

only 200 of them were taken. The reservation desk said that the airplane was fully booked, but when he got on it there were available seats, seats were available on many flights. He requested that this issue be taken care of.

**Ms. Suporn Pathumsuwanwadee**, a shareholder, asked the following:

1. While the shareholders did not receive dividends, what had the Board and the Executives cut-down on, and what benefits previously said to have been reduced, were.
2. Other companies generally broadcast meetings on screen for a good atmosphere. She deemed that such broadcasting did not seem to have caused any damage to the meeting. She suggested that sometimes when the director made clarifications, she did not know who was talking as half of the said person's face was behind the computer, and it took time to eventually know who was speaking.

**Mr. puwanat Na Songkla**, a representative of the Thai Investor Association, suggested that he was a representative of Thai Investor Association and had come here to observe the meeting. At the beginning, he sensed a strong feeling from the shareholders that the corruption investigation should be conducted for the benefit of the Company, which was of good intentions. Certain shareholders might have been too intense. The middle of the meeting went quite smooth although it took too much time than it should. However, from the shareholders' aspect, everyone should honor and respect the meeting. He thought that certain shareholders had lost control and behaved improperly. He admitted that such behavior created a bad atmosphere at the meeting. In accordance with international standards on measures against persons who showed improper behavior or attitude, the Chairman was entitled to instruct such persons to take a seat or stop talking, turn off the microphone of said person, or invite such person out of the meeting room. However, the threatening manner of the security guards who accompanied such person might have inflicted a bad image on Thai Airways. The Chairman could invite any person out, if it was the Chairman's wish, but not by accompanying such person out in such a manner. He, as the representative of Thai Investor Association, disagreed with certain attitudes or verbal statements because they indicated that some minority shareholders were not emotionally mature. Therefore, the Chairman should apply the measures of instructing said person to take a seat, turn off the microphone or inviting said person out of the meeting room .

**Mr. Chaikasem Nitisiri**, the Chairman, thanked the representative of Thai Investor Association and stated that he would consider his suggestions to ensure a smooth meeting.

**Mr. Monchai Rabruenthaveesuk**, a shareholder and proxy of shareholders who are his family members the Company's staff and many of the general public, suggested the following:

1. There should be audio broadcasting on hallways, in front of the rest rooms and cafeteria as no one could stay in this room all the time. He had to ask other shareholders about certain agenda and thereby distracted them from the meeting.
2. He proposed that ten domestic air tickets and one international air ticket should be used as prizes in a lucky draw for shareholders who attended the meeting and stayed until the end. If the winner was absent, then draw again. These tickets should not cost much although the Company suffered loss.

**Mr. Uthit Hemavattakij**, a shareholder, asked the following:

1. Almost every flight from Shanghai that he had taken had been delayed. The problem that followed was that the flight schedule was incorrect. Thereby an airplane was used for only 11 hours per day. He asked whether or not the Board had ever examined how other countries use their airplanes for the utmost benefit. Spare parts for airplanes have been changed according to their usable life but the Company's use of the airplane was less than half the time allotted per day. He asked whether this problem had ever been taken care of. The planes were still delayed in both Shanghai and Beijing.

(Translation)

2. In regard to the wine issue, he mentioned that he did not drink the wine but had heard the person sitting next to him on the airplane asking for it. However, the wine was not available on such airplane. Previously, he had heard discussions about corruption regarding the purchase of wine. He requested that an investigation be undertaken about the incident of having no wine to serve on TG634 and TG637 airplanes.

**ACM Narongsak Sangapong**, Acting President, explained that in terms of the reduction of benefits and expenses of executives, it was apparent that the transportation fee of the Company's executives had been cut. Every executive did not have an official vehicle or personal chauffeur but received an executive fee, which had been reduced by half. This was due to cooperation on the executives part to cut-down expenses. There would be neither salary raise nor bonus for either the executives or employees. As the Acting President, he did not receive any additional benefits. With respect to the ticket benefits of the Board of Directors, the entitlement to 15 free international flights and 15 domestic flights would be reduced in accordance with the agreement in Agenda 6. In addition, the Acting President appreciated the suggestion regarding broadcasting the meeting on screen. He stated that he would record and propose such a suggestion to the next shareholders meeting as well as consider the suggestion regarding the audio broadcasting. The surrounding structure should be taken into account for consideration of such a suggestion, but, in his opinion, it was a good advice.

**Mrs. Chamsri Sukchotrat**, a shareholder, asked how the selection of the President (DD) was progressing, when the new DD of Thai Airways would be appointed, and whether the news was true. She suggested that the Company should have selected the new DD by now because considering the situation of the Company, there should be an executive who would be directly responsible for it. She also asked when the new DD would be appointed and whether there would be any twist.

**ACM Narongsak Sangapong**, Acting President, explained that with respect to the selection of a new DD, the application period has been closed and there were 11 applicants. Currently, the committee has been examining the primary qualifications of all 11 applicants, and 4 of them had not replied as to whether they were qualified. The qualifications were, for example,

1. ranking in a position not below deputy head of the organization. If the applicant's position was lower than that, such applicant was not qualified; and
2. administering an organization that had turnover worth more than Baht ten thousand million, and there had been no confirmation that there was any organization with turnover exceeding Baht ten thousand million.

These were the qualifications that such 4 applicants have not confirmed, and we are waiting for their reply. If they fail to reply, they would be disqualified and there would be 7 applicants left. The nomination committee, appointed by the Board of Directors, would invite them to present their visions and consider the most appropriate person to be DD of Thai Airways based on how such person would lead this Company. The nomination committee would select the most appropriate person and a runner up, then propose such result to the meeting of the Board of Directors for approval. According to the original schedule, the Company planned that the new DD would be appointed today, which was the general shareholders' meeting day. However, since the Company has not received the confirmation on the qualification examination, the outcome therefore could not be decided today. Nonetheless, the nomination committee would work as quickly and efficiently as possible so as to select the new DD to work with the new Board of directors.

**Mr. Surasit Sriprapha**, a shareholder, requested that he would like to know the quickest deadline, as mentioned by the Acting President, and asked when it would be.

(Translation)

**ACM Narongsak Sangapong**, Acting President, answered that there were 4 applicants that had not returned answers to the primary qualification examination sent by the Company, and they were to return their reply within two weeks. Upon the expiration of two weeks, they would be considered, based on their replies, as to whether or not they were qualified. If they were not qualified, their vision would not be tested. Therefore, the outcome would be within two weeks.

**Ms. Piangpan Wangpattanakulchai**, a shareholder, stated as follows:

1. She agreed with the suggestion on broadcasting the meeting on screen as she sat at the back and could not see the person speaking, and she would like to know the members of the Board of Directors so that when she met them outside, she can greet them and give her suggestions.

2. With respect to the nomination of the members of the Board of Directors, she asked whether it was possible that a female nominee who, in her opinion, was proficient and capable would be selected. She also explained that as far as she had seen, a woman had never been selected as a member of the Board of Directors. Therefore, she would like to know whether it was possible that next time a woman would be chosen as a member of the Board of Directors.

**Mr. Chaikasem Nitisiri**, the Chairman, explained that it was not true that there had never be a female director, because as far as he knew there were female directors. At least there had been, as he recalled, Khun Pornthip Jala and Khun Ratchanee Treepipatkul. Therefore, there had been female directors. It was only the matter of who was selected.

**Mr. Uthit Hemavattakij**, a shareholder, asked whether or not there was a written record of what was said in the meeting apart from the recording, and if he would like the copy of the recording, who had the power to approve his request. He claimed that the Official Information Act prescribed that this must be in writing. He also stated that the Board should not say that the request must be in writing, as according to the Official Information Act, it could be made verbally. Then he asked that if he should make such a request, whom could he contact and obtain such a copy from.

**Mr. Chaikasem Nitisiri**, the Chairman, explained that in regard to the request for the copy of the recorded tape, he had to consider whether or not, and to what extent such a request could be made, and what were the rules in relation to this, since at least the meeting had been recorded, as the shareholder said.

**ACM Narongsak Sangapong**, the Acting President, stated that in regard to the Official Information Act, the version in the Company's possession was enacted in 1997. According to such Act and the Company's information center located in the Company's office, if a shareholder would like any information, normally such shareholder would have to submit the request to the information center, then the center would consider whether it was appropriate to disclose such information. If the information concerned any supervisor or was classified as confidential, the request would be proposed to a higher unit for further consideration. These were the procedures provided by the Official Information Act. Every person was entitled to information said person would like to obtain, but there were also categories of information as he previously stated.

**Mr. Chaikasem Nitisiri**, the Chairman, informed the meeting that there was no other business to consider at the 2009 Annual General Shareholders' Meeting. The Chairman thanked the shareholders for staying until the end of the meeting, and every relevant employee and officer. The Chairman then declared the meeting closed.

(Translation)

The meeting was adjourned at 22.01 hours.

(Mrs. Chutiporn Kamolbutra)  
Vice President of Compliance,  
Minutes Recorder

(Mr. Niruj Maneepun)  
Vice President, Legal Department  
Secretary of the Meeting

ACM

(Narongsak Sangapong)  
Executive Vice President,  
Corporate Secretariat Department  
Acting President

(Mr. Chaikasem Nitisiri)  
Deputy Chairman of the Board of Directors  
Chairman of the Meeting