

International Fencing Federation

88th Ordinary Congress



**Palermo, Italy
21 and 22 November 2009**

CONTENTS

Attendance	Page 3
Agenda	Page 8
Opening addresses by the FIE President and the President of the FIS	Page 9
Ratification of the new federations, attendance and validation of proxies	Page 12
Approval of the report of the 2008 Congress in Paris (FRA)	Page 15
Proposals submitted to the Congress and commission reports	Page 16
Candidatures for the organisation of the 2010 Congress	Page 54
Designation of the Members of Honour	Page 55
Awarding of the Chevalier Feyerick Trophy	Page 56
2012 Olympics in London	Page 66
Voting to award the World Championships	Page 79
- J/C 2011	
- Senior: 2011	
- Veteran: 2010 and 2011	

APPENDICES

Summary of the decisions of the Congress
Report of the Refereeing Commission
Report of the Legal Commission
Report of the Medical Commission
Report of the Promotion and Publicity Commission
Report of the Rules Commission
Report of the SEMI Commission

ATTENDANCE

The meeting opened at 9 a.m. under the chairmanship of Mr Alisher Usmanov, the President of the FIE.

Were seated on the tribune:

•M. Alisher USMANOV (RUS)	President
•M. Maxim PARAMONOV (UKR)	Secretary general
•Mme Ana PASCU (ROU, MH)	Vice-President
•M. Giorgio SCARSO (ITA)	Vice-President
•M. Wei WANG (CHN)	Vice-President
•M. Peter JACOBS (GBR, MH)	Secretary-Treasurer
•Mme Nathalie RODRIGUEZ M.-H.	CEO
•M. Ioan POP	International Technical Director

Members of the Executive Committee present:

- M. Max GEUTER (GER, MH)
- Mme Velichka HRISTEVA (BUL)
- M. Emmanuel KATSIADAKIS (GRE, MH)
- M. Guk-Hyeon KIM (KOR)
- M. Frédéric PIETRUSZKA (FRA)
- M. Sunil SABHARWAL (USA)
- Mme Ferial Nadira SALHI (ALG)
- M. Victor SANCHEZ (ESP)
- M. Omar Alejandro VERGARA (ARG)

Honourary Members present :

• M. René ROCH (FRA, MH)	Honourary President
• M. Mario FAVIA (ITA, MH)	Honourary Vice-President
• Mme Erika DIENSTL (GER, MH)	
• M. Samuel CHERIS (USA, MH)	
• M. Abderahmane LAMARI (ALG, MH)	
• M. Edoardo MANGIAROTTI (ITA, MH)	
• M. Jeno KAMUTI (HUN, MH)	

Presidents of the Confederations present:

• M. Frantisek JANDA (CZE)	European Confederation President
• M. NDIAYE Mbagnick (SEN)	African Confederation President
• M. Jorge CASTRO REA (MEX)	Panamerican Confederation President
• Mme Helen SMITH (AUS, MH)	Oceanian Confederation President
• M. Celso DAYRIT (PHI, MH)	Asian Confederation President

Federations present or represented

SOUTH AFRICA	Novak Perovic
ALGERIA	Kaabi Nourredine
GERMANY	Gordon Rapp
	Tanja Schönmann
	Wilfried Wolfgarten
	Lutz Schirrmacher
	Claus Janka
DUTCH ANTILLES	Raymond Jessurun
	Marie France Dufour
SAUDI ARABIA	Bandar Othman Al-Saleh
	Alragi Saleh
ARGENTINA	Victor Sergio Groupierre
ARMENIA	<i>Represented by Ukraine</i>
ARUBA	Thomas Austin Edison
AUSTRALIA	Andrew Ius
AUSTRIA	Ursula Hinterseer
AZERBAIJAN	Ramin Mammadov
	Nazim Ibrahimov
	Firangiz Lembaranskaya
BANGLADESH	Islam Qamrul
BARBADOS	Joseph Ryan Rodriguez
	Roslyn Wilson
BELGIUM	Alexandre Walnier
	John Leten
BENIN	Jacques Oukoumassoun
BELARUS	Alexandre Romankov
	Igor Krentik
	Henadz Khaliauski
BELIZE	Owen Sonny Meighan
BOLIVIA	<i>Represented by Costa Rica</i>
BOTSWANA	<i>Represented by Namibia</i>
BRAZIL	Gerli Dos Santos
	Ricardo Machado
BULGARIA	Dimitar Stoyanov
	Siran Doganian
BURKINA FASO	Vincent Sou Be
CAMEROON	Michel Guidi (2 nd day)
CANADA	Stephen Symons
CHILE	<i>Represented by Argentina</i>
CHINA	Christian Bauer
	Xiangyang Yuan
CYPRUS	<i>Represented by Greece</i>
CONGO	Kembe Sorel-Arthur
	Albert Kaya
KOREA	Kwang Gi Lee
	Jae Sung Shim
COSTA RICA	Luis Alberto Cruz
IVORY COAST	Mekrokro Dosso
CROATIA	Reno Marolt
CUBA	Rigoberto Morejon Llanes

DENMARK	Joergen Kjoeller
EGYPT	Esmaeil Gen. Ahmed
EL SALVADOR	Delmy Roxana Cuellas de Arias
ECUADOR	Pedro Manzano Torres
SPAIN	Marco A. Rioja Perez
	Antonio Garcia Hernandez
UNITED STATES	Francisco Martin
EX-YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF	Aleksandar Anastasov
MACEDONIA	
FINLAND	Kimmo Pentikainen
FRANCE	Jean-Pierre Kessler
GABON	Issa Mabadi
GEORGIA	David Sakhvadze
GREAT-BRITAIN	Keith Smith
	Steve Higginson
GREECE	Emmanuel Katsiadakis
GUATEMALA	Juan Carlos Bardales C.
GUINEA	Soriba Sylla
HOLLAND	Bert Van De Flier
HONDURAS	Marco Antonio Izaguirre
HONG-KONG	Tsan Wong
HUNGARY	Andras Fuleky
	Krisztian Kulcsar
	Attila Szalay
VIRGIN ISLANDS	Joyce Bolanos
INDIA	Rakash Gupta
INDONESIA	Suratman Tono
	Tanjung Aslizar
IRAN	Bagherzadeh Fazlloah
	Alireza Poursalmani
IRAQ	Adel Fadhil Ali
	Abdulwahid Mohammed
IRELAND	Tom Rafter
	Nuala Mc Garrity
ICELAND	Gudjon Ingi Gestsson
	Nicolay Mateev
ISRAEL	<i>Represented by the Czech Republic</i>
ITALY	Paolo Azzi
	Giuseppe Cafiero
	Maria Magherita Alciati
	Nicolai Gianandrea
	Marco Siesto
	Antonio Fiore
	Lioniero Del Maschio
	Salvatore Otaviano
	Rainiero Bernardini
JAPAN	Atsushi Harinishi
	Kazushige Hirano
JORDAN	Khaled Atiyat
	Hakam Al Khalidi
KAZAKHSTAN	Oleg Peskov
KYRGYZSTAN	Osmonjan Kasymov
	Aziza Moidunova
LATVIA	Erika Aze
	Klinta Aze
LEBANON	Ziad El-Choueiri
	Nada Saliba

LITHUANIA	Jogela Rimantas Povilas
LUXEMBURG	Armand Lemal
	Pascal Tesch
MALAYSIA	Abu Hassan Rusni
	Ahmad Farik Ainaa
MALI	Wahadou Zorome
MALTA	Juan Formosa
	Alex Micallef
MOROCCO	Abdelillah Zaji
MAURITANIA	<i>Represented by Guinea</i>
MEXICO	Vitaly Logvin
MOLDOVA	Mihail Paghiev
MONACO	<i>Represented by France</i>
NAMIBIA	Michael A. Dieterich
NICARAGUA	William Barberena Genet
NIGER	Ide Issaka
NORWAY	Bjorn Faye
NEW ZEALAND	Susan Grant-Taylor
UZBEKISTAN	Sabirjan Ruziev
PALESTINE	<i>Represented by Italy</i>
PANAMA	Ezequiel Rodríguez Rey
PARAGUAY	Pedro Cornet
PERU	Carlos Levi Cook
PHILIPPINES	Victor Africa
POLAND	Jacek Bierkowski
	Jacek Slupski
PUERTO RICO	Gregorio Lima
PORTUGAL	Frederico Valarinho
	Clauso Neves
QATAR	Saleh Amer Al-Hemaidi
	Feriani Ziad
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO	Pitshou Bolenge Yoma
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	Ange Ngoya Bodo
	Miledys de Jesus Pacheco de Grullon
	Alessandro Segnini Bocchia Di San Lorenzo
SLOVAKIA	Julius kralik
CZECH REPUBLIC	Frantisek Janda
ROMANIA	Octavian Zidaru
	Paul Novak
	Roxana Barladeanu
RUSSIA	Alexander Mikhailov
	Stanislas Pozddniakov
	Semen Rikhtman
	Ilgar Mamedov
SAN MARINO	Antonio Putti
SENEGAL	Oumar Maiga
SERBIA	<i>Represented by Ex-Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</i>
SLOVENIA	Savo Tatalovic
	Aljosa Cetinski
SRI LANKA	Abeywickrama Ushaan
	Silva Kasuni
SWEDEN	Lars Liljegren
	Per Palmstrom
	Pierre Thullberg
SWITZERLAND	Olivier Carrard (2 nd day: <i>Represented by Sweden</i>)

SYRIA	Abdul Basit Zakaria
TAJIKISTAN	Abdurakhmonovich SuleimanovTura
TAIPEI	Monica Ho
THAILAND	Somded Tongpiam
	Jakravudh Somapee
TUNISIA	Moncef Ben Jilani
	Salah Ferjani
TURKEY	Bilgin Muminhan
	Ahmet Duvan
TOGO	Carlos Cossi d'Almeida
	Katema Lamega M.
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	Muna Makki
UKRAINE	Serguey Mischenko
	Vadim Gutsayt
URUGUAY	Luis Filardi

Note : The nationality of the delegates is indicated only in the attendance list. It is not mentioned again thereafter in the report, except for the presentation of the bids for the organisation of the World Championships.

AGENDA

1. Address by the President of the FIE and welcome address by the President of the FIS
2. Ratification of the new federations, attendance and validation of proxies
3. Approval of the report of the 2010 Congress in Paris (FRA)
4. Proposals submitted to the Congress and Commission reports
5. 2012 Olympics in London
6. Voting to award the World Championships
 - J/C 2011
 - Senior 2011
 - Veteran 2010, 2011
7. Candidates for the organisation of the 2010 Congress
8. Designation of the Members of Honour
9. Awarding the Challenge Chevalier Feyerick
10. Miscellaneous items

1. Opening addresses by the FIE President and the President of the FIS

Maxim Paramonov: Thank you. Please sit down. Please take your seats, we will start to work. Thank you.

Alisher Usmanov: Dear Friends,

I declare our Congress opened and I want to say a few words before we begin our work.

It is a privilege and honour for me to open the first Congress of the new Olympic cycle and my first as a President of FIE. Over one hundred national federations participate in this Congress. It is a record number of a non elective Congress.

Eleven months have gone by, almost one year of my presidency, and the implementation of our program gave me the feeling that we created positive results. First of all, we increased the activity of the FIE, especially in the last six months.

I am grateful to our vice-presidents, Madame PASCU and Mr SCARSO and WANG Wei, who worked tirelessly in the Executive Committee in the past six months. Our Secretary General, Mister Paramonov has gained experience and we continue to believe in him and wish him success. A special thanks to our Chief Executive, Madame Nathalie Rodriguez M.-H.

We will discuss today the most important issues in our sport of fencing. For example, equal representation of athletes and weapons in the Olympic Games and we will continue our cooperation and consultation with the IOC.

For your information, we received a letter today from Mister DUBI and we will announce this later.

As far as the representation of fencing in the Olympic family is concerned, it is not an easy task but I assure you that I will do all I can during the remaining of my presidency to achieve it.

During the last period, many national federations presented proposals to amend the Statutes and the Rules. The Executive Committee and the Commissions have studied them carefully and it was a long process. We will vote on them today.

I want to tell you that from the beginning of my tenure, I felt some gap between the FIE, on one side, and the confederations and national federations on the other side. To close this gap between these organizations, we created a new program which includes a development plan for the confederations; a plan for equipment support, and a plan for coaches training.

We allocated a budget of 2 million Swiss francs to these items, and next year we will increase this budget to 3.3 million Swiss francs.

The conference of coaches organised in Antalya was successful, and we also created a new Commission of coaches.

We support the new national development program, as well as the federations, and this is the reason why we gave 300 000 Swiss francs to help national federation presidents to participate in the FIE congresses.

And almost 400 000 Swiss francs have been allocated to athletes to participate in the World Championship. 80 national federations received five full sets of fencing equipment each as a direct help from the FIE to the federations. More over, for the first time, we offered prize money to our best athletes.

Despite the economic and financial crisis our budget has increased compared to the budget we had before.

This year, our budget reached 5 400 000 Swiss francs, and everybody knows that previously the FIE budget consisted of the IOC contribution and the meagre donations from sponsors. Now, we can keep the full IOC contribution as a reserve fund. We received two days ago the last million dollars from this reserve, which will reach 10 million dollars. Next year, we will increase our budget again to 6 600 000 Swiss francs.

We will of course continue our development in 2010; we will reform the competitions calendar and create a special Commission on improvement of competitions and qualifications of referees. We will also completely renovate our web site.

Next year, for the first time, we will have the World Youth Olympic Games which we expect to be a great success.

With all our achievements, we should remember that the only way to success is joint actions and cooperation from everybody of goodwill, united by our common interests and goals, which I think for us, for everybody participating in our Congress, is our love of fencing.

And finally, of course, I would like to welcome and express my gratitude to Mr Scarso, who is a kind of godfather to our Congress in Sicily. I thank him for his contribution to the organisation of our Congress here in such good conditions and for the great hospitality for which everybody is grateful.

Applause

Maxim Paramonov: We will now present to Mister Scarso the Gérard Thibault of Antwerp fencing treatise of 1628, as well as a FIE commemorative plate.

Applause

Alisher Usmanov: Before we begin our task, I invite Mister Scarso to say a few words.

Giorgio Scarso: President Usmanov,

Dear friends from the Executive Committee,
Members of honour of the FIE,

Dear friends from the fencing world,

It is for me a privilege and an honour to welcome you in Italy. After more than 30 years, our International Fencing Federation Congress is returning to Italy, and I hope this is the ideal setting to discuss the topics of our agenda.

Dear friends, all of us have responsibilities for the promotion, diffusion and management of fencing. Each of us, within our own federation, must fight on a daily basis for the growth and development of our movement. We are not here as leaders of large or small federations. But today, we are managers with different duties, committing ourselves in order to develop fencing on a daily basis. The commitment from the so-called small federations is important and we must not underestimate their contribution. All leaders gathered here share common objectives. We want to increase the numbers in fencing, strengthen its place in the international arena, make it a mediatic sport without neglecting the safety of athletes, and ensure the ethical and sport values of our sport are more and more appreciated.

All this without forgetting that each change brings economical repercussions on the management of all federations. In dealing with several topics in this Congress, I am sure general interest is going to prevail and I am sure that the participants will make our statutes as compliant as possible to the needs of our sport as well as to its democratic and effective management.

On behalf of the Italian government, the Sicilian region, the organizing committee, and the Italian Fencing Federation which is celebrating 100 years this year, I would like to thank you all for having accepted to be here in Palermo.

Dear friends, enjoy your proceedings. Thank you.

Applause

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

Nathalie Rodriguez: Good morning Ladies and Gentlemen.

Let us deal with the second point of our agenda: the ratification of new federations. This year, several federations have submitted partial documents, so they are not yet members. Let us now check the attendance and the voting rights.

As you all know, we will use the electronic vote this year. So when I say the name of your country please raise your hand so that the hostesses can give you the equipment which will allow you to express your vote. I will explain the procedure later.

Dutch Antilles, Algeria, Argentina, Aruba. Is Aruba here? Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Belize, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Congo, China, Ivory Coast, Cameroon, Cameroon? Where are the representatives from Cameroon? Democratic Republic of Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Croatia? Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Dominican Republic? Is the Dominican Republic represented here? Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Spain, Estonia, Estonia? Is Estonia here please? Finland, France, Gabon, Great-Britain, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Is Guatemala here, please? Guinea? All right, Guinea is here. Hong Kong, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Indonesia? Is Indonesia here? India, India? Iran, Ireland, Iraq, Iceland, Virgin Islands, Italy, Jordan, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Korea, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Kuwait ? Is Kuwait here? Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Lithuania? Luxembourg, Morocco. Aruba has just arrived. Malaysia, Moldova, Mexico, Mongolia, is Mongolia here? Yes. Macedonia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania. Is Mauritania here? Namibia, Nicaragua, Netherlands, Nigeria, so Nigeria is not here yet. Norway, New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, Where is Paraguay? Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Qatar, Romania, South Africa, South Africa? Yes, ok. Russia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sierra Leone? Sierra Leone is not here. Slovenia, San Marino, Somalia, is Somalia here? Somalia is not here. Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Slovakia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tajikistan, Tajikistan? Tajikistan is not here. Togo, Taipei, Is Taipei here? Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, the United Arab Emirates? Thank you. Ukraine, Uruguay, Uruguay? Thank you. USA, Uzbekistan.

Are there any countries that have not been mentioned? Which country? Palestine? They had given a proxy. Is Turkmenistan here?

And now, we ratify the proxies.

Armenia gives a proxy to Ukraine, does Ukraine accept? Raise your hand, please. Thank you.

Bolivia gives a proxy to Costa Rica, does Costa Rica accept? Good.

Botswana gives a proxy to Namibia. Is Namibia willing to accept? Good.

Chile gives a proxy to Argentina. Does Argentina accept? Good.

Cyprus to Greece. Greece accepts.

Israel to the Czech Republic. Does the Czech Republic accept? Good.

Monaco gives a proxy to France, which accepts? Good.

Serbia gives a proxy to Macedonia, is Macedonia willing to accept? Yes, very well.

Palestine is giving a proxy to Italy. Does Italy accept? Good.

We have 106 countries present and nine represented, for a total of 115 countries as a whole. Does the number of keypads distributed correspond to this number? 115.

Mauritania is not here and is giving a proxy to Guinea, which accepts it.

Is there any attending federation that has not been given a keypad? Is there any federation with a proxy which has not been given two keypads?

Before going through the next point of the agenda I will explain how to use the keypads to vote. This system has been developed by GVI, a Swiss company which is present today, and the system has been homologated by the International Olympic Committee for its voting sessions, including the vote for Olympic cities. I assure you that this system is entirely confidential, no one can know what you are voting, not even the technicians counting the ballots. So, the system is absolutely secret and confidential. It is simple to use. When we ask a question and you have to vote, the GVI company will open the vote. On your keypad's screen, a flashing cursor will indicate that the voting session is open and that you may vote on the proposal. At the end of the voting session, the end of the vote will be announced, and the flashing cursor will disappear. To vote "yes", "no" or "abstention" you have to press 1 for "yes", 3 for "no" and 0 for "abstention". Subsequently, you will press the "valid" key to validate your vote. The word "ok" will appear to confirm your vote has been cast and taken into account.

If you made a mistake and wish to change your vote, you can do it as long as the vote is still going on. You just have to press the "correct" key to correct your vote and then you resume the procedure by pressing 1, 3 or 0 and then again the "valid" key to validate your vote. Once the voting session closed, I will tell everybody that everyone has voted and that the voting session is over.

Just to check if the procedure is clear to everybody, I propose two or three very brief tests, then we can go on with the remainder of the agenda.

My first question is, and we open the voting session, is today Saturday? Please express your vote by pressing 1, 3 or 0, i.e. "yes", "no" or "abstain". So you can vote now.

Is the voting session closed? Yes, the voting session is over. Maybe the question wasn't clear.

Laughter

I will now ask you a second question. Do we all agree for a very quick congress? Let us open the voting session.

The vote is closed. It would be great if everybody took part in the vote.

Now, one last question before starting: Is this the first day of the congress? The vote is open.

The vote is now closed.

Are there any questions about this system? In case of multiple choices questions, if you have to select between 1, 2, 3 and 4 you will see it on the screen. For example: 1 flowers, 2 chocolate, etc. so you just have to press the validation key after 1, 2, 3 or 4, but we will help you in this situation.

Let us now deal with the remainder of the agenda.

3. Approval of the report of the 2008 Congress in Paris (FRA)

Nathalie Rodriguez: So, we go back to the next point on the agenda now: approval of the 2008 Congress in Paris.

For the Congress in Paris, no observations have been submitted.

Do you agree to approve the report without any change? Anybody against it? No, therefore the report is unanimously approved.

4. Proposals submitted to the Congress and commission reports

Nathalie Rodriguez: So, we go to the fourth point of the agenda, i.e. "proposals submitted to the Congress" and we will start with the proposals on the statutes.

Alisher Usmanov: Excuse me. I wish to make a remark about this point because I think it is necessary for everybody to feel the unity between the Executive Committee and the Commission who prepared these proposals on which you are going to vote. As you can see in your documents, we have decided to approve the opinions put forward by the Commissions, including every remark and changes. Thus, we expressed our respect for the Commissions, in order to present you one joined and unanimous opinion from the Executive Committee and the Commissions. The Executive Committee and the Commissions have worked together.

Nathalie Rodriguez: As you all know, in order for any amendment to the statutes to be approved, we need 2/3 of the present or represented votes. Therefore, we need 75 votes in favour to adopt a proposal to amend the statutes.

Let us start with the proposals of the Argentinean federation, proposal 1.

You can see that the Legal Commission is in favour of the Argentinean federation proposal, but has slightly changed the wording to: "The National Federation must have an independent role in accordance with the principles of the Olympic Charter". The Executive Committee is in favour of the change made by the Legal Commission.

If nobody has questions about this proposal, I propose we open the vote to approve the proposal amended by the Legal Commission, as the Executive Committee is in favour of this change. The vote on this proposal is open. Do you agree with this modified proposal?

Is the vote finished? The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved, as there are 97 votes in favour.

Now, the second proposal by the Argentinean Federation is to add a sentence to article **1.6**. The Legal Commission is in favour and has modified the article **1.6**, adding the sentence: "Donations and income from its sponsorship contracts". The point **1.6** becomes **1.7**. The Executive Committee is in favour of the change made by the Legal Commission. If there are no questions we can start voting on proposal number 2. The vote is open on the second proposal.

The vote is closed.

The proposal is approved with 100 votes in favour.

Next proposal. The subsequent proposal refers to the confederations. The Legal Commission is against this proposal because they feel it duplicates other articles stating the same things, specifically **5.2.4**.

The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission.

So we vote if there are no questions. The Legal Commission and the Executive Committee are against this proposal. Do you agree to reject this proposal?

Novak Perovic (RSA): Just to check, are we voting on the Executive Committee and Legal Commission proposal? We are voting so that the proposal is not modified? Is that it?

Nathalie Rodriguez: No, we follow the opinion of the Legal Commission and of the Executive Committee. If the Legal Commission says "yes, we agree with the proposal but with the modification" and the Executive Committee says "we are in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission" in that case you are voting on the proposal modified by the Legal Commission and accepted by the Executive Committee. But when the Legal Commission is against a proposal and the Executive Committee is also against it, we ask you to follow the opinion of the Legal Commission.

My question is: "Do you agree to follow the opinion of the Legal Commission and the Executive Committee and reject the proposal?"

Novak Perovic (RSA): Just to clarify, that means if we wish to reject the proposal we have to vote "yes" to say "no". This is the meaning of my question, but I don't want to disturb the meeting.

Kimmo Pentikainen: Finland. I am just requesting if it is possible to vote again because it seems that what we were voting on was not clear enough for everybody in this case. Could we vote again this proposal? May we once again express our vote on this issue?

Marco A. Rioja Perez: I am Marco Rioja, President of the Spanish Federation, and President of the Legal Commission. Nathalie, I understand that what is submitted to the vote are the proposals of single proponents, not Legal Commission and the Executive Committee proposals. So we have to vote if we approve or disapprove the initial proposal, and then eventually on the amendment proposed by the Legal Commission and the Executive Committee. Is that it?

Nathalie Rodriguez: No. From the very beginning we said that the proposals have already been assessed. The various Commissions have already analyzed them and have given their opinion. The Executive Committee agrees with the opinion of the Commission, whether it be the Legal Commission or other Commissions. Therefore, we now ask you to vote on the proposals as modified by the Commissions, unless the Commissions have not made any modifications to them.

Marco A. Rioja Perez: So in this case, the federations which made proposals have the right to have those proposals voted on. So, if the federation accepts the amendment, do we vote on the amendment?

Nathalie Rodriguez: As the Commissions have given their opinion, and the Executive Committee agreed on the modified proposal, we vote on the modified proposal. But if in the end the Congress does not approve the modified proposal, we can vote on the initial proposal. I think that voting on the initial proposal, then on the modified proposal if indeed it is the one we ultimately want to approve) would be a waste of time. And this is the reason why we asked their opinion to the Commissions.

Alisher Usmanov: Mister Roch, do you want to speak?

René Roch (MH): I think we have to vote on the proposal of the Executive Committee, whether it is a modified proposal or not.

Alisher Usmanov: Everybody has all the proposals and all the modifications in their documents. I think it is not so difficult to understand which proposal we are talking about, and if it has been modified by the Legal Commission or by the Executive Committee. You must vote "yes" or "no". Let us not create extra difficulties for the voting. I think every proposal has been fully explained. We already explained the work done by the Legal Commission and the Executive Committee. Just pay attention to the question asked by Mme Rodriguez and answer "yes" or "no" without complicating things, please. Thank you.

Emmanuel Katsiadakis: Excuse me, I think that in the text, for all proposals the Executive Committee and the Commission have the same opinion, so we can readily vote to say "we agree" or "we do not agree" with the Executive Committee and the Commission. It is clear enough and there should be no confusion. Thank you.

Alisher Usmanov: We would like to know the opinion of the delegates.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Grouppierre from Argentina.

Victor Sergio Grouppierre: There is a proposal and there is an opinion. The opinion is a wish of the Executive Committee and the Commissions, that is what it is. But we need to vote on the proposal; if we agree or not. Because the Executive Committee and the Commission have expressed their opinion, but we never vote on an opinion. We vote on a concrete proposal.

Applause

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mr Groupierre, we are not voting on an opinion, we are voting on a text, a text which has been, we'll say, rephrased by the Legal Commission. For instance, proposal 1 by the Argentinean federation was the following one: *But these must have an independent role in accordance with the principles of the Olympic Charter.* And the modified proposal of the Commission was: *The National Federation must have an independent role in accordance with the principles of the Olympic Charter.*

So I think we are voting on a proposal that has been revised and corrected by the Legal Commission. The Executive Committee expressed its recommendations and suggested to stick to the wording as modified by the Legal Commission. But we are voting on a proposal. Always. I think it is strange to vote on a proposal and then on the change of this proposal.

Alisher Usmanov: I would like to answer Mr. Groupierre. Do not forget that the Commission has a great responsibility, as does the Executive Committee. We want to listen to all the opinions, then if we are against it, we say so.

I don't find this difficult to understand. Mrs. Rodriguez asks you to vote, and you vote "yes" or "no" to the proposal.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So we resume with proposal number 3, from Argentina which refers to the zonal confederations, article **2.3.2**. The Argentinean Federation wanted to change the sentence and the Legal Commission was against this amendment of the sentence because it seemed to be a repetition of an existing article, namely article **5.2.4**. Therefore, the Legal Commission proposes not to accept this proposal. The Executive Committee agrees with the Legal Commission. Therefore, we now ask you to turn down this proposal in compliance with the opinion of the Legal Commission and the Executive Committee.

The vote is open.

René Roch (MH): In the past Congresses we always agreed to vote on the proposals. We cannot vote on an opinion. Normally, the proposal would have needed to be rephrased, because you had a proposal, then you expressed your opinion, but this does not make it a proposal. This is the issue today. I understand fully that we can follow the opinion of the Legal Commission but we had to rephrase the text, and reformulate another proposal. We cannot vote on texts that don't exist. We are here in the Congress to vote on a text. We have been saying this for 20 years. It's always been said.

Alisher Usmanov: Thank you Mr. Roch for your remark which describes how we have worked in the past. But now we have changed our way of working, and we propose this new method because we think it is more respectful towards the delegates of our Congress.

You took part in four Executive Committee meetings, and four times you never said a word about the Executive Committee's opinion relative to the vote. Why does it create so many problems today? We will vote on the proposal, but one must take into account the opinion of the Executive Committee, as you participated in its meetings and always agreed on our approach and our formulation of the Legal Commission and Executive Committee opinions. It is a kind of respect shown to everybody. So, we can choose, for example, to reject the Argentinean proposal, but we have to respect democracy. We need the most democracy we can get, so the proposal will be voted on.

Nathalie Rodriguez: I am going to rephrase my question as follows: We have a proposal from the Argentinean Federation. The Legal Commission is against this proposal. The Executive Committee is also against it. I ask you again to vote on the proposal. Are you for or against, knowing that the Legal Commission and the Executive Committee are against the proposal? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal is rejected with 68 votes.

Giuseppe Cafiero: Excuse me. I think that this system is more respectful of the opinion of the Assembly, but there are cases in which the proposals should be rejected reasonably as they are, but should be accepted as modified by the Commissions. So I suggest that we pay close attention to the amendments proposed, which are indicated on the right side of the sheet. Is that possible? I suggest that when the result of this kind of vote is "no", but the modifications indicated on the right hand side of the document could make it acceptable, then we should vote a second time in order to accept the proposal as modified. Can we consider proceeding that way?

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Cheris, you have the floor.

Samuel David Cheris (MH): In parliamentary procedures, if an amended motion is put forward, you vote on the amended motion first, and if the amended motion is rejected, then you go back to the original. If there is only a request that you reject the motion then you will vote on the motion: a "yes" vote would mean that you are in favour of the motion; a "no" vote is an agreement with the recommendation to vote against, and you will just accept or reject the motion as it originally stands.

Amended motions first. And if that fails, then you go back to the original.

Alisher Usmanov: Now does everybody understand?

Olivier Carrard: Mrs. Rodriguez? I would like to add something from the legal point of view.

The International Federation main office is located in Switzerland and I am the President of the Swiss Federation. I am also a lawyer. It is a question of Swiss law because in an association's system (and the FIE is an association), proposals can be submitted within a certain time frame, and then it is the task of the Committee to make a selection of these proposals and maybe change them for the General Assembly. There are two situations: the first where the proposal can be accepted or rejected in its initial wording, because there were no modifications. Then there is a second case where the Executive Committee, with the Legal Commission or any other Commission, might have amended the proposal. In this case, we must vote on the text submitted or proposed by the Commissions or the Committee, and not on the initial proposal, because the Executive Committee is legally habilitated to change or modify any proposal.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Carrard, in this case, we were voting a second time, this time on the initial proposal, and not the reverse.

Olivier Carrard: Maybe you misunderstood me. I am not saying that we need a vote, I am just pointing out the way to operate.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Very well, I understand.

Alisher Usmanov: We will inform you of every modification made by the Commissions to the proposals, and of the approval of the Executive Committee, as our respectable friend from the United States explained. It is very simple.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Well. We now come to a new proposal from the Argentinean Federation which is quite complicated, as it pertains to the General Assemblies and the Congresses, as well as the fiscal year.

The Argentinean Federation points out that we now have three Congresses and four General Assemblies in four years. The Argentinean Federation has proposed to transfer the functions or roles of the General Assembly to the Congress, and therefore, to cancel the organization of the General Assembly.

In compensation, they propose to organize a Congress every year of the Olympic quadrennial. This way, instead of having seven meetings in four years (three Congresses and four General Assemblies), we would have four Congresses knowing that the General Assembly duties and functions would be transferred to Congress.

The Argentinean Federation also suggests that it would be interesting that each Congress had a specific topic. For example, the first Congress would be dedicated to the rules, and the second Congress to the statutes. This would alleviate the burden of proposals made at each Congress, knowing that the proposals must be made in a given year.

This proposal has been submitted to the Legal Commission and the Executive Committee. The Legal Commission thinks that the concept put forward by the Argentinean Federation is quite interesting but that, of course, a certain number of amendments are needed. Indeed, if the budget of the FIE is approved by the Congress, which usually takes place at the end of the year, we need to adapt the fiscal year.

The Commission consulted a certain number of people and proposed to change the fiscal year, which as you know now stands from October 1st to September 30th, and shift it from June 30th to July 1st. Why? Because if a Congress is organised in November, we need enough time to close the budget, the accounts and submit them to the Committee and the auditors, then forward it to the Congress at least one month before the Congress takes place. Therefore, if there is no General Assembly anymore we will have to approve the accounts in November or December, and not in April as we used to in the past.

This means that if we keep a fiscal year starting on October 1st, there will not be enough time to close the accounts, and send you the documents in order to have them approved by the Congress.

The Legal Commission maybe wanted to add something? Mister Cheris?

Samuel David Cheris (MH): Several proposals dealing with the fiscal year were forwarded by various countries, as well as on the procedure of future meetings. The Argentinean proposal was the first alphabetically, but it is not a proposal that could be voted on because it does not affect sections of the statutes. It is just talking about general concepts.

We analysed these concepts, along with those of the other countries. We talked to the Treasurer about when the fiscal year would have to end in order to be able to produce the accounts and have the audit completed in time for a meeting.

We came out with the proposal that you see on page 2 of the amendments of statute proposals. In this, we have dropped the General Assemblies where we were having difficulties having a sufficient number of countries to be able to vote on the budgets, and we have four Congresses.

The last year of the quadrennial, we would have the Elective Congress, as we had last year. The first year of the quadrennial would be the changes to the rules. The second year would be all matters dealing with the Olympic Games so we finalize qualification criteria and any of the methods that we would have for replacement athletes or other issues that were involved. And the third year of the quadrennial we would change the statutes.

This way, there would be less to deal with at each meeting, but each time we would have a definite focus and this was one of the points of the Argentinean proposal. The rest of the items that are in the proposal in your documents are all of the sections of the statutes that need to be altered in order to allow this to take place. So if anyone has questions on this topic, we would be happy to answer them.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Yes, Mister Cafiero?

Giuseppe Cafiero: I think that the concept is clear and we agree on the concept, but the point of fixing every subject in the agenda during the whole quadrennial is too rigid. I don't think we should limit the possibilities of the Congress too strictly, especially if we don't have General Assemblies any more. Let's take Olympic matters for example, we cannot wait three or four years to deal with them. It is too strict. I think that the Congress should be in condition to discuss any matter of their interest in any year. If there is a very important matter to deal with, we cannot wait four years for that. So, I would propose that we review this and, according to the indications of the Executive Committee, leave open the possibility of deciding on the agenda for every year.

Samuel David Cheris (MH): I would suggest that having a fixed agenda like the one that is proposed would actually favour order. I think having a four-year cycle creates order, as everybody will know on what to focus.

Nuala Mc Garrity: I would like to ask when you would propose to hold the calendar meeting if the General Assembly is cut out.

Nathalie Rodriguez: The calendar meeting essentially deals with modifications of dates. So I think that this can be done perfectly by electronic mail as we have always done in the past. I don't think the calendar meetings are necessary just to announce the changes of dates.

But what I would suggest on the proposal if you think that dedicating Congresses to specific items can be a problem, maybe we can just add the words "in principle". This way, we are not stuck to something specific.

Alisher Usmanov: Everybody can vote "no" and reject this proposal, as everybody can give his vote for the proposal or against it. So please vote.

Nathalie Rodriguez: The proposal is clear. The Argentinean Federation proposes four Congresses and no more General Assemblies. The duties and the proceedings of the General Assembly are organized to take place at the Congress and the fiscal year is changed to June 30th to July 1st. So, this is the whole proposal. The Legal Commission had revised and rephrased the proposal. The Executive Committee agreed with the opinion of the Legal Commission. So we now ask you to vote on this proposal. We would also like to add, as I said before, that for specifically themed Congresses we add the words “in principle”. The vote is open. Cast your vote on this proposal. Thank you.

The vote is closed.

Kimmo Pentikainen (FIN): Kimmo Pentikainen from Finland. I just wanted to make it clear that we did vote on the opinion of the Legal Commission. Is that true? The text of the Legal Commission?

Nathalie Rodriguez: Can you repeat what you have just said please?

Kimmo Pentikainen (FIN): We are voting on the proposal of the Legal Commission, but adding to it the words “in principle”, which means that we are not limiting the tasks of the Congress and that we could take into account other matters. That is what “in principle” means.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Exactly, I said before the vote that as the duties or tasks of each specific Congress are concerned, we add the words “in principle”.

The vote was closed and the proposal is approved with 84 votes.

Ok, let's go to the next proposal. The Argentinean Federation wants a revision of the article saying that if the accounts are not approved by the auditors the President and the Executive Committee are dismissed. So, the Argentinean Federation believes this sanction is excessive, as it depends on criteria outside the FIE politics. The Legal Commission said that when the independent auditors decided not to approve the accounts, it is for example because the FIE infringed on material accounting principles and then refused to rectify the situation, or made a fraudulent or illegal presentation. Obviously, the auditors do not reject the accounts based on mistakes in the accounting. In that case, they ask for a modification and when it is made, the accounts are approved. The accounts are not approved only in case of severe breaches of the rules. Therefore, the Legal Commission is against this proposal, and the Executive Committee agrees with the Legal Commission.

Now, we ask you to vote on this proposal. Are you in favour of the proposal of the Argentinean Federation, knowing that the Legal Commission is against the proposal and the Executive Committee too? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been rejected with 72 votes.

Now we come to the last proposal of the Argentinean Federation, to approve this text: *The President is the legal representative of the International Fencing Federation. If he is unable to attend, he is replaced by the Secretary General.*

In this case, we have an amendment of the proposal in order to make it more general, because the current text says that the President is the legal representative of the Federation so the Federation proposes to change a couple of words to indicate that he is the legal representative of the International Fencing Federation. Both the Executive Committee and the Legal Commission are in favour. Do you agree with the proposal of the Argentinean Federation? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been accepted with 96 votes.

Now we go to the proposals of the Executive Committee.

The first proposal focuses on the replacement of the title of article 2.1.2 *Conditions of memberships of Members of Honour*. The proposal is to replace the title with *Members of Honour*. The Legal Commission is in favour. Do you agree with this proposal? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 97 votes.

The subsequent proposal is to insert a couple of words in the sentence: *Before each Congress, the Central Office may single out one or more persons with the intention of proposing their nomination as Members of Honour*. The Executive Committee wants to add “*at the Congress*”. The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposal. So we proceed to the vote. Do you agree to insert “*at the Congress*”, at the end of this sentence? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 98 votes.

The subsequent proposal is to make a slight correction in the English version of the statutes. We should replace the words “Central Office” by the term “the Bureau”. It is just a terminology change which has no impact on the statutes. The opinion of the Legal Commission is in favour. So we proceed to the vote. Do you agree with this proposal? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been accepted with 102 votes.

The subsequent proposal refers to article **2.3 Zonal Confederations**. The aim of this proposal is to give the President the right to delegate his vote to the Secretary General of the FIE. The aim is to modify the current sentence: *As such, he has the right to vote* of this article so that it now reads: *As such, he has the right to vote, and may delegate his vote to the Secretary General of the FIE*.

Bert Van de Flier (NED): I have an opinion about this on behalf of the Netherlands. I think it is a good proposal, but would it also be reciprocal towards the Confederations?

Nathalie Rodriguez: Excuse me Mister Van de Flier but for reciprocity to be approved we need an extra proposal. No proposal has been submitted to this effect, and we cannot add it now after the fact. The objective of the proposal is not to give the President the right to vote, but to give the President the right to delegate his vote to the Secretary General of the FIE. Reciprocity was not originally considered in the proposal.

Bert Van de Flier (NED): I want to thank you all. I think that we can add it next year.

Nathalie Rodriguez: You just have to submit a proposal to this effect next time.

Bert Van de Flier (NED): So, in order for my country to decide what to vote, we would like to know if the FIE is in favour of this reciprocity.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Van de Flier wants to know if the FIE would be in favour of a proposal showing reciprocity for what takes place in the FIE and in the Confederation. I said it would be desirable to submit such a proposal to the Executive Committee and to the Commissions which can give their opinion once the proposal has been submitted to them, but this can only be done for the next Congress.

Bert Van de Flier (NED): Yes, of course, I understand. But I ask this only to make up my mind ...

Nathalie Rodriguez: I am sorry, but we can't hear you..

Bert Van de Flier (NED):

The only question was simply: are we going to do this in the future? Is the possibility there? We have to propose it, I understand that, but I can imagine that many federations will say "we might be in favour of this if we know that we have a fair chance that it would also happen the other way around". Otherwise, maybe it would be better maybe to postpone the decision until next year and have both proposals.

I would be happy to say yes at this moment if I hear the President of the FIE, for instance, say "I am in favour of the reciprocity". I would be reassured if I heard: "Yes, we will be able to do that. We will think about it."

Nathalie Rodriguez: This proposal does not exist for the moment and I don't think we can ask the Congress to make a vote on this principle. Please, make a proposal for the next Congress. For the moment, we are not talking about reciprocity. We are talking about a specific proposal.

Bert Van de Flier (NED): Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Now we vote on the proposal to modify the current sentence: *As such, he has the right to vote* so that it now reads: *As such, he has the right to vote, and may delegate his vote to the Secretary General of the FIE.*

The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposal. Now, I ask you to vote on this. Are you in favour or not?

Giuseppe Cafiero (ITA): Excuse me. I don't think that in a board of directors, which the Executive Committee is, there should be proxies. Normally this is an Assembly, a Congress, but in a restricted number of people the vote is always personal.

This is a new concept that I don't think is... if we are to accept this, it should be extended to any member not just to the President. Just for the dignity of the Executive Committee. All the members are equal, so no one should have more possibility than the others.

So, I don't agree with the first point. I agree with the points **2.4.1** and **2.4.2** but not with the point **2.3**.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Cafiero may I remind you that we have just voted that the President is the legal representative of the FIE but in case he cannot do something he is represented by the Secretary General. So why couldn't he give his vote?

Alisher Usmanov: Now you must vote for the proposal which we already have on the table. Please don't waste time. Vote first, then you can make a new proposal if you want. Vote please.

Nathalie Rodriguez: We are voting on: The President has the right to delegate his vote to the Secretary General of the FIE. Please, vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

Yes?

Kimmo Pentikainen (FIN) : I would request that always before the voting...

Alisher Usmanov: There are always requests before the vote. It is rejected.

Kimmo Pentikainen (FIN) : I would request that, as the statutes say, before each vote, what we are voting on is always clearly announced.

In this case it should have been announced that we are now voting on the opinion of the Legal Commission with the modified text. Please.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Excuse me, sir, but I have repeated it three times. I have explained the proposal and I said the proposal is "*With the right to vote, which may be delegated to the Secretary-General of the FIE*".

The vote is open. Do you agree with this proposal?

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been rejected with 70 votes.

Peter Jacobs (MH): Let's speak clearly. The statutes of the FIE don't state that 2/3 of the people have to be present in the room. It has to be 2/3 of those people who pushed a button to say "yes", "no" or "abstain". Therefore, if everybody in the room, all 112, vote on the statutes, we need a majority of 75. But if as in this case there are a number of people who did not push a button at all, the majority

required to obtain 2/3 is lower and it shows on the screen. Nathalie is just checking the statutes to make sure...

Nathalie Rodriguez: Actually, I don't agree with this, as I said at the beginning the majority should be according to the number of federations present or represented. 75 is the majority.

Alisher Usmanov: There are abstentions. Between "yes", "no" and "abstain" we have the majority. Very simple. Arithmetic logic.

Peter Jacobs: Sorry. I am wrong and Samuel has corrected me. We need 2/3 of the people who vote. My apologies. And the majority required for that is 70.

Alisher Usmanov: Mister Jacobs, it is the last mistake I will allow in your calculations, please. You are our treasurer!

(Laughs)

Nathalie Rodriguez: So the proposal has been accepted with 70 votes.

Now, the proposal of the Executive Committee was to insert a paragraph **2.4** dealing with the responsibility of Zonal Confederations, given that this text does not appear in the statutes

The article **2.4.1.** defines the responsibilities of the Zonal Confederations and refers to more detailed texts in the administrative rules.

The Legal Commission is in favour of the proposal, indicating that the Zonal Confederations support the FIE in the development of fencing in a particular geographical zone and that the support of Zonal Confederations for the FIE has been defined by the administrative rules

The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission.

If there are no questions we can vote on this article **2.4** which contains paragraphs **2.4.1** and **2.4.2**. Are you in favour of this proposal? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been accepted with 86 votes.

Now we propose to take a 15 minutes coffee break.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Ladies and Gentlemen we are about to resume. Please, make your way to your seats. Mister Cheris has the floor.

Samuel David Cheris (MH): With regard to the vote on section **2.3** Mrs. Rodriguez was correct. I asked the wrong question about 2/3 of the vote. Our statutes say 2/3 of the votes of the federations present and represented. So, it does not matter whether somebody cannot vote, goes to the bathroom, has a conversation and does not use his keypad. The votes of people not present for the ballot count as a "no". All those who are not pushing the buttons, or do not want to vote are voting "no".... If they vote "no", it is because they wanted to

express a negative vote. In order to have any statute proposal approved you must have 75 "yes" votes. It does not matter how many people vote "no", "abstain" or fail to vote. On the proposal **2.3** there were 70 "yes" votes. Mrs. Rodriguez was correct in saying that the proposal was not approved. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Thank you Mr Cheris. We now have a new country present, which is Indonesia. This means that the number of voting federations is 113. So, there are 113 present attending federations and voting federations. At this point, is the majority 75 or 76?

It is 76. And Tajikistan has just arrived.

So, we now have 114 federations in attendance today. The majority of 2/3 is still 76, for a proposal to be approved we need 76 "yes" votes, as far as the statutes are concerned, of course.

Now, we move on to the next proposal of the Executive Committee. The proposal reads as follows: *If a Member Federation has not fulfilled its financial obligations towards the FIE 30 calendar days [the Legal Commission has added the word "calendar"] (00:00 hrs Lausanne time) before the opening day of the Congress or General Assembly, such Member Federation will be prohibited from being represented at the said Congress or General Assembly....*

Why did we propose this modification? Because the text was referring to a "one month" period which was not precise. The text for the proposal is then changed by adding: *unless exception has been made for a valid reason and accepted by the Executive Committee* [and the Legal Commission has added:] *and such reason shall be announced to the Congress*. The opinion of the Executive Committee is in favour of the changes of the Legal Commission. You can vote now. Do you agree with the proposal? The vote is open. Thank you.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been accepted with 88 votes.

Next proposal. The objective here is to replace globally in the FIE Statutes the term "administrative office" by "Head office", and "8 months" by "6 month deadline" relative to the proposals. You are aware that currently, the proposals must reach the head office 8 months before the Congress. The Executive Committee thinks that this deadline is too drastic and should be reduced to six months. The Legal Commission has approved this proposal.

So if nobody has questions for this we can vote. So this proposal is 1) to replace "administrative office" with "Head office", which is just a house cleaning item, and 2) change the deadline to send proposals from 8 months to 6 months, of course no later than 00h00 Lausanne time. Do you agree with this proposal? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been accepted with 101 votes.

I propose to consider that the next proposal is already approved because in this proposal we are also speaking about replacing "administrative office" with "Head

office". As you just approved it in the preceding proposal, and as the Legal Commission is in favour, I propose to take it as being accepted too.

Next proposal refers to article **3.4.5**. The proposal is to erase several texts that are old or obsolete and give the CEO the power to accomplish these tasks, i.e. mentioning the exact text that would be submitted for voting, which is what I am doing now. The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposal. So please vote on this proposal. Do you agree with it? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been accepted with 95 votes.

Next proposal. Article **3.4.6**. We propose that the quick summary of decisions of the Congress be "*drafted by the CEO, revised by the President of the pertinent Commission, approved by the FIE President and sent to the Member Federations within a month.*"

The Legal Commission made several remarks and opinions, and the Executive Committee agreed with them.

So please vote on this proposal. Do you agree with it? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been accepted with 98 votes.

The next proposal is a consequence of the previous proposal. Because specific texts are being approved the new texts cannot be drafted after the Congress because we are voting on them now.

The Legal Commission is in favour of erasing underlined and italics sentences and words. So, we now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been accepted with 95 votes.

The next proposal concerns the General Assembly. Since we voted at the beginning of the Congress, that there would not be General Assemblies any more, the text included in this article would have to be erased, which is: "*The General Assembly can only reach valid decisions..*" and "*Failing this the administrative office will do a written consultation*". And as for the Congress the text speaks about "*half of the whole Members*" and we thought that it was better to replace "*half*" with "*50%*" which is more precise, and harmonised with the other figures given in the statutes.

The Legal Commission is in favour because the General Assembly had been cancelled.

You can now vote on the proposal. The vote is open.

Yes, Mister Cheris.

Samuel David Cheris (MH): Since we have eliminated the General Assembly there is no reason to vote on this paragraph.

Nathalie Rodriguez: It is because the Congress is mentioned, and the text says that it cannot deliberate.

Samuel David Cheris (MH): The Congress has its own majority already in the statutes.

Nathalie Rodriguez: But in the next proposal we are no longer talking about the General Assembly but about the Congress. So we wanted to change "half" for "50%". In the second part of the proposal you have to replace "half" for the Congress by "50%".

Samuel David Cheris (MH): Please accept my apologies.

Nathalie Rodriguez: The vote is closed.

The proposal has been accepted with 95 votes.

The next proposal suggested erasing the fact that the Elective Congress is called at the initiative of the Executive Committee of the FIE, which is obvious. So the Legal Commission is in favour of erasing these words in this sentence. Can you vote on this proposal? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 99 votes.

Next proposal. The Executive Committee proposes to erase the underlined and italics sentences and words in the proposal. i.e.: "*Special Rules for World Championships and Olympic Games Commission*". The Legal Commission is in favour of erasing this sentence. The vote is open. Yes?

Andrew Ius: I understand that this proposal will do away with the Special Rules Commission for the Olympic Games and World Championship, so am I correct in assuming that everything related to the Olympic Games in London 2012 will be decided at the 2010 Congress?

Nathalie Rodriguez: Excuse me but this has nothing to do with the proposal. Consult the agenda of the meeting and you will see that we have item 5 Olympic Games in London. It is already in our agenda for the Congress. So we will be talking about the Olympic Games when we will come to this item.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 93 votes.

The aim of the next proposal is to clarify that the candidacy to the elections for the Executive Committee or the Commissions that can be done with a limit of just one candidate per nationality. The Legal Commission has clarified "one candidate per nationality for any such position", that is to say to the Executive Committee and the Commissions. The Legal Commission is in favour and the Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission. Please, vote on this. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 99 votes.

The next proposal is, once again, a slight change to replace "administrative office" with "head office" so as to be more accurate as for the terms proposed for the positions. Instead of speaking about *"two months before the Congress"* we write: *"60 days 00h00 Lausanne time before the opening day of the Elective Congress"*. The Legal Commission is in favour of *"30 calendar days [adding calendar as we did before], at 00h00 Lausanne time the day before the opening day of the Elective Congress"*. The Executive Committee proposed 60 days and the Legal Commission wants to replace it with 30 calendar days. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission.

Please, vote on the proposal as modified by the Legal Commission, to indicate if you are in favour. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 98 votes in favour.

The next proposal is to add at the end of the sentence: *The President of the FIE cannot hold any position whatsoever within his national federation or in any Zonal Confederation*". The Executive Committee agrees with the Legal Commission. I propose to vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 97 votes in favour.

The next proposal aimed to rephrase the statute that says: *"If a candidate for the Executive Committee withdraws before an election only his Member Federation may present another candidate"*. The Executive Committee wanted to eliminate the underlined part of the sentence modifying it with *"such candidature is not replaced"*. The Legal Commission is in favour of the text as modified and the Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission. So, *"if a candidate for the Executive Committee withdraws, his Member Federation may present another candidate [which is the current text] before the deadline indicated in 4.1.4"*. Now we vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 97 votes in favour.

The next proposal referred to the election to the Executive Committee and the percentage of women. There were two proposals. One aimed at erasing the sentence *"if one or several of the women selected are of the same nationality as one of the first 12 men elected"*, which is redundant. This is not possible any more because each country can present only one candidacy for a given position, so it is impossible that a man and a woman of the same nationality are candidates for the same position on a Commission or the Executive Committee.

The second part of the proposal is the percentage indicated in the text at the moment. Replace "*about 20%*" by "*at least 20%*". The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposal. I ask you to vote on it. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 95 votes in favour.

The next proposal was similar to the one we have already examined, but we speak about the Commissions now, instead of the Executive Committee. The proposal was: "*if a candidate for a permanent Commission withdraws before an election, his Member Federation may present another candidate before the deadline indicated in 4.1.4.*" It is the same proposal already voted for the Executive Committee, but adapted to the Commissions. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission. So we can vote on this now. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 99 votes in favour.

Next proposal. Same situation as above. In article **4.4.4**: *If one or several of the women so elected is of the same nationality as one of the first 8 men elected, she (they) will be stood down in favour of the next woman of a nationality not already represented.* The situation can no longer happen. The text is therefore outdated as no federation can present more than one candidate per position. The Legal Commission is in favour of the proposal. Vote on this, please. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 97 votes in favour.

Next proposal. The Executive Committee wants to change this sentence as follows: *The Executive Committee outlines the work of the Commissions and the Congresses*", and then *"prepares the work of the Congress"*. The Legal Commission is not in favour of the text as proposed, and suggests a new text. The Commission also indicated that, as the statutes define the tasks and responsibilities of the Commissions, it proposes the following text: *"the Executive Committee gives an outline of the work of the Commissions and the Congresses"*. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission. We vote on this. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 99 votes in favour.

Next proposal. The Executive Committee wanted to change the text indicating that *"the Executive Committee will delegate one of its members to be responsible to control and liaise with each commission"*. At the end of the sentence, *"except the Special Rules for World Championships and Olympic Games Commission"* must be erased. The Legal Commission is in favour of the proposal, but wants to

modify it like this: "*The Executive Committee will delegate one of its members to be responsible to coordinate and liaise with each commission*", and agrees to erase the next part of the sentence about the Special Commission. The Executive Committee is in favour of the new wording of the Legal Commission. You can vote on this point. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 104 votes in favour.

As we had said before, in the subsequent paragraph we want to erase the text in italics and underlined concerning the Special Rules for World Championships and Olympic Games Commission. The Legal Commission approves and proposes: "*The Executive Committee is responsible for planning, modifying and drafting the text of the Administrative Rules. It approves the drafting of the texts prepared by the Rules Commission and the Legal Commission*". And the rest of the sentence is erased. The Executive Committee was also in favour of the wording proposed by the Legal Commission. You can vote on this now. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 104 votes in favour.

The next proposal is also a housekeeping item. In fact, the article now states that "*the Executive Committee approves the calendar of official competitions*" but it actually approves the final version of the FIE official calendar. The Legal Commission is in favour of the opinion of the Executive Committee. I ask you to vote on this point. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 98 votes in favour.

The next proposal is not really an amendment but just an update to what actually takes place. The current text indicates that: "*The President has the power to open and operate an account in a banking establishment*". This text was written when the FIE only had one account in just one currency. But today, the FIE has several accounts, current accounts and term accounts, so we had and the Legal Commission has approved the revised text. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission. Therefore, I ask you to vote on this now. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 84 votes in favour.

Given the approval of the preceding proposal that included also a power of attorney for the CEO the subsequent proposal is no longer valid. That is why the Legal Commission said "*see the previous proposal*", as that proposal already included the preceding proposal. The only change was the replacement of "*Administrative and Financial Director*" by "*CEO*". This proposal is not going to be

voted on because it was included in the previous text and you have already expressed your opinion.

The next proposal concerns the responsibilities of the bureau. The proposal is to refine the current text by adding a sentence about the kind of decisions which could be taken by the bureau. The proposal was: "*The Bureau may make decisions on all urgent and routine/current issues linked to FIE activities with the Executive Committee's subsequent approval.*" The Legal Commission wanted to modify the text as follows: "*The Bureau may make decisions on current issues of FIE activities with the Executive Committee's subsequent approval*". The Executive Committee is in favour of this modified text. So you can vote on it now. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 92 votes in favour.

The next proposal aimed at adding the fact that "*The CEO receives a power of attorney from the President to perform current financial transactions*". The Legal Commission is in favour of adding the CEO in several articles: **5.8.1.** d) as an additional party in the 1st and 3rd sentences, and as a replacement of "Administrative and Financial Director" in the 2nd sentence, but also estimates that the CEO position must be added to **5.8.1.** e).

Additions should be made to several articles. The Legal Commission wanted to add a new chapter to the statutes, entitled "Chiefs of personnel", which would include responsibilities and activities of the CEO, similar to all other members of the FIE executive. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission. So you can vote on this point now. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 96 votes in favour.

The next proposal is a consequence of the previous votes. In chapter 6.1.1 "The Commissions", erase the line in italics and underlined, i.e. "*the Special Rules for World Championships and Olympic Games Commission*" and the Legal Commission is in favour. Therefore, I ask you to vote on this point. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 94 votes in favour.

Of course, what you have just decided also has a consequence on other texts. So I ask you to decide on the elimination of the lines in italics and underlined in article **6.2.1.** The Legal Commission is in favour. You may vote on this point now. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 96 votes in favour.

The next proposal is to erase paragraph b) stating that when, among the ten elected Members of a commission, every geographic zone is not represented, that commission can co-opt a member of the missing zone, but without voting rights and only with a consultative status. The Executive Committee and the Legal Commission both thought that it was not useful, as these members do not have the right to vote. So the proposal we are going to vote now is to scratch paragraph b). The Legal Commission is in favour. You may vote on this point now. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 92 votes in favour.

The next proposal concerns the reformulation of article **6.2.3** dealing with the Executive Committee delegating one of its members in each Commission. The Legal Commission has revised the proposal, indicating that the Executive Committee will delegate one of its members in each commission, by indicating after "to coordinate with" and inserting "and supervise the work of the Commissions". The Legal Commission wants to replace "supervise" by "coordinate". And in the other proposal, the Commissions wants to state: "*The President may, as agreed with the Executive Committee and after consultation with the President of the Commission, have relevant experts involved in the commissions' work.*" Of course, these are details in the wording of this paragraph. The Executive Committee is in favour of the proposal as modified by the Legal Commission.

Giuseppe Cafiero: Excuse me. I think there is a mistake because we speak of two Presidents: *President may, and after consultation with the President of the Commission.* We already are in a Commission. So which President are we talking about? If the President is the one of the Commission, who is the other one?

Nathalie Rodriguez: No, we speak about the President of the Commission.

Giuseppe Cafiero: But, the *President may... after consultation with the President...* maybe we are speaking about the supervisor in this case: after consultation with the President? The text is not clear here... The President consults the President...?

Nathalie Rodriguez: I don't think we are talking about the same proposal, about the same text. The second proposal of the Executive Committee stated: *The President may...*

Giuseppe Cafiero: What President?

Nathalie Rodriguez: *...as agreed with the Executive Committee., have relevant experts involved in the commissions' work.* In this part of the sentence for the second proposal, it is the President of the FIE who may with the agreement of Executive Committee have relevant experts.

Giuseppe Cafiero: You need to make it clear.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Yes, so we can add "President of the FIE" to be more specific.

Giuseppe Cafiero: But in the article, we speak of the supervisors. Then we speak about the President, without saying which President, we need to be more accurate I think.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Currently, article 6.2.3. states: "*The Executive Committee will delegate one of its members to be responsible to coordinate with each commission*". This is the first part of the text. Similarly, the Legal Commission is in favour of a revision of **5.5.4:** "*The Executive Committee will delegate one of its members in each Commission*". In order to liaise with them, except for the Special Rules Commission, for which we erased the article. Did I answer your question?

Yes? Mr. Cheris? Mrs. Dienstl?

Erika Dienstl (MH): What happens if the President of the Commission does not agree? And my second question is that I think the expert has no right to vote.

Nathalie Rodriguez: No, the expert does not have the right to vote. He is just an expert and he gives his expertise and opinion that is all.

Let us vote on the proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 79 votes.

Next proposal. Because we erased all the references to this Commission the aim is to erase the paragraph **6.2.4.** of the Statutes. The Legal Commission is in favour. Let us vote on the proposal. The vote is open. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 92 votes in favour.

The next proposal is similar, we are going to erase all the references to this Commission in the Statutes; so once more, delete the underlined and italics sentences. The Legal Commission is in favour. So now vote please. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 90 votes.

We keep on erasing references to this Commission, similarly, we suppress article **6.3.2.** The Legal Commission is in favour. And as the next proposal is the same for another article, i.e. article 6.5.8., we could vote on both of these at the same time, as it pertains to the same Commission. The Legal Commission is in favour. So, we are voting to erase paragraphs **6.3.2** and **6.5.8.** Let us vote on the proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 99 votes.

Maxim Paramonov: Dear friends, could I have your attention please? We still have a few pages left for the proposals of the Executive Committee. If you agree we can stop when we conclude with these proposals before lunch.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So let us go on. As you know the Executive Committee has created a Commission, composed of designated members, which is called “Women and Fencing”. The objective of the proposal is to make it official so that it can be included in the statutes. The Legal Commission is in favour for the inclusion of this Commission “Women and Fencing”, but as a Council, as its members are nominated and not elected. The Legal Commission is in favour of the proposal, but entitled “Women and Fencing Council”. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission. You will also see that the roles and functions of that Council are listed in the proposal. Please, vote on the modified proposal, as proposed by the Legal Commission. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 99 votes.

Similarly, the Executive Committee also wanted to create a “Veterans Council” whose members are appointed by the Executive Committee and which would give advice to the Executive Committee on all matters related to veteran’s fencing. The Legal Commission is in favour, but indicates that it is not a real commission, but a council of the veterans. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission. We can vote. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 90 votes.

Next proposal. The aim was to add a paragraph as for the responsibility of the Commission Presidents and to define their role, the drafting of documents and their function within the Commission and in relation with the Executive Committee. The Legal Commission is in favour of the text **6.6.1: Management of the operations of the Commissions**, and **6.6.2: Preparation of the Commissions’ work plans and control over their implementation shall be done in coordination with the Executive Committee delegate to the Commission**. It is in favour of the article **6.6.3** pertaining to the relationship with the Executive Committee members. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission. Let us vote on the proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 94 votes.

The next proposal concerns licenses and aims at defining better how a referee can obtain a license from the FIE. This proposal is also aimed at indicating on the license itself that a referee from one country can reside in another country, and therefore it is the federation of his country of residence which applies for his license, and not his national federation. So that when the referee uses his license, one would know that he has a country of residence and an nationality. So the proposal was to indicate FIE on the license, instead of the referee's nationality, under the title Nationality. So this is to make clear that there is a citizenship and a country of residence. The Legal Commission proposes to rephrase the Executive Committee's text as follows:

"a) A National Federation can obtain a license for a referee who is a citizen of such country and whose license will specify the nationality of the referee.

b) A National Federation can obtain a license for a referee who is not a citizen of such country, but who has been a resident in such country for more than three (3) years [it is still the current condition] and whose license will specify the nationality of the referee as FIE."

The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Legal Commission. Let us vote on the proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 94 votes.

We get to the last page of the Executive Committee proposals. The following proposal is to replace "the administrative office" with "the Head office". The Legal Commission expressed its positive opinion. Let us vote on the proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 98 votes.

The next proposal aims at completing the current text concerning the prohibition of political, racial or religious discrimination which in our Statutes is prohibited only for the Olympic Games. We want to add after the Olympic Games *"and all FIE official competition"*, and move the sentence at the beginning of the article. The Legal Commission is in favour. Let us vote on the proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 100 votes.

Last proposal, about the chapter on honorary awards of the FIE. Firstly, we should change the name of this chapter to *"Titles and Awards Conferred by the Congress"* as indeed this chapter deals with a mix of titles and awards conferred by the Congress and other entities of the FIE. Secondly, it is proposed to erase articles **11.2.1**, **11.3** and **11.4** of this chapter and add them in the Federation's Administrative Rules because these are not titles or awards conferred by the

Congress. So the proposal is 1) change the title of the chapter, and 2) move the aforesaid articles in the Administrative Rules of the FIE. The Legal Commission is in favour. Let us vote on the proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been approved with 96 votes.

We have concluded the proposals from the Executive Committee. I would like to remind you that we need to take a photo of the Congress. The photo will be taken upstairs, just in front of the entrance of the hotel. Please, follow the hostesses who will take you outside in front of the hotel for the photo and then we meet soon after for lunch. We will resume the meeting after lunch. Thank you.

Kimmo Pentikainen: Just a little comment before we go. I would express already in this stage of our work that I think the Legal Commission and the Executive Committee have done exceptional work on preparing the proposals concerning the modifications of the statutes. I believe that this work will make the statutes more logical and coherent. In the end, they've done a very effective job on behalf of fencing. And I think that one of the reasons is that there has been a cultural change in the attitude of the Executive Committee towards the Commissions, and that they are working together in a more coherent and united way. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Alisher Usmanov: Ladies and Gentlemen, we are about to continue our work. Please be seated.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Let's go on with the proposals.

Just a light reminder for the vote. After "yes", "no" or "abstain" do not forget to push the "valid" button to confirm your vote otherwise your vote is not valid. If you do not press this button, your vote is not cast.

I also wanted to announce that Nigeria has arrived so we now have 115 federations. So for the modifications to the statutes, the 2/3 proportion is now 77 votes.

Let us now examine the proposals of the Hungarian Federation.

Proposal 1 on article 1.5.9. The Legal Commission was against the proposal and the Executive Committee not in favour of the proposal either. Now let us vote on the proposal. The vote is open. Are you against or in favour of this proposal? The vote is open.

Alisher Usmanov: 67 votes.

Nathalie Rodriguez: We said we were 115 federations so 77 is the majority, in fact it is 76.666. And, of course, we are still dealing with the statutes.

The vote is closed.

So the proposal is rejected.

Proposal 2 on article **3.3.3** of the statutes. The Legal Commission is against as well as the Executive Committee. So they are both against. You can vote on this proposal now. The vote is open.

Alisher Usmanov: I want to add that we are against this proposal because we will prepare new statutes for the Members of Honour.

Mister Roch and I will submit a common proposal for these rights of Member of Honour. I want everybody to know this before voting.

Krisztian Kulcsar: What the Hungarian federation is proposing here is to preside over the meetings in French or in English, which is actually the practice. So, I don't see why it is so crucial. According to my experience it is what is going on at the moment. Thank you.

Maxim Paramonov: The Executive Committee will prepare the criteria for the Members of Honour, in order to understand who has the right to become a Member of Honour and how the things proceed... After the proposals are submitted we will, of course, discuss the topic again.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Since the vote was interrupted we have to re-open the voting session. So the vote is open again on this proposal.

The vote is closed.

The proposal is rejected.

Yes?

Giuseppe Cafiero: Since we have now a group of proposals from the Italian Federation and we have seen also the opinions and the comments of the Legal Commission and of the Executive Committee, in order to speed up our work we can group these proposals and clarify a few points if you allow me to give you some explanations.

The first one is **1.6** and considering the opinion of the Legal Commission and of the Executive Committee we think we can withdraw this proposal. So, we withdraw this proposal.

The second one is **2.2.2**. We just wanted to make clear that certain organizations exist but they have no acknowledgement by the FIE. The idea was not to load the FIE with additional work but simply to make it clear that there are limits of powers, responsibility and of competence for this groups that are territorial groups. We could withdraw the proposal, but I would like to suggest a study for a solution in the future on this issue.

As far as point **2.3**. is concerned...

Maxim Paramonov: May I just add something? Just a remark. It is an absolutely great idea because there are a lot of territorial groups in existence making it a good idea to form a working group to study the situation.

Giuseppe Cafiero: Thank you.

We will withdraw point **2.3**, if the Congress agrees.

But we would like to maintain point **2.3.5** that is indicating certain rules that are not an increase of entities but simply a clearer indication of the point **2.3.5** giving some more consistency with the FIE rules.

So my proposal is to limit the vote to the articles **2.3.5** up to **2.3.9** and skipping the points **2.3.1** up to **2.3.4** if everybody agrees.

Here are all our proposals, so then we can vote only on those remaining. Point **3.1** is not necessary any as we already expressed our opinion.

The role of the Assemblies is not significant any more.

The point **3.3.2** must be revised together with **3.2.1** because since we have cancelled the General Assemblies we must integrate the competence of the Congress to some points within paragraph **3.2.1**. So I think we have to re-propose this in the future, in a more integrated way. I would maintain point **3.3.2**.

I would like to underline that **3.3.3** concerns the right to vote of the delegates, and the proxies, for the Members of the Executive Committee. The proposal just aimed at giving more significance to the Congress, nothing against the Members of the Executive Committee. This is up to you, I don't want to insist.

In the end, we can maintain the proposal **3.4.1**, but we already voted in favour. So we don't need to vote on that.

Point **4.3.1** is not necessary any more if we don't insist on the point 2, as these are continental entities that are not accepted; now we don't need that.

Finally, **4.3.2** and **4.3.3** meet with our favourable opinion, but they have already been dealt with in previous votes. The other proposals are just corrections in wording that don't really need a vote in my opinion. Women rights, for example, in point **4.4.4**.

So, in the same way, **5.2.4.**, and we accept the comment on **7.1.4.**, so we withdraw this proposal.

I think this is all. I think we leave very few points to vote on. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So, Mr Cafiero, if I understood correctly you wanted to keep the proposal, or rather the article **2.3.2**. No, I was wrong, it is the **2.3.5**. Is it correct? You wanted to keep **2.3.5**?

Giuseppe Cafiero: I repeat: the points that we can keep are **2.3.5** up to **2.3.9** with a change of ... as according to the text, we cannot mention the Continental Confederations but only the Zonal Confederations.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So, articles **2.3.5** up to **2.3.9** are maintained by the Italian Federation. Mister Cheri?

Samuel David Cheris (MH): Ok, **2.3.5** as proposed is virtually the same as **2.3.3** of the existing statute which says that the Zonal Confederations: "may have no rules or statutes contrary to those of the FIE. In case of disagreement in the interpretation of the Statutes and Rules of the FIE and those of a Zonal Confederation, those of the FIE have priority."

2.3.5 and **2.3.6** say that we have five zones and we have already said that we have five zones.

2.3.7 and **2.3.8**: the President of the FIE is an ex officio Member of the Executive Committee and has the right to vote. The statutes already say that. Additionally, the statutes already say that the Presidents of the Zonal Confederations are ex officio Members of the Executive Committee with the right to vote.

And **2.3.9** is the same as **2.3.5**.

So voting for these is going to put in a second section that says exactly the same thing as already is in the statutes. So we are going to have different wording but with the same purpose. According to me, there is no reason to vote on this.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So, Mister Cafiero, the Legal Commission says that **2.3.5** to **2.3.9** are already in the statutes but with a slightly different wording. Do you want to withdraw these? Good.

Do you maintain points **3.3.2** and **3.3.3**? I remind you that **3.3.2** had already been voted on according to what has been said by the Executive Committee so it shouldn't be voted on.

Giuseppe Cafiero: I think we agree. We don't need this point any more. I have withdrawn **3.3.3** because it was not accepted by the Executive Committee.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So, are there any proposals left from Italy?

Giuseppe Cafiero: Yes, there are proposals from Italy. **3.4.1** is consistent and **4.3.2** is consistent with the previous vote and we don't need them anymore. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez: But Sir, **3.4.1** has already been voted and we agreed on it as it has already been voted with the proposals of the Executive Committee. So, actually I think there is no proposal left. Do you agree?

So, that was the end of the proposals submitted by Italy.

Now, the proposals from Ukraine. However we are not voting on it because it has already been considered before in the Executive Committee proposals.

Serguey Mischenko : The Ukrainian Federation withdraws its proposal as it has already been voted on. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So we come to the proposals on the dates of the World Championships. As you all know, the dates of the World Championships are already in the statutes both for the Seniors and the Juniors. The Executive

Committee had proposed to hold the Senior World Championships in autumn in a period normally between September 15th and November 15th; and to keep the Junior and Cadets World Championships in April.

France wanted to organise the Junior World Championships at the beginning of April so no changes. The Senior World Championships in mid-October. And also France and Germany proposed the elimination of Cadets World Championships. It is included in their proposal.

Germany proposed to hold the Seniors World Championships in August and to suppress the Cadets World Championships.

Hungary would like the World Championships to be held between June 15th and July 31st.

Russia proposes a date for the World Championships between August 1st and August 10th.

Ukraine proposed for the Senior World Championships between September 1st and September 20th.

The Legal Commission did not express its opinion because it has stated that the dates of the World Championships were not part of the decision making process of this Commission.

The present statutes indicate October 1st – November 15th for the open World Championships.

Maxim Paramonov: I think this is a very delicate point because it does not only affect the athletes, but the whole fencing community. In order to be clear, in our federation and outside our federation we have to consider that there are different realities to be taken into account, i.e. spectators, medias, television, and so on. Therefore, I would like to invite Mr. Jochen Farber, our Director of television, to explain clearly the situation as far as television is concerned.
Mister Farber, please.

Jochen Farber: Hello everybody,

Of course, various federations have requested to change the dates. I want to just give you now some details on the figures of the TV in the last period.

We started in 2001. The figures indicated an increase of the audience worldwide. So, we had 270 million people watching these World Championships worldwide on television. The peak was actually in 2005, and then it went a little bit down and then up again. The peak is going up and then down again. And it was the same in Lisbon in 2002. The results were the lowest, but it was actually in the period in August, when some federations would like to have these World Championships. It is easy to understand that if you are going on holidays, you spend your time on the beach, and not watching television. Many people on holiday do not watch television at all while on holidays. So I am not sure it is a good idea to propose that the World Championships be held in August. I will briefly give you some figures.

Italy is one of the strongest countries in terms of television. Rai, the public broadcast, has been supporting fencing for many years. You can clearly see here that in Lisbon it was the weakest viewing figure ever. When the championships take place in September, October or even November, we had many more spectators, for example when they were held in Leipzig. We must give a greater importance to our sport. In direct elimination as well, for example, not only the finals. That was a test what we did in Leipzig and you see here the broadcast time in hours. Torino shows the most hours. But in Lisbon you are down to only 33 hours. This gives you just an indication of the research we have done regarding the audience, showing that Lisbon was not a great success.

In St. Petersburg due to the qualification for the Olympic Games we wanted to have the video refereeing system in all the bouts, including the pools. The FIE wants to go back to six days of competition. Frederic Pietruszka agreed with me. After 8 days of competition, we have two additional days, which is more expensive for us and for the television stations as well. For the FIE, it is essential to reach again the standards of the Leipzig World Championships, especially in regard to infrastructures. We must cover not only live but also on demand.

The European Broadcasting Union (EBU) recommends the period between September and November because in the summertime we have the Soccer World Cup; we have the Swimming World Championships; we have Wimbledon and other events, including tennis. So it is almost impossible for us to get good coverage timing in this period. This is the reason why we do not really like a World Championships in this July or August period.

I had a discussion with Christian Bauer and told him there is no disagreement between the television needs and those of the athletes, but I think we should avoid the months of July and August as we risk to lose coverage and a lot of the audience.

Maxim Paramonov: Mister Farber, can I ask you to distribute this very interesting presentation to all the federations so that they can all understand this phenomenon; so that each Federation President can inform his members about this topic.

Jochen Farber: We can give you the global figures, but also country by country if you want, as they are available in more details.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Zidaru?

Octavian Zidaru: We heard Mr. Farber's demonstration. It is fine, but I don't fully agree that all the elements for this have been taken into account. Of course, the TV is important for our image but I am not sure that the comparison between Lisbon, Leipzig or Turin is really without flaws. Maybe there are some other reasons for their differences. We should also think that the performance is something that we owe to the athletes and we must consider also the importance of their progression towards peak form. We cannot just stop the season for three months only to have a slight and questionable increase in the audience with very few percentage points. Maybe we should maybe revise the whole calendar, why

not, so that it culminates at the end of June with the World Championships. I think we should think over this very carefully. Thank you.

Applause

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Cafiero?

Giuseppe Cafiero: Firstly, I think it is really important to know the consequences of our decisions and the analysis of the audience. It is a essential tool, extremely important for our decisions. But I also think that fencing has become what we are, number of countries, quality of the sport, ethics. Without the television, we cannot become... Now, we cannot become dependant on the television. Each sport has its own physiology. For example, we cannot skate on ice in August. We cannot choose the seasons as we wish.

We have to respect the needs of the athletes. We cannot ask the fencers to fence the whole season; to keep training the whole summer and start again with the World Championships. So, a new decision based on the season from the beginning of the year and the end of the year with a World Cup ending with the World Championships in mid July or beginning of August and then give the athletes a reasonable and natural rest. Just as all of the other sports do. This is more consistent and it is an important characteristic of our sport.

If we have to look for an audience that is coming to fencing only because they have nothing else to watch we are a miserable sport and I don't agree with this attitude. So I think we have to make our own decision based on what is our convenience not just considering money or TV audience, because if fencing interests people, they will be interested by it at any period of the year.

Applause

Jochen Farber: I don't want to come back on what I said. But the question was "what do you put in first priority?" You say the season is not perfectly fitting the athletes and the preparation, everything.

But the question is "do you start with the season and decide when are the World Championships?" or do you decide when are the World Championships and calculate the season backwards? Of course the athletes must have a three months recuperation period and then come back to shine. I can only suggest that according to the discussion we had, and that includes the Italian state broadcast, they were all saying "We don't have the time to put it on air at this time". They all suggest the period of September to November. So we have to be careful not to be in competition with other events. Therefore, please think carefully. We must recalculate and restructure the season, and imagine a process calculating backwards.

Alisher Usmanov: Thank you Mr. Farber. Of course, everybody has their arguments. But everyone must remember that our target is to increase the popularity of fencing among the youth. When we vote we must remember this also. For this we put on voting and you choose. After all, you are responsible of your choice.

René Roch (MH): Mister President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

We often discussed the dates of the World Championships. I think we must not say, as I heard several mention it, that the World Championships should take place when the others have nothing else to do than watch TV. That is not true. But we should also not compete with others big sports or disciplines. Who is going to watch fencing when there is the Soccer World Cup in July? Who will watch fencing when Wimbledon is on? Who will watch fencing when Roland Garros is being broadcast? Who will watch fencing when other major competitions are on? All this is not serious for us. We must take into account the other disciplines. We compete with the other sports. But we are also obliged to have an impact on TV because the IOC judges us based on the TV broadcasting impact that we have to give us more importance on the Olympic Games, and perhaps 12 medals, perhaps removing us from the Games altogether. This is our problem. Our problem is to protect our sport, not to adjust it. We want to defend it, and we want it well broadcast. It is true, as Farber rightly said, that often the TVs tell us "we have no room for you unless you organize the championships between September 15 and the end of November." That's all.

Take sports such as cycling for example, sports that everyone knows and that are important too, they have their World Championships in November because they know that if they don't do it in November nobody is going to watch cycling during Roland Garros, and nobody is going to watch it during the Soccer World Cup. So there is the Soccer World Cup, but also the European Cup. Many sport events are organised, so I think it is more reasonable to keep the dates we have now. Yes, I also think that we may have to completely adjust the calendar. Maybe it is better to wait for a complete restructuring of the calendar including the World Championships, rather than taking a quick decision that is not matching what we want to achieve globally. So, we must consider the World Championships and the calendar as a whole, in order to bring the athletes at the best moment possible for the World Championships. I completely agree. We must defend the fencers, but we must also adapt. Thank you.

Applause

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Cheris?

Samuel David Cheris (MH): Right now, we have various countries proposing three or four different dates; we have an incomplete modified calendar which is being developed by the Executive Committee. So I would move to table these proposals to next year's Congress. The Executive Committee proposed a date for the World Championships along with a calendar that matches the dates of the other competitions, so it is all coordinated in one set, which allows a better analysis.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mrs. Dienstl?

Erika Dienstl (MH): The figures of Antalya are missing at the moment, but there were not that many spectators. I was at the Congress in Copenhagen and I would have liked to have had some information about the television. I think we must think carefully about the choice of the World Championships, in which

countries they are organised. We have long heard that we must give a better image to fencing. This is what is lacking.

The President spoke about data from the recent years, but I feel the image and the number of spectators of the World Championships have diminished. So let us think about the future, about the next time. It depends where the World Championships are organised; we will try to get the interest of the television and of the spectators as much as possible, of course.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mrs. Dienstl, I just would like to point out that for 2009, the EBU did not sign a contract with the FIE. We had signed individual contracts with the Italian television, the Russian television, the Austrian television. However, the current situation is slightly different, as the contracts have been signed in a different way.

Jochen Farber: It is true I don't have the figures from Antalya yet because the research is not finished. I wanted to present a set of real comparisons where you can really compare the figures between countries. But I did not have enough figures for Antalya therefore I did not include it in my presentation. Indeed, there was no exhaustive broadcast this year. It was difficult to negotiate but that had nothing to do with the time frame and the period of broadcast. One can clearly see how difficult it is to find the ideal solution. This year, the World Championships were firstly planned at the beginning of October, but at that time there was still the FIFA and the World Cup. So it is true that we should not be too strict about the dates, and choose a specific week rather than another on the international scene. We always have to see the international calendar to see if there is a competing event going on. So we have to control the dates and eventually start and finish on a given date. In the past, when we chose the right date, we saw that there was interest from the public, the spectators. We have even had exceptional experiences. The period of September, October, and November really gives us unparalleled results.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So we propose... I think everybody has expressed their point of views. So we will propose two votes.

Stanislas Podzdniakov: Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish to express my thoughts before we vote. What the speakers have told us about the dates do not take into account the physiological aspects of the athletes who throughout the season, without having a rest, without additional training, have to participate in competitions. In my opinion, from an athlete's point of view, I can say that the World Championships in November don't give an opportunity for the athletes to recover. This means that we have to take this decision in a very cautious way. We must really decide what we want. Are we interested in having healthy athletes or are we interested in media and TVs? So, before voting for one or the other, think this over carefully.

Applause

Nathalie Rodriguez: Fine, we propose two votes to make things simpler. We ask you to vote if you are in favour to hold the Senior World Championships in the summer. So, you are going to vote "yes", "no" or "abstain" on this. Then we will ask you if you want the Senior World Championships in autumn. So we are speaking about summer or autumn without choosing a specific month, such as

October, September. Why? Because we have proposals for all these months: June, July, August, September, October. It is simpler to just vote for summer or autumn.

René Roch (MH): Shouldn't we think that it is preferable to postpone the vote until the whole calendar is adjusted? I agree with Mr Pozdniakov. We have to take into account the point of view of the fencers. We have to review the whole calendar so that the end of the season leads us to the World Championships. I think a decision that is taken too quickly could lead to an embarrassing situation. We have to take into account what the medias want, what the IOC want, i.e. media coverage, and we cannot forget the issues connected to our sport. It will be a huge task to revise the whole calendar, so that it leads normally to the World Championships at the end of the season.

Alisher Usmanov: I understand. Thank you.

René Roch (MH): I would postpone until next year the vote on this issue.

Alisher Usmanov: For the World Championships, we wanted to see the figures so that we can maybe create a new calendar.

Nathalie Rodriguez: I remind you that we are still in the framework of the proposal on the statutes and it is necessary to have 2/3 of the votes to approve a proposal. Currently, the 2/3 of the votes corresponds to 77 votes.

First proposal: Hold the Open World Championships in the summer. Who agrees with this proposal? The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal only got 62 votes so it is not approved.

Second proposal. Would you like the Senior World Championships to be organized in autumn?

Maxim Paramonov: If I understood well we already have voted, we can not...

Krisztian Kulcsar: Can I just say one word? Summer is not at the same time in England and in Australia. So if you have to decide if we go right or left then it is going to be very hard to reach the 2/3 majority. I think we should reconsider that. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez: I would like to remind you that we have several proposals. One from the Executive Committee which is asking to change the dates. So the question is the following one: are we speaking about autumn or are we speaking about the September 15th – November 15th period?
Or there is no change at all, and we keep the current date.

Dimitar Stoyanov: Excuse me, may I make a remark here from the Bulgarian Federation? I think the way the proposal was put to vote wasn't correct. Just saying autumn or summer is not a good idea because it is different in the different parts of the world. We have several proposals here.

I think we should vote firstly on the proposal of the Executive Committee, and secondly on the proposal of France. We cannot just summarize everything and then put it to the vote, as it will be difficult to approve anything this way.

Nathalie Rodriguez: We have several proposals and nobody agrees on this. One is for June, another is for July, another one is for August, another one is for September, then October. Then, as you can see we cannot vote for each month of the year. I think it is more serious to say that we should not be too strict on the dates, therefore we should say either summer or autumn. Then, we will define the dates. Let us say that it is to roughly know where we stand.

So summer was rejected. So who is in favour of autumn? We will vote in this now and we will see. Then, if nobody agrees we will keep what we have currently in the statutes.

Dimitar Stoyanov: But what does autumn mean? When we speak of autumn, which months are we talking about? And when we speak of summer, what does summer mean?

Alisher Usmanov: We talk about June and July. Are these not summer months to you? Summer was rejected. Summer has three months: June, July and August. That is all.

Now we vote for autumn. If you vote for it after we can speak about concrete dates. In the statutes we have concrete dates proposed for our World Championships.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Groupierre?

Victor Sergio Groupierre: I think we must clarify the idea of summer and winter, as in the two hemispheres they are not the same. I think we should speak about months and not seasons.

Andrew Ius: Speaking on behalf of a country from the southern hemisphere we knew what summer meant and we are understood that summer meant the northern summer, so we voted with full understanding of what was being said. And we have voted to reject the concept of the World Championships held in summer.

Alisher Usmanov: Thank you very much. You really clearly understood our Executive Committee proposal. Congratulations.

Nathalie Rodriguez: We are going to vote on the proposal of the Executive Committee. It has specific dates for the Senior World Championships: in principle between September 15th and November 15th. Do you agree with these dates? Let us vote on the proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

Laughter

So the Executive Committee proposal has been also rejected. So it is very simple, we keep the dates as they are in the statutes.

Giuseppe Cafiero: Excuse me, by the vote we must acknowledge that there are at least 30 people that changed their minds within 10 minutes because having said “no” to one season and “no” to the other one means either that they don’t want any World Championships or I don't know what happened. I would say that even if we don't have an absolute majority the summer is preferred by a majority of federations. So I ask the Executive Committee to study and to propose as soon as possible a complete calendar integrating the World Championships in a consistent way.

Nathalie Rodriguez: We have finished with the proposals concerning the statutes. So, as I mentioned before, France and Germany would like to suppress the World Cadet Championships. Let us vote on this proposal. Do you agree to suppress the World Cadet Championships? The vote is open.

Yes? The vote is not open. The vote is open now.

The vote is closed.

The proposal was not accepted.

Maxim Paramonov: The proposal was not approved so the Junior and Cadet championships are kept.

Nathalie Rodriguez: We have officially finished with the proposals on amendments to the statutes.

Maxim Paramonov: Dear friends, can I have your attention please? We have just finished a difficult task, i.e. working on the proposals of amendment to the statutes. Therefore, I would like to propose to go to the point in the agenda for tomorrow, to relax the mood a bit, to try to focus on the this point and then we will discuss about the proposals on the rules. I think this will create a more relaxed atmosphere. So the next point first and then we will come back to the proposals concerning the rules. And of course, the presentations from the cities, then we will come back to the proposals concerning the rules.

Alisher Usmanov: Yes indeed, these votes have created a little bit of tension. So we propose to move to the point in the agenda for tomorrow and change slightly the program, in order to relax and deal with easier agenda items, on a more relaxed way.

Krisztian Kulcsar: I am sorry. If I understood well you propose to move forward to another agenda item, which means that we have to be ready to make our presentations today, and ...

Alisher Usmanov: Why are you talking about the presentations?

Krisztian Kulcsar: So if I understood correctly the proposal is to have the presentations today and my answer to that as one of the representatives of the candidate cities is that I would strictly stick to the tomorrow date because it has been announced months before that we are going to have the presentations tomorrow. We have certain material to be prepared and the people who are

going to present the presentations are not here. Therefore, I kindly ask you to reconsider that and go according to the present agenda. Thank you.

Alisher Usmanov: I think it is not unrespectful to the Congress because we did not say today or tomorrow. We never said today or tomorrow. So well, let us come back to our precision.

Nathalie Rodriguez: If you agree our idea is to discuss easier points in our agenda, for example point 7, the candidates for the organization of the 2010 Congress, the designation of the Members of Honour, the Awarding the Challenge Chevalier Feyerick and then we will come back to the next point in the agenda. Do you agree? Very well.

5. Candidacies for the organisation of the 2010 Congress

Nathalie Rodriguez: Given that we voted that each year we will have a Congress we need candidates for next year and the future years too. So, who is willing to host the 2010 Congress?

Dimitar Stoyanov: The Bulgarian Federation is proposing its candidature to be host of the 2010 Congress. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Can you tell me where exactly, please?

Dimitar Stoyanov: In the city of Sofia.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So Sofia in Bulgaria is a candidate city to host the 2010 Congress.

Alexander Mikhailov: Russia is proposing its candidature to host the 2010 Congress.

Maxim Paramonov: If I am right Moscow is presenting its candidature for the 2010 Congress. Isn't it?

Nathalie Rodriguez: So, we have two candidate cities for 2010. We will ask the two candidates to file a report and submit it to the Executive Committee, as it is the Executive Committee which decides on the host city of the Congress. We will be informed about the final decision shortly afterwards. Thank you for your proposals.

6. Designation of the Members of Honour

Nathalie Rodriguez: Point 8 in the agenda. Designation of Members of Honour. The President wanted to express the opinion of the Executive Committee.

Alisher Usmanov: I will give the floor to Mister Paramonov, as we have our special opinion about five candidates for the nomination of the Members of Honour of our Federation.

Maxim Paramonov: This time, we had to deal with several candidates for the status of Members of Honour. However, we understand that this question is not very clear in the statutes. We will have to review the status of the Members of Honour.

During the meeting of the Executive Committee we decided not to present any candidate except for Mr. Marcello Baiocco.

Applause

Thank you so much. He is a well known person who really deserves the designation as Member of Honour. On the other hand, a working group will be put together and it will study all the aspects concerning this topic in depth and afterwards it will present you the status and the criteria of selection of the Members of Honour. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez: I think that Mr. Baiocco has been, of course, been chosen by everybody without the need of opening a voting session.

Applause

Maxim Paramonov: I would like to clarify that the other candidates...

Marcello Baiocco (MH): Ladies and Gentlemen, allow me to say a few words for the great honour you have awarded to me today. This is a very special day for me because it is a sort of final step of my career in the world of fencing at the international level, a career that has lasted over 30 years. I have to thank especially our President Mr. Usmanov and the Executive Committee for supporting me and manifesting their friendship to me. I thank you and I will keep you forever in my heart. I wish the Fédération internationale d'escrime and all of you all the best. Thank you so much.

Applause

Maxim Paramonov: I would like to clarify that all the other candidates are not rejected. They can still be proposed as candidates at the next Congress, but after the criteria are set. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Very well, now we move to item 9 on the agenda, which is the attribution of the Chevalier Feyerick Trophy.

7. Awarding of the Chevalier Feyerick Trophy

Nathalie Rodriguez: I think the President wanted to make clear the position of the Executive Committee.

Alisher Usmanov: It is with great pleasure that I confirm that the Executive Committee attach the utmost importance to the Chevalier Feyerick Trophy, and decided to nominate Miss Zagunis for this Challenge.

Applause

Nathalie Rodriguez: I suppose that you approve by acclamation the awarding of the Chevalier Feyerick Trophy to Miss Mariel Zagunis, from the United States of America.

Applause

Nathalie Rodriguez: Now we propose coffee break. Should we vote on that as well?

4. (continuation) Proposals submitted to the Congress and commission reports

Maxim Paramonov: Dear friends, please be seated. Are you ready to resume this afternoon session and start again? Yes, so we start. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So, we go back to the proposals of amendments of the rules. I think Mr. Cheris will confirm this, but you know that as far as the rules are concerned, a proposal needs a simple majority to be adopted. Do you agree Mr. Cheris?

Samuel David Cheris (MH): I do.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Very well. So, we start with a proposal from the Belarus Fencing Federation. You received the proposals so I am not going to read it. I just give you the opinion and we immediately go to the vote. We start on the basis that you already know the proposal.

The Rules Commission is in favour of the proposal from Belarus and the Executive Committee is also in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. So let's vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 85 votes in favour.

Proposal from the Czech Republic Federation. I inform you that proposals 1 and 2 of the Czech Federation have been withdrawn.

Let's move to the proposals of the Executive Committee.

Proposal 1. The Commission approved this proposal with some changes, which were accepted by the Executive Committee. You can vote on this proposal, given the opinion of the Rules Commission. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 67 votes in favour.

Next proposal refers to article **o.31.4**. The Rules Commission has approved the proposal with the changes indicated in blue characters in your document. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 82 votes in favour.

Proposal pertaining to article **o.33.3**. The Commission unanimously approved it. So I ask you to vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 87 votes in favour.

Proposal on article **o.81.3**. The Commission unanimously approved the proposal. Therefore, I ask you to vote on it. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

I have been informed that there have been technical problems, so we have to start again the vote, sorry. The vote is open again.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 81 votes in favour.

The next proposal refers to restructuring and the homogenisation of articles **o.53** and **o.54**.

Let's vote on **o.53**. The Rules Commission has approved the proposal with the changes indicated in blue characters in your document. I ask you to vote on o.53. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 76 votes in favour.

The same for article **o.54**. There has been a restructuring and homogenization of the article and the Rules Commission has approved the proposal with the changes indicated in blue characters in your document. So we vote on this proposal **o.54**. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 84 votes in favour.

Proposal 3, about article **o.2.2**. The Rules Commission had unanimously approved the proposal. Therefore we go to the vote. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 95 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to article **o.7**. The Rules Commission has approved the proposal with the changes indicated in blue characters in your document and the Executive Committee is also in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. So we vote on this proposal now. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 92 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to article **o.9.1**. The Rules Commission approves the proposals with the amendments in blue in the document. The opinion of the Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. So we vote now on **o.9.1**. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 96 votes in favour.

Proposal on article **o.9.3**. The Rules Commission has slightly amended this proposal and after its modification has approved it. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. So I ask you now to vote on **o.9.3**. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 99 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to article **o.10**. The Commission has approved the proposal with the amendments in blue in your documents. I propose we vote on it. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 99 votes in favour.

Article **o.13**. The Rules Commission has unanimously approved the proposal. You can vote on **o.13**. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 102 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to article **o.15.3**. The Rules Commission had unanimously approved the proposal. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 94 votes in favour.

Proposal on article **o.18**. The Rules Commission had approved the proposal with the amendments shown in blue in your documents and the Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 98 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to article **o.29**. The Rules Commission unanimously approved the proposal. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 97 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to article **o.32.1**. The Rules Commission unanimously approved the proposal. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 89 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to **o.33.1**. The Rules Commission has approved the proposal. Therefore, we are voting it. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 89 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to **o.47.2**. The Rules Commission had approved the proposal with the amendments you can see in blue in your documents and the Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion expressed by the Rules Commission. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 98 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to **o.51 a)**. The Rules Commission has unanimously approved the proposal. We vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 92 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to **0.55**. The Rules Commission has approved the proposal with the changes indicated in blue on the document and the Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion expressed by the Rules Commission. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

Bert Van de Flier : Can ask something, please? May I assume that you mean here also Lausanne time?

Nathalie Rodriguez: It is not indicated in the proposal.

Bert Van de Flier : But maybe it should be there.

Giuseppe Cafiero: We discussed this in the Commission. The age of every boy or girl is established according to the date of their birthday in the calendar, not

according to what time it is in a given city. Therefore, this modification is not pertinent.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So, actually the text of the Rules Commission is correct. Mr. Cheris?

Samuel David Cheris (MH): If we take this date, a fencer who is not 13 years old on January 1st does not fence in the Junior World Cups and is not eligible to fence in the Junior and Cadet World Championships. I think the date should be July 1st not January 1st.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Cheris, this is indeed a minor change as the current text says December 31st and the proposal is to change to January 1st.

I think we should resume the vote on this because there have been some interventions. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 83 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to **o.56**. The Rules Commission had unanimously approved the proposal with the changes indicated in blue on the document. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 97 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to **o.57**. The proposal is approved by the Rules Commission with the two changes indicated in blue on the document. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 88 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to **o.58.3**. The Rules Commission thinks that the addition to c) is superfluous but approves the change to paragraph e) of article **o.58.3**. Therefore we are voting on the proposal concerning the change brought by the Rules Commission. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

There seems to be a problem. So we should vote again on this proposal. The vote is open again.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 89 votes in favour.

As for article **o.61**, the Rules Commission considers the last part of the sentence to be superfluous but approves what is left of the proposed text. But as what has been added has not been approved by the Rules Commission, the text is left as it is now. So as there are no changes, it makes no sense to vote on this.

So we now proceed to the proposal referring to **o.70 1, 2, 3, 4**. The Rules Commission unanimously approves the proposal. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 96 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to **o.81.2**. The Rules Commission had approved the proposal with amendments that are shown in blue in the document you have been given. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

Yes?

Julius Kralik: I apologize for disturbing but what happened to the proposal where we have to choose eight referees instead of seven?

Nathalie Rodriguez: It was an opinion, but the Rules Commission did not change the text itself. In this respect, the proposal has not been modified.

Julius Kralik : Maybe it is better to join this proposal. Shouldn't we vote according to this proposal because it is here?

Nathalie Rodriguez: I think this opinion has consequences, as it is going to change the financial aspects for the organizers and I think this should be the object of a study as it increases the expenses, and the organizers have not even been consulted. Therefore, I propose to vote on the initial proposal. We are going to stay with seven referees.

I also have to say that when someone takes the floor we have to stop the vote. Then we have to open it again.

Please, vote on the proposal as it is. That is to say with seven referees, and slight modifications from the Rules Commission. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 88 votes in favour.

Now we go to article **o.82.2 c)**. The Rules Commission has unanimously approved the proposal. The vote is open now.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 90 votes in favour.

Now, we go to article **o.82.3**. The Rules Commission approved the text as amended in blue in your documents. The Executive Committee is also in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 96 votes in favour.

Proposal referring to **o.83.1**. The proposal has been approved by the Rules Commission with some wording amendments that you can find in your documents. The Executive Committee is also in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 93 votes in favour.

The subsequent proposal refers to article **o.6.2**. The Rules Commission approved the proposal nem con. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 92 votes in favour.

The next proposal refers to article **o.39**. The Commission has approved the proposal by a majority. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

Julius Kralik : Nathalie can we stop the vote?

Nathalie Rodriguez: Yes, we stop the vote.

Julius Kralik: I apologize for intervening again, but I feel I should speak on this topic as I have eight years experience in technical direction. Indeed, the criteria for the juniors is not sufficient here. Here, 35% is indicated. And it is sometimes higher. So the ranking of the cadets is the task of the delegation, then of the directoire technique. It is much more objective than what is being used here. So, only taking into account the Junior World Cup will greatly change the initial ranking for the Cadet Championships, which will afterwards, according to me, depreciate the competitions. It would be a pity. The only thing is that it is the DT's task and nobody else. Nobody else is concerned with this. So I ask not to amend this article.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Very well, we will now vote. The vote is open again.

The vote is closed.

The proposal is approved with 55 votes. No! I am wrong the proposal is rejected. That is because usually it is "yes" on top. So the proposal is rejected with 55 votes.

We finished with the proposal of the Executive Committee.

Now, we examine the proposals submitted by the British Fencing Federation.

Proposal 1. The Refereeing Commission has approved the proposal nem con and the Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Commissions, so we immediately vote on it. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 91 votes in favour.

Proposal 2 referring to article **t.21.1**. The Rules Commission has approved this proposal and the Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 99 votes in favour.

Now proposal 3 on article **t.70.4**. The Commission has approved this proposal. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the Rules Commission. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 93 votes in favour.

Now proposal 4 on article **m.32.5**. The Rules Commission approved this proposal nem con. The SEMI Commission approved the proposal and the Executive Committee agrees with the two Commissions. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 88 votes in favour.

Proposal 5 on article **m.33.4**. The Rules Commission approved this proposal nem con. The SEMI Commission approved the proposal. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of both Commissions. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been adopted with 91 votes in favour.

We now move to the proposals of the Hungarian Fencing Federation.

Proposal 1 has been withdraw by the Hungarian Federation. Do you confirm this? Yes.

We go to proposal 2 on article **t.87**. As for this proposal the Rules Commission was not homogeneous. There have been four votes in favour, four against and

two abstentions. As the President of the Commission has a decisive vote, finally the Commission decided to approve it. But the Executive Committee was not in favour of the proposal, and admits that the current text must be completely reexamined. The Executive Committee thinks the proposed amendments are not an improvement. I ask you to vote on this point. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been rejected with 58 votes.

Proposal 3 on article **t.92.4**. The Rules Commission has approved the proposal although it saying that there may be some difficulties in terms of insufficient space in some venues. I believe the current surface is 9m² and the objective of the proposal is to extend it to 15m². The Executive Committee was not in favour of the proposal because it implied larger sport facilities which are, of course, an extra difficulty. We now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been rejected with 74 votes.

The next proposal refers to article **o.83**. Does the Hungarian Federation confirm that it has been withdrawn?

Same for the next proposal, proposal 6. Do you confirm the withdrawal? Very well.

Same for the next proposal, which refers to article **o.84**. It is the same proposal, but for the teams. Do you confirm the withdrawal? Very well.

Same for the next proposal, which refers to article o.84 c)? Confirmed.

We now move to proposal 9, which refers to article **m.16**. The SEMI Commission has rejected the proposal. The Rules Commission wished to know the opinion of the SEMI Commission, but it had temporarily approved the proposal by 7 votes for, 2 votes against and 1 abstention. The Executive Committee is in favour of the opinion of the SEMI Commission. So we now vote on this proposal. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

The proposal has been rejected with 74 votes.

Samuel David Cheris (MH): I apologize for the disruption but we appear to have lost the English translation in the ear-pieces. Maybe there is a technical problem.

Nathalie Rodriguez: You had no English translation? So I repeat. About the last proposals of Hungary, they were all withdrawn except the last one which has been rejected.

Now the proposals submitted by the Russian Fencing Federation.
Proposal 3 and 4 have been withdrawn.

Now, as for the Ukrainian Federation, it is the same, proposals 3 and 4 have been withdrawn.

We are at the end of the proposals concerning the amendments to the rules.

Applause

Maxim Paramonov: My friends, I would like to remind you that this time, as you well know, the best athletes in each weapon have been invited to take part in the work of the Commissions. As you see the results are really excellent. Thank you very much. So my friends, the next item on the agenda is...

Alisher Usmanov: Pay attention please.

|

8. 2012 Olympics in London

Maxim Paramonov: Dear friends, the next point in the agenda is extremely important, it is the Olympic Games in London. Before Nathalie speaks about the qualifying system and the related details, but first of all I would like to read a letter from Christophe Dubi which expresses the opinion of the International Olympic Committee and I will read it in English.

“As I have had the opportunity to tell you over the phone recently it would have been an honour to be with you on the occasion of the FIE Congress in Palermo. Unfortunately, I will not be in a position to attend due to other commitments on the same day as well as logistical difficulties that will prevent me from being on time for this important meeting.

Over the last few months we had different opportunities to discuss a number of important issues concerning fencing on the Olympic program. In particular, we discussed the request to increase the number of medals, which could not be accommodated by the International Olympic Committee. I would particularly like to emphasize the quality of the FIE submissions and the tremendous efforts that have been conducted at many levels to reach your objective.

As you know the IOC executive board marginally increased the number of medals in only one sport: boxing. In this sport there were no women represented until then.

In this context you will understand that fencing was treated no differently than all the other federations.

As a result the fencing family will have to choose for teams and events that will be on the program for London. We trust that your decision will be made in the best interest of the sport of fencing and the Olympic Games in general. Christophe Dubi.”

Maxim Paramonov: I will now ask my dear friend and colleague Sunil Sabharwal to give you an overview of our work on the subject.

Sunil Sabharwal: I will try to be brief. The President has asked me to summarise the efforts of the Federation regarding the additional two medals for the 2012 Olympic Games in London.

First of all, I want to emphasize that it really was a team effort by the entire Federation. Many Executive Committee members have helped, as well as the Confederation Presidents. We also engaged Members of Honour, including Erika Dienstl, and the IOC Members Pal Schmitt and Thomas Bach, who are also fencers.

The message that we had for all the IOC members is positive. We have been very consistent and we emphasized that fencing has been in the Olympics since the first Games and that in Beijing we had perfect parity.

We have really become a universal sport. We increased our visibility to the media and spectators. We introduced wireless technology and have added the transparent masks for the media. We have become a more objective sport with the addition of the video refereeing. We have increased the television coverage and our visibility in the media. We followed the IOC's orientation guidelines. We demonstrated that our request for two additional medals was not artificial, as it is in line with the evolution of our sport and its three weapons, for both men and women. In Beijing we had 1,5 billion spectators, and fencing was among the most followed sports globally. In Beijing we had 45 countries represented. And we did not request more days of competition, more athletes, or more accreditations from the IOC. We do not make cost increase.

Therefore, we hoped that the IOC would agree to our request. But in Berlin, the IOC Executive Commission rejected our request. Similar to the other sports, they decided not to increase our number of medals.

An analysis made by the Sports Department has shown that two more medals would reduce to 35 the number of participating countries.

In conclusion, as far as our future is concerned, it is the first time that the whole fencing family has participated in the process. This is a positive aspect.

But we are in a difficult situation. The Commission expressed its opinion, and the Sports Department was neither for us nor against us, but it was leaning that way. This position is similar to that taken for many other sports. We must not give up, and we must continue fighting in order to obtain the number of medals we want.

So we will work with the Executive Committee, and we will soon have some very important World Championships in Paris in 2010 in the Grand Palais des Champs-Élysées. We must use that to showcase and promote our sport.

There are other multisport events where fencing is not yet considered as a fundamental part of the program. We must work so that fencing is included everywhere, in order that we are recognized globally.

We need to work very hard for 2012 and for Brasil in 2016 because it is important that the athletes in those countries become very strong, so that the stadiums are filled with spectators. We need a full audience.

When we go to London or Rio de Janeiro, we need as many spectators as possible. We need to keep working on intensifying the communications at all levels with the IOC so that in 2013, we can really say "we have accomplished all this, so please give us these extra medals, because we deserve them".

Applause

Alisher Usmanov: Excuse me. Thank you Mr. Sabharwal. I must add something. We are not in a difficult position, first of all because we have as many weapons for men and women, which is not the case in boxing. During the Executive Committee meeting we analyzed our approach to get these two medals. We talked about the medals, and recognized that receiving the permission to add women's sabre to the Olympic program was a big success for the FIE. We must thank Mr. Roch for achieving this for fencing.

We must not speak of difficulties, but of an objective situation which exists within the IOC. We must be very firm, and work very hard with the Executive Committee members with only one target in mind. We must attack all the weak spots. As early as tomorrow. We must reach our goal. I don't know when we will get it, but we will. Because of this, everybody understands that we need to follow the previous solution of our Congress, that is, the weapon rotation, and because we

want to defend the interests of our federations we don't announce in this Congress our solution, which weapons we choose. This is to give to many federations the possibility to protect and defend their budget for next year. As Mr. Paramonov explained, it is very logical to refer to the rotation system.

Maxim Paramonov: We have to abide the decision taken in the preceeding Congresses and follow the rotation rules previously accepted. However, it is clear that we need to try our best to have a good record towards the federations. The International Olympic Committee asks us to develop the qualifications rules, which we discussed yesterday. These rules will be announced by Mrs. Rodriguez, but it is not necessary to announce the weapons. This way, we have a possibility to keep this budget for at least one season. I give the floor to Mrs. Rodriguez who will speak about the qualifications.

Nathalie Rodriguez: We have the same number of athletes, it did not change. It is 212 athletes in total, with 102 men and 102 women, plus eight athletes for the host country.

For the weapons which have no team competition, same as in Beijing there will be a maximum of two fencers for each country. Therefore, no change.

As for the qualifications for teams, eight teams will qualify. The teams are made of three fencers, as in the past, so we've got 24 fencers per weapon, plus the team of the host country, if it is necessary. The Executive Committee has decided to qualify the teams as follows:

The first four teams of the official FIE team ranking, without taking into account the zone. All four teams.

Then the team of each zone as best classified in the ranking, between the 5th and the 16th place of the official FIE team ranking.

As for the individual qualifications, for weapons that have a team competition, we have the 24 fencers coming from the qualified teams; then, the seven best classified fencers according to official individual adjusted ranking and per zone. Then the five best ranked fencers in the zone qualification competition. So there are no fundamental changes compared to the previous years.

For the weapons with no team events, the Executive Committee decided to comply with the request of the IOC and of several federations, to the effect that that the best athletes participate in the Olympic Games. Therefore, the first 16 of the official ranking of the FIE will be qualified, instead of having just the first 10, as it happened in the past. Then, four athletes would be qualified by the official adjusted ranking (OAR), and 10 athletes will be qualified through the zonal qualification competitions.

These are the project of criteria developed yesterday by the Executive Committee which will have to be sent to the IOC that has already asked to receive it at the latest on November 9th.

Mrs. Dienstl?

Erika Dienstl (MH): We have had a long day and this is a question which is extremely important. I need a document, and I think we all need a paper about these details. Is it possible to get it tomorrow?

Applause

Alisher Usmanov: You don't have to vote for this. There is no need to vote on this.

Nathalie Rodriguez: We covered this topic yesterday and we are informing you today, as we have to send urgently these documents to the IOC because they wanted these documents by the 9 of November.

We will of course send you all the documents in all FIE official languages, but we were in a rush to develop them here. We are already running late but don't worry, you will have these documents in the three FIE official languages.

Krisztian Kulcsar: Sorry, I just would like to know when we can expect to have a decision.

Maxim Paramonov: Mister Kulcsar, I'm sorry but you should understand that this point was for information only, this is not something that is submitted to a vote.

I agree with Mrs Dienstl that the day has been long and quite difficult. We all understand that everybody is interested in this qualification system, and that's why we decided to present it today.

Krisztian Kulcsar: Yes, but I wasn't asking about that. I was asking about when we are going to vote on which weapons are not going to be among the events of the Olympic Games in London.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Can you speak louder, please, because we cannot hear you.

Krisztian Kulcsar: Yes. According to the agenda we should decide on the events of the Olympic Games of London. As I see we are not going to make a decision on that. I have to go back and report to my federation, to my fencers. When are going to decide on that?

Maxim Paramonov: It's clear. I repeat once again that we try to keep the budget for the federations. Normally, we decide to follow the rotation rule. But in order to avoid expenses or losses from the budget for the following year, we will announce the decision in Baku. I repeat in Baku. Is it clear?

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Grouppierre?

Ana Pascu (MH): Excuse me. I'd like to announce that yesterday, after the President left, we decided during the Executive Committee meeting to talk today about the events which will be not be part of the Olympic Games program. And we must do it, as it is unjust to decide on something in the Executive Committee, and then not to apply it. Thank you.

Alisher Usmanov: There is no problem here. Yesterday, we discussed this during the Executive Committee meeting. All the members of the Executive Committee voted on this. We adopted a solution of rotation. We can announce it today. But I must tell the Congress that if we announce the weapons today, we will not be able to defend the budget of our federations. Let us put this to the vote, if the Congress says “yes” we announce it today.

We have started a debate. For example, Mr. Kulcsar proposed something six times today.

Victor Sergio Groupierre: Mister President, the first question I would like to...

Alisher Usmanov: Wait until I’m finished. Please do not interrupt me; we cannot do it like in a discussion club. This Congress is taking decisions for one year and I agree with Mrs. Pascu because yesterday we voted 52 times and this is the reason why we must solve this problem now. As President, I think it is important to announce it today because it is a formal action. But many federations could lose their budget. Please, put it to the vote, let us ask the Congress.

Victor Sergio Groupierre: You have just announced a system that wasn’t voted by the Congress. The qualifying system is not a decision of the Executive Committee but it’s a decision that must be taken by the Congress.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Mister Groupierre, we have just explained it to you. The IOC asked us to provide our criteria before November 9th. We told the IOC we couldn’t give them the criteria because we had to speak about them in the Executive Committee and the Congress. We asked the IOC to postpone its deadline, and the IOC agreed on the beginning of December. We must submit these documents to the IOC, so the Executive Committee made some proposals that will have to be analysed by the IOC, which will give its response in April. At the moment, because it was an urgent matter, we discussed it during the Executive Committee meeting, and now we inform the Congress of what we said yesterday, but it is just as information.

We do not have documents ready to propose to you. We do not have documents translated in the three languages, with all modifications included. This is a simple announcement of what has been said yesterday at the Executive Committee meeting.

But this was not our President's point. He was asking if the federations want to announce today the weapons that will not have a team at the Olympic Games, knowing that some federations could lose their budget. That was the question asked.

Alisher Usmanov: Everybody is interested in our national federation but if we proceed the Congress like a legal case in the court it will not help us, we will never reach our target. I am a professional lawyer, and I think Mr. Roch also understands this well. When I hear many interventions, I want to understand which target we are aiming for. When someone asks the Executive Committee about specific activities - we announce and we inform. We have five or six people who take 60-70% of our time. Please, think about everybody and not only about you. We must avoid personal interests. Frankly, we do not want to put an end to

this discussion, but we must not be superficial and we must reach some level of discussion.

We can announce the weapons because we already have a solution. I'm very surprised that some people don't understand this. We only want to defend the budgets of our federations and wait until next year in Baku to announce it. This way we have one more year in front of us.

What do you want to speak of now? You raised your hand. Which question do you want to discuss now?

Andrew Ius: I want some clarification.

Alisher Usmanov: Clarification?

Andrew Ius: If you allow me, for us and for many people here, I don't think the issue is the rotation policy. We are happy, and I am happy to leave the announcement of the rotation to Baku. What I want to talk about is the qualification criteria that were spelled out by Mrs. Rodriguez. It has been very difficult to take down all the details. If the qualification criteria have remained unchanged, this is fine, but if they have changed, we must take notes, as the principles have been explained when we had no translation in our head-sets.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Maybe I will say it in English. I only explained the outline. We will have the same number of athletes. We will have eight athletes for the host country. We are qualifying the individual through the teams. We have eight teams and the four best ranked team in the FIE ranking team. Then, the four of the teams ranked between 5 and 16 in the FIE ranking, one per continent. These teams will qualify 24 fencers like in the past.

So, for the weapons that have a team event, you will have the 24 fencers qualified by the teams, as in the past. In the weapons which have a team event, 24 fencers will be qualified through the team qualification. Then, you will have the seven fencers qualified by the adjusted FIE ranking by zone. Not a big change. Then, the five fencers from the zonal qualifying events.

For the individual events, the main change is that, if you remember in Beijing, the weapons which had an individual and team event had 39 fencers, and for those weapons which had no team events, we had 24 fencers. So there was a big gap between 39 and 24 and the Executive Committee thought that is was not fair and that we had to reduce that gap. Now, what is proposed is 36 fencers and 30 fencers. This way, the gap is less important. We think it is fairer for these weapons.

For the weapons that have no team events we now have 30 places instead of 24. So we are qualifying the best 16 of the ranking without taking into account the zone. Then we qualify four by the official adjusted ranking (OAR) and then 10 by the zonal qualifying events.

For the individual events, the change is to try and balance between the numbers of the two types of weapons, with or without team. But there is no major change regarding the system. We dealt with this yesterday as it was urgent for the IOC.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Helen Smith?

Giuseppe Cafiero: Excuse me. If I may return on the point of weapons that are excluded, I understand what the President says about protecting the budget of certain countries we should avoid expressing this officially now but if we say that the rotation must be respected, in practical terms, what does this mean? On the other hand, maybe there are other countries whose budgets are better oriented, and who know where to concentrate investments and efforts because their budgets do not depend on the weapon but on the total activity of the sport and the disciplines. I think that if we want to have the reassurance of the rotation, as it is, this would give us comprehensive indications of what the reality is. This way of hiding the truth is not helping us. Thank you.

Helen Smith (MH): I asked this question yesterday at the Executive Committee meeting; I asked the President and Mrs. Rodriguez what is the process for deciding the Olympic qualification criteria. I was told that the Executive Committee would decide and that the federations would not vote. I could not change this situation during the Executive Committee meeting but I cannot remain silent at the moment because, I believe, this is such an important decision for every country in the world. We are being asked to accept a system which has changed in various points. And these are major changes, especially for smaller countries, that will affect your ability to qualify or not to qualify for the Olympic Games in London, for example.

We are being asked to accept this system and we haven't even seen the system in writing. You don't really understand yet what the implications are, what happens at the qualification level, and how this would play out in the qualifications leading up to London. In my opinion, this is not a proper, fair, good and transparent process, we cannot decide on such an important topic, as the challenge is enormous, and everyone should be provided with the documents.

We have not had enough time to consult with the federations. We should ask the IOC to wait for our special meeting in Baku next year as we will vote on it then. It would give federations an opportunity to truly understand the implications of the proposed changes, to make other proposals if they wish; or to do counterproposals keeping a balance between the best fencers and universality.

I seriously believe that if we accept this now we are making a big mistake. I know that the Executive - of which I am a member - is trying to do the right thing but I believe we will not be following the correct process if we agree to this today. We have to postpone this decision.

Alisher Usmanov: Mrs. Smith, I understand your point of view. But when you give your opinion, it is wrong to say it's not an equitable process. As an Executive Committee member you have very important responsibilities. When you say the process is not transparent, what do you mean? We talked about it yesterday. Tell me. I am here and I am listening to you. Because today, you talk about a lack of transparency. We do not want to discriminate. We do not want to do something that is not equitable.

Helen Smith (MH): I talked about a lack of transparency. I did not talk about discrimination. I am saying that it is a process which is not transparent for the federations.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Right from the beginning, I said that we had to send a document to the IOC who wanted it by November 9th, before November 9th, and we could not because this had not been discussed before at an Executive Committee meeting. So we discussed it at the Executive Committee meeting. Now we announce it because we discussed it yesterday, but we don't even have a finished paper on this. Then I said that you will receive the documents when it will be done, translated and ready. So please, don't say it has been done without transparency, because we cannot accept that.

Helen Smith (MH): I'm sorry. Can you please clarify for me? Are you saying Nathalie that this is a draft document?

Nathalie Rodriguez: Yes, as we talked about this yesterday in the Executive Committee meeting; I thought it was fair to speak about it at the Congress, even if it only a draft.

Alisher Usmanov: Mrs. Smith, you already explained your position. Thank you. You have regional interests. Yesterday, in Executive Committee we talked about it and we even voted. Why is there a problem today?

Yesterday, we were there with Mr. Scarso until the press conference. Then we moved and went there together. If we change the qualification from 7 to 10 we win universality. We spoke about this yesterday for one hour, and then we put the issue to the vote. We voted 11 for, 7 against and 2 abstentions. I remember our voting very well. Why are you attacking the Executive Committee today? You want to defend only Asia and Oceania. You want to receive 3 places, nothing else. Then say it clearly.

I want to close this artificial discussion. We have worked for eight hours today. We had many questions in our agenda. We spoke and speak about the Olympic Games as colleagues. We must be friends to each other because without that, what do we do? If you would like to receive three places, ok, let us speak about it. If you want all this transparency, we can discuss it without problem in the Executive Committee.

Helen Smith (MH): That was not my point.

Alisher Usmanov: Two years ago... could you speak about Oceania and Asia to the Executive Committee? Today, you are a member of the Executive Committee.

Helen Smith (MH): I don't understand what you're talking about, Mr President.

Alisher Usmanov: So let us vote on the announcement about the rotation to clarify the position of the Congress to everybody. The Congress wants us to announce it today.

Ok, let's vote then.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So, we vote for the following: do you want, after the decisions taken in the previous Congress as for rotation, to announce today the weapons that won't participate in the Olympics in London, knowing that some federations will lose their budget if this announcement is made today. Do you agree to make this announcement or not?

Do you agree to announce the two weapons today? We proceed to the vote. The vote is open.

The vote is closed.

56 votes, which means you have decided to announce today the two weapons that will not be participating at the 2012 Olympics in London.

According to the rotation rules voted by previous Congresses it is women's sabre and men's épée.

Alisher Usmanov: I want to ask the Congress ... Maybe Mister Janda wants to clarify something about the voting process..

Frantisek Janda, translated by Maxim Paramonov: I'm going to speak about yesterday's vote in the Executive Committee. Dear friends, please take into account that the atmosphere in the hall has changed. We've been having rows and ... Sorry my friends, we have been working since 8:00 in this room, and you see, you are all a little agitated. Maybe ... Do you want to continue to work and continue to have rows? Everybody is tired. I don't know why we decided to talk about this important question at the end of the day. We cannot reach an agreement.

Alisher Usmanov: I think we have to postpone the other items on the agenda until tomorrow, the presentations for the World Championships, because we are tired. Does everybody agree with this? Tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock.

Applause

Alisher Usmanov: Mister Kulcsar, are you happy?

Krisztian Kulcsar: I'm sorry to take two minutes of your time. Hungary has no special interests because it's a very painful issue but...

Alisher Usmanov: Tomorrow, the Congress will resume at 10:00, good evening.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Please, it is imperative that give back the voting system to the hostesses who will take them, and you'll have them back tomorrow. Tomorrow, as the Congress starts at 10:00, the transportation will be at 9:30.

End of the 1st day of the Congress

2st day of the Ordinary Congress

Attendance and validation of the proxies

Nathalie Rodriguez: Is Azerbaijan here? I repeat, is Azerbaijan here? Not yet. Bangladesh, Barbados, Barbados? Belgium, Benin, is Benin here? Belize, is Belize here? Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Congo, China, Ivory Coast, Democratic Republic of Congo, Is the Democratic Republic of Congo here? Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Spain, Finland, France, Gabon, is Gabon there? Ok. Great Britain, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Where in the back? Guatemala? Good. Guinea, Hong Kong, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, India, Iran, Ireland, Iraq, Iceland, Israel, Virgin Islands, Italy, Jordan, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Korea, Saudi Arabia, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Lithuania? Is Lithuania here? No? Luxembourg, Morocco, Malaysia, Moldova, Mexico, Mongolia, is Mongolia here? Macedonia, Macedonia? Ah sorry. Mali, is Mali there? Ok. Malta, Namibia, Nicaragua, the Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Panama, Panama? Is Estonia here? Has Estonia arrived? No. Paraguay, Peru, is Peru there? the Philippines, Poland, is Poland here? Portugal, Porto Rico, Qatar, Romania, South Africa, Russia, Senegal, thank you. Slovenia, San Marino, Sri Lanka, Slovakia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, is Turkmenistan here? Not yet. Togo, is Togo here? Taipei, Tunisia, Turkey, is Turkey here? The United Arab Emirates, Ukraine, Uruguay, USA, Uzbekistan.

And now, let's go to the proxies.

Armenia to Ukraine.

Bolivia to Costa Rica.

Botswana to Namibia.

Chili to Argentina.

Cyprus to Greece.

Israel to Czech Republic.

Monaco to France.

Mauritania to Guinea.

Nigeria to Burkina Faso.

Switzerland to Sweden.

Are there any countries that haven't been mentioned yet?

Palestine? Palestine is here.

Are there countries that have not been mentioned?

Azerbaijan, I already called you but you were not here, so I put a question mark after your country's name. Then, Barbados, has Barbados arrived? And Belize? Is the Democratic Republic of Congo here? Austria? Is Lithuania here? Is Turkmenistan here? Turkmenistan is not here yet. Is Togo here? Is Turkey here? Is Cameroon here? Good. Panama is also here. India? Well, yes. Iraq?

In order to see how many countries are present, as there have been changes since yesterday, we will have a vote to which you must absolutely participate, so that we can be sure about the total number of countries that are present. So, in a few seconds we will open the vote and you can vote either “yes” or “no” or “abstention”. Just press any button and then push valid. It might be better if all of you press the button “yes” so we have the total figure directly. The vote is open. Those having two keypads have to vote twice, of course.

Wait a moment it seems that some of the countries who were absent are arriving now. Who just arrived? What countries have just arrived? Is Belize here? Has Togo arrived? Is Aruba here? Jordan. Good. Is Jordan here? Did you receive a voting box? Is Togo here? Togo is not here yet.

Now, we do the test vote to determine the exact number of countries present. Those who have two keypads, vote twice please. The vote is open. There are five countries missing. If you don't vote, we cannot be sure of the exact number of countries that are present now. I request that all countries vote, please. Vote whatever you want and don't forget to validate your vote.

Three countries are still missing. There are still two countries missing. I think we are going to make it. Two countries have not voted yet. We have given you 113 keypads, isn't it? 113 keypads and two countries have not voted yet. Now only one missing.

Well, I'm sorry but we have to stop.

Alisher Usmanov: Some countries didn't vote. Some of you don't want to vote here?

Maxim Paramonov: I think you all agree that we can start this morning session. 111 countries is a good majority so if you all agree we can start. Thank you.

Applause

Now, I give the floor to Mrs. Rodriguez who will start with the first point of the agenda.

9. Voting to award the World Championships

Nathalie Rodriguez: We start with point 6, voting to award the World Championships. As for Junior and Cadet World Championships in 2011, I think Ukraine had a declaration.

Serguey Mischenko: Thank you. The Ukrainian Fencing Federation had placed an application to organize in 2011 the Junior World Championships in a timely manner. We started the preparations, but unfortunately the financial situation in the country did not turn the right way. The government is supporting us but the city of Kiev has serious financial problems and the principal sponsors have closed their budgets because of the financial crisis. So, unfortunately, we would like to ask to withdraw our application for the Junior World Championships 2011, but we hope that we will be ready to organize it in the year 2012, when the situation will improve. Thank you.

Nathalie Rodriguez: So as far as I know, so far we have no other candidate countries to organize the Junior and Cadet World Championships in 2011.

Then, let us move to the organization of the Senior World Championships in 2011. At present, we have four candidate countries: Bulgaria, China, Hungary and Italy. I think that Mrs. Hristeva wants to take the floor.

Velichka Hristeva (BUL): Dear Mister President, Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear friends,

One of the things the Bulgarian Fencing Federation is famous for is the excellent ability to organize big sport events like the Grand Prix Competitions for the last five years, for example, this year's European Championships and this year's European Elective Congress. What is my beautiful and small country famous for? Bulgaria is famous for its over four thousand year history and its warm hospitality. Beyond its culture, religion or traditions, Bulgaria is also famous for its yogurt and its wine. Many of you, I believe, have already tasted our wines. They are as good as Italian, French and Latin American wines. Bulgarian women, many foreigners believe, are among the most beautiful in the world. Bulgarian cuisine is also very good. Bulgaria prides itself on the fact that John Atanassov invented the first computer in the world. And last but not least, I have to mention Bulgarian champions in many sports like fencing, or soccer with well known champions.

Therefore we are a candidate for the Senior World Championships. I do believe that the other candidates are also worthy of being hosts. All of them represent very strong fencing nations and their countries are also beautiful. So what are we going to do now? Fight? Not me, I don't want to fight. I will never forget the 2007 Congress when the hosting of the World Championships was on the agenda. I was opposed to the Russian Federation and I lost. I suffered an emotional trauma then and I do not wish to oppose my colleagues and friends and face another loss today. As I was preparing for this Congress I thought about my position and this is what I have decided. In my opinion, as far as the organization

of the competition is concerned, what is important is the preparation. So, for my part, I feel that I did not prepare enough in this respect due to changes in my government following general elections. China and Hungary did not do enough as far as I'm concerned. The Italian Fencing Federation did all this very well. They worked very very well. They did an excellent job on promoting Italian and world fencing. This is the reason why I would like to withdraw Bulgaria's candidature for 2011.

But, I would also like to draw your attention to my determination to do everything possible so that Bulgaria is the strongest candidate for 2013. It is my ambition to do all the best... Bulgaria will do its best, as well as the Italians or better, and why not?

Finally, may I wish the 2011 host, soon to be elected, a lot of success. I very much hope I will welcome you all in 2013 and maybe in the Congress in 2010 in my beautiful country, Bulgaria. Thank you very much.

Applause

Nathalie Rodriguez: Ok, so we have three candidates now and now I ask you to draw lots to decide who will make the first presentation, then the second, then the third. We have prepared some pieces of paper. Can I ask Mrs. Pascu to pick one of these pieces of paper?

Catania is the first. Budapest is the second. Tianjin is the third.

We remind you that each candidate is going to have a 15 minutes presentation.

Mario Favia (MH, ITA): Mister President of the International Fencing Federation, Members of the Executive Committee, Members of Honour, all Congress participants, I have the honour and great pleasure to read a letter written by the President of the Italian Republic, Mister Giorgio Napolitano. I'm going to read it in Italian and it will be simultaneously translated.

"Catania is proud and willing to host the World Fencing Championships in 2011. It is a great opportunity for sports in Italy as we have rich tradition of extraordinary successes in this sport. These great results were obtained thanks to the talent and the commitment of our athletes. They are very well known at an international level thanks to the value, the professionalism and of the passion of coaches and managers.

Sicily, which has already shown its great organizing capacities thanks to the perfect organization of the Junior Championships in Catania, Acireale and Trapani and which is the candidate city for hosting this important international fencing event, offers with the candidacy of Catania a guaranty that the organization of this prestigious event will be realised in the most appropriate way. I am sure that Catania will be a perfect host for all the delegates and athletes, and all those passionate towards fencing. Of course, we are very famous for our hospitality and also for the beauty of the area, not only from a landscape point of view but also from a historical and archeological point of view. I wish you all the best for your candidacy. Sincerely. The President of the Italian Republic, Giorgio Napolitano."

Applause

Giorgio Scarso (ITA): Dear friends from the international fencing world.

It is a privilege for Italy and the Italian Fencing Federation, and for Italian fencing at large which has always been striving for a very high penetration and dissemination of our movement at the national and international level, and it is a great honour to support the Fencing Promotion Committee Sicily 2011. In a few moments, the regional minister for sport in Sicily is going to be here with us and will officially inform you of the sum of money which will be allocated for these championships that will allow the organizing committee to organize the World Championships worthy of our discipline.

The candidature of Catania must not be seen as an opposition to the other candidate countries that deserve the utmost respect and consideration, such as the Hungarian, Chinese, as my Bulgarian friend expressed it so well. Catania as a candidate has to be an opportunity to build an event that goes beyond a mere World Championships.

Dear friends from the international fencing world, we must go beyond the culture, as we are many. We must not have the feeling that the others don't care about us, that they don't pay attention to our sport. We must build up our big events. This Congress, for instance, which takes place in a hotel, in Italy, Sicily to be specific, has been a great success, and you can see this also through the press articles which are being given to you. We must be good at raising awareness among public administrators, politicians, the public opinion and the society at large. We do not want to spend time here to tell you what we're going to do. We want to underline what the Committee has been doing since last November. In this lapse of time which goes from November last year. Our candidacy was announced at a meeting at the International Tourism event in Milan. A whole series of press conferences were organized, including a very important one in the Chamber of Deputies in Rome where all the local administrators were attending together with most important leaders of Italian sport, as well as the Deputy Secretary for the Ministry of Tourism of the Berlusconi Government who assured us of his support. All this has allowed the Promoting Committee to generate a set of events such as the one from last night, the Calabrese Trophy event. The fact that we had champions coming from all over the world is a testimony to the interest in fencing and its importance. We do not want to do something just for Italy but for international fencing at large. An internet web site was set up and organized so that people can see what the Promotion Committee has been doing. We had many participants in Bourges, Belfast and Antalya, at the World Championships. All these activities aim at disseminating or promoting not the fencing competition, as we can organize a competition anywhere we want as long as we have space to put the pistes. Creating an event is always different. It means involving the sponsors, the administrations, the press people, so that our discipline, our movement can gain a real personality and get the real value it deserves so that it can have a major impact in the world of sport. We organized this FIE Congress trying to do our best; but always with the aim of conveying values outside. This allows us to say that the 2011 Promotion Committee of Catania has been doing, so far, anything they could to reach its objective.

If the Congress trusts Catania, I just would like to make a reference to some important steps of the process. If the World Championships are assigned to Catania, the first event would be a major contest open to all the fencers of the world to design the mascot of the Championships. The winner would be given a

prize of 10 000€ to spent for studying or for competition, not just for fun to spend the money and go on holiday to some islands, such as the Maldives. These 10 000€ will have to be spent on the buying of sport equipment or material, or on university studies. This is the most important message to convey, not just for the competition but also for the culture. Our objective is to provide free registration and no taxes to our participants; nobody will have to pay fees at the individual or the team level. Transport is free from the airport to hotels and the places for competitions. This will allow all our friends from all over the world to have the best quality services.

Our objective is Sicily in the world. Each single federation will be invited to nominate or appoint an athlete as an ambassador of Sicily in the world. This athlete, one for each country, will be hosted free of charge in Italy, and will take part in the World Championships, also free of charge. They will be named Sicilian ambassadors to the world. But the objective is to increase the number of participating countries in the World Championships.

Together with all the activities of the FIE, the Promotion Committee wants to promote these as much as possible to make these World Championships a huge event, and provide the best possible conditions to the participating delegations. Catania is a ideal city for fencing. There are twelve fencing salles in Catania. We will have a hall dedicated to the preparation of the World Championships. We will organize a training camp where athletes coming from various countries can train adequately to strengthen the level at the World Championships.

Therefore, dear friends of world fencing, the candidacy of Catania, and the Catania Championships will be a World Championships at the service of fencing. I repeat that Italy as a candidate is not in opposition to any other country. But it is a great opportunity for fencing. We heard today our Ukrainian friends, and we thank them for the willingness and their ability to postpone being a candidate because they've got economic problems. We are lucky enough now because the Sicilian government has decided to bet on fencing, and to invest on fencing. They could have decided to invest on swimming or track and field events, any other sport but the Sicilian region decided to do this because, they think that fencing is a sport that can convey the image of our country. So it goes way beyond just organising a World Championships in Italy, it is the beginning of a new policy that the government is trying to implement through a prestigious sport with a great tradition and healthy values. The Sicilian government wants to invest on this. And it is not just a project, it is something that has already been signed and passed in our Court of auditors. So, we are sure about this. It will allow the Promotion Committee to work safely and organize a big event for national and international fencing. We have the certainty that the 2011 World Championships will be a success. As President of the Italian Fencing Federation, I think this a guarantee for global fencing. Today the world of fencing must grab this opportunity given to us by the government. Today I'm inviting the world of fencing not to miss this opportunity, to take advantage of it. The Sicilian government has invested in your beloved and cherished discipline which is fencing. I'm going to show you a video now. I think the regional Minister for Sport for Sicily is about to arrive and I can guarantee you that the decree is in the bank. Let's watch the video. Thank you.

Video presentation

Applause

Mr. Nino Strano (ITA) : Dears friends of the international fencing world. As someone from Catania, living in Catania, although not a fencer, close to you in spirit, I got emotional watching these images, to see this marvellous cosmopolitan city, which welcomes the whole world, which has always welcomed everybody, from Normans to Greeks, from Muslims to Romans, and Latins. A land which has been open to everybody and keeps being open to everybody. Sicily is happy, with its government, to allocate five million Euros for the World Fencing Championships. Five million Euros which the President of the Sicilian region, Mr. Lombardo, who greets you all, is happy to offer, given the value of a sport like fencing, but also as a contribution to our economy and to our development, to the development of Sicily, a land which is in the middle of the Mediterranean Sea. We count on you and on your support.

We are not competing with the other candidate cities, Budapest and Tianjin. These Hungarian and Chinese cities want to bring a great contribution to fencing. We do not know who is going to win but we are ready. We are ready because we have already secured five million Euros. But we are also ready with our hearts, with our passion, with our pride to be in the center of the Mediterranean Sea at the service of sport as a whole, but particularly of international fencing. Mr. Usmanov, Mr. President, we are happy to have you here in Sicily. I hope you have appreciated our beautiful setting and enjoyed the three days in our land. We hope you will have good memories, as even today the sun found us. Thank you, and thank you for all you have done for us.

Applause

Nathalie Rodriguez: The second candidate, please.

Attila Szalay-Berzeviczy (HUN): Mister President, Dear colleagues, Friends of fencing, thank you for this opportunity to present today the city of Budapest. The Hungarian team is standing before you today with a great sense of history. We are proud of our glorious past and hopefully glorious future in the world of fencing with our many international medals. We regard fencing as a very Hungarian sport, because it is the most successful Hungarian sport. I'm delighted to have been asked to convey to you the message of the Prime Minister of Hungary:

"Dear Congress participants, fencing is already considered a traditional Hungarian sport and Hungary is often mentioned as a major fencing nation. As the Hungarian Fencing Federation is bidding for the World Championships, I would like to assure them that the Federation has my whole support. With my statement of support I intend to express that we would consider it as a great honour, a noble task and a significant opportunity to popularise this already well known and recognised sport even more. We will put all our infrastructures to your disposal.

Now, I would like to hand you over to Mr. Gábor Demszky, mayor of Budapest. He has been elected five times and has been running the city for 20 years.

We will show you a video.

Video presentation.

Gábor Demszky (HUN): Buon giorno, Buenos días, Good morning, my name is Gábor Demszky, and as you have heard I'm the mayor of the city of Budapest since 1990. It is a great honour for me to attend the current Congress of the International Fencing Federation and express my respect and very high regard to the sport of fencing and its representatives. There are few sports in the world that demand as high a level of development and coordination of physical and mental abilities as fencing. Fencing is exemplary in this respect. Everything is precisely controlled. Fencing is the sport of the brave and the savvy. This is the reason for its popularity around the world, including Budapest, the capital of Hungary.

The video has given you a flavour of our beloved city: the beautiful landscapes, the well known architectural heritage, and its vivid cultural life, with sports and arts at heart. But the real recipe for us to obtain this wonderful opportunity offered to us to organise the World Championships would be to share with you the Hungarian lifestyle. For Hungarians, fencing is a national sport like soccer, swimming, water polo, kayaking and canoeing, sports in which thousands of youngsters train and in which Hungary has achieved major successes in the past decades. As you may have heard, in a country with a population of 10 million, in these sports, Hungarian men and women win international medals and they rank amongst the most popular sports in the country. We have many World champions, and this the reason why Budapest has long been named the capital of fencing. These results show that Hungary has a rich tradition in sports, and particularly in fencing. This is why we propose our city as the destination for the World Championships. Beyond the fact that it has an extraordinary natural landscape, and spectacular panoramas, its stimulating cultural life is also a major attraction, so I am sure you will be very pleased to come visit us.

The city regularly stages very prestigious competitions, as international sport has always been very important to us. Our athletes have garnered many medals for their country. In 1991, our country, our fencers earned many medals.

As the mayor of Budapest, as the mayor of the city, I would be very pleased if we could stage the 2011 World Championships. It would serve as another example of Budapest's ability to implement its objectives by the year 2020, the staging of Summer Olympic Games, Games for which we are bidding.

The Fencing World Championships must choose an ideal venue for the preparation of the 2012 Olympic Games. So Hungary is candidate because it shall be the President of the European Union at this time. This represents an additional advantage for our city, thanks to its urban development strategy and improvement of the the infrastructural environment. Also, measures have been approved to improve the sport environment of the city. But, I have to repeat, we can say that Budapest will be the capital of Europe in 2011 because of the EU Presidency.

This year, the British Institute of Analysis and the Economist Intelligence Unit ranked Budapest number one for its standard of living, and declared that Budapest is the most livable capital in Eastern central Europe. Budapest has an outstanding geographical location, because we are in the center of central Europe. Many highways lead to the city and our busy international airport, situated very close to the city limits, offers frequent connexions to the whole world. Our many sport infrastructures propose a high standard of service. The

outstanding public transportation, and our cultural and touristic traditions, all contribute to make the Hungarian capital the ideal venue for staging the Fencing World Championships.

Therefore, as the mayor of the city, I'm fully committed to personally supporting the International Fencing Federation and I can assure you that in cooperation with the International Fencing Federation, the Assembly of Budapest, the municipality and all fencing federations, we will make all our efforts with our sponsors to make the 2011 Fencing World Championships a great success. The Hungarian capital is ready to provide maximum amount of support possible for the event. Regularly, every year, we organize events of this magnitude. We know how to make it very successful and very interesting for the participants and for everybody, for the citizens of Budapest.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Budapest is confident and prepared to stage the 2011 Fencing World Championships. I am sure that one of the greatest celebrations of the sport of fencing will be organized smoothly, benefiting from the hospitality of Budapest and earning recognition from sports fans and the whole world. Thank you very much for your attention.

Applause

Attila Szalay-Berzeviczy (HUN): Thank you very much. Mister President, dear colleagues. In my present role as a Chairman of the Bid Committee for Budapest and as the co-president of the Hungarian Federation I'm often asked why we are so keen on hosting the 2011 World Championships. Obviously, our answer could be very simple as the mayor already referred to it, as it is one year before the London Olympics, and as Hungary has the presidency of the European Union that year, it will be a great opportunity, and a chance to make fencing lovable and attractive for future generations. If young people, children, come to the fencing halls because they love it, that's what's going to keep this sport on the Olympic program.

So the city wants to take this opportunity to pass this message on to the youth. What we can promise you is, obviously the mayor already listed number of things that are referring to Budapest, but probably what's the most important, especially in light of this year's World Championships is that we need spectators because they can electrify the mood at the World Championships, which makes a big difference for the Olympic Games. The spectators are the foundation of everything else. And as fencing is the most popular sport in Hungary, it means that we can guarantee a great number of spectators. Transportation, I guess everyone likes to be at the competition site quickly, smoothly, coming from the airport without losing luggage. We have an excellent transportation system, excellent highways and an international airport with direct flights to and from 41 countries. Getting easily and cost-effectively to a capital city makes it possible to bring along family members, fans and supporters in larger number, than in any other place.

As far as accommodation is concerned, we are totally aware that our family of fencing is bound together. We already made arrangements with hotels ready to host you and your families. We managed to secure economic prices in these hotels. One of them is literally just two minutes from the Championships venue

so, basically, the fencers are able to walk out of their room in their fencing dress and get to the pistes within 2 minutes. The other hotels will have a shuttle service during the day, so those who are hosted in downtown Budapest can get to the fencing halls and sport venues quickly and easily.

All we ask of you is a good mood among the athletes and the support staff. So we are giving you a spacious fencing hall with appropriate segmentation of the training part, the preliminaries and the finals sections. Altogether 17 000 m² will be allocated to the World Fencing Championships. As far as financial means are concerned, it is important to point out that finance is not everything, and we must not forget that fencing is our priority number one. The Hungarian Government and the municipality of Budapest, as well as other local communities, have already allocated funds to the project, and we can count on the support of many corporate sponsors, enterprises and companies. Even the lotto accepted to help us, as we know there will be many participants, already in our country, who have been supporters of our sport for quite some time. So we will have a substantial budget at our disposal.

As far as television is concerned, we talked about it a lot yesterday and we know that television is a means for our survival; to channel our message to the world and attract new fencers in future generations. So we are very proud to say that the Hungarian television is the partner of the International Olympic Committee since the Barcelona Olympics. When you were watching TV and you watched Olympic fencing competitions it was the Hungarian television that was producing the pictures of the entire broadcast and managing the video and audio transmissions. So Hungarian television knows exactly what fencing is all about and how it's supposed to be staged on TV.

What else will we offer you? I already mentioned that getting to Budapest is simple, and Hungarian Airlines made arrangements with our sponsors. As a matter of fact, we made an arrangement with them that free plane tickets will be offered to the federations that are participating in the World Championships. Any federation coming with less than 10 people will be provided one free ticket. Any federation coming with more than 10 people will be getting a 20% discount for the rest of the tickets. In addition, Hungarian Airlines will allow you to have luggage heavier than usual. They will be more lenient for the weight of the luggage, and the agreement to this effect is already signed.

A whole system will be put in place to guarantee access to the country even from countries that did not sign the Schengen treaty. The Hungarian Fencing Federation will help all the federation with the visa fees.

As mentioned already, transportation in Budapest functions very well. Shuttle transportation between the hotels, the venue and the airport will be provided by the organization Committee, for free obviously. The shuttles will be available on a very frequent basis. In addition, we also signed an agreement with the Hungarian transport company in Budapest which is providing all the accredited participants of the World Championships a free access to any public transport and museums, for trams and trolleys and the underground metro of Budapest.

Many of you will be arriving from overseas and you'll be jet-lagged. There is an adjustment to be done. We planned for this, and we will offer free training space

to all those who want to get organised and train several days in advance and have a relaxing adjustment to our time zone.

It is in our interest to have as many countries competing as possible in these championships. Obviously, we would like to see a very strong participation from all the federations. Therefore, all the Presidents of the different federations would be the favoured guests of the Hungarian Fencing Federation for the nine days of the competition. There will be no competition fee. This is going to be provided by the Hungarian Fencing Federation.

As the last message, what we really have to offer you is that, we, Hungarians do care about fencing very much and thus we're trying to offer the best we have. As I mentioned, our capital city, Budapest, can count on sponsors and television, as only a capital city can really grant. This is why we are sure to give you great attention. We believe that the Senior World Championships must be in a capital city to get the prestige that is needed to continue its fight for the Olympic program. We will make a lot of publicity on our national TV channel, and our main message is "Let's make fencing more attractive for the youth, for our future generations". This is our goal. Thank you.

Attila Szalay-Berzeviczy (HUN) : Sorry, can anybody help with the sound? I'm sorry, we are trying our best. The technicians tested it yesterday and it worked. I don't understand why it does not work now.

Alisher Usmanov: Please, Budapest has finished. Thank you. Now I invite Mister Wang Wei, Tianjin, to speak. Where is Tianjin delegation? It is coming in two minutes. Let us wait.

Video presentation.

Applause

Jochen Farber : I just wanted to apologize again. It's not a mistake by the Hungarians; it was a technical problem that we had in the régie. Thank you.

Video of Tianjin candidature.

Applause

M. Jingguang Chen (CHN): Mister President, Members of the FIE family, Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning. Thank you very much for giving us this great opportunity to speak about my city. The video you've just watched gave you general information about my city, a complete overview of the city, and its fundamental assets to host the World's top sport events. I am eager to describe all the efforts Tianjin has made for the benefit of all the participants for the 2011 World Championships. Number one: no entry fees will be charged for either individuals or the teams.

Number two: you will benefit from a 50% discount by taking China Airlines. We have made an agreement with China Airlines that every participant pays only half of the regular ticket price from his/her most convenient airport to the Tianjin airport. You know that China Airlines covers almost all the continents and nearly

all the major cities in the world. Number three: you will benefit from a 30% accommodation discount.

After discount, the room prices in 2011 will be: for four star hotels 45USD in double rooms and 75USD in single rooms, including breakfast, per day and per person, and for three star hotels 30USD in double rooms and 55USD in single rooms, including breakfast, per day and per person. These are very competitive hotel rates. And you have to remember and consider that those prices are the prices two years from now and the organizers have taken into account the devaluation of the US dollar.

Number four: free and convenient transportation are provided from Beijing and Tianjin airports to hotels and from the hotels to the venues.

Ladies and Gentlemen, these offers reduce largely the costs of every participant. Meanwhile, it is, of course, a big sacrifice and a challenge for my city. We are pleased to see there are other world cities also bidding for this top level FIE world event and, no matter who wins, we must always keep in mind the promotion of fencing world wide.

Mister President let me assure you that the mayor of my city is enchanted to be given this possibility. Of course, the World Championships should have a global importance. The World Championships are expected to be held in qualified cities and countries in different continents. However, it has been more than 10 years since an Asian country has hosted the World Championships. So this would be the second time, and during this long lapse of time, many changes and much development has been taking place in Tianjin, as well as in China, as you know. We are now more confident in our efforts, and we are sure to make a great success of the 2011 World Championships if we win it.

We do hope, and they are sincere wishes, that all of you FIE Members will offer us a chance; to offer the 11 million people of Tianjin a chance. We promise we'll make a brilliant one. We already welcome all of you to Tianjin! Thank you so much.

Applause

Nathalie Rodriguez: Ok, now we vote. This screen indicates the countries in alphabetic order so if you want to vote for Budapest, press 1 and then confirm; then, Catania 2 and then confirm; if you want to vote for Tianjin press 3 and then confirm.

The rule is that if a candidate has the absolute majority at the first voting session he is immediately elected. If no majority is present we withdraw the candidate with the lowest number of votes and we will have another voting session.

The absolute majority is 58 votes. Now, we vote. The vote is open.

Alisher Usmanov: Vote, please.

Nathalie Rodriguez: The vote is closed. I am told there has been a problem. I'm sorry. We will have to vote again. We have to wait a while. Again, the vote is

open. Apparently, there is a technical problem because the voting session has not been opened yet.

Maxim Paramonov: Be patient, please. The system has worked without problem for two days but it might be a bit tired now, and that may be the reason it doesn't work.

Alisher Usmanov: Can you tell me what is going on?

Maxim Paramonov: Don't worry; we will be able to vote in a way or another. We are going to vote today, even if you have to raise your hands. Don't worry.

Krisztian Kulcsar: I'm sorry. Can I just ask if we can go to the traditional way of voting on paper? I really do trust the new era technology but apparently it's not working so I might suggest going back to the traditional way of voting with paper ballots.

Alisher Usmanov: Mr. Farber can you inform the Congress on what's happening and what we must do?

Jochen Farber: Please check your voting box. Actually, we have seen that this box works fine. When the voting is open, you should have a blinking light on the left side of the display. Check. You see? See this blinking light on the left hand side of your voting box? The little blinking square. Ok. This is a test. Nathalie, you can open the vote again for the choice of the candidate cities. We have verified the system. Again, it's not a system provided by the Italians so no need to think that they are tampering, the system is provided by the FIE.

Maxim Paramonov: Is everything clear? No questions? We can open the vote.

Nathalie Rodriguez: The vote is open. To vote for Budapest, press 1. To vote for Catania you press 2 and to vote for Tianjin press 3 and then don't forget to confirm your choice.

The vote is closed. There is no majority because it was 58 votes, so we don't have the absolute majority. As I said before, the city with the lowest score must be eliminated, and it is Tianjin with 13 votes. There will now be a new voting session with the two cities that have the highest votes.

Alisher Usmanov: You have to vote for Budapest or Catania.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Very well, so we will vote again. So I repeat, if you want to vote for Budapest press 1 and then confirm. If you want to vote for Catania press 2 and then confirm. We will open the vote. The vote is open.

Alisher Usmanov: Please, vote carefully.

Nathalie Rodriguez: The result of the vote is 62 votes for Catania and 52 votes for Budapest.

Applause

Alisher Usmanov: Please, pay attention. Ladies and Gentlemen, we can congratulate the Italian Federation. The 2011 World Championships will take place in Catania. Congratulations.

Nathalie Rodriguez: As I told you earlier, we have no candidates for the Junior/Cadet World Championships for 2011. I've been informed that Jordan is a candidate for hosting the 2011 Junior/Cadet World Championships.

Maxim Paramonov: Dear friends, please, be patient. I would like to invite our friend Ramin Mammadov from Azerbaijan to inform us about something really important. Thank you.

Ramin Mammadov: Dear Mister President, dear Executive Committee Members, dear members of the FIE family,

First of all, I would like to congratulate the city of Catania for having been designated host of the 2011 Championships. I would like to present our candidacy for the next Junior/Cadet World Championships. I suspect that most part of the delegates participating to this Congress have never been in Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan. It would be a real opportunity for you to be in Baku next year when the Junior/Cadet World Championships would be held from April 1st to 10th.

I do believe that you will be satisfied not only with the city and the hospitality of people but also with competition management which will be carried out according to handbook FIE rules. I kindly present the letter from the Minister of Sport of the Republic of Azerbaijan. "The Azerbaijan Fencing Federation requested to host the 2011 Junior/Cadet World Championships in Baku. We wish to inform you that the Ministry of Youth and Sport of the Republic of Azerbaijan support their initiative. The Minister will give its full support in order to ensure a high level organization of the mentioned event. We wish to draw you attention to the fact that Azerbaijan has got great experience in organizing competitions and international tournaments. We organised such competitions in 2007, then again in 2008 and many other great sport events. Please take into account this experience when you analyse our candidacy. You will get the full information about the Championships before December 10. If you have any questions, don't hesitate to contact us. Thank you very much for your attention."

Applause

Nathalie Rodriguez: I also wanted to inform you that as for the 2010 Veterans World Championships, the city of Poreč, in Croatia, is candidate. The proposed dates are: September 29th to October 3rd. I think the Congress agenda has been completed.

Alisher Usmanov: Thank you. Our agenda is finished and we close.

Julius Kralik: There's still point 10, the miscellaneous items. We have to speak about miscellaneous items.

Nathalie Rodriguez: I think there are no element under miscellaneous items. Yes? But you haven't given us the items, Mr. Kralik, and you didn't inform us unfortunately.

Julius Kralik: But it's a quite serious issue and I would like to kindly ask you to allow me to present it.

Maxim Paramonov: Normally, it's now the rule that questions must be proposed officially beforehand for the agenda. We cannot deal with a point that has not been proposed beforehand. This is a very serious issue for security, but our work is finished. Thank you for your attention and good bye.

Julius Kralik: Excuse me but this is a very serious issue for security, I'm sorry.

Maxim Paramonov: We have finished, our work is finished.

Alisher Usmanov: Our Congress is closed.

Nathalie Rodriguez: Please leave your voting boxes on the tables, do not take them with you. Thank you.

APPENDICES

