight and tomorrow to kindly go to the lobby at the « transportation desk » to confirm their flight schedules in order that transportation be organised for tonight and tomorrow morning.

## ANNEXES

