



NATIONAL COURT OF APPEAL

PUBLIC HEARING OF NOVEMBER 12, 2024

The RACB Sport National Court pronounces the following decision in the case:

W RACING TEAM

Appellant

Represented by Mr Vincent VOSSE (Team Principal), Mr Pierre DIEUDONNE (Sporting Director) and Mr Antoine HERBLOT (Performance & Data Engineer)

Considering the Steward's decision n°30 on October 12, 2024, 18:50 h;

Considering the appeal introduced on October 12, 2024, 19:49;

Considering the convocation of the Appellant ;

Considering the intervention of Emil Frey as an interested party ;

Considering the opinion of the Sport Prosecutor;

Considering the Appellant's "submissions of the competitor and exhibits ;

Considering the notes and exhibits of the interested party;

Having held a hearing in English on November 12, 2024, the National Court of Appeal (NCA), presided by Mr Umberto Stefani, and attended by Mr Hervé de Liedekerke and Mr Louis Derwa has passed the following.

1. DECISION SUBJECT TO APPEAL

1.

A dispute occurred following Race 1 of the Fanatec GT World Challenge Europe powered by AWS event at Barcelona on Saturday 12th of October 2024.

2.

Following Race 1, the Stewards received a protest from Team WRT against the classification of Race 1 concerning an alleged irregularity in the pit window opening during safety car procedure (article 20.5.2 of the Sporting Regulations).

The decision subject to the appeal is the decision n°30 of October 12, 2024, 18:50 (hereafter, the “Decision”) by the Panel of Stewards. Decision :

DECISION No: 30

From: The Stewards

Date: 12 October 2024

To: All Teams

Time: 18:50 hrs

The Stewards, having received a protest from Team WRT against the classification of Race 1, summoned and heard from the Race Director and the competitor's representative(s), have considered the following matter and determine the following:

Session: Race 1

Fact: Team WRT submitted a protest against the classification of Race 1 concerning pit window during Safety-Car procedure.

Offense: Alleged Breach of Article 20.5.2 of the Fanatec GT World Challenge Europe powered by AWS Sporting Regulations

Decision: The protest is rejected. Pursuant to International Sporting Code Article 13.10.1 the protest deposit will be retained in its entirety.

Reason:

The protest was lodged against the Provisional Classification.

The Stewards first considered if the protest was admissible.

The Stewards determined that as it was lodged on time and complied with the requirements of Chapter 13 of the FIA International Sporting Code, it was an admissible protest.

Hearing Procedure:

On October 12, the Race Director was heard at 16h00 and Team WRT was summoned to declare at 16h15 (Document 54).

On behalf of Team WRT:

- Vincent Vasse*
- Pierre Dieudonne*
- Maxime Bonnefoy*

At the hearing there were no objections against the composition of the Stewards panel. At the hearing the parties referred to the documents submitted. None of the parties submitted further evidence or initiated the hearing of additional persons or conducting further investigations.

The Race Director arguments:

The Race Director decided not to delay the pit window open during safety car procedure due to safety reasons. Due to the bad weather conditions and some incidents on track even with the presence of the safety car, he decided to keep the safety car on track and not to delay the pit window opening because it was uncertain when it would be possible to call the safety car in. In his opinion, if the pit window open would have been delayed it would have affected the fairness and the safety of everyone involved in the competition.

After receiving requests from several teams, the Race Director decided to clarify through a message in the timing monitors "WE CONFIRM PIT WINDOW IS OPEN".

The claims of Team WRT:

Team WRT alleged that there was an irregularity in Race 1 regarding article 20.5.2 of the Fanatec GT World Challenge Europe powered by AWS Sporting Regulations. According to Pierre Dieudonne, the situation was confusing and it was not clear when the pit window was a en. He continued and claim that the result did not reflect fairly and the race classification was not correct. In Team WRT perspective, the pit window will not be open after 25 minutes since the start of the Race due to the safety car procedure, as stated in article 20.5.2 of the mentioned regulations. Vincent Voss stated that it was the team's responsibility to be aware of the applicable regulation and they felt penalized in this instance by having followed it. He considered that could have been at least useful to have the clear information that the pit window will be open even under safety car procedure. In the end, they raised the question if we were able to cancel the race.

Conclusion of the Stewards:

Having considered the various statements made by the parties, the Stewards determine that although the stated in article 20.5.2 of the Fanatec GT World Challenge Europe powered by AWS Sporting Regulations, the safety reasons presented by the Race Director support the decision made of keep the pit window opening without delay.

After having reviewed the Pit Stops Timekeeping Report, it was possible to see that car #32 pitted at 14h25:01.190 and changed the driver, being the fifth car to do so. Also, car #30, from the same Team, pitted at 14h25:05.622, being the tenth car to do it. There is no way of knowing if and how much they were affected or benefited from the fact that pit window opening was not delayed. The Stewards agree that at this point, any attempt to rectify a possible unfair situation could create another one to other competitor and so on.

Accordingly, the Protest is dismissed and the Protest Deposit is not refunded.

Competitors are reminded that they have the right to appeal certain decisions of the Stewards, in accordance with Article 15 of the FIA International Sporting Code, within the applicable time limits.

<i>Luis ROBY</i>	<i>Yves BACQUELAINE</i>	<i>David FUENTES</i>
<i>Steward (Chairman)</i>	<i>International Steward</i>	<i>ASN Steward</i>

Received by the Comptitor

Date: 12/10/2024

Time: 19h14

Signature : Pierre DIEUDONNE

2. PROCEDURE

a) Hearing

3.

The appellant has been convoked in accordance with Art. 3 and 18 of the National Sporting Code 2024 (Judicial Procedure).

Emil Frey Racing intervened as an interested party.

The hearing of the parties took place on November 12th, 2024. The Sport Prosecutor's opinion was heard.

The Appellant appeared assisted by Mr Pierre DIEUDONNE, who set out the Appellant defense.

The interested party, Emil Frey Racing, appeared assisted by Dr Lucien W Valloni, attorney at law.

b) Sport Prosecutor's opinion

4.

The Sport Prosecutor argued that the race conditions were extremely difficult (early collision, incidents, bad weather...), which meant that the competitors were unable to compete fairly under equal conditions. These circumstances meant that the race lasted only a few minutes. The Sport Prosecutor is of the opinion that art. 20.5.1 and 20.5.2. of the FANATEC GT World Challenge Sporting Regulations (FGTWC SR) have not been correctly applied. In this context, awarding points to some competitors would be unfair since the results of the race are not based on merit and equity. Consequently, he asked that the appeal be considered well-founded and that the results of the race be annulled and that no points be awarded. He also requested that SRO, the organizer, be reprimanded for its failure to react appropriately in accordance with the above regulations.

c) Position of the Appellant

5.

The appellant states that the organizer has committed several infringements of the applicable regulations, essentially art. 20.5.1 and 20.5.2. of the FANATEC GT World Challenge and art. 1.3.1 of the FIA International Sporting Code.

It invites the NCA to:

(a) Set aside the Appealed Decision;

(b) Consequently, order the return of the protest and appeal deposits paid by the Appellant;

Cc) Refrain from making any order that the Appellant should pay any part of the costs pursuant to Article 23c of the National Sporting Code 2024 – Judicial Procedure;

(d) Require that the Stewards should further consider if the classification of the Race is correct and – most importantly – fair for all competitors' legitimate expectations with regards to positions and championship points awarded in the Series;

(e) Take any further action or decision that the National Court of Appeal may find appropriate regarding the classification, regarding the accountability of SRO as the Promoter/Organizer and – more importantly – regarding the prejudice caused to the sport, its stakeholders and the competitors entered in the Race.

NCA asked Appellant at the hearing to clarify its request. W RACING TEAM declared it pursues the cancellation of the results of Race 1 of the Fanatec GT World Challenge Europe powered by AWS event at Barcelona on Saturday 12th of October 2024 and the organizer to be reprimanded.

The Appellant's position is summarized in its memorandum :

"D. Incorrect application of the provisions of the FGTWC SR governing the Pit Window

44. Art. 20.5.2 FGTWC SR clearly provides that "If the Safety Car is on track or a Full Course Yellow period is in operation at the time when the pit window is scheduled to open (25:00 after the start of the race) the pit window will be delayed. "

45. With regard to what happened with respect to the Race, with the normal time of the Pit Window approaching (25 minutes after the start of the Race), it is obvious that the Race Director's concern and intention was to end the Safety Car procedure (which had been ongoing since the first lap of the Race), in order for the Pit Window to open without delay in accordance with the applicable provisions of art. 20.5.1 and art. 20.5.2 FGTWC SR.

46. With the rain increasing and further incidents on track, it soon appeared that ordering the end of the Safety Car regime for the purpose of enabling the opening of the Pit Window was problematic.

47. The Race Director thus decided, contrary to what is foreseen by the clear language of art. 20.5.2 FGTWC SR, not to delay the opening of the Pit Window, and this even if the Safety Car was deployed. This obviously occurred in breach of the clear wording of art. 20.5.2 FGTWC SR, which does not provide any exception to the rule (not even for safety reasons), the solutions in case of a safety issues being those outlined in other specific provisions of the FGTWC SR.

48. If safety, as stated by the Race Director during the hearing (see Annex 2), was his concern at that time, it is hard to understand why he did not suspend the race by using the red flag, as he should have done pursuant to what is provided by art 47.1 FGTWC SR.

49. The Race Director's decision is even less comprehensible given that the red flag procedure during the Pit Window is a procedure specifically presented and explained by the Race Director during his Team Managers and Drivers Briefings (see the relevant extracts of the Race Director Presentation presented at the first two Sprint competitions of the Series at Brands Hatch and Misano (Annex 16 & 17, pages 29 & 30 of 37).

By possibly instructing the competitors to follow the Safety Car into the pit lane in a red flag scenario during the Pit Window, the relevant procedure is meant to allow the safe execution of the mandatory change of driver and all four wheels in no rush and keep the cars in Parc Fermé conditions before resuming the race behind the Safety Car as prescribed by the regulations.

50. *By applying the red flag procedure during the Pit Window, safety would have been ensured without breaching the rules, much more effectively than it was the case at the Race, and the order of cars at the time in which the Pit Window should have been opened had the Safety Car not been on track, would have been correctly and fairly preserved.*

51. *With reference to art. 47.1 FGTWC SR, it must be noted that suspending the race is not just an option for the Race Director: at the minimum, it must be viewed as a strong recommendation as the text stipulates that if "because weather or other conditions make it dangerous to continue, the Race Director / Clerck of the Course will order red flags to be shown (...)."*

52. *Furthermore, it is a known problem of SRO that on many circuits visited by the Series, space in the pit lane is tight to accommodate a large number of competitors (32 cars allowed to participate in the Barcelona Competition). Therefore, safety in the pit lane is much more at risk when many cars rush into the pit lane at the same time to perform a pit stop and change wheels in race conditions (as quickly as possible). This situation is even more likely to happen if the cars would be entitled to perform the mandatory pit stop during the Pit Window also when the Safety Car is deployed as all cars are lined up behind the Safety Car and tightly grouped at the opening time of the Pit Window in a Sprint Competition. This is why art. 20.5.2 of the FGTWC SR expressly foresee that the Pit Window cannot be opened under a Safety Car regime.*

53. *In conclusion, by opening the Pit Window while and notwithstanding the fact that the Safety Car was on track, the Race Director acted clearly in violation of art 20.5.2 FGTWC SR. If safety was the (legitimate) concern of the Race Director, the FGTWC SR gave him other solutions (e.g. suspending the race in accordance with art. 47.1 FGTWC SR) that would not have resulted in a breach of the applicable rules".*

d) Decision of the National Court of Appeal (NCA)

6. *The NCA's jurisdiction*

The NCA is the appellant competent court according to the FANATEC GT World Challenge Europe Sporting Regulations, art 18. There is no dispute on this point.

7. *Admissibility of the appeal*

Before examining the merits of the case, the NCA must consider whether the appeal has been lodged within the time limit.

The NCA noted that:

W RACING TEAM lodged a claim against the classification of Race 1. On October 12, 2024, 15:28;

W RACING TEAM received Summons n°1 from the Stewards at 16:09;

Decision no. 30 was taken at 18:50 PM and received by competitor including Emil Frey Racing at 19:14 PM.

At 19:49, 12th of October 2024, the Stewards received from the Team WRT representative the Intention of appeal.

The intention of appeal was lodged within the hour.

The payment of 2,000 EUR was paid on October 14, 2024.

Consequently, according to the FANATEC GT World Challenge Europe Sporting Regulations, art. 18.1.c and according to FIA International Sporting Code (2024), article 15.4.2.a, the appeal the appeal is admissible.

9. *Emil Frey Racing Interested party*

Emil Frey Racing is present at the procedure as an interested party.

Emil Frey Racing can justify of a personal interest since it may obtain a higher ranking if the appeal is successful.

It is therefore eligible as an interested party and it can be heard in the present proceedings with the agreement of each present party.

10. *Facts*

The following description was in addition supported by a video reconstruction of the events provided by the Appellant (Annex 6 – Appellant) and the messages from the official channels of communication (Race Control monitors) (Annex 7- Appellant), the Race Control Team Messaging System (Annex 8 – Appellant), the Race Control Radio (Annex 9 – Appellant). Appellant also provided the replays from Race 1's live TV coverage in English (Annex 10 – Appellant) and in French (Annex 11 – Appellant) available on the Series' official website as well as on YouTube

(links: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ljKTWzo040I&t=3204s> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SyCjKzsyphc&t=3792s>).

Images are projected during the hearing.

The Race was scheduled to take place on Saturday October 12, 2024, from 14h00 to 15h00, with cars due to leave the grid at 13h55 for 2 formation laps prior to the rolling start.

The weather conditions being uncertain, with light drizzles at times, the track was declared wet by Race Control.

At the 5 minutes signal (13h50:00), all cars had their wheels on, the competitors having made their own decision about tyres' choice between dry-weather or wet-weather specifications.

At 13h51: 29, a Race Control message on the monitors confirmed "WE WILL HAVE TWO FORMATION LAPS".

At 13h51:57, a Race Control message reminded that "CLOCK STARTS AT THE END OF THE FIRST FORMATION LAP as per regulations.

At 13h55:02, a Race Control message "FORMATION LAP" appeared on the Race Control monitors as cars departed from the grid behind the leading car.

At 13h58:04, the Race Control message "GREEN FLAG" appeared on the Race Control monitors at the end of the first formation lap, as cars continued for another lap behind the leading car.

At the end of the second formation lap, the Race Director switched the starting lights from red to green and the competitors started racing.

A collision occurred immediately as all cars were accelerating on the main straight, with the consequence that car #66 made contact violently with the tyres barrier and concrete wall on the right-hand side, being severely damaged in the impact and bursting into flames before coming to rest on the outside of Turn 1. The rescue vehicles and marshals extinguished the fire.

A Safety Car procedure was immediately deployed by the Race Director.

Thus, competitors have been in racing conditions, free to race and to overtake each other (green track) for only a very short portion of this first lap (until Turn 4 of 14).

With work taking place on the track, the Safety Car procedure continued for several laps, while the weather conditions deteriorated, with other incidents' taking place.

Competitors who elected to keep their dry-weather tyres while the rain increased started to struggle to maintain the speed of the Safety Car, causing disruption and gaps in the line of cars behind the Safety Car. Some cars were falling back much more than the maximum of 5 cars' length apart which are required by the regulations (see art 46.7 FGTWC SR), and these cars thus unduly delayed other cars behind.

21 min 47 into the Race, as the conditions on track were still worsening, Race Control announced "SAFETY CAR IN AT THE END OF THIS LAP" by Race Control Radio and on the Race Control monitors (message at 14h19:51). This clearly indicated that the Race Director's intention was to clear the track from the Safety Car, in order for the Pit Window to open at the scheduled time (i.e. 25 min into the race, providing there is no Safety Car procedure).

This information was reversed shortly afterwards, with the announcement (by Race Control Radio first, then also on the Race Control monitors) that the Safety Car would stay on track for another lap.

By then, the situation became tense and very confused, with competitors asking questions that were not answered on the Race Control Team Messaging System, more rain and further incidents on the circuit.

Race Control announced "SAFETY CAR CONTINUE ON TRACK" by Race Control Radio and on the Race Control monitors (message at 14h22: 54, thus 24 min 50 sec into the race).

Adding to the quickly increasing chaos, **a very untimely message "pit window open" was broadcasted live on public TV¹** (which is obviously not an official communication channel for the competitors).

No similar message was announced at that same time by the Race Control on either the official Race Control Team Messaging System, by the Race Control Radio or on the Race Control monitors.

It took 2 min 45 seconds, after several cars had entered the pit lane to serve their mandatory pit stop, based only on the "unofficial" message shown on the TV screens (and not based on the official Race Control channels), that the Race Director issued a late message stating that **"WE CONFIRM PIT WINDOW IS OPEN"** posted on the Race Control monitors and announced by the Race Control Radio to the competitors.

With the message regarding the pit window opening having been announced and broadcasted on the TV screens only, car #9 entered into the pit lane. Just before entering into the pit lane, car #9 had dropped from P4 to P5 by aquaplaning off track, having already lost contact with the leading group formed by cars #10, #93 and #14 and also having very badly delayed those cars behind it as it was struggling to cope with the wet conditions on track (overtaking another car being forbidden under Safety Car procedure).

Further down the field, a similar situation occurred with car #111, blocking a very large group of cars which lost about one third of a lap or even more as they could not continue at the speed dictated by the Safety Car.

In those circumstances, with **the Safety Car having considerably reduced its speed**, car #9, with no traffic ahead and its mandatory pit stop completed, was free to go much faster than cars stuck behind the Safety Car or impeded by slow cars, found itself in P1 at the end of its out lap. Car #9 had gained almost a full lap compared to the cars that were coming into the pit lane on the following lap.

To the opposite, car #69, which was last to stop on the third and last lap of the Pit Window opening time, having waited for the late message from Race Control confirming that the Pit

¹ It's the NCA that emphasizes.

Window had been opened, despite the fact that the Safety Car was on track, and dropped unfairly down into the depth of the classification.

When considering all the questions sent by competitors on the official Race Control Team Messaging System, at 14h42 (thus approximately 44 min into the Race), one competitor (Barwell Motorsport) submitted a formal request regarding the fact that some cars had entered the pit lane before it was opened for the Pit Window. This request also was disregarded by Race Control and by the Stewards.

In the end, **the Safety Car cleared the track only for the final 5-6 minutes, and only three laps of racing without Safety Car concluded the race.**

11. *Merits of the decision of the National Court of Appeal (NCA)*

The applicable regulatory provisions are as follows.

Art. 20.5.1 Fanatec GT World Challenge Sporting Regulations (FGTWC SR):

“A mandatory pit stop is to be carried out during each of the races. The car must cross the pit entry line from 25:00:00 after the Official start of the race until 34: 59.99 after the Official start of the race. [...]”

Art. 20.5.2 FGTWC SR :

“If the Safety Car is on track or a Full Course Yellow period is in operation at the time when the pit window is scheduled to open (25:00 after the start of the race) the pit window will be delayed. The pit window will be opened immediately after the green flag is shown at the end of the SC or FCY period. At the end of a Safety Car period, all cars must take the green flag at the Line before pitting. The pits will remain open for 10 minutes after the green flag was shown for the mandatory stops. Any pit stops taken before the start of the new pit window, or before the car has taken the green flag on track, will not count as the mandatory pit stop”.

Art. 46.7. Safety Car Procedure – FGTWC SR :

“(in accordance with Appendix H of the ISC, Article 2.10, varied only in respect of the flag signals shown at the end of the intervention period which will be as detailed below.)

[...]

All the competing cars must then form up in line behind the Safety Car no more than five car lengths apart, and overtaking, with the following exceptions, is forbidden until the cars reach the Line after the Safety Car has returned to the pits.

[...]

Any car being driven unnecessarily slowly, erratically or in a manner deemed potentially dangerous to other drivers at any time whilst the Safety Car is deployed will be reported to the Stewards. This will apply whether any such car is being driven on the track, the pit entry, the pit lane or the pit exit.

[...]

While the Safety Car is in operation, competing cars may enter the pit lane except when it is closed during the Wave-By operation, but may only rejoin the track when the green light at the end of the pit lane is on. It will be on at all times except when the Safety Car and the line of cars following it are about to pass or are passing the pit exit”.

[...]

47.1. Suspending the race – FGTWC SR :

“Should it become necessary to suspend the race because the circuit is blocked by an accident or because weather or other conditions make it dangerous to continue, the Race Director / Clerk of the Course will order red flags to be shown at all marshal posts and the abort lights to be shown at the Line.”

[...]

Art. 2.1 FGTWC SR :

“All Manufacturers, drivers, Competitors and Officials participating in the Series undertake, on behalf of themselves, their employees and their agents, to observe all the provisions as supplemented or amended of the Code, the Technical Regulations (Article 257A of Appendix] to the Code), Bulletins and Clarifications from the SRO Sporting Board and SRO Technical Board issued during the season, and the present Sporting Regulations. Bulletins will be approved by the parent ASN, which is the RACB.”

Art. 3.1. FGTWC SR :

“It is the Competitor's obligation to ensure that all persons concerned by his entry observe all the requirements of the Code, the applicable Technical Regulations, the present Sporting Regulations, the Appendix 1 to each Competition as well as Bulletins and Clarifications from the SRO Sporting Board issued during the season.

According to the provisions of the FGTWC SR quoted above, a Sprint Competition is made up of two races of 60 minutes each, comprising a mandatory pit stop to change the driver and all four wheels during a 10-minute window in the middle of the race (the "Pit Window") (see art. 20.5.1 FGTWC SR).

The Pit Window provides crucial strategic opportunities for the competitors, who must decide

when it is best to enter the pit lane during the 10 minutes opening time (generally 3 or 5 possible laps, depending on the circuit's length and weather conditions). A quicker execution of the driver and wheels changes allows to gain positions in the pit lane (rather than by overtaking on track, which is more difficult and entails more risks), while time gained by faster in and out laps produces similar benefits.

Mainly for safety reasons and also to keep chances equal for all competitors, art. 20.5.2 FGTWC SR provides that the Pit Window shall not occur when the race is neutralized by a Safety Car procedure. Indeed, if it would be possible for the Pit Window to be opened while the Safety Car is on track, all cars lined up behind the Safety Car would rush into the pits at the same time and at the earliest possibility, which creates a dangerous situation with heavy traffic in a congested pit lane, hardly capable to accommodate all cars together on most circuits.”

Art.1.1.1 FIA International Sporting Code (FIA ISC):

“The FIA shall be the sole international sporting authority entitled to make and enforce regulations based on the fundamental principles of safety and sporting fairness [...]”.

Art. 1.3.1. FIA ISC

“Any person, or group of persons, organizing a Competition or taking part therein: a – Shall be deemed to be acquainted with the statutes and regulations of the FIA and the national regulations. [...]”

In light of those provisions and considering the above-described facts, the Court considers that a breach of the applicable regulations had occurred given the way the decision taken by the Race Director in breach of art. 20.5.2 FGTWC SR to declare the Pit Window open was communicated to the competitors. When the Safety Car is on track at the time when the pit window is scheduled to open the pit window will be delayed. The Pit Window cannot be opened under a Safety Car regime (art. 20.5.2 FGTWC SR).

Moreover, the Race Director should have applied the red flag procedure during the Pit Window to ensure safety (art. 47.1 FGTWC SR).

The NCA agrees with the appellant that articles 20.5.1 and 20.5.2 FGTW SR have not been correctly applied.

The NCA notes that the race was restarted (green flag) at 5 min 38' from the 60 minutes. The “winner” received the checkered flag 60 min 31' after the race start time. The actual race time was therefore just over 6 minutes (5 min 38' + 31' + the few seconds between the start of the race at the end of the second formation lap and the announcement of the safety car due to the accident at the first corner). The race lasted just 6 and a half minutes.

In these circumstances, the NCA considers that awarding points to some competitors would be unfair since the results of the race are not based on merit and fairness (art. 1.1.1. FIA ISC).

Consequently, the NCA cancels the classification of Race 1 of the Fanatec GT World Challenge Europe powered by AWS event at Barcelona on Saturday 12th of October 2024. No points are awarded to competitors.

12. Request for reprimand

The organizer was not a party to the appeal proceedings and is not in a position to exercise his rights of defense. This request is therefore rejected.

e) Costs of the Appeal

As the appeal is well-founded, the € 2,000 is reimbursed to the appellant. For these reasons, the Court decides :

- The appeal is admissible and founded;
- The classification of Race 1 of the Fanatec GT World Challenge Europe powered by AWS event at Barcelona on Saturday 12th of October 2024 is cancelled. No points are awarded to competitors. The classification will have to be adapted according to the present decision.
- The appellant's other claims are dismissed.
- The Appeal costs of € 2,000 will be refund to the Appellant.

The National Court of Appeal, Brussel, November 28th 2024.

M. Umberto STEFANI

M. Louis DERWA

Mr Hervé de Liedekerke