

**PROPOSALS FOR 2020 MODIFICATIONS TO THE  
GENERAL REGULATIONS**

22 October 2019

Dear Member Federations,

Please find below a summary of the proposed changes to the FEI General Regulations together with the corresponding explanations, the comments received as well as the reasoning for accepting or not accepting the comments.

Modifications to the text are indicated in red print.

Kindly note that modifications of a purely editorial nature and corrections to spelling and/or article numbers are not included in the summary below.

The proposed change will be submitted for voting at the FEI General Assembly 2018.

Finally, please note that the proposed changes that have an impact on a Discipline Rule, such as the removal of the Appeal Committee, or the protective headgear requirements, will be adjusted in the relevant Discipline Rule after the FEI General Assembly, in the final version to be published on the FEI website.



Sincerely,

Mikael Rentsch

FEI Legal Director

**Section A: Proposals from FEI Board and FEI Headquarters (hereinafter "FEI")**
**Article No. 101 – General Regulations and Sports Rules**
**Explanation for Proposed Change**
**Proposal from FEI**

The FEI proposes to introduce a new rule in order to ensure equal treatment of Athletes across all disciplines at multi-disciplinary FEI Championships. In the past, some Organisers have provided accommodation free of charge for some Athletes from particular disciplines but not for others.

**Proposed Wording**

**100.1** The General Regulations (GRs) are established so that individual Athletes and teams of Athletes from different National Federations (NFs) may compete against each other under fair and equal conditions with the welfare of Horse as paramount. At multi-disciplinary FEI World and/or Continental Championships, the Organiser must provide similar benefits and conditions to all participating Horses and Athletes, for example in relation to transport, accommodation, meals etc.

**Comments received**

**GBR NF:** Agree. **Question:** How would this work when the Endurance is held away from the other disciplines?

**CAN NF:** Add reference to Regional Championship

**USA NF:** This proposal is not supported by the USEF as it could put off OCs hosting minor disciplines. For example the accommodation costs for Vaulting are significant. It is suggested that benefits should be part of the Bidding Process. In addition, if accepted, should the Article include Series Finals?

**FEI feedback**

Further to GBR NF comment, if Endurance is held away from the other Disciplines, then it is not considered a multi-Disciplinary Event.

Further to CAN NF comment, it is proposed not to add Regional Championships as such Events fall under responsibility of Regional Groups. Therefore it is for the Regional Groups to decide on the conditions.

Further to USA NF comments, the FEI proposed wording above states "**similar** benefits and conditions", not the **exact same** benefits and conditions. Therefore, there is some flexibility to the OCs to have different hotels depending of the Disciplines (such as Youth Hostels for Vaulting while Jumping riders would be accommodated to a different hotel. But if the OC pays for the accommodation for the Jumping riders, the OC also needs to pay for the accommodation for the Vaulters. In addition, the FEI suggests not to include Series Final in this Article.

**Proposed Final Wording**

Proposal stays as above.

## Article No. 103 – Official International Events (CIO)

### Explanation for Proposed Change

#### Proposal from FEI

Further to the conclusions of the Jumping Round Table (held on 4-5 June), it is proposed to confirm that only the FEI is permitted to allocate the “O” status to a CI. This does not mean that the role of NFs in deciding this is entirely removed. NFs will still be able to decide which OCs they will put forward to the FEI as a proposed CIO. It will then be for the FEI to decide whether to award the “O” status or not. As a CIO stands for Official International Event, it is logical that the FEI, as the international governing body, should be the entity to decide which events at which official team competitions amongst nations/countries are held.

### Proposed Wording

1. An Official International Event (CIO) is an Event to which NFs are invited to send selected representative individuals and teams, and must be organised under the FEI Statutes, GRs and Sport Rules.
2. Only the FEI may allocate “Official”, “O” and “CIO” status to an Event.
3. CIOs must include the official Competition for individuals and teams according to the Sport Rules of the relevant Discipline.
4. In Europe, each NF may only organise one CIO for Seniors in any Discipline in any calendar year, unless otherwise decided by the Board.
5. For other age groups and for Seniors outside Europe, the number of CIOs must be specifically approved by the Board on the recommendation of the relevant Technical Committee.
6. A NF shall not be allowed to host or to organise a CIO outside of its territory.
7. Only CIOs, Games and Championships may organise a Competition for teams representing nations/countries.

### Comments received

**FRA NF:** The proposed change to Article 103 is strongly opposed. The “O” events must remain the property of National Federations as it is now. This position apply for all disciplines, all age categories.

**ITA NF:** In our view the proposed wording for article 2 does not sufficiently reflect the given explanation about the role of the National Federation. As it stands we cannot support this proposal. The National Federation has the knowledge about its local organisers and is in the best position and should have the authority to decide which OC should be allocated the “O” status. As it has been in the past the “O” status is the responsibility of the NF. The ITA NF strongly opposes the proposal of taking away this existential responsibility of the NF’s.

Furthermore, in the explanation for the proposed change there is a reference to the conclusions of the Jumping Round Table of 4-5 June. There is no mentioning of this change being discussed in other disciplines.

The same does apply the proposed change to Article 108. The ITA NF strongly oppose both changes in articles 103 and 108.

**SUI NF:** As the new proposal is currently formulated we cannot support this proposal. Currently it is a responsibility of the NF’s to assign this status as they best know their

organizers and events which we think should remain like it is. Therefore we oppose this change.

As we heard a revision of the wording is already in discussion following a discussion with the German NF, we hope the new wording will reflect our concerns.

**GER NF:** We strongly oppose this proposal.

1. It is premature to put this proposal up for decision whilst it has only been discussed at a Jumping Round Table in June 2019. The proposal has to be discussed in all other disciplines as well. The National Federations will need time to ponder and debate on the reasons and consequences of this proposal.

2. The Memo does not give sufficient reasons for the change. The proposal of a change that forms such a grave curtailment of the rights of the National Federations needs to be accompanied by a valid and substantial justification.

The only reason the memo offers is that it would be "logical" for the FEI to decide on the allocation of the "O" to an event since it stands for "Official". However, CIOs are no more official than any other international event. All international events have to be approved by the FEI. All international events are governed by FEI rules. The decision- making in all international events is left to FEI Officials. The allocation of the term "Official" to an event only leads to the applicability of Art. 103 Gen Regs. There is no substantial reason that the decision to trigger the applicability of said rule needs to be moved to the FEI.

There is a vast number of official duties that the FEI leaves to the National Federations. This applies to the entire registration process of all equestrian Athletes and Horses (Art. 113 Gen Regs), the notification of Athletes and Owners on disciplinary actions and charges, the reverse transaction of prizes, the encashment of fees and fines etc. The mere fact that an action or event is official does therefore not cause an authority or responsibility by the FEI.

3. NFs have better competence to decide what events within their territory should be allocated the "O". The NFs have much more knowledge about the events (site, Organising Committees, infrastructure, difficulties with regard to media and politics.) Relative to the NFs the FEI is not a superior third party. The FEI essentially is the community of its member Federations. The FEI may decide in what countries a CIO is organised. It is then up to the NFs to decide which event will be selected to be the CIO.

The "O" status has for 100 years been an asset of NFs even before the FEI was founded. It is our responsibility and must remain ours.

The proposed changes to Art. 103 and 108 are a grave curtailment of the sovereign rights of the National Federations. It will have significant effects on all disciplines. In case this rule will be amended against our protest, the FEI needs to be aware that some National Federations have already awarded their Nations' Cup events to Organisers for a number of years in the future. These contracts must be respected as a matter of protection of vested rights.

**SWE NF:** We strongly oppose this proposal as the "O" status has been the asset of NF's since a very long time. The proposed change is a grave curtailment of the NFs rights and it will have significant effects in all disciplines. The FEI must respect the NFs knowledge concerning the respective OC's and its capacity to receive an "O" status or not.

**NED NF:** In our view the proposed wording for article 2 does not sufficiently reflect the given explanation about the role of the National Federation. As it stands we cannot support this proposal. The National Federation has the knowledge about its local organizers and is in the best position and should have the authority to decide which OC should be allocated

the “O” status. As it has been in the past the “O” status is the responsibility of the NF. The NED NF strongly oppose the proposal of taking away this existential responsibility of the NF’s.

Furthermore in the explanation for the proposed change there is a reference to the conclusions of the Jumping Round Table of 4-5 June. There is no mentioning of this change being discussed in other disciplines.

The same does apply the proposed change to Article 108. The NED NF strongly oppose both changes in articles 103 and 108.

**EEF:** The proposed change to Article 103 is strongly opposed. The “O” events must remain the property of National Federations.

### FEI feedback

Further to the comments above, it is proposed to slightly amend the wording as per the below.

In addition, the FEI agrees that a transition period shall apply for the CIOs that have already received such status by their NF for a number of years, such as Aachen. The respective OCs/NFs shall inform the FEI about such situation, including the length of the existing agreements and this shall be taken into account by the FEI when deciding whether or not to allocate the “O”/ “CIO” status.

Finally, it is suggested to have the implementation of such below provision as of 1 January 2022 for 5\* Jumping Events and as of 1 January 2021 for all the other categories/Discipline given the applications in the FEI Calendar that have already been made.

### Proposed Final Wording

#### 1.1. Article 103 - Official International Events (CIO)

1. An Official International Event (CIO) is an Event to which NFs are invited to send selected representative individuals and teams, and must be organised under the FEI Statutes, GRs and Sport Rules.
2. Effective as of 1 January 2022 for 5\* Jumping Events and as of 1 January 2021 for all other categories/Disciplines, only the FEI may allocate “Official”, “O” and “CIO” status to an Event, further to an application from the NF.
- ~~2.3.~~ CIOs must include the official Competition for individuals and teams according to the Sport Rules of the relevant Discipline.
- ~~3.4.~~ In Europe, each NF may only organise one CIO for Seniors in any Discipline in any calendar year, unless otherwise decided by the Board.
- ~~4.5.~~ For other age groups and for Seniors outside Europe, the number of CIOs must be specifically approved by the Board on the recommendation of the relevant Technical Committee.
- ~~5.6.~~ A NF shall not be allowed to host or to organise a CIO outside of its territory.
- ~~6.7.~~ Only CIOs, Games and Championships may organise a Competition for teams representing nations/countries.

### Article No. 108 – Titles of Competitions

#### Explanation for Proposed Change

### Proposal from FEI

The Jumping Round Table (held on 4-5 June) concluded that there was a lot of confusion within the equestrian community regarding the use of the term "Nations Cup" but confirmed that there was strong support for the Longines FEI Jumping Nations Cup series both among NFs, OCs and Athletes.

Therefore it is proposed to clarify the situation by confirming that the use of the term "Nation" or "Nations" in the title of a Competition may only be used with the approval of the FEI Board.

Furthermore, only specific competitions/Events that are a part of an FEI Nations Cup Series may be described as "Nations Cups". Other team competitions for Nations must be described as "Official Team Competition".

### Proposed Wording

1. At CIMs (see Appendix E), the title of Competitions may not include the name of any country or International region.  
At other CIs, the name of the respective nation or country may, with Approval of the relevant NF, be used for the title of one (1) Competition.  
At CIOs, the same provision applies to one (1) Competition in each Discipline.
2. The name "World" or names of continents, regions or other groups of nations or countries including the use of the word "Nation" or "Nations" as title of Competitions, Cups or any other classifications may only be used with Approval of the Board.
3. The use of other names given to an Event or to a number of linked Events (FEI-named Series and/or Series) as defined in Appendix A taking place under the jurisdiction of one (1) or more than one (1) NF requires the Approval of the Board.
4. Only specific Events and Competitions designated by the FEI and that are part of an FEI Nations Cup Series may be described and/or named "Nations Cups".
5. Events and Team Competitions for Nations held during CIOs that are not part of an FEI Nations Cup Series may not be described and/or carry the name, or a name similar to, "Nations Cup". They must be described and/or named "Official Team Competition".

### Comments received

**FRA NF:** We oppose to this proposal as we think that the term "Nations Cup" in itself does not cause confusion and the use of the title cannot be reserved for sole use of the FEI. The consequences of removing the title Nations Cup and exchanging it with the title Official Team Competition will have unwanted consequences with regards to the interest of athletes, spectators.

**ITA NF:** We oppose to this proposal as we think that the term "Nations Cup" in itself does not cause confusion and the use of the title cannot be reserved for sole use by the FEI. If anything, the use of the term has to be reserved to the National Federations who are members of the FEI. The consequences of removing the title Nations Cup and exchanging it with the title Official Team Competition will have unwanted consequences with regards to the interest of athletes, spectators, organizers and other stakeholders.

**GER NF:** We strongly oppose this proposal.

It is premature to put this proposal up for decision whilst it has only been discussed at a Jumping Round Table in June 2019. The proposal has to be discussed in all other disciplines as well. The National Federations will need time to ponder and debate on the reasons and consequences of this proposal.

The FEI has no right to claim the well-established title of "Nations' Cups" exclusively for the promotion of its series. Nations' Cups have a very long tradition. They date back to 1909,

20 years before the foundation of the FEI. Relative to the existence of Nations' Cups, the FEI Nations' Cup Series only has a very short history. The modus and the title of the series have repeatedly changed. The current version, the so-called "Longines FEI Jumping Nations' Cup", has only been introduced in 2018. If the FEI wishes to install a stronger differentiation between the competitions, it would have to be the Longines FEI Jumping Nations' Cup Series that needs to be awarded a new title.

The term "Nations' Cup" has become a trademark that is known to and appreciated by Athletes, OCs, sponsors, spectators and the media. The withdrawal of the title would have harsh consequences to all of the mentioned stakeholders. Spectators, media and sponsors will withdraw their attention, leaving a vacuum that causes a not compensable economic and reputational loss to organisers and competitors.

Regarding the explanation for the proposed change - there is support for the series, but there is no confusion about the use of the term "Nations' Cup". Round Table, FEI, NFs, we all want to support the Nations' Cup. The Nations' Cups are much more than just events in an FEI series. The Nations' Cup traditionally has been the most honourable competition to participate in for Athletes of all ages and disciplines. A pony rider is proud to be nominated for a Nations' Cup. "Official Team Competition" is a non-emotional and non-valuable term.

There are almost 100 Nations' Cups every year. Trying to protect the NC Series by taking the title "Nations' Cup" away weakens all those hundreds of events. Protecting the NC is more than just protecting a series. In addition, we do not see the huge benefit for the NC in a series if all the others could not be called Nations' Cup any more. This would not solve the challenges.

The proposed changes to Art. 103 and 108 are a grave curtailment of the sovereign rights of the National Federations. It will have significant effects on all disciplines. In case this rule will be amended against our protest, the FEI needs to be aware that some National Federations have already awarded their Nations' Cup events to Organisers for a number of years in the future. These contracts must be respected as a matter of protection of vested rights.

**SWE NF:** The SWE NF strongly oppose the proposal that the FEI Board has the only right to designate the word Nation as title of a competition and that only designated Events/series by the FEI may be named "Nations CUP" and that Events/Team competitions for Nations held during CIOs that are not part of a series cannot be described and/or named Nations Cup.

**NED NF:** We oppose to this proposal as we think that the term "Nations Cup" in itself does not cause confusion and the use of the title cannot be reserved for sole use by the FEI. If anything, the use of the term has to be reserved to the National Federations that are members of the FEI. The consequences of removing the title Nations Cup and exchanging it with the title Official Team Competition will have unwanted consequences with regards to the interest of athletes, spectators, organizers and other stakeholders.

**EEF:** The proposed changes to Article 108 are strongly opposed. The term "Nations Cup" has a long equestrian tradition and is of great importance for all disciplines and all age groups. A protection of this title for the sake of a very small number of shows that are part of an FEI series is unproportionate to the damage it will do to a big number of team competitions, especially for the Youth. If an FEI series shall be clearly differentiated from all other events then it is recommended to find a new title for the series, and not the other way around.

**USA NF:** The intent of this Article is understood and supported but it is suggested that the title "Nations Cup" should be allowed for Team Competitions Nations that are not part of a Series.

### FEI feedback

Further to the above comments, please see below a proposed revised wording that should address the concerns. And as mentioned above a transition period shall apply for the CIOs that have already agreements in place with their National Federations. Therefore the respective OCs/NFs shall inform the FEI about such situation, including the length of the existing agreements so that it can be acknowledged and recorded.

### Proposed Final Wording

#### 1.2. Article 108 - Titles of Competitions

1. At CIMs (see Appendix E), the title of Competitions may not include the name of any country or International region.  
At other CIs, the name of the respective nation or country may, with Approval of the relevant NF, be used for the title of one (1) Competition.  
At CIOs, the same provision applies to one (1) Competition in each Discipline.
2. The name "World" or names of continents, regions or other groups of nations or countries **including the use of the word, or any form of the word, "Nation"** as title of Competitions, Cups or any other classifications may only be used with Approval of the Board.
3. The use of other names given to an Event or to a number of linked Events (FEI-named Series and/or Series) as defined in Appendix A taking place under the jurisdiction of one (1) or more than one (1) NF requires the Approval of the Board.
4. **Only specific Events and Competitions designated by the FEI and that are part of an FEI Nations Cup Series may be described and/or named "Nations Cups".**
5. **Events and Team Competitions for Nations held during CIOs that are not part of an FEI Nations Cup Series not designated by the FEI as "Nations Cup" may not be described and/or carry the name, or a name similar to, "Nations Cup". They must be described and/or named "Official Team Competition".**

### Article No. 112 – Official Calendar

#### Explanation for Proposed Change

##### Proposal from FEI

As communicated in the NF Liaison Office News of 23 January 2019, the Belgian Competition Authority (BCA) issued a decision on 21 December 2018 confirming that the BCA had agreed to drop any charges against the FEI arising from the various complaints that had been lodged against the FEI in 2015 (kindly note that the complaint filed by Ms Lisa Nooren is a separate matter and is therefore outside the scope of this decision).

Therefore, the following changes to the process for reviewing Late Date Applications/modification requests are part of the commitments given by the FEI to the BCA



to adjust the FEI's Rules and Regulations (see also below FEI's commitments to amend the Unsanctioned Events Rules).

### Proposed Wording

112.7 For Late Date Application and/or modification for higher level Events as defined in the relevant Rules and received after the deadline, only a NF and/or OC of another higher level event that may be deemed to be affected by the acceptance of such Late Date Application and/or modification ~~shall~~ may be provided the opportunity to give ~~its opinion and if objecting to the late addition or change of dates must explain the reasons for the objection relevant information to the Secretary General~~. After an evaluation of the information received (if any) and the reasons for an objection Late Date Application or modification request (as the case may be), the Secretary General ~~shall have the right to~~ may accept or reject the ~~Late Date Application addition or~~ change ~~modification~~. Any such Decision by the Secretary General shall be duly motivated.

### Comments received

**IRL NF:** We note the proposed changes arising from the decision of the Belgian Competition Authority.

### Proposed Final Wording

Proposal stays as above.

## Article No. 113 – Registration and Eligibility of Athletes and Horses

### Explanation for Proposed Change

#### Proposal from FEI

Following the Belgian Competition Authority's decision of 21 December 2018, the FEI has committed to make the following changes to the FEI's Unsanctioned Events Rules.

### Proposed Wording

1. All Athletes and Horses must be registered with the FEI, and their own NF, or where appropriate with their host NF, before they can be entered and permitted to take part in an International Event, unless otherwise specified by the Sport Rules. (See also Article 119- Sport Nationality Status of Athletes and Chapter V Horses).
2. NFs are responsible for registering all Athletes and Horses and shall ensure that such Athletes have the appropriate corresponding sport nationality pursuant to Article 119. NFs are also responsible for unregistering any Athlete and/or Horse that are not competing anymore for any reason.
3. Any Athlete and/or any Horse not registered with the FEI and/or not fulfilling an eligibility requirement shall be automatically disqualified, unless compelling circumstances warrant otherwise.
4. An Athlete and/or Horse, even if registered with the FEI, is not eligible to participate in an International Event or National Event (and so may not be invited by an OC to such Event or entered by an NF in such Event) if that Athlete and/or Horse has participated, in the six (6) months prior to the first day of the International Event or National Event in question, in an Unsanctioned Event.

5. For purposes of Article 113.4, an 'Unsanctioned Event' is an event and/or a competition that is neither published in the official Calendar nor authorised by an NF and/or a National Event authorised or organised by a NF that is suspended by the FEI. Please also refer to the Appendix J for the rationale for the Unsanctioned Event Provisions.

~~6. An Athlete, Chef d'Equipe, Owner, or NF may challenge the application of Article 113.4, or seek a waiver thereof in exceptional circumstances, by application to the Secretary General. A denial of that application may be appealed to the FEI Tribunal, such appeal to be heard on the papers without a live hearing unless the FEI Tribunal orders otherwise.~~

6. The FEI may only apply Article 113.4, if the FEI has either (i) informed the Athletes and Owners, via the NF(s) with whom the Athlete/Horse is registered/administered by, of the competition(s) or event(s) that are considered as Unsanctioned Event(s) and/or (ii) published the list of such Unsanctioned Event(s) on FEI website so that Athletes, Chefs d'Equipe, Owners, or NFs are on notice, such notification/publication to occur no later than seven (7) days prior to the relevant competition(s) or event(s).

7. Where it is then alleged by the FEI that a person participated in an Unsanctioned Event, the FEI shall notify the relevant person(s) of the alleged participation in an Unsanctioned Event and shall give such person(s) an opportunity to be heard in either written or oral form.

8. Any Decision of the FEI Secretary General to apply Article 113.4 may be appealed to the FEI Tribunal in accordance with Article 162.5 of the FEI General Regulations and the Internal Regulations of the FEI Tribunal.

9. Instead of applying the sanctions provided for in Article 113.4 the FEI may issue

(i) a "no fault" finding where:

(a) the Athlete and/or Horse participated in an event that would clearly have been sanctioned by the FEI or the NF but for administrative error by the organiser of the Unsanctioned Event; or

(b) exceptional circumstances exist ; or

(ii) a "Warning" in circumstances where the Athlete or Owner was reasonably aware that the event was not sanctioned (and there is no suggestion of an administrative error by the organiser) but has demonstrated that the event otherwise adhered to the objectives of the FEI as stated in the Appendix J.

### Comments received

**ITA NF:** In article 6 it is stated that the FEI can either inform the Athletes about and/or publish a list of Unsanctioned Events. It is our view that the Athletes should always be informed, it cannot be expected of them to keep on checking if an event is published on the list. The either/or wording should be taken out of the proposed wording.

**IRL NF:** We note the proposed changes arising from the decision of the Belgian Competition Authority.

**GBR NF:** Mixed opinions.

- Experienced officials should be allowed to officiate at other events to improve horse welfare
- How are the FEI going to decide which events are unsanctioned?
- How will this affect the C100, Sport Endurance, etc?
- How will it affect equestrian sports affiliated to non-FEI bodies (ie racing, Le Trec)
- The wording needs clarifying

**GER NF:** Line 3, and/or (ii) published the list ...: Delete “or”. If this information is only given by publishing the list of Unsanctioned Events on the website, this would be asking too much from the Athletes.

Please specify what happens if NF/FEI only get to know about an event retrospectively.

**NED NF:** In article 6 it is stated that the FEI can either inform the Athletes about and/or publish a list of Unsanctioned Events. It is our view that the Athletes should always be informed, it cannot be expected of them to keep on checking if an event is published on the list. The either/or wording should be taken out of the proposed wording.

### FEI feedback

As to the question from GER NF, if the NF/FEI only get to know about an event retrospectively, there will be no consequences against the athletes and horses as the Unsanctioned Event must be identified prior to their participation to such event.

As to the other comments, it is suggested not to change the wording of the provision as the above wording has already been signed off by the BCA and the FEI has an obligation to have it approved at the upcoming FEI General Assembly, else the BCA may re-open proceedings against the FEI.

### Proposed Final Wording

Proposal stays as above.

## Article No. 156 – Status and Liability of Officials

### Explanation for Proposed Change

#### Proposal from FEI

Following the Belgian Competition Authority’s decision of 21 December 2018, the FEI has committed to make the following changes to the FEI’s Unsanctioned Events Rules. These changes correspond to the changes made in Article 113.

.....  
6. An Official is not eligible to participate in an International Event or National Event (and so may not be invited or nominated to participate in such event) if he has participated, in the six (6) months prior to the first day of the International Event or National Event in question, in an Unsanctioned Event.

7. For purposes of Article 155.7, an ‘Unsanctioned Event’ is an event and/or a competition that is neither published in the official Calendar nor authorised by an NF and/or a National Event authorised or organised by a NF that is suspended by the FEI. Please also refer to the Appendix J for the rationale for the Unsanctioned Event Provisions.

8. The FEI may only apply Article 155.7, if the FEI has either (i) informed the Officials and their respective NFs of the competition(s) or event(s) that are considered as Unsanctioned Event(s) and/or (ii) published on FEI website the list of such Unsanctioned Event(s) so that Officials and their respective NFs are on notice such notification/publication to occur no later than seven (7) days prior to the relevant competition(s) or event(s).

9. Where it is then alleged by the FEI that an Official has participated in an Unsanctioned Event the FEI shall notify the relevant Official of the alleged participation in an Unsanctioned Event and shall give such Official an opportunity to be heard in either written or oral form.

10. Any Decision of the FEI Secretary General to apply Article 155.7 may be appealed to the FEI Tribunal in accordance with Article 165.2 of the FEI General Regulations and the Internal Regulations of the FEI Tribunal.

11. Instead of applying the sanctions provided for in Article 155.7 the FEI may issue:

(i) a “no fault” finding where:

(a) the Official participated in an event that would clearly have been sanctioned by the FEI or the NF but for administrative error by the organiser of the Unsanctioned Event; or

(b) exceptional circumstances exist ; or

(ii) a “Warning” in circumstances where the Official was reasonably aware that the event was not sanctioned (and there is no suggestion of an administrative error by the organiser) but has demonstrated that the event otherwise adhered to the objectives of the FEI as stated in the Appendix J.

~~9. An Official or his National Federation may challenge the application of this Article 156.9, or seek a waiver thereof in exceptional circumstances, by application to the Secretary General. A denial of that application may be appealed to the FEI Tribunal, such appeal to be heard on the papers without a live hearing unless the FEI Tribunal orders otherwise.~~

#### **Comments received**

**GBR NF:** Mixed opinions.

- Experienced officials should be allowed to officiate at other events to improve horse welfare
- How are the FEI going to decide which events are unsanctioned?
- How will this affect the C100, Sport Endurance, etc?
- How will it affect equestrian sports affiliated to non-FEI bodies (ie racing, Le Trec)
- The wording needs clarifying

**GER NF:** Line 3, and/or (ii) published on FEI website the list ...: Delete “or”. If this information is only given by publishing the list of Unsanctioned Events on the website, this would be asking too much from the Officials.

Please specify what happens if NF/FEI only get to know about an event retrospectively.

#### **FEI feedback**

As per our comment under the article 113, it is suggested not to change the wording of this provision.

#### **Proposed Final Wording**

Proposal stays as above.

### **Article No. 140 – Protection of Athletes and Participating Support Personnel**

## Explanation for Proposed Change

### Proposal from FEI in consultation with the FEI Medical Committee

Under the current FEI General Regulations, the respective Sports Rules determine whether or not wearing Protective Headgear is mandatory in the Competition arena, warm up areas and to/from the stables.

It is proposed to make the wearing of Protective Headgear mandatory while riding at all times in the show grounds. This will not apply to the discipline of Vaulting as the Vaulters are not considered to be "riding" the horses.

The exception allowing the removal of Protective Headgear permitting Athletes to remove their Headgear during prize-giving, national anthem etc. has been maintained even though it is the wish of the FEI Medical Committee that this practice be discontinued.

This proposal had the unanimous support of the FEI Board.

## Proposed Wording

1. While riding and, for Driving Athletes and Grooms, while in or around a carriage when it is attached to Horses, anywhere on the show grounds the use of a properly fastened Protective Headgear ~~will~~ is be mandatory. The applicable Sports Rules may provide for an exception to this rule permitting Athletes to remove their Headgear while accepting prizes, during the playing of the National anthem and any other ceremonial protocol. ~~In the Competition arena venue and adjacent warm-up areas, as well as riding from one to the other and from the stables for the purposes of competing, the Protective Headgear requirements are governed by the applicable Sport Rules.~~ Failure to wear such Protective Headgear where and when required ~~(either as per the requirement(s) of these General Regulations or as per the requirement(s) of the relevant Sport Rules) after being notified to do so by an Official,~~ shall result in a Yellow Warning Card, being issued to the Athlete or Participating Support Personnel (as applicable) unless exceptional circumstances apply. The use of cameras on Athletes or Participating Support Personnel (as applicable) or equipment (such as on Protective Headgear, head covering or carriage) shall not be permitted, unless otherwise specifically agreed by the FEI. An Athlete's decision to wear a camera while competing shall always be voluntary and at their own risk.

## Comments received

**USA NF:** The US Driving community do not support the compulsory wearing of headgear for Dressage and Cones. Certainly the wording "when in or around the carriage" is ambiguous and would result in Grooms (who know the horses) having to wear protective headgear and the Officials checking horses and carriages (who do not know the horses) not having to wear headgear. Furthermore it would appear that the Driving Rules have not been updated to reflect the amended Gen Regulations (if passed) and thus allowing different headgear for Prize Giving.

### **BEL NF:**

The Belgian driving committee doesn't agree with the fact that for Driving athletes and grooms a protective headgear is mandatory at all times on the show grounds while in or around a carriage when it is attached to horses.

The Belgian NF is in favour of the fact that a protective headgear is only mandatory during the marathon.

### **GBR NF:**

The British Federation objects to the proposal to amend GR Art 140. If, however, the Regulation is to be amended it should only apply to those on a carriage. A rule which applies to those "in and around a carriage" is too vague to be meaningful and impossible to police.

**ITA NF:** The proposed wording leaves no room for athletes saluting or waiving their headgear after finishing their test or the wearing a top hat instead of a helmet during dressage tests. Therefore, we cannot support this proposal if there is no solution provided for these issues.

**GER NF:** Please specify whether this will result in an Athlete being sanctioned if he waves the helmet during the lap of honour or right after the jump-off. If a consequence will be that the top hat is going to be prohibited in Dressage and Driving, our NF is not in favour of that.

**NED NF:** The proposed wording leaves no room for athletes saluting or waiving their headgear after finishing their test or the wearing a top hat instead of a helmet during dressage tests. Therefore we cannot support this proposal if there is no solution provided for these issues.

We also wish to remain the allowance of the classical and charming dressage hats in dressage, dressage in eventing and driving

**USA NF:** Whilst not supported by the Driving community, the USEF does support this proposal less for the following: As written in regards to "around a carriage" the Rule would be impossible to enforce. What does "around a carriage" mean? This will also apply to Stewards and Vest but they are not covered so there will be the ludicrous situation where Grooms (who know the horses) have to wear helmets and Stewards / Vets checking horses & harness will not have to wear helmets.

Propose removing "around a carriage"

### FEI feedback

Given the above comments, it is suggested the following:

**For Driving:** To only make it mandatory for the Marathon and to remove the reference to "around the carriage".

**For Dressage:** To maintain the protective headgear requirement as per the proposal. It is to be noted that there are top hats in the market that are protective headgears.

**For all Disciplines:** The FEI is of the opinion that the mandatory protective requirement should also apply for the lap of honor as it is where the risks of a fall/injury exist. However, as the initial proposal above did allow for some flexibility if the relevant Sport Rules stated so, it is suggested to task the Technical Committees for 2020 onwards to review their specific requirements regarding protective headgear during laps of honor.

Finally, further to the proposed changes to the Jumping Rules in case of a fall, it is proposed to add a clarification in art. 140.2 as per the below.

### Proposed Final Wording

1. While riding anywhere on the show grounds and for Driving Athletes and Grooms in the Marathon phase, the use of a properly fastened Protective Headgear ~~will~~ is be mandatory. The applicable Sports Rules may provide for an exception to this rule permitting Athletes to remove their Headgear while accepting prizes, during the playing of the National anthem and any other ceremonial protocol. In the Competition arena venue and adjacent warm-up areas, as well as riding from one to the other and from the stables for the purposes of competing, the Protective

~~Headgear requirements are governed by the applicable Sport Rules.~~ Failure to wear such Protective Headgear where and when required ~~(either as per the requirement(s) of these General Regulations or as per the requirement(s) of the relevant Sport Rules) after being notified to do so by an Official,~~ shall result in a Yellow Warning Card, being issued to the Athlete or Participating Support Personnel (as applicable) unless exceptional circumstances apply. The use of cameras on Athletes or Participating Support Personnel (as applicable) or equipment (such as on Protective Headgear, head covering or carriage) shall not be permitted, unless otherwise specifically agreed by the FEI. An Athlete's decision to wear a camera while competing shall always be voluntary and at their own risk.

2. The Ground Jury after consultation with the responsible medical officer (or if not available, with a relevant medical doctor and/or the Event medical service) may at any time exclude from further participation in a Competition or an entire Event any Athlete or Participating Support Personnel who is unfit to continue by reason of a serious or potentially serious injury, impairment, or health condition.

#### Article No. 144 - Judges

#### Explanation for Proposed Change

The age limit requirements have been deleted from Article 144 to take account of the competency based evaluation system that will apply to FEI Officials as of 1 January 2020.

#### Proposed Wording

~~4.—Judges of all categories must retire at the end of the year in which they reach the age of 70. In special circumstances and by decision of the relevant Technical Committee, this age limit may be extended.~~

#### Comments received

**ITA NF:** We are, as always, slightly concerned regarding the removal of the age limit for judges. This will be happening from the start of 2020 but we have yet to see and understand exactly how the evaluation test will be carried out.

How will the transition period work?

The age limit provides a continuing and steady flow within the population and therefore creates possibilities for judges to progress to the next level. There is a risk that an entire generation of judges may be passed over as judges will stay on longer.

How will the rotation of judges work?

We would like to know how the FEI will proceed and ensure that this will not be the case.

**FRA NF:** Supported in general but requesting clarification with regards to the implementation of the new evaluation system and the rotation system.

However, this gives us some reason for concern. The age limit provides a continuing and steady flow within the judges population and therefore creates possibilities for judges to progress to the next level. There is a risk that an entire generation of judges may be passed over as judges will possibly stay on longer. We would like to know how the FEI provides for this not to happen and what type of tests will guarantee a fair and effective "maintenance agreement".

**GBR NF:** Agree in principle

- We can't afford to lose good officials because of their age
- Need to take care that this doesn't mean that officials can just be inept for longer

**SUI NF:** Further we have a general remark to all the age limit removals in the various discipline rules. We understand that this is necessary given the legal situation in certain countries but would strongly need to have a system in place to make sure young judges can progress to the next level and some sort of removal possibility based on competencies or similar for existing judges. We know this is in your plan, however we have not yet seen any tests or proposals. Such tests should be in place before you remove the age limit.

**NED NF:** In itself we support the removal of the age limit for judges as suggested. However, this gives us some reason for concern. The age limit provides a continuing and steady flow within the judges population and therefore creates possibilities for judges to progress to the next level. There is a risk that an entire generation of judges may be passed over as judges will possibly stay on longer. We would like to know how the FEI provides for this not to happen.

**EEF:** Supported in general but requesting clarification with regards to the implementation of the new evaluation system and the rotation system.

**Other item from EEF:** The FEI is asked to clarify and communicate the criteria and correct process according to which national judges of some NFs can automatically be promoted to FEI 1\* level. Who decides on those requests and how can a decision be appealed?

**USA NF:** Removing this Article is dependent on the new evaluation system being effective. Should a "back stop" be retained in case there are issues with the new system? It is difficult to support this without knowing how effective and practical the new system will be. This Article can be removed once an approved alternative system is up and running.

### FEI feedback

The FEI Education & Officials Department communicated on 11 October 2019 (see NF Liaison Update) about the agreed competency based evaluation.

**Below are the key facts:**

- All Officials will be subject to the FEI CES
- Three main advantages:
  - Provide an opportunity for inactive/retired Officials to re-enter the system.
  - Provide the same universal, fair and transparent evaluation process.
  - Provide a more time/cost effective process.
- FEI Competency-based Evaluation System (CES) to be introduced in progressive phases with the first phase (2020) based around the knowledge of FEI Rules and Regulations, either through an online assessment or through an in-person maintenance course with assessment. Additionally, each Official will have to personally certify that they are "Fit to officiate" according to the function requirements, and top officials will also be invited to undertake a separate English language proficiency assessment.
- FEI CES based on a 3-year cycle:
  - Year 1: online assessment on FEI Campus
  - Year 2: online assessment on FEI Campus
  - Year 3: in-person maintenance course with assessment

### Proposed Final Wording

Proposal stays as above.



## Chapter VIII – FEI Legal System and new Chapter IX – Miscellaneous Provisions

### Explanation for Proposed Change

As presented at the FEI Sports Forum 2019\*, a full review of the FEI Legal System (*Chapter VIII of the FEI General Regulations*) was carried out this year and this entire chapter has been revised.

The key changes are listed below and NFs are encouraged to consult the attached draft of the FEI General Regulations to see the proposed final version of Chapter VIII.

- Removal of Appeal Committee from all Events (if this proposal is approved at the FEI General Assembly, all Sports Rules will be updated accordingly)
- Possibility for FEI Officials to give a Yellow Warning Card to an Athlete arising from the Incorrect Behaviour of a member of his/her entourage
- New “Catalogue of Sanctions” dividing sanctions for various offences into 4 categories: “Low-end”, “Mid-Range”, “Top-End”, “Max”.
- Flexibility to allow the FEI/FEI Tribunal postpone the start date of a suspension to ensure it has a real effect
- New Administrative Disciplinary Process – allowing FEI HQ to impose sanctions for “minor offences”
- Alignment of deadline to appeal to FEI Tribunal with deadline to appeal to Court of Arbitration for Sport (21 days)
- New Chapter IX: “Miscellaneous Provisions” section with generally applicable provisions on: Governing Law, Personal Data, Matters Not Otherwise Provided For, Waiver of Claims, Communications (Notices), Severability, Amendments

In addition to the above changes, the chapter has been restructured and renumbered for ease of reference and to ensure a more logical sequence of the articles.

\*Please note that the proposal to allow non-official video recordings (e.g. mobile phone footage) was not supported by the FEI Board and has, therefore, not been incorporated in the revised rules.

### Proposed Wording

See Chapters VIII and IX of the attached draft of the FEI General Regulations 2020 for full wording.

### Comments received

**FRA NF:** Concerns are raised that the FEI is increasingly merging powers within its organization so that a separation of powers (legislature, executive, judiciary) is disappearing. This is not desirable in terms of good governance. Due to the extent of the proposed changes a briefing note is requested which explains the reasoning for the various changes. Due to the significance and number of changes, and due to the fact that a full revision shall only take place every four years, it is requested that corrections to this new Legal System can still be made next year in case of issues that may surface during the first year of the rules’ implementation.

**ITA NF:** We ask for decisions to be delivered in writing only (and not orally).

**IRL NF:** In respect of the revised Chapter VII the Legal System, the IRL NF support the revision in principle.

However, we note the view of the EEF that there are concerns that the “FEI is increasingly merging powers within its organization so that a separation of powers (legislature,

executive, judiciary) is disappearing". The IRL NF would share that tentative view. It is important that good governance is kept at the forefront of equestrian sport. Furthermore, it is imperative that a certain degree of independence between the parties exist whereby a system of checks and balances can operate.

The IRL NF appreciate the need for swift resolutions and the administrative procedures via FEI HQ has the opportunity to provide same. However, we would agree with the suggestion of the EEF:

"Due to the extent of the proposed changes a briefing note is requested which explains the reasoning for the various changes. Due to the significance and number of changes, and due to the fact that a full revision shall only take place every four years, it is requested that corrections to this new Legal System can still be made next year in case of issues that may surface during the first year of the rules' implementation".

**GBR NF:** Mixed opinions

- Some good changes proposed
- Less impressed with the refusal to accept non official video

**GER NF:**

**Art. 159/162.4:** Currently an appeal to the Appeal Committee has to be accompanied by a deposit of 150 CHF. The abolition of the Appeal Committee leads to a price increase of more than 230 percent for those appeals. Since both the content of cases and the effort and performance of the FEI (here the deciding body) will be unchanged, there is no compelling reason for this rise. We suggest a deposit of less than 500 CHF when filing an appeal to the FEI Tribunal.

**Art. 164.3:** How can behavioural deficits of a member of entourage be attributed to an athlete? Such attribution may work with regard to the principle of strict liability in ADRHA and EADCMR cases. This is, however, an exception. German law also allows for an attribution with regard to obligations to perform deriving from a contract, if a contracting party delegates this obligation to a third party. Behavioural duties are personal, they cannot be delegated. Therefore a person can only be held liable for his/her own behaviour. At least in Germany, there is no legal basis for this attribution.

**Art. 164.14:** The NF GER strongly supports the effort of the FEI in setting standards for sanctions in various case groups. It may, however, be worth considering a clause that allows the FEI to deviate from these standards in exceptional cases.

**Art. 171.1:** This clause could be void under German Law. The liability for certain damages (i. e. violation of cardinal duties) cannot be excluded. This may be different under Swiss law. But we cannot warrant that this clause will not be annulled with regard to cases in Germany.

**Art. 172:** This clause could be void under German Law. If a clause is invalid, the whole clause is invalid. It cannot be replaced by the valid regulation that comes closest. Instead, it will be the statutory rules that apply.

**SWE NF:**

**Article 161 - Protests**

**Art. 161.13**

The Ground Jury may request the advice and assistance of a representative of the FEI in order to ensure the correct Protest procedures are complied with.

**Comment:** Please refer to what a correct Protest procedures complies with, either with a definition or to Art. 161.11 and/or Art. 161.12.

**Art. 161.18**

Decisions must be orally delivered or notified in writing to the parties concerned.

**Comment:** Decisions must be delivered in writing to the parties concerned. In case of an appeal to the FEI Tribunal all decisions must be in writing therefor delete orally!

## **Article 164 - Sanctions**

### **Art. 164.7 (b)**

If so specified in the relevant Notification/Decision, the person may be barred temporarily or for a specific period of time from participating in or attending, in any capacity, including as a spectator, any Competition or Event that is authorised or organised by the FEI or any National Federation.

**Comment:** It's more or less impossible for an OC to follow up when a barred/suspended person is attending a large Event as spectator. We must be able to follow a sanction. Therefor please delete the phrase "including as a spectator".

**EEF:** Concerns are raised that the FEI is increasingly merging powers within its organization so that a separation of powers (legislature, executive, judiciary) is disappearing. This is not desirable in terms of good governance.

Due to the extent of the proposed changes a briefing note is requested which explains the reasoning for the various changes. Due to the significance and number of changes, and due to the fact that a full revision shall only take place every four years, it is requested that corrections to this new Legal System can still be made next year in case of issues that may surface during the first year of the rules' implementation.

Article 161.18: We ask for decisions to be delivered in writing (and not orally).

### **USA NF:**

**Article 161.15. Use of Video Evidence.** Does this need to align with Eventing where they have video taken by Fence Judges on the landing side of narrow obstacles in order to help decide penalties?

**Articles 162.5 / 162.7.** There is a lack of consistency as to how deadlines are decided (date decision sent V date received by NF)

**Articles 163.4.** There are two paragraphs numbered **163.4**

**Article 164.14** sets out the sanctions for offenses listed in Article 164.12. This includes safeguarding violations. The chart is not clear that a Life penalty may be imposed for a safeguarding violation. My suggestion is that you include it in the chart so that it's clear such a sanction may be imposed depending on the severity of the situation.

**Article 171:** Would you include the NF's so that we too are protected under that provision?

**STEWARDSHIP MANUAL.** The USEF is very supportive of having draws for familiarization training times and horse inspection draws; however, we find it odd to have this placed in the Stewarding manual and not in the General Regulations.

### **FEI feedback**

### General Feedback

Further to the request from several NFs and the EEF for additional information on the new Administrative Disciplinary Procedure, please see attached (in Annex I) the Briefing Note that explains the new system in an easy to read Q&A format.

### Feedback on ITA NF's, SWE NF and EEF comment

Article 161.18 has been updated to state that "**Where possible, Decisions must be notified in writing to the parties concerned**". Due to time constraints (e.g. the need to issue a decision urgently before the next competition is due to start, it may not be possible to provide a written decision).

### Feedback on GER NF's comments

It is not proposed to change the cost of filing an appeal to the FEI Tribunal. In practice, there were very few appeals to the Appeal Committee so the fact that the appeal will be to the FEI Tribunal instead will not have a huge financial impact. Also, the work involved in a FEI Tribunal appeal is significantly more than an Appeal Committee appeal and the deposit needs to reflect that.

164.14 The FEI does not propose to allow for deviations from the recommended sanctions in exceptional cases. The guidelines already provide for a wide range of sanctions and exceptional circumstances can already be considered as part of that system.

164.3, 171.1, 172 – We note the comments regarding how these clauses would be interpreted under German law by a Swiss law governed body (either the FEI HQ/FEI Tribunal), Swiss law will be the relevant law to consider here.

### Feedback on SWE NF's comments

161.13 - See clarification added here. There are various protest procedures to take note of in 161 so rather than specifying 161.11/161.12, we propose to keep the wording generic.

164 – It is very important that certain suspended persons are also suspended from attending events as spectators. In some disciplines, spectators have direct access to the participating Athletes and Horses. Also, for persons serving suspensions for safeguarding offences, we do not want them at FEI Events (or national events) in any capacity. We do not put the responsibility on the OC to proactively check that suspended people do not attend their events. If the FEI becomes aware that a person whose suspension extends to being a spectator is attending an event, we will liaise with the OC/officials on site to deal with it.

### Feedback on USA NF's comments

Article 161.15 – See clarification added to 161.15

Articles 162.5 and 162.7 – now aligned, deadline determined by date the notification is sent.

Article 163.4 – Numbering corrected

164.14 – The table of sanctions (Article 164.14) has been updated to make specific references to the sanctions that may be imposed for a breach of (i) the FEI Code on the Manipulation of Competitions and (ii) FEI Safeguarding Policy against Harassment and Abuse. It is important that the table clarifies that a maximum.

Article 171.1 – Updated to include National Federations.

### Proposed Final Wording

Only those articles to which further changes have been made are set out below. Please consult the General Regulations themselves to review the Legal System Chapter in full.

161.13 The Ground Jury may request the advice and assistance of a representative of the FEI in order to ensure the correct Protest procedures, as set out in this Article 163, are complied with.

161.15 The use of all technical assistance available including, but not limited to, official video-recordings (an official video recording is considered to be a recording made by a broadcast network or a video company hired by the OC, except where specified otherwise in the relevant Sports Rules) is permitted to assist Officials in carrying out their responsibilities under FEI rules.

161.18 Where possible, Decisions must be ~~orally delivered or~~ notified in writing to the parties concerned.

162.7 Appeals to the CAS together with supporting documents must be dispatched to the CAS Secretariat pursuant to the Procedural Rules of the CAS Code of Sports-related Arbitration so as to reach the CAS within twenty-one (21) days of the date on which the notification of the FEI Tribunal Decision was ~~received by~~ sent to the National Federation of the Person Responsible.

164.14 The following table sets out the sanctions that will apply for ~~the certain~~ offences listed in Article 164.12 above. Where an offence is not listed in the table below, general sanctioning power will apply and sanctions may be imposed in accordance with this Article 164.

Offence	Low-End	Mid-Range	Top-End	Max
Incorrect Behaviour	2 months	Up to 6 months	Up to 1 year	2 years
	Up to CHF1,500	CHF1,500 – 3,000	CHF3,000 – 7,000	CHF10,000
Abuse of Horse	3 months	3 months – 2 years	2 – 5 years	Life
	CHF 1000 – 1,500	CHF2,000 – 3,000	CHF5,000 – 10,000	CHF15,000
Criminal Acts, Fraud, Violence	1 month	3 months – 2 years	2 – 5 years	Life
	CHF 1000 – 1,500	CHF2,000 – 3,000	CHF5,000 – 7,500	CHF10,000
Failure to cooperate with an investigation	1 month	Up to 6 months	Up to 9 months	1 year
	Up to CHF1,500	CHF1,500 – 3,000	CHF3,000 – 7,000	CHF10,000
Bringing the FEI and/or equestrian sport into disrepute	1 month	Up to 6 months	Up to 9 months	1 year
	Up to CHF1,500	CHF1,500 – 3,000	CHF3,000 – 7,000	CHF10,000

<u>Breach of the FEI Code on the Manipulation of Competitions</u>	<u>Warning</u>	<u>3 months - 2 years</u>	<u>Up to 5 years</u>	<u>Life</u>
	<u>CHF 1000 – 1,500</u>	<u>CHF2,000 – 3,000</u>	<u>CHF5,000 – 10,000</u>	<u>CHF15,000</u>
<u>Breach of the FEI Safeguarding Policy against Harassment and Abuse</u>	<u>Warning</u>	<u>3 months - 2 years</u>	<u>2 years to 10 years</u>	<u>Life</u>
	<u>CHF 1000 – 1,500</u>	<u>CHF2,000 – 3,000</u>	<u>CHF5,000 – 10,000</u>	<u>CHF15,000</u>

171.1 Subject to Article 171.2, by registering with the FEI, submitting an entry and/or participating in any FEI Event, each person agrees to waive all claims of any kind, nature and description, for themselves and for their executors, administrators, heirs and personal representatives, including past, present and future claims, against each of the FEI (and its designees), any National Federations, OCs, FEI or FEI Event sponsors and any other FEI or FEI Event commercial partners, for any injuries, losses or damages sustained in travelling to and/or from any FEI Event venue and/or while participating in any FEI Event.

## Appendix G – FEI Code on the Prevention of the Manipulation of Competitions

### Explanation for Proposed Change

According to advice received, the FEI would have a duty under Swiss law to report any potentially criminal activity in relation to the manipulation of competitions to the relevant legal authorities.

- 1.2.2. It shall be the personal responsibility of every Participant to make himself or herself aware of this Code including, without limitation, what conduct constitutes a violation of this Code and to comply with those requirements. Participants should also be aware that conduct prohibited under this Code may also constitute a criminal offence and/or a breach of other applicable laws and regulations including other regulations of FEI or any other Sports Organisations. Participants must comply with all applicable laws and regulations at all times. The FEI will report any behaviour, which in the reasonable opinion of the FEI, amounts to potentially criminal behaviour to the appropriate legal authorities.

### Comments received

**GBR NF:** Agree.

- The wording of this rule need clarifying
- How are non Swiss nationals meant to know what is a breach of Swiss law

### FEI feedback

It's not clear what needs to be clarified and Swiss law applies to the whole FEI Regulatory system already.

### Proposed Final Wording

Proposal stays as above.

## Section B: Proposal from NFs

### Article No.: Appendix A – Definitions (“Children”)

#### Explanation for Proposed Change

#### PROPOSAL RECEIVED FROM USEF:

##### Explanation from USEF

- The USEF believes, especially in Jumping, that it would greatly benefit the development of young athletes if they could have the option to remain in Children for one more year (i.e. until they are 15). This would still give them 3 years until the finish in Juniors which is consistent with the three years they can have in Young Riders once they finish in Juniors.
- In the US, we want to do all we can to encourage young athletes to participate in FEI level Jumping events and we believe it would be very beneficial for development if athletes at the age of 15 could still compete at 1.20M. We do not believe this will impact on Junior competitions and will in fact provide a more effective pathway for young athletes.
- We acknowledge that this change will have to be made across all disciplines and cannot see that it will disadvantage other disciplines as no change is being proposed to the minimum age for Juniors.
- In summary we believe this change will bring the transition between Children and Juniors in line with the transition between Juniors and Young Riders. More importantly it will give coaches and parents more flexibility as they map out the progression of young athletes ensuring they are not pushed to move up the levels but progress as their development allows whilst also still enjoying equestrian sport.

#### FEI FEEDBACK

This proposal did receive the support of some (but not all Technical Committees). However, it did not receive the support of the FEI Board who did not want an overlap between the Children's category and the Junior Category and were not in favour of allowing “children” compete.

#### Proposed Wording

No change to current wording.

#### Comments received

**USA NF:** The FEI's explanation for not changing the age group for Children lacks logic or explanation. There is overlap between Juniors and Young Riders and where are the FEI not in favour of competing?

#### FEI feedback

The matter was discussed with the Jumping Committee in particular and the Board and it is proposed to keep the FEI's initial position.

#### Proposed Final Wording

Proposal stays as above.

### Article No.: Appendix A – Definitions ("Horse")

#### Explanation for Proposed Change

##### **PROPOSAL RECEIVED FROM ITA NF:**

To amend the definition of "Horse" to clarify that Mules are not considered as Horses and therefore cannot compete in FEI Competitions.

This current definition of "Horse" leave the opportunity to compete to the mule also. It seems useful that the General Assembly be aware on this possibility to allow to compete horses and mules together mixing two different genetic animal (horse and mule that is a hybrid from horse mare and donkey stallion).

This situation (compare two different animals from within different genetic characteristics) seems to be incorrect for both, horses and mules, considering their physiological, biomechanical and ethological characteristics and may affect the historical perception of Equestrian sport.

##### **FEI FEEDBACK**

Supported by FEI Veterinary Department and FEI Board.

#### Proposed Wording

**Horse:** Refers also to a Pony or other member of the genus Equus unless the context requires otherwise. A Horse shall be born from the union of a mare and a horse stallion and classified as Equus caballus.

#### Comments received

**Mary Binks, FEI Group IX Chair:** It would be clearer if worded slightly differently: "Horse: Refers also to a Pony or other member of the genus Equus, classified as Equus Caballus, unless the context requires otherwise. A Horse shall be born from the union of a horse mare and a horse stallion.

**GBR NF:** Disagree.

- This is equine racism



- If mules cannot compete against horses then they should be given their own section
- If a mule has qualified, why should they not compete?

**ITA NF:** In our opinion, our statement doesn't automatically exclude mules from the FEI competitions; we just wish to underline the gap within the rules and as a consequence, generate deeper reflection and discussion among the NFs and FEI Groups at the next FEI G, as to whether this specific cross-bred (or any other cross-breeds among equines) should be expressively and deliberately permitted to participate in FEI events, through specific and clear provisions/ articles aimed at regulating the competitions reserved for them, by defining cross-breeds accurately. All of the above because the actual definition of the "horse" needs, according to us, to be more precisely defined.

### FEI feedback

Given the above comments, the proposed modification is withdrawn and we suggest to revert to the initial wording.

### Proposed Final Wording

**Horse:** Refers also to a Pony or other member of the genus Equus unless the context requires otherwise. A Horse shall be born from a mare.

### Article No. N/A – No specific article referenced

#### Explanation for Proposed Change

#### **PROPOSAL RECEIVED FROM USEF :**

To introduce a rule for Games and Championships familiarisation training times and the order of the first Horse Inspection will be decided by a random draw.

#### **Explanation from USEF**

There is, currently, no definitive "Rule" that defines how Training Times are allocated at Games and Championships. The allocation of training times is therefore at the purview of the Chief Steward. Whilst there is no suggestion that Chief Stewards do anything but an excellent job, when there are weather and/or "time of day" factors (early start or late finish) there should be openness and transparency as to how key Training Times (for example Main Arena) are allocated: Also allocation should not be on predetermined factors that can never change (e.g. alphabetical order). The same applies to Horse Inspections where if it is an early inspection, going late could be an advantage and if it is a late Inspection, going early could be an advantage (it is acknowledged that many Horse Inspections do run off a draw).

An example of this was Tryon WEG 2018 with the Dressage. Both SWE and the USA were disadvantaged with Main Arena training because all the timing allocations were done by Nation alphabetical order; this meant that USA and SWE were late on in the training window and on consecutive days the weather impacted on the training.

In Tokyo, the weather will be of great influence and there will be training sessions when the order of training will have advantages or disadvantages.

Whilst there may be a feeling amongst some that this is unnecessary it was a very real challenge in Tryon and perception is as important as actual. In Tokyo there is no doubt

that some training times and the Horse inspection order will be more beneficial in terms of preparing for competition and also in terms of finishing riding earlier so as to avoid the sleep deprivation that will be a factor in Tokyo. Introducing a Draw protects the Chief Steward and eliminates any complaints.

It is acknowledged that some disciplines already have a draw for the Horse Inspection. There does not have to be a “random draw” for each day of training. A draw for the order could be done at the start of the training period and then each day the starting point on that “order of go” is drawn.

### **FEI FEEDBACK**

Supported by FEI Steward General and the FEI Jumping Committee but only for Games and Championships. The FEI Board was in favour of including this concept in the Stewarding manuals rather than in the FEI General Regulations.

### **Proposed Wording**

Not for FEI General Regulations but for Stewarding Manuals instead.

*“At all Games and Championships Field of Play familiarisation Training Times and the First Horse Inspection order will be decided by a random draw. The Second Horse Inspection will be decided either by a draw, which could be the same as the first Horse Inspection, or by the current standings of the Individuals or Teams.”*

## **Article No. 100.3 – General Regulations and Sports Rules**

### **Explanation for Proposed Change**

#### **PROPOSAL RECEIVED FROM ITA NF**

We feel that it is important for NFs to have the opportunity to offer proposals also for series such as the FEI Nations Cup. The Nations Cups are a qualification for the Olympic Games and there should be the opportunity for NFs to review the draft documents and offer proposals in a clear and transparent manner.

This already happens for the Olympic and Paralympic Rules.

We feel that the wording in point 4 is outdated and needs to be updated to represent the current situation.

Suggested wording:

Sport Rules, including Series, Olympic Regulations for Equestrian Events at Olympic Games and Paralympic Regulations for Equestrian Events at Paralympic Games are published under the authority of the General Assembly.

*In alternative:*

Sport Rules are published under the authority of the General Assembly whereas Sport Rules for Series, Olympic Regulations for Equestrian Events at Olympic Games, and Paralympic Regulations for Equestrian Events at Paralympic Games are published under the authority of the Bureau following a period for review and evaluation by National Federations to be included in the FEI Rules Revision Policy.

**FEI FEEDBACK**

This proposal was not supported by either the FEI Headquarters, the Technical Committees or the FEI Board.

**Proposed Wording**

No change to original wording

**Comments received**

**FRA NF:** We agree with the proposal made by the Italian Federation and therefore would like to know the motivation for declining this proposal as there is no explanation provided in the document. As the Nations Cup series and the World Cups series are the most prestigious in our sport it is just logical and transparent, also from a governance point of view, that the NF's are being consulted for rules changes in both series.

Confirmation is requested from the FEI that NFs are entitled to submit input on proposed rule changes that are subject to the approval of the FEI Board (and not the FEI GA). In case the proposed changes/comments are rejected by the respective Discipline Committee the respective NF shall be provided with a reasoning for the rejection.

**ITA NF:** Regarding our proposal we would like to know the motivation for declining it as there is no explanation provided in the document.

We have understood from members of the Sports Departments that they would welcome this chance to have feedback and input from the NFs.

Following the rule revision policy would offer a clear and transparent process of doing this.

As the Nations Cup series and the World Cups series are the most prestigious in our sport it is just logical and transparent, also from a governance point of view, that the NF's are being consulted for rules changes in both series.

We see no reasoning behind declining this proposal and kindly request that you further examine the question.

**NED NF:** We agree with the proposal made by the Italian Federation and therefore would like to know the motivation for declining this proposal as there is no explanation provided in the document.

As the Nations Cup series and the World Cups series are the most prestigious in our sport it is just logical and transparent, also from a governance point of view, that the NF's are being consulted for rules changes in both series.

**EEF:** Confirmation is requested from the FEI that NFs are entitled to submit input on proposed rule changes that are subject to the approval of the FEI Board (and not the FEI GA). In case the proposed changes/comments are rejected by the respective Discipline Committee the respective NF shall be provided with a reasoning for the rejection.

**USA NF:** The USEF supports the proposal of the ITA Federation suggestion as there have been issues with Series Rules where we have had to identify errors to the FEI after the publication of Series Rules. Also, they often come out late and with changes we have not had prior warning of.

**FEI feedback**

Series Rules shall be dealt with by the Board. It would too burdensome to have the same consultation process with NFs/Stakeholders than for the Sport Rules. In addition, the Board takes into account the recommendations from the Technical Committees, and thus there are various representatives in such Committees (OCs, Officials, Athletes, etc) to provide the Board with their feedback. The Board is also composed of Regional Group Chairs who represent the interests of their NFs.

#### **Proposed Final Wording**

No change to original wording.

#### **Article No. 116 - Entries**

#### **Explanation for Proposed Change**

##### **PROPOSAL RECEIVED FROM AUT NF**

Nominated Entry should only fix the number of athletes/horses no names.

Especially in CH for Children, Ponies Juniors and Young Riders there often need to be changes more close to the event or they reach MER too late and sometimes there is no second chance next year because of the age requirements.

##### **FEI FEEDBACK**

This proposal was not supported by either the FEI Headquarters, the Technical Committees or the FEI Board.

#### **Proposed Wording**

No change to original wording

#### **Code of Conduct for the Welfare of the Horse**

#### **Explanation for Proposed Change**

As part of the Endurance Rules revision, the Code of Conduct for the Welfare of the Horse was reviewed and some minor changes/clarifications were proposed.

As the Code of Conduct for the Welfare of the Horse is included in all Sports Rules, if approved, the changes below will be included in the 2020 versions of all Sports Rules.

#### **Proposed Wording**

## **FEI CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE WELFARE OF THE HORSE**

The FEI requires all those involved in international equestrian sport to adhere to the FEI Code of Conduct and to acknowledge and accept that at all times the welfare of the Horse must be paramount. ~~The W~~welfare of the Horse must never be subordinated to competitive or commercial ~~influences or other interests~~. The following points must be particularly adhered to:

### **1. General Welfare:**

#### a) Good Horse management

Stabling and feeding must be compatible with the best Horse management practices. Clean and good quality ~~foragehay~~, feed and water must always be available.

#### b) Training methods

Horses must only undergo training that matches their physical capabilities and level of maturity for their respective disciplines. They must not be subjected to methods ~~which-that~~ are abusive or cause fear.

#### c) Farriery and tack

Foot care and shoeing must be of a high standard. Tack must be designed and fitted to avoid the risk of pain or injury.

#### d) Transport

During transportation, Horses must be fully protected against injuries and other health risks. Vehicles must be safe, well ventilated, maintained to a high standard, disinfected regularly and driven by competent personnel. Competent handlers must always be available to manage the Horses.

#### e) Transit

All journeys must be planned carefully, and Horses allowed regular rest periods with access to food and water in line with current FEI guidelines.

### **2. Fitness to compete:**

#### a) Fitness and competence

Participation in Competition must be restricted to fit Horses and Athletes of proven competence. Horses must be allowed suitable rest period between training and ~~e~~C~~ompetitions~~; additional rest periods should be allowed following travelling.

#### b) Health status

No Horse deemed unfit to compete may compete or continue to compete, ~~v~~V~~eterinary~~ advice must be sought whenever there is any doubt.

#### c) Doping and ~~M~~m~~edication~~

Any ~~action or intent of~~ doping ~~and or~~ illicit use of medication constitutes a serious welfare issue and will not be tolerated. After any ~~v~~Veterinary treatment, sufficient time must be allowed for full recovery before Competition.

d) Surgical procedures

Any surgical procedures that threaten a competing Horse's welfare or the safety of other Horses and/or Athletes must not be allowed.

e) Pregnant/recently foaled mares

Mares ~~must may~~ not compete ~~when more than four months pregnant after their fourth month of pregnancy~~ or with foal at foot.

f) Misuse of aids

Abuse of a Horse using natural riding aids or artificial aids (e.g. whips, spurs, etc.) will not be tolerated.

3. **Events must not prejudice Horse welfare:**

a) Competition areas

Horses must be trained and compete on suitable and safe surfaces. All obstacles and ~~e~~Competition conditions must be designed with the safety of the Horse in mind.

b) Ground surfaces

All ground surfaces on which Horses walk, train or compete must be designed and maintained to reduce factors that could lead to injury.

c) Extreme weather

Competitions must not take place in extreme weather conditions that may compromise ~~Horse~~ welfare or safety ~~of the Horse~~. Provision must be made for cooling conditions and ~~cooling~~ equipment for Horses after competing.

d) Stabling at Events

Stables must be safe, hygienic, comfortable, well ventilated and of sufficient size for the type and disposition of the Horse. Washing-down areas and water must always be available.

4. **Humane treatment of Horses:**

a) Veterinary treatment

Veterinary expertise must always be available at an Event. If a Horse is injured or exhausted during a Competition, the Athlete must stop competing and a ~~v~~Veterinary evaluation must be performed.

b) Referral centres

Wherever necessary, Horses should be collected by ambulance and transported to the nearest relevant treatment centre for further assessment and therapy. Injured Horses must be given full supportive treatment before being transported.

c) Competition injuries

The incidence of injuries sustained in Competition ~~should~~must be monitored in accordance with the relevant discipline's requirements. Ground surface conditions, frequency of Competitions and any other risk factors should be examined carefully to indicate ways to minimise injuries.

d) Euthanasia

If injuries are sufficiently severe a Horse may need to be euthanized on humane grounds by a ~~v~~Veterinarian as soon as possible, with the sole aim of minimising suffering.

e) Retirement

Horses must be treated sympathetically and humanely when they retire from Competition.

5. **Education:**

The FEI urges all those involved in equestrian sport to attain the highest possible levels of education in areas of expertise relevant to the care and management of the Competition Horse.

This Code of Conduct for the Welfare of the Horse may be modified from time to time and the views of all are welcomed. Particular attention will be paid to new research findings. ~~and t~~The FEI encourages further funding and support for welfare studies.

**Section C – Proposed Rule Changes where no comments have been provided**

**Article No. 102 - International Events (CIs)**

**Explanation for Proposed Change**

**Proposal from FEI**

Further to the conclusions of the Jumping Round Table (held on 4-5 June), it is proposed to make the following change to the FEI General Regulations:

- Clarification that at CIs, team competitions consisting of teams that represent a nation or country are not permitted. Other team competitions are allowed.

### Proposed Wording

102.2 CIs are primarily for individual Athletes. However, Competitions for ~~national or otherwise named~~ teams not representing a nation or country of not more than four (4) members may be organised, but they may never be described as "Nations' Cups".

### Article No. 125 – Ceremonies

#### Explanation for Proposed Change

##### Proposal from FEI

Under the current FEI General Regulations, it is mandatory for Athletes to remain mounted during prize-givings. The amendment proposed below allows the discipline rules to allow deviations from this, for example, on safety grounds.

#### Proposed Wording

125.3 Unless the relevant Sports Rules provide otherwise, All Athletes invited to be present at a Prize-giving ceremony must remain mounted on the Horses on which they have competed, or on their carriages. If a podium is used for the ceremony (as for the Olympic Games), the prize winners may be asked to dismount. The Ground Jury should have the ability to approve a substitution in the interest of either safety or horse welfare

### Article No. 155 – Status and Liability of Officials (previously Article 156)

#### Explanation for Proposed Change

It is proposed that the process for the suspension (provisional and/or up to 3 months), removal or demotion of FEI Officials will now be dealt with under the proposed new Administrative Disciplinary Process. Therefore, the provisions that previously dealt with these have been deleted from Article 155.

A new Article 155.1 has been inserted to take account of the competency based evaluation system that will apply to FEI Officials as of 1 January 2020.

#### Proposed Wording

1. The qualification and requirements to be satisfied to act as an FEI Official at the respective levels are set out in the relevant Sports Rules and related education systems.

~~1. Any Official may be removed from a list or from an Event or demoted by the body that appointed him or by his NF. This paragraph confers no power of removal on the OC of an Event. In addition, the FEI Secretary General may provisionally suspend any Official and/or not accept the appointment of any Official in the event there is reasonable cause to believe that any Official has failed to observe the FEI Rules and Regulations.~~

~~2. Any proposal to take action under paragraph 1 must be reported to the Board.~~



~~3. The Secretary General shall notify in writing any person whom it is proposed to remove and that person may make oral and/or written representations against the proposal for consideration by the relevant body.~~

### General Change – FEI World Equestrian Games/FEI World Championships

#### Explanation for Proposed Change

For 2022, FEI opened the bidding for FEI World Equestrian Games and/or individual & combined FEI World Championships. References to FEI World Equestrian Games in FEI General Regulations to be updated accordingly.

#### Proposed Wording

See Appendix D of the FEI General Regulations.

### General Change – Miscellaneous

#### Explanation for Proposed Change

Further to the FEI Sports Forum presentation on Gender Equality, the FEI is making an effort to reflect the gender balance of our sport in the wording of the FEI Rules. Therefore, it is proposed that the FEI General Regulations will no longer only use the masculine gender when referring to physical persons.

The 2020 versions of all other FEI Rules and Regulations will be updated accordingly prior to publication of the final versions.

#### Proposed Wording

~~The masculine gender used in relation to any physical person (for example, names such as Athlete, Owner, Judge, Technical Delegate, Official, Chef d'Equipe, or pronouns such as he, they or them) shall, unless there is a specific provision to the contrary, be understood as including the feminine gender.~~

The following ancillary changes are proposed, references to:

- "he" are updated to "he/she";
- "him" are updated to "him/her"
- "himself" are updated to "himself/herself"

## BRIEFING NOTE –ADMINISTRATIVE DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE

### 1. What is the Administrative Disciplinary Procedure?

The Administrative Disciplinary Procedure (ADP) is a new FEI disciplinary process that would allow FEI Headquarters, acting through the FEI Legal Department, to directly impose sanctions for “Minor Offences” committed on or after 1 January 2020.

Minor Offences are those offences where the maximum sanction(s) would be:

- (a) Formal Warning;
- (b) Fine not exceeding CHF2,000;
- (c) Provisional Suspension;
- (d) Suspension not exceeding 3 (three) months;
- (e) Demotion of Official (following consultation with the FEI Director of Officials and the relevant FEI discipline director),
- (f) Removal of an Official from a specific Event (following consultation with the FEI Director of Officials and the relevant FEI discipline director).

### 2. Why is it proposed to create the Administrative Disciplinary Procedure?

Currently, almost all disciplinary cases go before the FEI Tribunal. FEI Tribunal proceedings can take a number of months before a final decision is issued. There can be multiple exchanges of long written submissions even in minor cases and this can be expensive especially when lawyers are involved.

Sometimes, for urgent cases, an immediate decision is necessary. The Administrative Disciplinary Procedure allows the FEI to be more responsive and to intervene and take action when a rule breach occurs by imposing a provisional suspension.

The number of cases going before the FEI Tribunal has increased quite significantly in recent years. The Administrative Disciplinary Procedure would allow the FEI Tribunal to focus on the more serious cases (breaches of the EADCMRs, safeguarding cases, serious disciplinary cases, horse abuse). The FEI Tribunal is composed of volunteers, from across the world, who deal with the Tribunal cases in their spare time. This is an aspect that needs to be managed when considering time zone, work load issues and availability to attend hearings.

### 3. If I am charged with a Minor Offence, is the Administrative Disciplinary Process mandatory?

No. The system operates in much the same way as the “Fast Track” procedure operates for Controlled Medication Cases under the EADCMRs.

If you are notified that you are accused of committing a Minor Offence, you will receive a “Minor Offence Notice of Charge”. This document will explain all details of the alleged offence and the sanction(s) proposed by the FEI. You have 3 options:

- (i) Admit the offence and accept the proposed sanction;  
OR

(ii) Deny the offence and have the case dealt with under the Administrative Disciplinary Procedure;

OR

(iii) Choose to have the case submitted directly to the FEI Tribunal for adjudication.

**4. If I deny the offence and choose to have my case dealt with under the Administrative Disciplinary Procedure (option (ii) above), will I have the chance to explain what happened and defend myself before the decision is taken by the FEI?**

Yes. You will have a full right to be heard. You can make a written submission to the FEI and, if you want to, you can also make an oral submission by video or teleconference.

**5. Is the decision taken by the FEI under the Administrative Disciplinary Procedure final?**

No. You have a right to appeal the FEI decision to the FEI Tribunal under the normal appeals process. However, if you lose your appeal, the FEI Tribunal will impose a higher sanction than the one originally imposed by the FEI.

**6. If I choose to have my case submitted directly to the FEI Tribunal (i.e. not have it decided under the Administrative Disciplinary Procedure), what difference will that make?**

If you choose to go directly to the FEI Tribunal, once the case is submitted to the FEI Tribunal, it will no longer be considered as "Minor", meaning that if the Tribunal finds you have committed the alleged offence, it may only impose higher sanctions than the listed "Minor Sanctions", meaning that the minimum sanction that the FEI Tribunal would impose on you would be greater than a 3 months suspension.

**7. Is the decision of the FEI Tribunal final?**

No. All decisions of the FEI Tribunal can be appealed to the Court of Arbitration for Sport.

**8. Even if I choose not to have my case decided under the Administrative Disciplinary Procedure, can the FEI still impose a Provisional Suspension?**

Yes. The FEI acting through the FEI Legal Department can impose a Provisional Suspension in urgent cases. The Provisional Suspension will remain in effect until the final decision is taken by the FEI or the FEI Tribunal.

**9. Is the decision to impose a Provisional Suspension final?**

No. You may apply to the FEI Tribunal to request the lifting of the Provisional Suspension. This is similar to what currently applies in equine anti-doping cases where the FEI imposes a provisional suspension and the Person Responsible can apply to the FEI Tribunal to have it lifted.