



Aeronautical & Astronomical Association of France
Executive Offices [address, phone, fax, email & website—see original French document]

TRANSLATOR’S NOTE

This English translation of the Progress Report of the Commission Sigma/3AF is far from a polished rendition of the original French text. Basically, the original work was put through the Google Translator, but then every paragraph was double checked for accuracy. My knowledge of French, while not perfect, is sufficient (I studied French Language and Civilization at the Sorbonne University in Paris in 1970). Given the importance of the contents of the Sigma Report itself, my goal was to insure that this basic English translation be at least accurate.

– Antonio Huneus

PROGRESS REPORT COMMISSION SIGMA/3AF Paris, May 31, 2010

Summary

- 1) Introduction
- 2) The current situation in France
- 3) The balance of Sigma for 2 years
- 4) The most significant French cases
- 5) Comments
- 6) Conclusions

.....

1) Introduction

France is the only country where the collection of Unidentified Aerospace Phenomena (French acronym PAN) and its scientific study have been assigned since 1977 to a civilian official organization, the CNES [National Center for Space Studies, the French space agency] through the GEPAN study group.

GEPAN's Information sources come mainly from cooperation protocols signed with the CNES, the National Gendarmerie, the General Directorate of Civil Aviation (DGAC), the Air Force and Météo France [weather service].

Since 2005, GEPAN has added to its traditional missions an information component, becoming GEIPAN, the Study and Information Group on Aerospace Unidentified Phenomena.

The 3 AF, as a learned society in the fields of aeronautics, space and defense, felt therefore particularly affected by these "strange" phenomena and understood that the certain "fuzziness" of the information could be answered more objectively.

Thus, under the leadership of Michel Scheller, it was decided to create an analytical group dedicated to this issue and to set up the commission 3AF/PAN [PAN is the French acronym for Unidentified Aerospace Phenomena], which recently became SIGMA/3AF.

For two years, the committee's work advanced significantly, while looking for the best way to interact with existing official agencies such as those mentioned above.

Its activity was reflected by the publication of articles in the 3 AF newsletter devoted to first-hand testimonies, analysis of official documents of all kinds, and a synthesis of various sources, including the Internet as well as lectures throughout France and radio programs.

Tonight, the Sigma Committee has the honor to present the first overview of its work.

2) The current situation in France

Several official bodies, groups of study and analysis, as well as various associations have been involved for years in France in one way or another with the study of Unidentified Aerospace Phenomena (PAN).

To date, Sigma has identified a dozen.

2-1 GEIPAN

Located in the CNES building in Toulouse, on which it depends, the Study and Information Group on



OpenMinds
production

Aerospace Unidentified Phenomena, previously called GEPAN and later SEPRA, is then the oldest civilian government agency dedicated to this research. For the record, let's recall that GEPAN was created in 1977, following a previously done study by former auditors of the IHEDN [French acronym for the Institute of High Studies of National Defense, an official think tank] to establish an agency to research these phenomena.

Since early 2009, Yvan Blanc leads this service.

Previously, he was in charge of various scientific and astronomical projects.

It's working team is small with a few persons but it has liaison with about sixty IPNs (French acronym for Top Level Contributors).

GEIPAN's task is to collect evidence, to archive all related documents, informing the public and addressing the areas of specific scientific research. The annual rate of Minutes of Proceedings [eyewitness testimonies] received is approximately 200.

2-2 COMETA (French acronym that can be literally translated as Committee for In-Depth Studies, COMité d'ETudes Approfondies)

Created in 1995 under the initiative of General D Letty (2 S), this association of former IHEDN auditors—about twenty-officially—became known by the release of its public report in late July 1999 with a total of 70,000 copies, under the title “UFOs, What should we prepare for?”

This report was submitted to the PR [President] and PM [Prime Minister] at the time.

From the moment of its release, this report was the subject of criticism from the military establishment including the 51st and 52nd session of the IH, for which it was nothing else than nonsense and smoking mirror rants, and it was also pinned down by the Parisian press...

Currently, this working group does not want to be noticed and refuses to be compared to traditional French UFO groups, preferring instead to work in completely low key.

However, it is curious and also very encouraging that COMETA is far better known and appreciated abroad, especially in the USA, than in France, as we were able to ascertain in Washington last year.

As they say, nobody is a prophet in his country....

We also know that some methods of approach taken by COMETA have been used by other countries.

2-3 The DGSE (General Directorate for External Security)

By definition, it seems inconceivable that such a service of around 5000 people does not have at least one unit



OpenMinds
production

dedicated to this research.

According to an “authorized” source, it [UFO monitoring unit] has existed since the early 60s, that is to say for 60 years anyway!.....

2-4 The DCRI (Central Directorate of Interior Intelligence)

Contact is expected during the second half of 2010 with this Directorate.

2-5 The DGA (General Directorate for Armaments)

If at present there is no clear certainty about the possible existence of a research entity devoted to PAN, this institution has all the ingredients both human and technical to undertake extensive research in this area, particularly in view of its exceptional fabric of scientific expertise available to it.

Its multidisciplinary high quality teams and advanced laboratories could be involved at any time.

If the DGA has had access to sensitive information or even to recovered physical elements, it is probably far ahead to Sigma concerning some aspects of the problem (Trans en Provence).

2-6 The SGDN (General Secretariat of National Defense)

An official document was apparently circulated here about 6 years ago prepared by top level officials concerning the study of PAN within the SGDN.

The entry clearance indicated on the document showed it was not only related to UFOs but also to UAOs (Unidentified Aquatic Objects) as stated in the letters.

Given the context of our research, this document seems to be especially instructive with regard to the Unidentified Aquatic Objects, for which we lack concrete evidence.

2-7 The DGGN (General Directorate of the National Gendarmerie)

This institution with over 100,000 people is the foundation for the collection of testimonies by witnesses of unusual observations.

The expertise and quality of the work of the National Gendarmerie can no longer be questioned when it comes to the collection of witness testimony.

Indeed, in the case of a Valensole of July 1 1965 – the landing of a craft – the ground survey and the final report, all of which were conducted by the National Gendarmerie, were even more outstanding if we consider they were undertaken 12 years before the procedures established by the GEPAN for recording protocols...

2-8 Air Force

With a force of 65,000 and acting as a sensor of aerial observations, the Air Force has systematic recourse to recorded radar tracks of observations in sensitive cases (November 5, 1990).

2-9 DRM (Directorate of Military Intelligence)

Located at Creil in the Oise, this agency of 1,500 people invited Mr. Boudier and Mr. Greslé on February 1 1995 for a conference with over 50 senior officers. A report was subsequently prepared by the DRM team. You can see here the cover of this report.

2-10 DGCA (General Directorate of Civil Aviation)

Contact underway will be developed during the second half of 2010

2-11 UFO groups

With a number of 45 over 90 metropolitan areas, these groups contribute enormously to the study of Parex (External Parameter) by collecting directly firsthand accounts.

2-12 CSD (The Scientific Defense Council)

Located within the Military Academy, this council is headed by the Ambassador of France, Francis Gutmann. This think tank could be ideally operational regarding the subject studied by Sigma.

2-13 SIGMA / 3 AF

The latest of the organizations related to PAN, this technical committee was officially established on May 15, 2008 under the leadership of the President of the 3AF, Michel Scheller.

Here is the description of the work done in the last 2 years.

But just before, this is the chart summarizing the formal organization of our Research Services, where all syntheses converge at 55 Rue du Faubourg St Honoré.



OpenMinds
production

3) The balance of Sigma after 2 years

Since its inception on May 15, 2008, here is the listing of the most significant actions undertaken by our technical committee

1) Organization of the evening of October 1, 2008 during which our Committee was presented at the Aero Club of France.

At the opening session, Jean Greslé presented our future work under the title, "Unexplained aerial intrusions in our terrestrial environment."

The text of his speech was published in the newsletter N° 3, March 2009.

2) On October 21, 2008, four members of the Committee went on the Mont Verdun air base (BA 942) to meet its boss, General Hervé Vourch of the National Air Operations Center (CNOA) in order to establish an initial dialogue with one of two suppliers – with the National Gendarmerie (GN) – of information and evidence relating to PAN.

Out of this working meeting, it became clear that the current surveillance radar in France is limited to an altitude of 30 km and for speeds below Mach 3.

It therefore exists an area between 30 and 300 km of altitude where no monitoring is performed.

At an altitude of 300 km, the GRAVES radar picks its surveillance up to over 1000 km.

3) Two members of the Committee 3AF/PAN, renamed Sigma, participated in the radio show "Here and Now," dated February 4, 2009.

This intervention was rebroadcast 12 times during the year 2009 and at least once in 2010.

In addition, a new program with one of its members—J. Greslé—was conducted early in March 2010 with the same success on the part of the listeners.

4) A trip to Washington from April 15 to 24, 2009 allowed to meet U.S. counterparts as well as the heads of lobbyists pressing for the recognition of the phenomenon and its disclosure by the Obama administration.

An official contact was also made with our Defense Attaché (DA) on site.

5) Contacts have been made in the meanwhile with the main institutions involved with the study of "external parameters" (Parex).

Besides the Air Force already mentioned, contact was also made with the CNES, the GEIPAN, the DGAC, the DGGN (General Directorate of the National Gendarmerie).

Contact with the National Weather service and the DGA (General Directorate for Armaments) are planned for the second half of 2010.

6) Very positive contacts have been established with representatives from countries of the Southern hemisphere. A formal request for cooperation was sent to the 3AF recently.

7) At the level of our team, two new highly qualified recruits have joined Sigma.

These are the exobiologist André Brack, CNRS (National Center for Scientific Research) Orleans and Richard Wolstynski, former CEMAA (Chief of Staff of the Air Force, 2002-2006).

An astrophysicist is expected to complete the composition of our “Team” in the second half of this year.

8) Following up on previous contacts with General S Abrial (CEMAA 2006-2009) and with JP Paloméros after 2009, an interview with members of the General Staff of the Air Force was conducted on May 18 at Balard.

The transcript of this interview will be published in the next newsletters of the 3AF. It must be noted that this is the first time that the Air Force General Staff in the domain of aeronautics and space has given a learned society the privilege of addressing so openly such a sensitive issue.

We take the opportunity to thank them here again warmly.

9) The presentation to members of the commission of a 22-page document entitled “External Parameters,” conducted by Jean Greslé, dealing with declassified U.S. reports on the period 1947-1967.

This very informative document include among others:

- Text of some laws (Janap146 / 200-2 AFR)
- Summaries of U.S. (report on guided missiles over Scandinavia)
- Reports relating to overflights of many sensitive facilities in the territory of the U.S. and worldwide.

10) In the course of 2 years, an intellectual output of over 120 pages of transcripts, records, reports, letters and pictures.

Further studies and high quality analysis have been made during these two years on which it’s not possible to expand given the sensitive nature of our work, which means we cannot communicate openly in some areas.

11) Presentation of the first progress report of the Committee Sigma this May 31, 2010.



4) The most significant French cases

1. Madagascar / 08/16/1954 / between 20 to 30,000 witnesses leaving work in Antananarivo (Tananarive in French) / In view of the craft, herds of buffaloes were fully affected and broke the fences / Considerable damage (witness Edmond Campagnac X38).

2. Valensole / 07/01/1965 / Investigated by the Gendarmerie
Among other essential findings / Ground traces on the soil caused by an anchor collision (witness M. Masse) / No doubt whatsoever about the material nature of the phenomenon.

3. Trans en Provence / 01/08/1981 / Investigated by GEPAN with the Technical Note
“Inquiry 81/01 / Analysis of a Trace.”

I quote: “It must at least be admitted that there is here a new confirmation of an event of great magnitude which occurred at this location,” on page 65 of this note.

4. Nancy / 10/28/1982 / Technical Note 17 86/06 entitled “amaranth”
70 pages describing the phenomenon / Measurements made
In fact, there is no doubt about the reality of the observation made by the witness.

5. The evening of November 5, 1990
On the diagonal Biarritz / Strasbourg / Numerous eyewitnesses (several hundreds in fact).
The concurrency and quality of the evidence is overwhelming.

5) Comments

The following elements don't add any new discovery that has occurred since October 1, 2008. We regret this a bit. For those who know the whole file we bring nothing new. For members of the Sigma Commission, the following notes represent a deepening of the data that we have.

The very successful meetings that our President has just mentioned have added significantly to our understanding, despite the discretion of our interlocutors. In fact, none of them have criticized us, none have proposed an alternative methodology, all have encouraged us to continue.

It is likely that within all the official agencies that we have contacted, those in charge have long since reached the same conclusions as us. We hope that many of them have gone well beyond to what we are telling you.

No natural phenomenon can account for the majority of observation reports accompanied by electromagnetic detections made by one or several radars. Both the defense services and air traffic control have been confronted a number of times around the world with unknown aerial intrusions or artificially induced phenomena.



OpenMinds
production

The documents discussed during our presentation of October 1, 2008, especially the summary of General Twining, dated 23-09-1947, to the commander of the Air Materiel Command, did not say anything else. Other elements confirmed by official documents, such as repeated overflights of the facilities of the Atomic Energy Commission from 1948 to 1952, the deprogramming of ICBMs in 1967, and more recently, the deliberate interference with airliners, as in Bariloche, Argentina, confirm our hypothesis.

The behavior of these devices during encounters with fighter jets or interceptors – some have participated in real swirling battles in the U.S. – suggests they are controlled, guided or led by particularly sophisticated automation.

9

The observations made since 1946 suggest that some craft use an unknown technology. However, we have not yet sufficiently analyzed the documents and available evidence. We are content for now to cite a few examples:

- Longitudinal accelerations exceeding 10 g were measured in Belgium by Air Force interceptors in 1989, 1990 and '91. We will resume an analysis of the data recorded available to us.

Remarkable accelerations of the craft right after a stationary mode were repeatedly noted by civilian witnesses. Unusual accelerations and decelerations, sudden stops as well as very tight turns were detected simultaneously by two radars and observed by competent witnesses over Washington DC on July 19, 26 and 29, 1952. Radar echoes of these objects were also detected briefly on the onboard radars by the crew of the F-93 interceptors chasing after them.

- An unknown form of support that does not involve the reaction of a mass projected down – as is the case for aircraft, helicopters and rockets – was noted on multiple occasions, especially in the case of Trans-en-Provence [January 1981] and Amaranth [October 1982]. It was shown by some of the devices involved in the flights over Scandinavia during the summer of 1946 * [* See Hillenkoetter document]. Many witnesses in France in 1954 observed in the sky stationary craft of great dimensions. It should be emphasized that no man-made aerial craft is capable of these kinds of performances.

- Flights at very low speed of very large craft, often triangular in shape, were observed at very low altitude by dozens of motorists in Belgium in 1989 and 1990.

On November 5, 1990, in France, between 6:15 p.m. and 7:45 p.m., many “apparatus” of various shapes were observed and even filmed on two main routes: from the tip of Finistère to Strasbourg, and the Basque Country to Nancy, passing through the Massif Central. The observations ranged from a triangle with lights at the bottom, to an elongated wingless fuselage over two hundred meters long [Gretz-Armainvilliers]. An unusual silence was noted during most of these events.

- A speed of 2300 km/h in horizontal flight was reported by radar in Finland in 1946. Speeds of about Mach 5 at relatively low altitude – 9 to 10000 meters – were measured by an airliner in 1966, southwest of Buenos Aires. In July 1994, air traffic radar on the Detroit vertical, measured the same speed at a



OpenMinds
production

slightly higher altitude. This last observation was confirmed by three airliner crews of Air France, Lufthansa and Olympic Airways.

10

Because of kinetic heating leading edges and a high-drag, these performances are virtually out of reach of current military aircraft... which was even more true in 1966.

- A particular form of stealth has been verified with regards to the simultaneous observation of a very large aerial disc by CDB Duboc and his crew, as well as by an air defense radar station. While the disc observed visually disappeared for the crew of Air France, it continued to be detected by the military radars. In other cases, the craft remained clearly visible to the observers but without appearing on the radar screens. It seems that this was the case for some of the observations made on November 5, 1990.

- The air superiority of the craft concerned, if they are indeed crafts, is such that none of the many interceptions which have been made against them, in the United States for example, have been able to overcome one of these devices. On the contrary, they allegedly caused the destruction of several U.S. aircraft launched in their pursuit in the late forties. They seem able to violate with impunity the airspaces of the best defended countries in the world.

The above features suggest that in many cases the devices detected, far from being unidentified, are easily recognizable by the aerial defense agencies as part of a technology far ahead of ours. [The jerky trajectories at right angles and the descents like dead leaves are known since the fifties. High speeds at relatively low elevations appear in several documents (La Paz for example.). They seem almost like signatures!]

We have been unable to get any serious indication as to the origin of the aerospace phenomena that is the subject of our research. The technological elements that we selected are confirmed by many military documents, rare summaries and texts of laws (like JANAP 146). They allow us to draw some assumptions about the aircraft in question, which do not seem to belong to an identifiable terrestrial technology at the times when they were observed.

Before reviewing the previously proposed hypotheses, we can reject all the theories showing a more or less complete ignorance of the materials contained in the files available in the public domain. In particular, those who ignore declassified military reports or knowingly conceal some of the evidence [for example, the Air Force report of Research Regarding the Roswell Incident, Col. Weaver, July 1994] have no reason to be included by our committee.

11

We feel that we must reject the thesis of a terrestrial origin for all the observations made



OpenMinds
production

since World War Two. Indeed, if a nation of the world had been able to secretly develop such an armada of exotic craft, like those observed for more than half a century, the means of analysis and strategic logistics available would have permitted their rapid identification. The illegal overflights which they have been guilty of conducting could constitute a casus belli.

Thus, the central hypothesis proposed by the COMETA report still cannot be rejected up to this day and remains perfectly credible. Many documents and materials examined by the authors of this report confirm it. We have therefore retained, among some others but only as a working hypothesis, the possibility that most of the craft observed could have a non-terrestrial origin.

The Sigma Commission has not so far examined the problem of communications, if that's what it is, between human beings and the hypothetical persons who control the aerial and space craft detected in the terrestrial environment.

However, repeated overflights from 1948 to 1949 of all the U.S. bases where atomic weapons were constructed and stored, could be considered a clear transactional message and an implied threat. The same can be said for the confirmed deprogramming of ICBMs at Malmstrom AFB in Montana on March 16, 1967, for example, while a luminous machine the size of a B-52 flew over the site at very low altitude.

It remains possible that certain groups of people, most of the intelligence services of the more developed countries in the world and some politicians, have information that we have not had access to during our research. This information could involve, among other things, physical elements – unknown materials, more or less complete wrecks, biological specimen, films and photos, direct contacts with those responsible in the reported incursions – which are equivalent to admissible evidence.

Everyone knows that the government of the United States is deemed to hold, since the summer of 1947, such elements. Over thirty affidavits – statements considered as legal evidence in Anglo-Saxon countries – maintain that the recovery of hardware was conducted in July [1947] in New Mexico by the U.S. armed forces. We have brought one copy. They are reproduced and translated in several books.

6) Conclusions

We asked what would be the possible consequences for the conceptions of humanity if the disclosure of a foreign presence to Earth were to be confirmed. This topic has not attracted our attention for a long time since we have neither the vocation nor the obligation to make public the results of our research.

In addition, our opinion on the whole subject that we are studying, if it became known, could not be considered an official statement.



OpenMinds
production

During our investigations we have met several people who reached, through the study of documents and books, the same conclusions than us. This fact has not at all surprised us. The amount of open information on the subject that interests us is such that anyone who is patient and can read English – or has the translation of the most important documents – should be able to draw a personal conclusions very similar to ours.

Therefore, we believe that making available to the public all the elements of this dossier – at least those that can be disclosed without jeopardizing the national defense – represents a preferable alternative to a premature announcement. It would allow those who wish it to reach a well-founded personal conclusion. Those who feel threatened by the very nature of this subject could continue to ignore it.

As you can see, if we have made real progress in the evaluation of the data that we have, we're still not able to be very assertive tonight. Whole sections of the problem remain in the shadows... which makes it even more exciting.

*

* *