

DRAFT

Item 2



EUROPEAN PARALYMPIC
COMMITTEE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ATHENS
28TH SEPTEMBER 2003

MINUTES

DRAFT

1 Opening

1.1 Welcome

The President welcomed all participants to the 4th ordinary EPC General Assembly in Athens and thanked the Hellenic Paralympic Committee for hosting the meeting. He handed over to the President and Secretary General of the Hellenic Paralympic Committee, Ioanna Kariofilli and Aris Pananos, for some words of welcome. Yannis Vardakastanis, President of the European Disability Forum, followed with a short speech to the participants. The final host speaker was the deputy mayor of Athens, Theodoros Skylakakis, who welcomed the EPC General Assembly to Athens. After thanking the Greek speakers for their kind words of welcome, the President gave credit to and thanked EPC Secretary General Enrique Sánchez-Guijo and David Stirton for their outstanding preparatory work to this general assembly. The president gave the floor to the Secretary General for him to proceed with the roll call.

1.2 Roll Call

Delegates from a total of 33 EPC Members were present.

Official voting delegates from EPC Members:

Austria – Petra Huber
Azerbaijan – Ziyadkhan Karimov
Belgium – Leen Coudenys
Bosnia and Herzegovina – Mustafa Demir
CP-ISRA – Alan Dickson
Croatia – Ratko Kovacic
Cyprus – Christos Antoniou
Czech Republic – Frantisek Janouch
Denmark – Karl Vilhelm Nielsen
Estonia – Toomas Vilosius
Faroe Islands – Jogvan Jensen
Finland – Arto Pehkonen
France – Bernard Verneau
Germany – Brigitta Blomqwist
Great Britain – Mike Brace
Greece – Ionna Karyofilli
Hungary – Pal Nadas
Iceland – Sveinn Aki Ludviksson
IBSA – Kannarath Meystre
INAS-FID – Bernard Atha
ISMWSF – Maura Strange (also representing ISOD by delegation)
Ireland – Anne Ebbs
Israel – Radu Rosenthal
Netherlands – Erik de Winter
Norway – Hilde Oftedal
Poland – Witold Dluzniak
Portugal – António Neves
Russia - Alexander Tarabykine
Slovakia – Jan Riapos
Spain – Alberto Jofre
Sweden – Katherine Wiklund

DRAFT

Switzerland – Hugo Woelfli
Ukraine – Valery Sushkevych

European Sports Co-ordinators attending the meeting as observers:

Alpine Skiing – Michael Knaus
Archery – Arik Vamosh
Athletics – Chris Cohen
Cycling – Tony Yorke
Equestrian – Rosemary Georgopoulos
Swimming – Tim Reddish

All members of the Executive Committee, representatives from IPC and EPC staff members Bart Schell and David Stirton were also present.

1.3 Voting

The President announced that the General Assembly was quorate. It was announced that a simple majority required 17 votes and a 2/3 majority required 22 votes.

INAS-FID moved and CP-ISRA seconded to appoint the following individuals as tellers to serve throughout the assembly:

- Chris Cohen, Athletics
- Tony York, Cycling
- Bart Schell, EPC

The General Assembly **agreed** unanimously.

2 Agenda

The President indicated some minor changes to the agenda as circulated with the meeting documents. The Netherlands moved and ISMWSF seconded to adopt the modified agenda. The **motion carried** unanimously.

3 Minutes 2001 General Assembly

3.1 Accuracy

Israel moved and Germany seconded to adopt the Minutes of the 2001 General Assembly. The **motion was carried** with 32 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 1 abstention.

3.2 Matters arising

No questions were raised nor comments made.

4 Reports – EPC Officers

The reports of the EPC Officers had been circulated to the members in advance. The President proposed that each EPC Officer would present his own report.

4.1 President's Report

DRAFT

The President made a short summary of his report to the General Assembly, giving an overview of the achieved developments on the part of the EPC as well as the IPC.

Comments/Questions:

No questions or comments were made with regards to the President's report

4.2 Secretary General's Report

The Secretary General pointed out the importance of this General Assembly within this mandate, as it would set down priorities for the second half of his term of office.

He summarised his report while speaking to each item included. The Secretary General went on to present the process that has been initiated and the results that have been achieved with regards to the new EPC website. He emphasised the fact that the website was being made accessible to all disability groups and stressed the fact that the significant work on the website was provided by persons with a disability. The members were asked to support the improved website by making documents or photos available that could be posted on the currently created website's archive.

The Secretary General finished his presentation by appealing to the members for their ongoing co-operation, this being essential to the work of the EPC.

Comments/Questions:

Denmark raised the question of the new IPC logo and asked if the EPC had taken any decision or had anything in progress in that regard. The President replied that nothing had been discussed nor decided on the part of the EPC.

4.3 Technical Officer's Report

The Technical Officer stated that the goals set out in the Operations Plan had been achieved so far. Along with his report he gave an overview of the European Championships that have taken place from 2002 until now. The Technical Officer then gave an update on the current bid and application process for European Championships, stating that the work involved in this process had increased due to further requirements to the organising committees, such as the newly required doping agreement.

The Technical Officer thanked the NPCs and Sport Co-ordinators for their work and support with regards to the organisation of the European Championships.

Comments/Questions:

Ukraine asked for clarification regarding the reasons for not awarding the 2003 Swimming European Championships to the Czech Republic. Tim Reddish, EPC Swimming Co-ordinator, answered stating that the bid had not been presented sufficiently in advance to ensure a decent organisation of the Championship.

Ukraine proposed for further consideration a 5-point evaluation process that would enhance the standard of organisation of the Technical Delegate's required responsibilities. The Technical Officer welcomed the proposed evaluation plan and asked for detailed information to be provided to him and the EPC Executive Committee for further discussion on this matter.

The EPC Treasurer urged potential organisers to submit bids for championships as soon as possible, according to the event calendar, so as to be able to guarantee

DRAFT

enough time for the application and organisational process of European Championships.

4.4 Development Officer's Report

The Development Officer gave a short summary of his report. He also mentioned the long term development plan that had also been circulated with the other meeting documents. It is intended as an additional informative document for the EPC membership in the field of EPC development activities.

Comments/Questions:

No questions or comments were made with regards to the Development Officer's report

4.5 Operations Plan

The President presented the revised Operations Plan, as being a mid-term evaluation report. He also called attention to the upcoming IPC Strategic Review and its possible influence on the goals set out in the Operations Plan. The President stressed that although having clearly defined and timed objectives, the Operations Plan was an ongoing process without a set beginning and end.

Comments/Questions:

No questions or comments were made with regards to the Operations Plan.

Germany moved and Israel seconded to adopt the reports from the EPC Officers as circulated. The **motion carried** unanimously.

5 Finance – EPC Treasurer

5.1 Accounts 2001-2002

The Treasurer presented the audited accounts for the years 2001 and 2002. See Appendix I for the treasurer's presentation on the audited accounts.

Belgium moved and Azerbaijan seconded to adopt the audited accounts. The **motion carried** unanimously.

5.2 Discharge of the Executive Committee

The President reported that according to the EPC registered constitution and as a requirement of German legislation the General Assembly should be asked to discharge the Executive Committee from its responsibilities.

The Netherlands moved and Belgium seconded to discharge the EPC Executive Committee. The **motion carried** unanimously.

After the vote INAS-FID requested clarification as to what extent the Executive Committee was accountable after their discharge. The President and the Treasurer clarified that the Executive Committee could still be held responsible for their actions after having been discharged.

5.3 Membership fees

DRAFT

CP-ISRA moved and Cyprus seconded to adopt the annual membership fee to remain unchanged at EURO 300. The **motion carried** unanimously.

5.4 Budgets 2004 - 2005

The Treasurer presented the forecast budgets for 2004 and 2005. See Appendix II for the presented budgets.

Comments/Questions:

Switzerland asked for an estimation of EPC's financial situation in the future as they thought the Treasurer's income calculation was too optimistic. The Treasurer replied that he had calculated the expenses on a worst case scenario, therefore balancing a maybe too optimistic income calculation. The Technical Officer stated that he was of the opinion that the calculated income from the capitation tax was realistic to be achieved through upcoming European Championships. The Secretary General stressed EPC's need to expand and search for additional financial sources. The EPC should not be restricted by a tight budget and should continue to move forward.

CP-ISRA moved and Croatia seconded to adopt the proposed budget for the years 2004 and 2005. The **motion was carried** with 31 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 2 abstentions.

5.5 Appointment of Auditors

CP-ISRA moved and Iceland seconded to approve of the Executive Committee's proposal to appoint as auditors TRB, Treuhand-Revision-Beratung, from Düsseldorf, Germany. The **motion carried** unanimously.

6 Motions

6.1 Motions from the Executive Committee

6.1.1 Constitution/tax-exempt status

Constitutional motion that requires a 2/3 majority

The EPC Executive Committee moved and Denmark seconded that EPC's constitution should be amended to remove all specific reference to its affiliation to IPC, hereby generating the conditions to achieve tax-exempt status for the EPC. The President explained the background for the constitutional change that had already been proposed during the previous 2001 General Assembly. He gave the floor to the Treasurer who has been in charge of the constitutional changes and the tax-exempt status process.

The Treasurer gave a detailed explanation of the constitutional requirements the EPC, as a registered organisation in Germany, must meet to be exempt from taxes. He recapitulated the progress made since the last General Assembly, where the EPC Membership had not accepted the constitutional changes. Alongside a short presentation (see Appendix III) the Treasurer pointed out the reasons for EPC's seeking tax-exempt status.

DRAFT

The Ukraine suggested approaching the German Government or the European Union with the request for tax-exempt status, instead of changing EPC's constitution.

France made clear that it was not supporting this motion. According to their point of view the rationale of the motion was limited to financial reasons, not taking EPC's political legacy into account. In their opinion not enough alternatives or possibilities had been presented. With regards to the possible autonomy of EPC through the IPC strategic review, France commented that it could not be used as an argument as it was not accepted yet and therefore not certain to this point, hence France expressed the view that the EPC constitution should comprise a link to the IPC.

Switzerland, Belgium, INAS-FID and ISMWSF pointed out the strong relations between the EPC and the IPC, which they think will not be influenced by the mentioned changes to the constitutions. They furthermore stressed the substantial need of the tax-exempt status for the future of the EPC.

Cyprus assented to the statement of France, indicating that they are not in favour of the changes to EPC's constitution as presented.

The Treasurer closed the discussion by summarising the arguments that led to the decision on the changes to the constitution and assured that these changes were in understanding with the IPC, regardless of the outcome of the IPC Strategic Review during the IPC General Assembly in Torino.

The **motion was carried** with 25 votes in favour, 1 vote against and 2 abstentions

6.1.2 Removal from EPC Membership (Moldova)

6.1.3 Removal from EPC Membership (Russia)

Due to the similar content of the two motions they were taken together. The President made clear that a removal from membership was not desired by the EPC, but was initiated for reasons of fairness to the other EPC Members.

The President reported that Russia had meanwhile responded and had settled the outstanding fees and contact details. Herewith the **motion concerning Russia's removal from membership was withdrawn**.

With regards to Moldova's membership, all attempts from the EPC Executive Committee to contact the NPC had failed. In accordance to this lack of communication and failure to pay the membership fee the Executive Committee had drafted the motion. The EPC Executive Committee moved and Switzerland seconded.

Comments/Questions:

Belgium indicated their support to the motion provided that Moldova would not be excluded from European Championships, where athletes can qualify for the Paralympic Games.

Ukraine offered to write a letter to the Moldovan government, as the current political involvement in Moldova is in favour of the Paralympic Movement.

The **motion was carried** with 26 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 5 abstentions.

DRAFT

6.1.4 Appointment of Treasurer

The EPC Executive Committee moved and CP-ISRA seconded to appoint Juerg P. Weber as EPC Treasurer. Mr. Weber had been co-opted onto the Executive Committee as Acting Treasurer at the EC meeting on the 30th of September in Dublin. Mr. Weber was **appointed unanimously and by acclamation**.

6.1.5 Relations with the European Union

The EPC Executive Committee moved and Belgium seconded that the EPC should intensify its relations with other European organisations and especially towards the European Union and develop a long-term strategic plan on this issue. The Secretary General presented the rationale of this motion, as he was appointed by the Executive Committee to co-ordinate this field of action. He reported on the conference on Relations with the European Union that took place in April of this year in Bollnäs, Sweden. There the need for further and concrete actions to strengthen the relations towards the European Union had been expressed and included as one of the conclusions of the Conference. He continued by giving a short summary on the achievements and actions taken since the Bollnäs Conference. The Secretary General indicated that the acceptance of this motion would show the full support of the EPC Membership to the development of European Relations.

Comments/Questions:

CP-ISRA expressed their general support to this motion, while stressing the importance of keeping the membership fully informed in this process as outlined in the motion.

The **motion carried** unanimously.

6.2 Motions from the Members

6.2.1 Classification of Athletes with a Learning Disability (British Paralympic Association)

The British Paralympic Association moved an amended version of their circulated motion and Iceland seconded the amended motion, which read as follows:

“The British Paralympic Association supports the inclusion of athletes with a learning disability at the Paralympic Games with full medal status at the earliest opportunity, under a robust classification system tested at Regional and World level.

*The British Paralympic Association proposes that a ~~discussion~~ **decision** should ~~take place now~~ **be made at the IPC General Assembly** regarding the suitability of the new classification system for athletes with a learning disability and its application at the Athens 2004 Paralympic Games **in respect of its ability to meet the criteria stipulated in the IPC/INAS accord.**”*

The BPA explained that the main intention of the motion was to enable ID athletes to be reinstated as soon as possible, considering the approaching deadline of the qualification procedure for the Paralympic Games. The BPA stressed that decisions had to be taken soon to give the athletes the possibility to qualify.

DRAFT

INAS-FID proposed to keep the original version of the motion as it was suggesting a discussion instead of a decision. Furthermore, INAS-FID summarised the past actions that had been taken between the IPC and INAS-FID in this respect.

The Czech Republic and the Ukraine indicated their support for the motion for the reason that it would strengthen the Paralympic Movement.

The IPC gave a brief overview of the current situation, stating that a classification process for ID athletes had not been finalised yet. The IPC pointed out that good results were being achieved, but that there was still much progress to be made.

Switzerland expressed their overall support concerning the content of the motion, but stated that they were not completely in agreement with the wording of it.

Finland acknowledged the comment from the IPC on the working procedure between them and INAS-FID. They therefore thought that the motion was being presented too early in this process.

Iceland indicated their support and said that they saw the motion as a possibility to force the IPC and INAS-FID to move on with their work.

The BPA stressed the importance of this motion with regards to the Athens 2004 Paralympic Games.

The **motion fell** with 14 votes in favour, 7 votes against and 9 abstentions.

6.2.2 Use of Development Money to Support Classification (British Paralympic Association)

The British Paralympic Association moved an amended version of their circulated motion and the Czech Republic seconded the amended motion, which read as follows:

“The British Paralympic Association seeks the endorsement of the EPC to the following resolution to be put to the IPC General Assembly:

*The British Paralympic Association proposes that the IPC should make development money available to support countries where there are insufficient personnel and expertise **available** to manage ~~proper and~~ a robust, **sport-specific functional** classification of athletes with disabilities, ~~(in particular learning disability)~~ so preventing them from adopting ~~more stringent~~ **the** classification systems as approved by IPC.”*

CP-ISRA interpreted the motion as an additional sign of support, while it recognises the significant work by the IPC and supports the classification process of INAS-FID.

The **motion was carried** with 28 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 1 abstention.

6.2.3 Demonstration and Exhibition Events at Paralympic Games (British Paralympic Association)

The British Paralympic Association moved and Austria seconded the motion, which read as follows:

DRAFT

“The British Paralympic Association seeks the endorsement of the EPC to the following resolution to be put to the IPC General Assembly:

The British Paralympic Association proposes that the Paralympic Games should no longer be used as a vehicle for demonstration or exhibition events unless athletes are additional to the NPC quota and unless the IPC fund the athletes. Events of this nature should be staged at Regional or World Championships and not at the Paralympic Games where elite athletes are performing to the highest standards, in the most demanding and public arena for disability sport.”

The BPA clarified that the motion’s content was intended for events after the Athens 2004 Paralympic Games. The aim hereby is to reach out for more full-medal status sports instead of exhibition events.

Belgium agreed to the content of the motion and proposed a friendly amendment suggesting that not the IPC but the respective Organising Committee should cover the costs of athletes competing at exhibition events. The friendly amendment was not accepted.

The **motion fell** with 15 votes in favour, 2 votes against and 10 abstentions.

6.2.4 Restructuring of IPC Governing Body (British Paralympic Association)

The **motion was withdrawn**.

6.2.5 Role of the EPC (British Paralympic Association)

The British Paralympic Association moved and Switzerland seconded to urge *“the EPC to reconsider its role in relation to the endorsement and support for regional championships and suggest instead a focus on links and resources between organisations and youth sport, such as a European Youth Championships”*.

The BPA added that they are seeing the need to concentrate on youth championships to assure the future of Paralympic Sport and its athletes. Iceland emphasised the need to promote youth, but indicated that this would lie within the responsibility of the IOSDs. The European Championships were needed for the overall promotion of the European Paralympic Movement.

Switzerland pointed out the difference between youth and junior athletes. They proposed a friendly amendment to the motion, changing the last sentence to: *“... such as European Youth **Games**”*.

Following this, Ukraine, Israel, Finland, Norway, Germany supported the friendly amendment. Germany added another friendly amendment proposing to change *“...and suggest **instead** a focus...”* to *“...and **in addition** suggest a focus...”*.

The EPC Athletics Sport Co-ordinator indicated that after having organised the European Athletics Championships for the first time this year, it is critical to continue this development process at the present time.

The friendly amendment from Switzerland was accepted by the BPA. They clarified that the motion was not intended as criticism to the EPC, but as further enhancement of EPC’s responsibility in the field of youth work. The BPA further added that considering the fact that the role of the EPC as Championship organiser

DRAFT

might be reduced due to sport independence, it should envisage focusing its attention on youth games.

The amended **motion fell** with 12 votes in favour, 10 votes against and 6 abstentions.

6.2.6 Joint Motion from IBSA & CP-ISRA

IBSA and CP-ISRA moved and the Czech Republic seconded that the EPC should acknowledge and endorse the right of the IOSDs (International Organisations of Sports for the Disabled) to organise their own world championships and/or games. Furthermore the motion expresses the need for the EPC to *“mandate its Executive Committee to liaise and reach agreement with the IOSDs, and any other stakeholders that may in the future be involved in the provision of international competitions, in order to establish a full and coherent competition calendar for all disability groups which takes into account the rights and wishes of all parties and seeks to avoid clashes between the competition calendars offered”*.

CP-ISRA added, speaking in the name of both members submitting this motion, that clashes of sport events within the championship sport calendar was not only affecting the schedule of the relevant organisations (i.e. IPC, EPC, IOSDs, etc.) but also and most importantly the athletes themselves.

Denmark indicated its position against this motion for reasons of having yet too many events offered by different organisations spread over the year. This would lead to confusion within the membership and among athletes.

INAS-FID backed the motion, agreeing that it would help increase the opportunities for athletes to compete.

Switzerland supported Denmark’s point of view emphasising the possible confusion, especially with regards to media coverage of Paralympic sports.

Iceland stated their position against this motion as it does not promote EPC/IPC as one movement.

The Czech Republic expressed their support as they see the IOSDs as individual organisations with the right to organise championships.

France proposed a friendly amendment to the text by including the IPC in the last sentence of the motion (as quoted above). The friendly amendment was accepted.

The EPC Treasurer pointed out that changes to the championship event calendar would subsequently affect EPC’s income resulting from championships’ capitation taxes.

The amended **motion was carried** with 17 votes in favour, 11 votes against and 3 abstentions.

6.2.7 Motion 1 from ISMWSF

ISMWSF moved and CP-ISRA seconded that the EPC should *“seek to establish a working group in conjunction with the IOSDs to study the interface/relationships between IOSDs/Regions with a view to establishing and publishing a Memorandum*

DRAFT

of Understanding outlining the partnership rights and obligations, principles of cooperation and benefits to shared and singular constituencies”.

ISMWSF added that the motion was meant to improve and extend the relations between the IPC/EPC/IOSDs and their stakeholders, which would also support the process of the IPC Strategic Review.

Germany and CP-ISRA asked for clarification concerning the operational area of the motion and if it was intended to be limited to a European level or not.

Belgium expressed the opinion that there was no need for the creation or establishment of new structures within the EPC.

Switzerland asked about the availability of the Development Officer’s working group to take over the required task set out in the motion.

ISMWSF clarified that it was not its intention to create new structures. It thanked the Members for their valuable comments. Accordingly the **motion was withdrawn**.

6.2.8 Motion 2 from ISMWSF

ISMWSF moved and Croatia seconded *“to seek support of IPC/EPC to advise their NPCs that they should recognise, support and/or incorporate the NDSOs and their membership of respective IOSDs”.*

ISMWSF stated that the motion was intended as a reminder with regards to the activities that take place within the Paralympic Movement and as a request for recognition of the different organisation that are active in the Movement.

The **motion fell** with 12 votes in favour, 12 votes against and 6 abstentions.

7 IPC General Assembly

7.1 Strategic Review

The President indicated that the IPC President would present the IPC Strategic Review during the EPC Conference following this General Assembly. No comments or questions were raised.

7.2 Motions from IPC Members

The motions to the upcoming IPC General Assembly had been circulated to the attending members during the meeting. No comments or questions were raised.

8 Closing

There being no further business, the President officially closed the General Assembly. He thanked the members for their attendance and valuable contribution. Furthermore, he especially thanked the Hellenic Paralympic Committee for their organisation and administration before and during this General Assembly.

DRAFT

Enrique Sánchez-Guijo
Secretary General

Dr. Bob Price
President

Appendices: Auditor's reports accounts 2001 and 2002
Budgets 2004 and 2005
Presentation on tax-exempt status

DRAFT

APPENDIX I

Auditor's reports accounts 2001 and 2002

Accounts 2001 - 2002

- Accounting System has been introduced
- Detailed audit reports have been translated and made available to all members
- All transactions are accounted for, including „Doping disables 2001“ resp. „Doping Conference Bratislava 2002“
- Surplus of EUR 16'307.15 in 2001
Loss of EUR 3'185.22 in 2002
- Capital per end 2002 = EUR 38'734.74

Profit & Loss 2001

- „Doping Disables“ project EUR 125'000.- as well in income and expenditures – no influence on result
- Gross accounting for capitation tax:
Income = EUR 75'000.-
Expend. = EUR 51'000.- refund 2/3 to IPC
Net for EPC = EUR 24'000.-
- Representation cost (flags, gifts etc.) high due to EUR 5,200.- for Trophies Euro-Cup ski alpine

EPC- Profit and Loss 2002

- Doping Conference Bratislava“ project EUR 103'000.- as well in income and expenditures – no influence on result
Final settlement still pending
Balance = EUR 37'000.- not yet refunded by EU-Commission
- Substantial (book)-loss of EUR 11'000.-
in exchange rate difference – parity US\$/EURO

DRAFT

APPENDIX II

Budgets 2004 and 2005

Budget 2004 & 2005 - INCOME

- Major income = capitation tax
 - ⇒ only every two years
 - ⇒ important that all Championships can be awarded
- Same applies to the logo rights
- Starting 2003 the IPC support is provided in manpower – Bart Schell
No income in cash any longer
- Funds ex „Operation Plan“ are fed into the current accounts

Budget 2004 & 2005 - EXPENDITURES

- New: Funds for support SAEC's
- Travel Executive Committee:
 - ⇒ travel to 2 meetings per year financed by NPC (as previously done)
 - ⇒ travel to attend General Meeting financed by EPC (new)
 - ⇒ more intensive travels expected - EU

Budget 2004 & 2005 - DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITAL & ACCRUALS OPERATION PLAN

- Capital per end of 2003 = EUR 36'535.—
- Capital per end of 2004 = EUR 20'935.—
- Capital per end of 2005 = EUR 19'785.—

- Accrual OP end of 2003 = EUR 40'602.—
- Accrual OP end of 2004 = EUR 31'152.—
- Accrual OP end of 2005 = EUR 21'702.—

DRAFT

APPENDIX III

Presentation on tax-exempt status

Changes to the EPC Constitution - Why?!

1. Due to the fact that the EPC is a registered Association in Germany, its constitution has to be in accordance with German legislation.
2. In order to obtain tax exemption, the Constitution has to be in accordance with requirements imposed by the German Tax-Office.
3. The German Tax-Office has accepted the Constitution as presented.
4. Without tax exemption EPC, runs the risk of paying up to 53% in income taxes (worst case scenario) – this could apply to all income (i.e. also for donations and particularly funds received from sponsors).
5. Without tax exemption, our consultants caution us, that payments from the IPC, or even worse from the EU Commission could be subjected to taxes.
6. Without tax exemption, potential donors cannot claim tax relief.
7. The main objection of the EPC membership, namely the definition of the relation between IPC and EPC has been insofar clarified, as according to IPC's strategic review, the regions shall become independent legal entities.