

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	AUS	This rule change should be rejected because of the implications to the rule making process. The vast majority of rules can be construed as being related to horse welfare. While EA are firmly in favour of optimal horse welfare, this will provide leeway for the FEI to change virtually any rules with regards to endurance without consultation with the Federations. EA suggest speeding up the consultation/feedback process rather than eliminating the voice of the Federations.
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	ARG	We don't agree with this new rule. Even if the majority of NFs respond by disagreeing with a rule amendment, the FEI Board may suggest that it is 'not possible to rescind the measure (rule)'
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	BRA	The BRA NF believes that rule changes should go through the GA or if taken during the year have the majority of votes of the National Federations
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	BRN	We recommend the proposed addition of Art. 20.4 of the FEI Statutes to be rejected. We believe that consultation with NFs and stakeholders, and voting through the General Assembly is the only way to approve the emergency welfare rule proposals.
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> Remove the words "if possible" from rescinded <input type="checkbox"/> The FEI board should be able to bring in emergency measures. It is similar to the power that the EGB board have to bring in welfare measures <input type="checkbox"/> There is a risk of knee jerk reactions which have not been properly debated and have unintended consequences <input type="checkbox"/> Allowing the 30 days for NFs to comment before the rule comes in would be preferred
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	KSA	This rule change should be rejected. The new Article poses a risk as the FEI Board can control any discipline without referring back to the floor of the General Assembly. Even if the majority of NFs respond by disagreeing with a rule amendment, the FEI Board may suggest that it is 'not possible to rescind the measure (rule)'.
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	NAM	Agree to this amendment.
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	NOR	This is ok
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	NZL	In addition to the foregoing, in order to ensure the safety of the Athlete and/or the welfare of the Horse the Board may, by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of votes cast, pass Resolutions which are normally the prerogatives of the General Assembly. In such cases, the National Federations shall be notified promptly of these measures. If a majority of the National Federations eligible to vote, responding within thirty (30) days of the date of the notice, signifies its disapproval, the measure shall be rescinded if possible. Whilst we applaud the intent to speed up the introduction of rules that improve the safety or welfare of horses and riders, the last 2 words "if possible" are concerning and suggest that rules that are deeply unpopular with the NFs may not be rescinded. This places too much power in the hands of the Board. We would not support this proposal.
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	OMA	The rule change is unacceptable and rejected because even majority of NFs disagreeing with rule, The FEI board may suggest it is not possible to revoke the measure rule.
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	RUS	THIS RULE CHANGE SHOULD BE REJECTED
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	SLO	We recommend that General Assembly stays main body to take decisions.
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	UAE	This rule change should be rejected. The new Article poses a risk as the FEI Board can control any discipline without referring back to the floor of the General Assembly. Even if the majority of NFs respond by disagreeing with a rule amendment, the FEI Board may suggest that it is 'not possible to rescind the measure (rule)'.
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	LBN	This rule change should be rejected. The new Article poses a risk as the FEI Board can control any discipline without referring back to the floor of the General Assembly. Even if the majority of NFs respond by disagreeing with a rule amendment, the FEI Board may suggest that it is 'not possible to rescind the measure (rule)'.
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	LBN	This rule change should be rejected. The new Article poses a risk as the FEI Board can control any discipline without referring back to the floor of the General Assembly. Even if the majority of NFs respond by disagreeing with a rule amendment, the FEI Board may suggest that it is 'not possible to rescind the measure (rule)'.
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	SUD	This rule change should be rejected. The new Article poses a risk as the FEI Board can control any discipline without referring back to the floor of the General Assembly. Even if the majority of NFs respond by disagreeing with a rule amendment, the FEI Board may suggest that it is 'not possible to rescind the measure (rule)'.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
A.1	FEI Statutes 20.4	LBY	This rule change should be rejected. The new Article poses a risk as the FEI Board can control any discipline without referring back to the floor of the General Assembly. Even if the majority of NFs respond by disagreeing with a rule amendment, the FEI Board may suggest that it is 'not possible to rescind the measure (rule)'.
B.01	802.5.1	AUS	EA suggest that a test event under the same climatic conditions should also be conducted, which may mean an event 12 months before the championship, to satisfactorily test all aspects of the venue and region and the impact on horse welfare and safety.
B.01	802.5	ARG	We agree with this proposal.
B.01	802.5	CAN	We agree with the proposals, a test event must represent as close as possible the actual event so that readiness can be assessed, and if not ready a clear mechanism to take away the event from the organizer.
B.01	802.6	CAN	If 20 or fewer Combinations are entered in an FEI Event (other than a CEIO or Championship), at the request of the National Federation concerned the FEI may approve the FEI Event being combined with a National Event. CEI Combinations must be given entry priority over national-level Combinations for such combined events. We recommend that this be changed from Event to Competition, and that the number be increased to 50. In addition, we seek clarification on definition of terms "event" vs "competition" as these terms are used throughout the proposed rule changes. If the term remains "event", then no competitions in Canada will be allowed to be combined with a National event, and we depend on these entries to run financially viable events.
B.01	802.4.2	CRC	CRC Comment: In countries where Endurance is developing, it might be best to maintain the 1* distance (80 -119 kms) and let the OC decide depending on the reality of the region and the training of their horses. It is proven that Regional Championships increase the amount of competitors participating but for some countries that aspire to compete for the first time 100 might just be too much. .
B.01	802.6	CRC	CRC Questions: Entry priority. What is the meaning of this? Is it registration? Entry into the vet gate. Please clarify.
B.01	802.6.3	CRC	CRC comment and question: If the event is approved as combined where national and FEI combinations are allowed to start together, how will this be enforced? The only way to have FEI events in our country is to run them together with national rides as it is the national riders who help pay for some of the expenses associated with FEI rides.
B.01	802.5	BRN	We agree with this proposal subject to the condition that the OC should be experienced in organizing a minimum of 5 CEI events.
B.01	802.5	ESP	These tests should be done one year prior to the Championship, on the same season and as close as possible to the dates of the Championship.
B.01	802.5.1	IRL	Should include (C) the same weather conditions as the event.
B.01	802.6.1	IRL	These should be allowed as most small nations rely on the CEN's to underwrite the CEI's. Subject to an overall maximum of 200 starters per day.
B.01	802.5	ITA	Proposal: In addition to the ETC recommendation, we request that the test event must be organised one year before in the same period of the year in which the Championships will be held. Reasoning: This would allow better preparation from OC and participants point of view especially with reference to weather condition. It would also give the chance of finding a solution in the case of a negative test event.
B.01	802.5	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> Test events a good idea <input type="checkbox"/> Some say test event should be closer to the event, some would prefer the previous year <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear why it says will require for 3* championships and may require for other championships <input type="checkbox"/> Test events are more critical where an event has not hosted endurance before <input type="checkbox"/> Test events only valuable if feedback taken on board and not ignored <input type="checkbox"/> The test event won't test most event variables such as weather
B.01	802.5	NAM	We agree with this proposal, we also recommend that test events have almost the same climatic conditions (as much as is possible to achieve) Test events should be held at a similar time of the year
B.01	802.6.1	NAM	This seems to mean no more than 20 combinations in all classes at the Event. Suggest that this needs to be clarified that it is the number at the Event and not in each individual Class. If it is no more than 20 combinations at the entire Event, then this would exclude us from holding any combined classes at our normal big rides.... We have weight divisions.
B.01	802.5	NED	The test event should be in the same period of the year as the Championships and organized on the same track. Furthermore it must be organized one year before the Championships.
B.01	802.6.1	NED	FEI and National Events may always be combined despite the amount of combinations.
B.01	802.5	NOR	This is ok, but want to add that the test event must be held in the same time period of the year, thinking about the weather climate, temperature etc.
B.01	802.5	NZL	We support this proposal but strongly recommend that the wording be altered to include that the test event should also be held at a time of year when the climatic conditions are likely to be similar to what will be encountered at the Championship as this will also have a significant impact on horse welfare and whether the track and facilities will be appropriate under those conditions e.g. adequacy of water, track conditions etc.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.01	802.5.1	OMA	Agree with Proposal
B.01	802.5.1	POR	Agree
B.01	802.5	RUS	WE AGREE WITH THIS PROPOSAL
B.01	802.5	SLO	We agree
B.01	802.5	SWE	It is better if the Test Event for a Championship will be held one year prior to the Championship (same time period as the Championship) as one of the reasons of having a Test Event is to have the weather conditions etc. as similar as possibly as for the Championship. It will also give the Organizer more time to consider and work with upcoming issues that occurred during the Test Event.
B.01	802.5	UAE	We agree with this proposal
B.01	802.5	LBN	We agree with this proposal
B.01	802.5	LBN	We agree with this proposal
B.01	802.5	SUD	We agree with this proposal
B.01	802.5	SUD	We agree with this proposal
B.01	802.5	EEF	European Equestrian Federation Endurance Working Group position - EEF WG : In addition to the ETC recommendation, we request that the test event must be organized one year before the Championship (at the same period of the year). Reasoning : This would allow a better preparation from OC and participants point of view especially referring weather conditions at this time of the year. It would also give the chance to find an alternative OC/location in the case of a negative test event. OC and location endurance background are main criterias.
B.01	802.6	EEF	National competitions should remain a viable way for O.C.s to fund their events. An O.C. cannot request that a National event to be held 4 days before the competition starts, since most National Federations require their calendars to be in place since the previous year, and competitors must train their horses and plan for these competitions. It is unrealistic for the FEI to propose that a National ride be organized only after definite entries have been declared.
B.01	802.5	AUT	European Equestrian Federation Endurance Working Group position - EEF WG : In addition to the ETC recommendation, we request that the test event must be organized one year before the Championship (at the same period of the year). Reasoning : This would allow a better preparation from OC and participants point of view especially referring weather conditions at this time of the year. It would also give the chance to find an alternative OC/location in the case of a negative test event. OC and location endurance background are main criterias.
B.01	802.6	AUT	National competitions should remain a viable way for O.C.s to fund their events. An O.C. cannot request that a National event to be held 4 days before the competition starts, since most National Federations require their calendars to be in place since the previous year, and competitors must train their horses and plan for these competitions. It is unrealistic for the FEI to propose that a National ride be organized only after definite entries have been declared.
B.01	802.5	LBY	We agree with this proposal
B.02	805	AUS	To reduce riding weight to 70 kg discriminates against many races of the world, and especially males who will struggle to comply with that minimum weight. For example, the 2012 Australian Bureau of Statistics reports average weights for Australians as males 85 kg and females 71 kg; and the trend is for individuals to grow taller and heavier. Such a weight restriction would thus prevent many Western owners/riders from competing at that level and lead to a greater use of lightweight jockeys. This is a negative for horse welfare, at a time when the rules should be encouraging greater incentive to develop the rider/horse connection. The knowledge of one's horse and emotional connection with the horse is paramount to protecting horse welfare. Ensuring excellent equestrianism by the rider, good training and conditioning of the horse, and appropriate speed are better means by which to control the workload of the horse and therefore the risk.
B.02	805	BEL	Belgium does not agree and proposes the following minimum weights: 0 on 1*, 70 on 2*, 75 on 3*excepted for horses with a pony size (1m50 max) where the weight will be limited to 70 max. Explanation: The decrease of the weight is motivated by the fact that the profile of the 2020 endurance rider is much lighter and fitter than 10, 20 or 30 years ago. Thus, the charge of dead weight is increasing. A study conducted by Dr. David Marlin presented at "The 4th International Endurance Conference" held in Bouthib (UAE) states that: 1. Weight increases the energy the horse must use / 2. Weight places extra strain on the tendons and joints / 3. Weight often causes injury to the back / 4. The greater the added weight the greater the risk of injury to the horse / 5. Any additional weight that a horse carries in the form of a rider with tack will increase the amount of energy the horse must use. >> > It is unreasonable to add weight to the horses for long distances given that the weight is usually placed in iron sheets or industrial materials that affect the health and safety of the horse and damages the principle of the welfare of the horses. >>> The substantial evolvement in Endurance Sport, in terms of training, veterinarian and nutritional care, is accompanied by evolvement in the rider's fitness in order to become real athlete >>> Results of the recent Endurance events proved that the weight addition did not contribute to speed reduction. For instance, it was observed that in Ladies, Young and Junior events which do not require weight, the average speeds are similar to those requiring weight and thus the targeted speed reduction by weight adding has not been achieved.
B.02	805	ARG	CEI1* Athlete weight 70 kg for Senior at the discretion of th OC. For Senior CEI2* and above we agree
B.02	805	CAN	We agree with this proposal as it lowers the requirement by 5kg but maintains minimum weights that helps level the playing field.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.02	805	CHI	We prefer to maintain the current minimum weight of 75 kgs, considering that increases the participation of more riders. Although there are some opinions on going down to 70 Kgs.
B.02	805	CRO	NF Croatia does not agree with decrease of minimum rider weight because such decrease is discriminatory to male riders; would cause that not more experienced riders are selected for competitions but only lighter riders which cannot go in favour of the argument that it is the welfare of the horse. NF Croatia proposes that the Minimum rider weight remains as it is prescribed currently.
B.02	805	CRC	CRC Comment and question: If studies show that weight controls speed and we want to lower speed, why lower the weight? Championships should remain at 75 and 2* should be at least 70 kg. Specially since CEI2* count towards the qualification of championship rides. Maintaining weight would also help maintain the gender equality that we pride ourselves with in equestrian sports. Men usually weigh more than women and by having weight all riders have a base line to start with.
B.02	805	BRA	Minimum weight The Brazilian riders are strongly in favour of 75 kg. Endurance is a gender friendly discipline and in South America we have a higher percentage of male riders compared to the rest of the World. We believe that Championships and 3* should remain at 75 kg and 2* at least 70 kg.
B.02	805	BRN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For CEI 1* & 2*, we recommend to have a minimum weight category extending from 60 kg to 70 kg with the decision for the same to be left with the OC. The reason for our recommendation is that the difference between the 1* to the 2* category is a mere 1 Km with a difference that until 119 KM there is no weight while from 120 KM there is a minimum weight enforced. ▪ We agree to the proposal to reduce Athlete weight to minimum 70kg (including all riding equipment, except for the bridle) for CEI 3*, CEIOs, and Championships.
B.02	805	ESP	<p>On Weight matters:</p> <p>YR/Juniors: After review of publications and studies made by medical entities in the last few years and those conclusions coming to most typical weight of females between 16-18yrs is around 58kg and 71kg for 18yrs males, we believe a minimum weight should be added here. Not only would it be beneficial to the health of these minors and younger riders that today are trying to stay as slim as possible by giving them a range where they know that reducing their weight further will have no impact on their performance, it would also be beneficial for horses by reducing the speeds (or otherwise increase chances of early removal from competition without injury) and risk factors of high speed riding. We suggest this number being 65kg to accommodate for both female and male participants.</p> <p>For same reasons as above, and also to make sure that Endurance is kept a sport where riders from many ranges can comfortably compete at the highest levels without their genetic physiques being a high hindrance access factor, and at the same time keeping suit with past studies where it shown that going from competing with no weight to suddenly competing with weight or more weight has a noticeable impact on metabolic conditions of the horse, we propose to make 70kg compulsory at 1* and 2* rides.</p> <p>As for 3*, we believe this category should remain at the highest standard at 75kg to make it possible for athletes of the most different conditions to participate and be proficient in the sport, while keeping the positives of risk reduction with more weight. Due to different physical complexities, and profiting from the FEI's pony measurement systems in place, these Horses may be allowed a lower limit of 70kg.</p> <p>In any case, we would like to note that whatever rules are applied, none will matter unless weight control begins to be properly done at FEI events, as it keeps being cheated on repeatedly even at FEI Championships with no consequences (or adverse consequences for the sport and horses where such carelessness ultimately ends up in fatalities where Horses that would of had proper weight would have shown fatigue signs early enough to prevent a catastrophe instead of being allowed to push Horses to their vital limits in last loops as has happened recently)</p>
B.02	805	FRA	<p>We do not support the reduction from 75 to 70 kg as it would be damageable in terms of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● horse welfare. The 75kg weight is a way to control the speed and is not responsible of injuries, so by reducing it would encourage faster speeds which is not a good motivation. ● universality. Having in mind worldwide population studies and evolution of the average heights, by decreasing the weight as proposed it would limit the diversity within the discipline by giving a competitive advantage to an even more limited part of the population scope as this is the case now. <p>To be as competitive as others, currently with 75kg it already means +/- 68 kg riders + 7kg of clothes and equipments. 68kg riders is already excluding the majority of the men. Male riders would be place in a discriminatory situation and the sport even more dedicated to small riders, women riders...</p> <p>Endurance troubles - the core of the problem</p> <p>Regarding arguments raised about the alleged negative effect of "75kg minimum weight", "dead weight" ..., we want to remind the truth :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● several medallists even at championships are women riders with "dead weight" (but with good riding skills and riding strategy) ● doping, corruption, weak riding skills, dangerous riding strategy, artificial flat and straight courses are the reasons of endurance troubles, nothing else and certainly not the 75kg minimum weight which is part of the crucial rules which help to protect the sport.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.02	805	IRL	Tack without Bridle or Boots Young Rider / Junior = 60 Kg Senior 1* = 75 Kg Senior 2** & 3 *** 75 Kg Championships and CEIO's 75 Kg
B.02	805	ITA	MINIMUM RIDER WEIGHT FOR ALL YOUNG RIDERS AND JUNIORS COMPETITIONS Proposal: 60 kg as the minimum weight. Reasoning: After reviewing population studies made between 2000 and 2018 for children between 0 and 18 years old, based on 6743 subjects, the EEF Endurance Working Group has seen that the most typical weight for females at 16 to 18 years old is 58kg while for males it is 65 kg at 16 and 71 kg at 18. It is quite common in Endurance nowadays to see more and more athletes with much lower weight in this class of competition going as low as 35 kg in some cases, and as such, our proposal is to put a minimum weight of at least 60 kg in YR/Junior competitions which serves as a double function: <input type="checkbox"/> firstly ensuring that speed is lowered for horses <input type="checkbox"/> secondly, it helps protect the health of athletes by ensuring there exists a manageable range where they know that reducing their weight further will have no impact on their performance. MINIMUM RIDER WEIGHT FOR ALL SENIOR 2* AND 1 * COMPETITIONS. Proposal: 70 kg as the minimum weight. Reasoning: This minimum will contribute to a more normal evolution through the different competition levels and will be also positive in terms of speed management. MINIMUM RIDER WEIGHT FOR 3* CHAMPIONSHIPS Reasoning: We fully agreed on the fact to keep the minimum weight for Championships but there is no consensus for 70kg or 75kg. To optimise the future change, in line with the EEF Endurance WG, we would welcome the FEI to take a scientific approach on weight matters, and activate proper studies to take place that allow everybody to fully comprehend the impact of weight on speed and injuries on Horses before modifying these parameters excessively. Regarding these matters our main queries are in terms of horse welfare, accessibility to the largest population scope possible even at the highest level of the sport, fair and competitive sport. Depending of the validation and the efficiency of the new rules proposed for pony measurements, we could suggest in the future to take in account 2 different minimum rider weights for horses (75kg) and ponies (70kg).
B.02	805.2.1	ITA	Proposal After the recent experience at the European Championships we suggest the wording be modified as follows: OCs must provide homologated weighing machine with recalibration capability at the Event.
B.02	805	JPN	We'd strongly recommend to state the reason why MinimumWeight Requirement is introduced.It would be quite a burden for both horses and light-weightathletes to carry the excessive weight whilst competing. Forlighter athletes, this may be not fair, and for horses, this maylead to conflict with the welfare of horse.Other disciplines, which had Minimum Weight Rules previously,now have omitted such rules. We do wish to know the clarify thereason for introducing this rule (only) to Endurance.
B.02	805.2.3	JPN	We recommend the following changes; Weight control must becarried out before or after the First Inspection and immediatelyafter the finish.
B.02	805	ECU	<input type="checkbox"/> The current weight of 75 kg is suitable. <input type="checkbox"/> Lowering the weight to 70 kg limits the participation of many riders. <input type="checkbox"/> When you lose weight, you will not be able to protect the horse, unlike with less weight the horses will go faster. Example is the in the Young Riders races, they have less weight they go faster.
B.02	805	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> Many UK riders want weights abolished altogether, or perhaps just restrict weights to championships <input type="checkbox"/> Some suggest that weight divisions (as per the states) may solve the issue <input type="checkbox"/> Some riders would like there to be a maximum weight <input type="checkbox"/> There are better and more ethical ways of slowing horses down than applying weight
B.02	805	NAM	Agreed Staggered starts in all events where there are more than 200 horses in a certain distance.
B.02	812	NAM	Do not agree to rule change. The proposal of 70 kg means that riders will have to weigh approximately 66 kg. This is the average weight of a European woman. How will it ever be possible then for an average European man to compete at the top level??? Reducing weight will promote higher speed. It will promote "jockey like riders, it will promote to Endurance going from riding to racing" "The Endurance Temp Committee have drafted the Endurance rules to bring the sport back to where it should be riding vs racing" We suggest being totally fair, to introduce a handicapped system where ALL riders get penalties for weight? Such proposal already exists. Dr Bennet (Glasco Uni) has details. This will also be in line with the FEI's "No discrimination rule" Any weight of a specific kg will be discriminating against any other weight. This will always pose a problem. The racers will want to go lighter; the average people will also like to compete at top level. Please accommodate the riders and not the racers! Suggestion: No weight on Young Rider competitions.
B.02	805	NED	We agree with the proposal for minimum weights of 70 kg for CEI2* and above events with the following remark. We would like to propose a minimum weight of 60 kg for youth riders at all events.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.02	805	NOR	We suggest continuing with 75 kg at the Senior Championship, most senior level riders have no problem getting up to 75 km including equipment, we do not want it to be a focus on low weight - ala jockey. We want the original rule to remain.
B.02	805	NZL	We have reservations that a lighter rider weight may allow horses to compete at higher speeds. Additionally, many riders with their saddle weigh significantly more than 70 kg and thus may be disadvantaged when there are riders who are much lighter and particularly if there is no weight limit in CEI1* events. We do acknowledge that there is no way of factoring in the size/weight of the horse. We strongly recommend that the same minimum weight (70 kg) be imposed for CEI1* events. We believe that this proposed rule change will not improve horse welfare overall. Despite these strong reservations, we would support this proposal at a vote.
B.02	805	OMA	Agree with the proposai to reduce minimum Athlete weight to 70kg for Championships & CEI3*. For lower level events we advise to have a minimum weight margin of 60 kg to 70 kg with giving the right for the OC to select the suitable weight .
B.02	805	POR	AGREE
B.02	805	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULES (75 KG AT CEI3*, ETC.)
B.02	805	SLO	We agree with weight 70kg, also to CEI1* level and than implement in national regulations also
B.02	805	SWE	We believe the minimum weight should be as follows for seniors at 2*, 3* and Championships. Young Rider/Junior Competitions and Championships 60 kg (including all riding equipment, ex-cept for the bridle) CEI 1* 70 kg (including all riding equipment, ex-cept for the bridle) CEI 2* (regardless of the Athlete's age) 70 kg (including all riding equipment, ex-cept for the bridle) CEI 3* (regardless of the Athlete's age) 70 kg (including all riding equipment, ex-cept for the bridle) CEIOs and Championships (irrespective of star level/distance, and regardless of the Athlete's age) 70 kg (including all riding equipment, ex-cept for the bridle)
B.02	805	URU	1. As per our opinion the current 75 kgs. are right. By reducing the weight many athletes would remain with less possibilities to compete. 2. According to BMC PUBLIC HEALTH data the average weight varies according to the region; while for Europe it is 70 kgs. for the Americas it is higher. 3. The CEIs 1* are very important in our country and we do not see a reason to differentiate them from the other categories. Leaving this category without a "mimumum weight" would be prejudicial for our sport. 4. We consider that the reduction of the minimum weight would go against what the FEI aims, which is to lower the speed. To verify this, it is enough to see that the speed averages in Young Riders races are higher than in Seniors.
B.02	805	UAE	<input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to reduce minimum Athlete weight to 70kg for Championships & CEI3*. <input type="checkbox"/> For CEI2 level we recommend to have a minimum weight margin of 60 kg to 70 kg with giving the right for the Organizing Committee to select the suitable weight for the following reasons: - So far, there are no criteria to specify the weight. - Statistical analysis conducted by UAE NF: The analysis proved that the average weight of most male and female riders is between 55 and 65 kg. Our records, which include nearly 2,790 registered riders are from 64 different nationalities. - Study conduct by Dr. Divad Marlin presented at The 4th International Endurance Conference will be held in Boudheib/ UAE : 1. Rider weight increases the energy the horse must use 2. Rider weight places extra strain on the tendons and joints 3. Rider weight often causes injury to the back 4. The greater the added weight the greater the risk of injury to the horse. 5. Any additional weight that a horse carries in the form of a rider with tack will increase the amount of energy the horse must use. - it is unreasonable to add weight to the horses for long distances given that the weight usually placed is iron sheets or industrial materials that affect the health and safety of the horse and damage the principle of the welfare of the horses. - The substantial evolvment in Endurance Sport, in terms of training and veterinarian and nutritional care, was accompanied by evolvment in the athletes' performance in order to become professional, - Results of the recent Endurance events proved that the weight addition did not contribute to speed reduction. For instance, it was observed that in Young and Junior events which do not require weight, the average speeds are similar to those requiring weight and thus the targeted speed reduction by weight adding has not been achieved.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.02	805	LBN	<p><input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to reduce minimum Athlete weight to 70kg for Championships & CEI3*.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> For CEI2 level we recommend to have a minimum weight margin of 60 kg to 70 kg with giving the right for the Organizing Committee to select the suitable weight for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - So far, there are no criteria to specify the weight. - Statistical analysis conducted by UAE NF: <p>The analysis proved that the average weight of most male and female riders is between 55 and 65 kg. Our records, which include nearly 2,790 registered riders are from 64 different nationalities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study conduct by Dr. Divad Marlin presented at The 4th International Endurance Conference will be held in Boudheib/ UAE : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rider weight increases the energy the horse must use 2. Rider weight places extra strain on the tendons and joints 3. Rider weight often causes injury to the back 4. The greater the added weight the greater the risk of injury to the horse. 5. Any additional weight that a horse carries in the form of a rider with tack will increase the amount of energy the horse must use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is unreasonable to add weight to the horses for long distances given that the weight usually placed is iron sheets or industrial materials that affect the health and safety of the horse and damage the principle of the welfare of the horses. - The substantial evolvement in Endurance Sport, in terms of training and veterinarian and nutritional care, was accompanied by evolvement in the athletes' performance in order to become professional, - Results of the recent Endurance events proved that the weight addition did not contribute to speed reduction. For instance, it was observed that in Young and Junior events which do not require weight, the average speeds are similar to those requiring weight and thus the targeted speed reduction by weight adding has not been achieved.
B.02	805	LBN	<p><input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to reduce minimum Athlete weight to 70kg for Championships & CEI3*.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> For CEI2 level we recommend to have a minimum weight margin of 60 kg to 70 kg with giving the right for the Organizing Committee to select the suitable weight for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - So far, there are no criteria to specify the weight. - Statistical analysis conducted by UAE NF: <p>The analysis proved that the average weight of most male and female riders is between 55 and 65 kg. Our records, which include nearly 2,790 registered riders are from 64 different nationalities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study conduct by Dr. Divad Marlin presented at The 4th International Endurance Conference will be held in Boudheib/ UAE : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rider weight increases the energy the horse must use 2. Rider weight places extra strain on the tendons and joints 3. Rider weight often causes injury to the back 4. The greater the added weight the greater the risk of injury to the horse. 5. Any additional weight that a horse carries in the form of a rider with tack will increase the amount of energy the horse must use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is unreasonable to add weight to the horses for long distances given that the weight usually placed is iron sheets or industrial materials that affect the health and safety of the horse and damage the principle of the welfare of the horses. - The substantial evolvement in Endurance Sport, in terms of training and veterinarian and nutritional care, was accompanied by evolvement in the athletes' performance in order to become professional, - Results of the recent Endurance events proved that the weight addition did not contribute to speed reduction. For instance, it was observed that in Young and Junior events which do not require weight, the average speeds are similar to those requiring weight and thus the targeted speed reduction by weight adding has not been achieved.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.02	805	SUD	<p><input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to reduce minimum Athlete weight to 70kg for Championships & CEI3*.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> For CEI2 level we recommend to have a minimum weight margin of 60 kg to 70 kg with giving the right for the Organizing Committee to select the suitable weight for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - So far, there are no criteria to specify the weight. - Statistical analysis conducted by UAE NF: <p>The analysis proved that the average weight of most male and female riders is between 55 and 65 kg. Our records, which include nearly 2,790 registered riders are from 64 different nationalities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study conduct by Dr. Divad Marlin presented at The 4th International Endurance Conference will be held in Boudheib/ UAE : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rider weight increases the energy the horse must use 2. Rider weight places extra strain on the tendons and joints 3. Rider weight often causes injury to the back 4. The greater the added weight the greater the risk of injury to the horse. 5. Any additional weight that a horse carries in the form of a rider with tack will increase the amount of energy the horse must use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is unreasonable to add weight to the horses for long distances given that the weight usually placed is iron sheets or industrial materials that affect the health and safety of the horse and damage the principle of the welfare of the horses. - The substantial evolvement in Endurance Sport, in terms of training and veterinarian and nutritional care, was accompanied by evolvement in the athletes' performance in order to become professional, - Results of the recent Endurance events proved that the weight addition did not contribute to speed reduction. For instance, it was observed that in Young and Junior events which do not require weight, the average speeds are similar to those requiring weight and thus the targeted speed reduction by weight adding has not been achieved.
B.02	805	SUD	<p><input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to reduce minimum Athlete weight to 70kg for Championships & CEI3*.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> For CEI2 level we recommend to have a minimum weight margin of 60 kg to 70 kg with giving the right for the Organizing Committee to select the suitable weight for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - So far, there are no criteria to specify the weight. - Statistical analysis conducted by UAE NF: <p>The analysis proved that the average weight of most male and female riders is between 55 and 65 kg. Our records, which include nearly 2,790 registered riders are from 64 different nationalities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study conduct by Dr. Divad Marlin presented at The 4th International Endurance Conference will be held in Boudheib/ UAE : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rider weight increases the energy the horse must use 2. Rider weight places extra strain on the tendons and joints 3. Rider weight often causes injury to the back 4. The greater the added weight the greater the risk of injury to the horse. 5. Any additional weight that a horse carries in the form of a rider with tack will increase the amount of energy the horse must use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is unreasonable to add weight to the horses for long distances given that the weight usually placed is iron sheets or industrial materials that affect the health and safety of the horse and damage the principle of the welfare of the horses. - The substantial evolvement in Endurance Sport, in terms of training and veterinarian and nutritional care, was accompanied by evolvement in the athletes' performance in order to become professional, - Results of the recent Endurance events proved that the weight addition did not contribute to speed reduction. For instance, it was observed that in Young and Junior events which do not require weight, the average speeds are similar to those requiring weight and thus the targeted speed reduction by weight adding has not been achieved.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.02	805	EEF	<p>EEF WG general statement :</p> <p>It is a general consensus of the community that the lower the weight is, the fastest the speed can be. There is no objective scientific studies defining the weight as a main cause of horse injuries. Insufficient riding competences - alone or combined - with excessive speed are the main causes of horse injuries. Consequently weight control is a crucial lever to be used. Please find below our recommendations, having in mind that our main queries are in term of : horse welfare, accessibility to the largest population scope possible even at the highest level of the sport, fair and competitive sport.</p> <p>It is very important to note that even if it is clear that weight control is a crucial lever in term of horse welfare and also to ensure a fair and competitive sport, rider controls and weight controls keep being cheated too often and easily at events including recent championships. In addition to the rules evolution it is first of all required to fully implement the rules in all events,for all riders. Minimum rider weight for all Young Riders and Juniors competitions</p> <p>EEF WG position : 60 kg as the minimum weight.</p> <p>Reasoning : After reviewing population studies made between 2000 and 2018 for children between 0 and 18 years old, based on 6743 subjects, the EEF Endurance Working Group has seen that the most typical weight for females at 16 to 18 years old is 58kg while for males it is 65 kg at 16 and 71 kg at 18. It is quite common in Endurance to see nowadays more and more athletes with much lower weight in this class of competition going as low as 35 kg in some cases, and as such, our proposal is to put a minimum weight of at least 60 kg in YR/Junior competitions which serves as a double function : firstly ensures that speed is lowered for horses, and secondly, it helps protect the health of athletes by ensuring there exists a manageable range where they know that reducing their weight further will have no impact on their performance.</p> <p>Minimum rider weight for all Senior 2* and 1* competitions.</p> <p>EEF WG position : 70 kg as the minimum weight.</p> <p>Reasoning : This minimum will contribute to a more normal evolution through the different competition levels and will be also positive in terms of speed management. Minimum rider weight for 3* Championships</p> <p>Reasoning : We fully agreed on the fact to keep the minimum weight for Championships but there is no consensus for 70kg or 75kg.Depending of the validation and the efficiency of the new general rules proposed for pony measurements, we would suggest in the future to take in account 2 different minimum rider weights for horses (75kg) and ponies (70kg).</p> <p>Minimum rider weight for 3* Championships (other writing based on your email feedbacks)</p> <p>EEF WG position : we do not support the proposal of reducing the weight from 75 kg to 70 kg.</p> <p>Reasoning : Depending of the validation and the efficiency of the new general rules proposed for pony measurements, we would suggest in the future to take in account 2 different minimum rider weights for horses (75kg) and ponies (70kg).</p>
B.02	805	AUT	<p>EEF WG general statement :</p> <p>It is a general consensus of the community that the lower the weight is, the fastest the speed can be. There is no objective scientific studies defining the weight as a main cause of horse injuries. Insufficient riding competences - alone or combined - with excessive speed are the main causes of horse injuries. Consequently weight control is a crucial lever to be used. Please find below our recommendations, having in mind that our main queries are in term of : horse welfare, accessibility to the largest population scope possible even at the highest level of the sport, fair and competitive sport.</p> <p>It is very important to note that even if it is clear that weight control is a crucial lever in term of horse welfare and also to ensure a fair and competitive sport, rider controls and weight controls keep being cheated too often and easily at events including recent championships. In addition to the rules evolution it is first of all required to fully implement the rules in all events,for all riders. Minimum rider weight for all Young Riders and Juniors competitions</p> <p>EEF WG position : 60 kg as the minimum weight.</p> <p>Reasoning : After reviewing population studies made between 2000 and 2018 for children between 0 and 18 years old, based on 6743 subjects, the EEF Endurance Working Group has seen that the most typical weight for females at 16 to 18 years old is 58kg while for males it is 65 kg at 16 and 71 kg at 18. It is quite common in Endurance to see nowadays more and more athletes with much lower weight in this class of competition going as low as 35 kg in some cases, and as such, our proposal is to put a minimum weight of at least 60 kg in YR/Junior competitions which serves as a double function : firstly ensures that speed is lowered for horses, and secondly, it helps protect the health of athletes by ensuring there exists a manageable range where they know that reducing their weight further will have no impact on their performance.</p> <p>Minimum rider weight for all Senior 2* and 1* competitions.</p> <p>EEF WG position : 70 kg as the minimum weight.</p> <p>Reasoning : This minimum will contribute to a more normal evolution through the different competition levels and will be also positive in terms of speed management. Minimum rider weight for 3* Championships</p> <p>Reasoning : We fully agreed on the fact to keep the minimum weight for Championships but there is no consensus for 70kg or 75kg.Depending of the validation and the efficiency of the new general rules proposed for pony measurements, we would suggest in the future to take in account 2 different minimum rider weights for horses (75kg) and ponies (70kg).</p> <p>Minimum rider weight for 3* Championships (other writing based on your email feedbacks)</p> <p>EEF WG position : we do not support the proposal of reducing the weight from 75 kg to 70 kg.</p> <p>Reasoning : Depending of the validation and the efficiency of the new general rules proposed for pony measurements, we would suggest in the future to take in account 2 different minimum rider weights for horses (75kg) and ponies (70kg).</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.02	805	LBY	<p><input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to reduce minimum Athlete weight to 70kg for Championships & CEI3*.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> For CEI2 level we recommend to have a minimum weight margin of 60 kg to 70 kg with giving the right for the Organizing Committee to select the suitable weight for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - So far, there are no criteria to specify the weight. - Statistical analysis conducted by UAE NF: The analysis proved that the average weight of most male and female riders is between 55 and 65 kg. Our records, which include nearly 2,790 registered riders are from 64 different nationalities. - Study conduct by Dr. Divad Marlin presented at The 4th International Endurance Conference will be held in Boudheib/ UAE : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rider weight increases the energy the horse must use 2. Rider weight places extra strain on the tendons and joints 3. Rider weight often causes injury to the back 4. The greater the added weight the greater the risk of injury to the horse. 5. Any additional weight that a horse carries in the form of a rider with tack will increase the amount of energy the horse must use. - it is unreasonable to add weight to the horses for long distances given that the weight usually placed is iron sheets or industrial materials that affect the health and safety of the horse and damage the principle of the welfare of the horses. - The substantial evolvement in Endurance Sport, in terms of training and veterinarian and nutritional care, was accompanied by evolvement in the athletes' performance in order to become professional, - Results of the recent Endurance events proved that the weight addition did not contribute to speed reduction. For instance, it was observed that in Young and Junior events which do not require weight, the average speeds are similar to those requiring weight and thus the targeted speed reduction by weight adding has not been achieved.
B.02	805	RSA	I don't agree that the minimum weight should be reduced to 70kg, for CEI 3* Speed kills and lighter riders will be able to ride faster.
B.03	807.2	ARG	We don't agree with this proposal. We believe that if the venue is qualified to receive a certain number of participants there should be no objection. It is the job of the DT to verify that the conditions are met.
B.03	848	ARG	We don't agree with this proposal. We believe that if the venue is qualified to receive a certain number of participants there should be no objection. It is the job of the DT to verify that the conditions are met.
B.03	807.2	CAN	We agree with these proposals because the option to have a staggered start can decrease the risk of start line wreck when all start at the same time at a large competition. Also, it takes the pressure of the timing process and vet gate because it spreads the competitors out. We agree with limitations on the number of combinations on the field of play to a number that is manageable. Other disciplines may have 1000 combinations at an event, but there is only one combination in the respective field of play at any one time.
B.03	848	CAN	We agree with these proposals because the option to have a staggered start can decrease the risk of start line wreck when all start at the same time at a large competition. Also, it takes the pressure of the timing process and vet gate because it spreads the competitors out. We agree with limitations on the number of combinations on the field of play to a number that is manageable. Other disciplines may have 1000 combinations at an event, but there is only one combination in the respective field of play at any one time.
B.03	807.2	BRN	We agree with the proposal to use Staggered Start for CEI 1* Events (FEI ER Art. 807.2)
B.03	848	BRN	but we disagree with the limit on the maximum starters as suggested by FEI ER Art. 848
B.03	848	BRN	We disagree with the limit on the maximum starters.
B.03	848	ESP	It is our opinion that 400 starters in a single day are still impossible to manage, and any number above 200 per day is not manageable by Stewards and Judges, no matter their number.
B.03	848	ESP	It is our opinion that 400 starters in a single day are still impossible to manage, and any number above 200 per day is not manageable by Stewards and Judges, no matter their number.
B.03	848	IRL	The agreed EEF proposal is for a maximum of 200 starters per day. It was agreed that above this number it would be impossible to have any control over the ride irrespective of the number of officials available. 200 starters means a potential 1200 people in a crewing area + 200 horses + officials.
B.03	848	ITA	Proposal: maximum 200 starters per day. Reasoning: 400 starters in a single day are always impossible to manage, and any number above 200 per day is not manageable by Stewards and Judges, no matter their number.
B.03	807.2	GBR	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Would prefer ratio of officials to starters</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Staggered starts require all riders to finish before results can be calculated</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not clear if the numbers also include national starters at the event</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some feel the numbers are still too high – not many venues/routes could cope with that many starters</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Staggered starts should be allowed above 1* too, and for rides with fewer than 50 starters</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.03	848	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> Would prefer ratio of officials to starters <input type="checkbox"/> Staggered starts require all riders to finish before results can be calculated <input type="checkbox"/> Not clear if the numbers also include national starters at the event <input type="checkbox"/> Some feel the numbers are still too high – not many venues/routes could cope with that many starters <input type="checkbox"/> Staggered starts should be allowed above 1* too, and for rides with fewer than 50 starters
B.03	848	KSA	<p>If OC meets all FEI condition there is no need to set any limit on the number of starters because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The great development in Endurance sport in recent years in terms of a number of horses, riders and the also officials, are increasing as the sport of Endurance is one of the most growing sport in the International Equestrian Federation. - The technological development and technology used in Endurance events in terms of infrastructure, equipment, number of stables, clinic, timing system and heart rate systems - The fact that Endurance season in most countries of the world is short and the demand by riders to compete in endurance events is very large due to the development of the sport. - All of these factors allow the NF and OC to accept a large number of participants. Accordingly, we recommend not to set any limit on the number of starters. - We suggest forming FEI Technical Committee group to evaluate the capacity of venues especially the permanent venues.
B.03	807.1	NAM	Agree with this proposal
B.03	848	NAM	agree
B.03	807.2	NED	<p>It is unclear whether combinations are supposed to start individually or in groups at a set time or if they can start at their own convenience. This should be clarified. There is a risk that combinations will strategically start late and 'hunt' for the combinations who started earlier. When they catch up, they will be sure of a shorter ride time and higher classification.</p> <p>This would lead to high speeds (especially in the beginning of the course) and risks to horse welfare. A safer alternative would be to divide the starters in groups, each with their own classification and mass start.</p>
B.03	848	NED	Normally this shouldn't be a problem. With the participation of more and more Asian countries at Championships, what will the FEI do with the maximum number of starters if over 40 countries will participate at the World Championship?
B.03	848	NOR	We think that 400 starter per day are too much, suggest only 200 starters per day.
B.03	848	NZL	<p>This proposed rule change would have no impact in New Zealand as we never have that many entries. In general, we believe it would be beneficial to horse welfare internationally. If there is that level of demand to compete in a class, then qualifying criteria should be introduced so that the most experienced horses and riders compete at that level. If there is still further demand then we suggest that more classes be offered over a longer period of time e.g. a 3-4 day competition and that some classes (even at the same distance or rating) would be more prestigious.</p> <p>This would still give other combinations the opportunity to qualify and enable trainers to bring horses through the qualifying criteria. We support this rule change.</p>
B.03	807	OMA	NF agree with this proposals
B.03	807.2	OMA	<p>Agree with the proposal to use Staggered Start for CEI 1 * Events. Recommend to have a Staggered Start for CEI 2* & CEI3* Events</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Better Horse welfare management. 2. Competitors completion percentage of the ride is improving 3. Economic saving the cost and time for organizer and competitors
B.03	848	OMA	<p>We are not supporting to set any limit on the number of starters.</p> <p>The vast improvement in Endurance sport in recent years with participation number of horses and competitors shows it is a most growing sport in the equestrian sports world. It improved technically in all the field of racing with timing system and heart rate monitors etc.</p> <p>Endurance season in most of the countries is short and participation by riders to compete in endurance events is very large .</p> <p>All these factors make NF and OC to accept a large number of participants. We suggest to evaluate the capacity of venues to accommodating the participants</p>
B.03	848	POR	Portuguese NF doesn't agree with the ETC proposal and suggest that FEI force OC's to have more officials in order the competition take place according to regulations.
B.03	807	RUS	WE AGREE WITH THIS PROPOSAL
B.03	807.2	RUS	WE ARE NOT AGREE WITH STAGGERED STARTS
B.03	848	RUS	<p>IF OC MEETS ALL FEI CONDITION THERE IS NO NEED TO SET ANY LIMIT ON THE NUMBER OF STARTERS BECAUSE OF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The great development in Endurance sport in recent years in terms of a number of horses, riders and the also officials, are increasing as the sport of Endurance is one of the most growing sport in the International Equestrian Federation. - The technological development and technology used in Endurance events in terms of infrastructure, equipment, number of stables, clinic, timing system and heart rate systems - The fact that Endurance season in most countries of the world is short and the demand by riders to compete in endurance events is very large due to the development of the sport. - All of these factors allow the NF and OC to accept a large number of participants. Accordingly, we recommend not to set any limit on the number of starters. - We suggest forming FEI Technical Committee group to evaluate the capacity of venues especially the permanent venues.
B.03	807.2	SLO	Staggered starts for safe start
B.03	848	SLO	Too big races are dangerous!
B.03	807	UAE	We agree with this proposal

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.03	807.2	UAE	<input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to use Staggered Start for CEI 1* Events. <input type="checkbox"/> We recommend to have a Staggered Start for CEI 2* & CEI3* Events for the following reasons: 1. Enhance Horse welfare. 2. the staggered start was applied for FEI-CEI* 80 km events and CEI2* 120 km and proved to be successful with no injuries, fractures, accidents of horses were reported, no riders accidents during the event. The field clinic was almost empty. Despite the larger number of starters, vet gate operations functioned efficiently and with much ease. 3. Increased the percentage of completion 4. Enable the NF & OC to cope up with the growth of the sport and high increased number of horses. 5. Staggered start saves the cost and time for the OC, Rider, Trainer, Owner, Officials. 6. Staggered starts allow the athletes to depart in relevant groups allowing them to set their own speed. This is also a protection to horses as mixing with faster combinations can be avoided.
B.03	848	UAE	If OC meets all FEI condition there is no need to set any limit on the number of starters because of: - The great development in Endurance sport in recent years in terms of a number of horses, riders and the also officials, are increasing as the sport of Endurance is one of the most growing sport in the International Equestrian Federation. - The technological development and technology used in Endurance events in terms of infrastructure, equipment, number of stables, clinic, timing system and heart rate systems - The fact that Endurance season in most countries of the world is short and the demand by riders to compete in endurance events is very large due to the development of the sport. - All of these factors allow the NF and OC to accept a large number of participants. Accordingly, we recommend not to set any limit on the number of starters. - We suggest forming FEI Technical Committee group to evaluate the capacity of venues especially the permanent venues.
B.03	807	LBN	We agree with this proposal
B.03	807.2	LBN	<input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to use Staggered Start for CEI 1* Events. <input type="checkbox"/> We recommend to have a Staggered Start for CEI 2* & CEI3* Events for the following reasons: 1. Enhance Horse welfare. 2. the staggered start was applied for FEI-CEI* 80 km events and CEI2* 120 km and proved to be successful with no injuries, fractures, accidents of horses were reported, no riders accidents during the event. The field clinic was almost empty. Despite the larger number of starters, vet gate operations functioned efficiently and with much ease. 3. Increased the percentage of completion 4. Enable the NF & OC to cope up with the growth of the sport and high increased number of horses. 5. Staggered start saves the cost and time for the OC, Rider, Trainer, Owner, Officials. 6. Staggered starts allow the athletes to depart in relevant groups allowing them to set their own speed. This is also a protection to horses as mixing with faster combinations can be avoided.
B.03	848	LBN	If OC meets all FEI condition there is no need to set any limit on the number of starters because of: - The great development in Endurance sport in recent years in terms of a number of horses, riders and the also officials, are increasing as the sport of Endurance is one of the most growing sport in the International Equestrian Federation. - The technological development and technology used in Endurance events in terms of infrastructure, equipment, number of stables, clinic, timing system and heart rate systems - The fact that Endurance season in most countries of the world is short and the demand by riders to compete in endurance events is very large due to the development of the sport. - All of these factors allow the NF and OC to accept a large number of participants. Accordingly, we recommend not to set any limit on the number of starters. - We suggest forming FEI Technical Committee group to evaluate the capacity of venues especially the permanent venues.
B.03	807	LBN	We agree with this proposal

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.03	807.2	LBN	<input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to use Staggered Start for CEI 1* Events. <input type="checkbox"/> We recommend to have a Staggered Start for CEI 2* & CEI3* Events for the following reasons: 1. Enhance Horse welfare. 2. the staggered start was applied for FEI-CEI* 80 km events and CEI2* 120 km and proved to be successful with no injuries, fractures, accidents of horses were reported, no riders accidents during the event. The field clinic was almost empty. Despite the larger number of starters, vet gate operations functioned efficiently and with much ease. 3. Increased the percentage of completion 4. Enable the NF & OC to cope up with the growth of the sport and high increased number of horses. 5. Staggered start saves the cost and time for the OC, Rider, Trainer, Owner, Officials. 6. Staggered starts allow the athletes to depart in relevant groups allowing them to set their own speed. This is also a protection to horses as mixing with faster combinations can be avoided.
B.03	848	LBN	<p>If OC meets all FEI condition there is no need to set any limit on the number of starters because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The great development in Endurance sport in recent years in terms of a number of horses, riders and the also officials, are increasing as the sport of Endurance is one of the most growing sport in the International Equestrian Federation. - The technological development and technology used in Endurance events in terms of infrastructure, equipment, number of stables, clinic, timing system and heart rate systems - The fact that Endurance season in most countries of the world is short and the demand by riders to compete in endurance events is very large due to the development of the sport. - All of these factors allow the NF and OC to accept a large number of participants. Accordingly, we recommend not to set any limit on the number of starters. - We suggest forming FEI Technical Committee group to evaluate the capacity of venues especially the permanent venues.
B.03	807	SUD	We agree with this proposal
B.03	807.2	SUD	<input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to use Staggered Start for CEI 1* Events. <input type="checkbox"/> We recommend to have a Staggered Start for CEI 2* & CEI3* Events for the following reasons: 1. Enhance Horse welfare. 2. the staggered start was applied for FEI-CEI* 80 km events and CEI2* 120 km and proved to be successful with no injuries, fractures, accidents of horses were reported, no riders accidents during the event. The field clinic was almost empty. Despite the larger number of starters, vet gate operations functioned efficiently and with much ease. 3. Increased the percentage of completion 4. Enable the NF & OC to cope up with the growth of the sport and high increased number of horses. 5. Staggered start saves the cost and time for the OC, Rider, Trainer, Owner, Officials. 6. Staggered starts allow the athletes to depart in relevant groups allowing them to set their own speed. This is also a protection to horses as mixing with faster combinations can be avoided.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.03	848	SUD	<p>If OC meets all FEI condition there is no need to set any limit on the number of starters because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The great development in Endurance sport in recent years in terms of a number of horses, riders and the also officials, are increasing as the sport of Endurance is one of the most growing sport in the International Equestrian Federation. - The technological development and technology used in Endurance events in terms of infrastructure, equipment, number of stables, clinic, timing system and heart rate systems - The fact that Endurance season in most countries of the world is short and the demand by riders to compete in endurance events is very large due to the development of the sport. - All of these factors allow the NF and OC to accept a large number of participants. Accordingly, we recommend not to set any limit on the number of starters. - We suggest forming FEI Technical Committee group to evaluate the capacity of venues especially the permanent venues.
B.03	807	SUD	We agree with this proposal
B.03	807.2	SUD	<p><input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to use Staggered Start for CEI 1* Events.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> We recommend to have a Staggered Start for CEI 2* & CEI3* Events for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance Horse welfare. 2. the staggered start was applied for FEI-CEI* 80 km events and CEI2* 120 km and proved to be successful with no injuries, fractures, accidents of horses were reported, no riders accidents during the event. The field clinic was almost empty. Despite the larger number of starters, vet gate operations functioned efficiently and with much ease. 3. Increased the percentage of completion 4. Enable the NF & OC to cope up with the growth of the sport and high increased number of horses. 5. Staggered start saves the cost and time for the OC, Rider, Trainer, Owner, Officials. 6. Staggered starts allow the athletes to depart in relevant groups allowing them to set their own speed. This is also a protection to horses as mixing with faster combinations can be avoided.
B.03	848	SUD	<p>If OC meets all FEI condition there is no need to set any limit on the number of starters because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The great development in Endurance sport in recent years in terms of a number of horses, riders and the also officials, are increasing as the sport of Endurance is one of the most growing sport in the International Equestrian Federation. - The technological development and technology used in Endurance events in terms of infrastructure, equipment, number of stables, clinic, timing system and heart rate systems - The fact that Endurance season in most countries of the world is short and the demand by riders to compete in endurance events is very large due to the development of the sport. - All of these factors allow the NF and OC to accept a large number of participants. Accordingly, we recommend not to set any limit on the number of starters. - We suggest forming FEI Technical Committee group to evaluate the capacity of venues especially the permanent venues.
B.03	848		<p>EEF WG position : maximum 200 starters per day.</p> <p>Reasoning :</p> <p>400 starters in a single day are always impossible to manage, and any number above 200 per day is not manageable by Stewards and Judges, no matter their number.</p>
B.03	848	AUT	<p>EEF WG position : maximum 200 starters per day.</p> <p>Reasoning :</p> <p>400 starters in a single day are always impossible to manage, and any number above 200 per day is not manageable by Stewards and Judges, no matter their number.</p>
B.03	807	LBY	We agree with this proposal
B.03	807.2	LBY	<p><input type="checkbox"/> We agree with the proposal to use Staggered Start for CEI 1* Events.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> We recommend to have a Staggered Start for CEI 2* & CEI3* Events for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance Horse welfare. 2. the staggered start was applied for FEI-CEI* 80 km events and CEI2* 120 km and proved to be successful with no injuries, fractures, accidents of horses were reported, no riders accidents during the event. The field clinic was almost empty. Despite the larger number of starters, vet gate operations functioned efficiently and with much ease. 3. Increased the percentage of completion 4. Enable the NF & OC to cope up with the growth of the sport and high increased number of horses. 5. Staggered start saves the cost and time for the OC, Rider, Trainer, Owner, Officials. 6. Staggered starts allow the athletes to depart in relevant groups allowing them to set their own speed. This is also a protection to horses as mixing with faster combinations can be avoided.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.03	848	LBY	If OC meets all FEI condition there is no need to set any limit on the number of starters because of: - The great development in Endurance sport in recent years in terms of a number of horses, riders and the also officials, are increasing as the sport of Endurance is one of the most growing sport in the International Equestrian Federation. - The technological development and technology used in Endurance events in terms of infrastructure, equipment, number of stables, clinic, timing system and heart rate systems - The fact that Endurance season in most countries of the world is short and the demand by riders to compete in endurance events is very large due to the development of the sport. - All of these factors allow the NF and OC to accept a large number of participants. Accordingly, we recommend not to set any limit on the number of starters. - We suggest forming FEI Technical Committee group to evaluate the capacity of venues especially the permanent venues.
B.03	848	RSA	No problem with rule change
B.04	810	ARG	We agree with this proposal.
B.04	865	ARG	We agree with this proposal.
B.04	810	CAN	We agree with these proposals, there needs to be stiffer penalties for removing a horse from the field of play without the horse being seen by the vets. We would have supported even stronger penalties.
B.04	865	CAN	We agree with these proposals, there needs to be stiffer penalties for removing a horse from the field of play without the horse being seen by the vets. We would have supported even stronger penalties.
B.04	810	BRN	We recommend maintaining the Current Endurance Rules.
B.04	810	ESP	agree
B.04	865	ESP	agree
B.04	865	ITA	Reasoning: We do support proposals to have stronger sanctions for all breach of rules, especially in case of horse welfare and cheating issues.
B.04	807.4	JPN	Please clarify what a "false start" refers to. Is it to cross the start line ahead of the scheduled time?
B.04	810	JPN	We recommend to maintain the current rule. The presenting time: within 30 minutes instead of 20.
B.04		GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> Good for horse welfare <input type="checkbox"/> Penalty should be higher <input type="checkbox"/> 20 minutes too short a time to get horse back to venue <input type="checkbox"/> Would be hard to implement – when does the 20 mins start? <input type="checkbox"/> Should include discretion to take longer in an emergency
B.04	810	NAM	agree
B.04	810	NAM	agree
B.04	810	NOR	This is ok
B.04	810	NZL	We strongly support this proposal.
B.04	865	NZL	Presumably if the athlete and the trainer are the same person, they won't get double penalty points e.g. for a FTQ-ME?
B.04	865	POR	AGREE
B.04	810	EEF	EEF WG position : we do support the FEI ETC proposal Reasoning : We do support proposals to have stronger sanctions for all type of contravention to the rules, especially in case of horse welfare and cheating issues.
B.04	810	AUT	EEF WG position : we do support the FEI ETC proposal Reasoning : We do support proposals to have stronger sanctions for all type of contravention to the rules, especially in case of horse welfare and cheating issues.
B.05	814.4.2	AUS	Length of loops: agree
B.05	814.4.5	AUS	The option (previously 800.2.3) to negotiate a minimum of 5 loops for a 160 km event should be retained, because of the challenges at some events of finding suitable track.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.05	826.4.2	AUS	Crewing restrictions: Agree. The athlete should manage the horse carefully without the need for continuous crewing which may encourage speeds faster than the horse should travel. Water availability: Agree with water available at least every 10 km. Options should also be explored to ensure horses are stopped for a drink at those water points (eg walk through zones, hold at water on course)
B.05	814.4	BEL	Belgium agrees but wants to keep the current situation concerning 160km (5 or 6 loops).
B.05	Chapter III	ARG	We agree with maximum loop length. Minimum number of loops for 160km 5. We agree with no crewing in between crew points. 5km distance between crew points, we agree with this rule, as long as it is authorized by the OC and the crewing zone is delimited.
B.05	814	CAN	We agree with the proposals, except; We would recommend that 814.4.2 be modified by the addition of "Special permission may be granted by the TD to have a loop of minimum 16 km." The rationale for this is that it is sometimes not possible to find all loops at 20 km or greater without modifying the land and that is not always possible.
B.05	814.4.8	CAN	We agree with the proposals
B.05	815	CAN	We agree with the proposals
B.05	816	CAN	We agree with the proposals
B.05	817	CAN	We agree with the proposals
B.05	818	CAN	We agree with the proposals
B.05	826.4.2	CAN	We agree with the proposals
B.05	814.4	CHI	We agree to maintain this rule to protect the welfare of the horse.
B.05	826.4.2	CRO	The proposal of the rules for distance between crew points according to the Memo is 5km between crew points. We would just add that it is defined as minimal distance between two crew points (5 km minimum).
B.05	814.4.2	BRN	Each Loop must be a minimum of 20 km and a maximum of 40 km in length.
B.05	814.4.5	BRN	We agree with the proposal but we recommend the CEI 3* events to be done over 5 loops as well.
B.05	826.4.2	BRN	we don't agree with this proposal and recommend maintaining the current Rules because each country has a different geography, climate and terrain. The welfare of the horse is pivotal for the success of the Endurance Sport and therefore, crewing areas in a distance of 200-300m is quite beneficial for horse welfare in dry and humid regions.
B.05	814	ESP	No benefits have been shown to do 160km rides on 6 loops over 5 loops, and the current flexibility offered by 5 or 6 loops in the design of a course helps Organizing Committees a great deal. Certain courses will benefit from as many loops as possible while others will be best at 5 or find no benefit over more loops, so we propose to keep 160km to have the option to be designed over 5 loops or more, taking into account that loops will no longer be lower than 20km.
B.05	826.4.2	IRL	This need to be amended to read "There must be at least 5 Km between crewing points / water points. " This is an either/or situation.
B.05	814	ITA	Proposal: Allow the possibility of 5 or + loops for 160km competitions, depending of type and size of competition terrain and area. Reasoning: No automatic/universal benefits have been shown to do 160km rides on 6 loops over 5 loops, and the current flexibility offered by 5 or 6 loops in the design of a course may help Organising Committees and FEI Officials to find the best solution. Some events will benefit from as many loops as possible while others will be better with 5 loops, taking into account that loops will no longer be lower than 20km. In addition with remind our position in favor of natural tracks, technical without artificial modification of the surface. Depending of the areas courses may be more flat than others but may never be artificially build flat and not using all the natural opportunities as slopes, turns ... Without controlling that low level of riding skills from the rider and excessive speeds are encouraged.
B.05	822.3.1	JPN	We request you to specify what unmodified (or modified) terrain refers to. Does this mean the course must be kept completely in its nature's form? In Japan an Endurance course usually is set out in a mountainous / forest area. Cutting trees, clearing vegetation, removing rocks --- would those be considered "modification?"
B.05	822.3.2	JPN	Do paving materials matter, e.g. asphalt, concrete, stone, crushed stone, bricks, etc?
B.05	822.4	JPN	Maximum distance between the finish line and the Vet Gate should be stated.
B.05	826.4.2	JPN	We agree with this proposal but not to allow too many crewing points per loop/phase, e.g. limiting one crew point per loop/phase.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.05		GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> May be difficult to manage <input type="checkbox"/> May not be practical for some routes and could mean some rides can't run <input type="checkbox"/> How would biosecurity be managed? <input type="checkbox"/> What does 'access to water' mean? <input type="checkbox"/> 'Water' should say 'drinking water' <input type="checkbox"/> A 16km loop at the end of a 160km is a good thing for a tired horse <input type="checkbox"/> Shorter loops can encourage faster riding <input type="checkbox"/> A horse which needs urgent assistance should be deemed FTC <input type="checkbox"/> Minimum loop lengths don't work for multi day rides <input type="checkbox"/> Some riders would prefer a return to single loop rides with vetgates on course <input type="checkbox"/> More loops and vetgates could mean more rides starting and finishing in the dark
B.05	814.4	KSA	We agree with the proposal but we recommend to keep the current rule for Number of loops for CEI3*
B.05	826.4.2	KSA	We don't agree with this proposal and recommend maintaining the current Rules because: 1. The Endurance sport is practiced in many countries in the world and in different geographical areas, some areas are characterized by extreme cold, moderate and rainy climate whereas some with high temperature, therefore the need for continuous crewing of horses in events vary in different regions. In countries where heat and humidity are high, the horses need to be crewed continuously throughout the loops for the horse welfare. therefore, we recommend that the current situation of continuous crewing should remain. For example, at the Tryon World Equestrian Games, where heat and humidity were high, there were few places to cool the horses, which led to many horses being eliminated. 2. The sport is growing tremendously in Asia and Africa where the weather condition is hot. 3. Study and recommendations presented by Dr. David Marlin at the FEI Sport Forum 2019 for the countries participating in the Olympics - Tokyo 2020, advises the participants countries to do continuous cooling of horses during training periods and competition in order to maintain the health and safety of horses because the period of the Olympics is characterized by high temperatures and humidity and this situation is similar to the climate in many regions of the world that are similar in climate including Africa, Asia, Middle East and Americas
B.05	814.4	NAM	Agree with the proposal
B.05	826.4.2	NAM	agree
B.05	814.4.8	NED	The text does not clarify whether the OC must provide water at least every 10 km or whether there should be either a crewing point or water provided by the OC every 10 km. Either a crewing point or water provided by the OC every 10 km should be sufficient.
B.05	826.4.2	NED	The text does not clarify whether the OC must provide water at least every 10 km or whether there should be either a crewing point or water provided by the OC every 10 km. Either a crewing point or water provided by the OC every 10 km should be sufficient.
B.05	814	NOR	This is ok
B.05	814	NZL	We support this rule change with the exception of the minimum loop length being increased to 20 km. Whilst we recognise that shorter loops are more likely to allow excessively high speed and thus are a risk to horse welfare, these very high speeds are already being seen when loops are 20-24 km long. When designing a course over natural terrain (farmland, forestry etc) it is sometimes impossible to find a loop of 20 km. We strongly recommend that the minimum loop distance remain 16 km. In New Zealand, this rule change is likely to reduce the quality of the track able to be offered on the last loop and is more likely to result in using a portion of a different loop. We would reluctantly vote to support this proposal if it was unchanged.
B.05	814.4	OMA	We agree with the proposal. But supporting the current rule for number of loops for CEI3*.
B.05	826.4.2	OMA	We are disagree with with this proposal and support to maintaining the current Rules because: 1. The Climatic condition our geographical area is requiring continuous crewing of horses, that's may be different in other part of world as per whether condition.
B.05	814	POR	We agree with the proposition of ETC exception made in the 6 loops. Should be left to each OC to decide if the competition has 5 or 6 loops. In case they decide to have 5 it should be in daytime in case of 6 the horse should have more one rest and the phases should be shooter.
B.05	814.4	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULES
B.05	826.4.2	RUS	WE ARE NOT AGREE WITH THIS PROPOSAL AND RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULES BECAUSE: 1. The Endurance sport is practiced in many countries in the world and in different geographical areas, some areas are characterized by extreme cold, moderate and rainy climate whereas some with high temperature, therefore the need for continuous crewing of horses in events vary in different regions. In countries where heat and humidity are high, the horses need to be crewed continuously throughout the loops for the horse welfare. therefore, we recommend that the current situation of continuous crewing should remain. 2. The sport is growing tremendously in Central Asian countries where the weather condition is hot.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.05	814.4.2	SLO	Minimum and maximum length of loops and number of loops.
B.05	826.4.2	SLO	Crewing on crew points, but if needed more water points, let say every 3km?
B.05	814.4.2	USA	Due to terrain, geographic considerations and the challenges with creating new loops, several courses in the U.S. physically are unable to allow for a 6 loop course at the 160km distance nor for a minimum loop length of 20km. Therefore, the recommendation is to leave Articles 800.2.1 and 800.2.3 as they are currently written which allows for a minimum loop length of 16km for all distances and five vet gates/loops for the 160km distance. At very least there should be a method for established Events with good safety records to apply for a dispensation.
B.05	814.4	UAE	We agree with the proposal but we recommend to keep the current rule for Number of loops for CEI3*
B.05	826.4.2	UAE	We don't agree with this proposal and recommend maintaining the current Rules because: 1. The Endurance sport is practiced in many countries in the world and in different geographical areas, some areas are characterized by extreme cold, moderate and rainy climate whereas some with high temperature, therefore the need for continuous crewing of horses in events vary in different regions. In countries where heat and humidity are high, the horses need to be crewed continuously throughout the loops for the horse welfare. therefore, we recommend that the current situation of continuous crewing should remain. For example, at the Tryon World Equestrian Games, where heat and humidity were high, there were few places to cool the horses, which led to many horses being eliminated. 2. The sport is growing tremendously in Asia and Africa where the weather condition is hot. 3. Study and recommendations presented by Dr. David Marlin at the FEI Sport Forum 2019 for the countries participating in the Olympics - Tokyo 2020, advises the participants countries to do continuous cooling of horses during training periods and competition in order to maintain the health and safety of horses because the period of the Olympics is characterized by high temperatures and humidity and this situation is similar to the climate in many regions of the world that are similar in climate including Africa, Asia, Middle East and Americas
B.05	814.4	LBN	We agree with the proposal but we recommend to keep the current rule for Number of loops for CEI3*

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.05	826.4.2	LBN	We don't agree with this proposal and recommend maintaining the current Rules because: 1. The Endurance sport is practiced in many countries in the world and in different geographical areas, some areas are characterized by extreme cold, moderate and rainy climate whereas some with high temperature, therefore the need for continuous crewing of horses in events vary in different regions. In countries where heat and humidity are high, the horses need to be crewed continuously throughout the loops for the horse welfare. therefore, we recommend that the current situation of continuous crewing should remain. For example, at the Tryon World Equestrian Games, where heat and humidity were high, there were few places to cool the horses, which led to many horses being eliminated. 2. The sport is growing tremendously in Asia and Africa where the weather condition is hot. 3. Study and recommendations presented by Dr. David Marlin at the FEI Sport Forum 2019 for the countries participating in the Olympics - Tokyo 2020, advises the participants countries to do continuous cooling of horses during training periods and competition in order to maintain the health and safety of horses because the period of the Olympics is characterized by high temperatures and humidity and this situation is similar to the climate in many regions of the world that are similar in climate including Africa, Asia, Middle East and Americas
B.05	814.4	LBN	We agree with the proposal but we recommend to keep the current rule for Number of loops for CEI3*
B.05	826.4.2	LBN	We don't agree with this proposal and recommend maintaining the current Rules because: 1. The Endurance sport is practiced in many countries in the world and in different geographical areas, some areas are characterized by extreme cold, moderate and rainy climate whereas some with high temperature, therefore the need for continuous crewing of horses in events vary in different regions. In countries where heat and humidity are high, the horses need to be crewed continuously throughout the loops for the horse welfare. therefore, we recommend that the current situation of continuous crewing should remain. For example, at the Tryon World Equestrian Games, where heat and humidity were high, there were few places to cool the horses, which led to many horses being eliminated. 2. The sport is growing tremendously in Asia and Africa where the weather condition is hot. 3. Study and recommendations presented by Dr. David Marlin at the FEI Sport Forum 2019 for the countries participating in the Olympics - Tokyo 2020, advises the participants countries to do continuous cooling of horses during training periods and competition in order to maintain the health and safety of horses because the period of the Olympics is characterized by high temperatures and humidity and this situation is similar to the climate in many regions of the world that are similar in climate including Africa, Asia, Middle East and Americas
B.05	814.4	SUD	We agree with the proposal but we recommend to keep the current rule for Number of loops for CEI3*
B.05	826.4.2	SUD	We don't agree with this proposal and recommend maintaining the current Rules because: 1. The Endurance sport is practiced in many countries in the world and in different geographical areas, some areas are characterized by extreme cold, moderate and rainy climate whereas some with high temperature, therefore the need for continuous crewing of horses in events vary in different regions. In countries where heat and humidity are high, the horses need to be crewed continuously throughout the loops for the horse welfare. therefore, we recommend that the current situation of continuous crewing should remain. For example, at the Tryon World Equestrian Games, where heat and humidity were high, there were few places to cool the horses, which led to many horses being eliminated. 2. The sport is growing tremendously in Asia and Africa where the weather condition is hot. 3. Study and recommendations presented by Dr. David Marlin at the FEI Sport Forum 2019 for the countries participating in the Olympics - Tokyo 2020, advises the participants countries to do continuous cooling of horses during training periods and competition in order to maintain the health and safety of horses because the period of the Olympics is characterized by high temperatures and humidity and this situation is similar to the climate in many regions of the world that are similar in climate including Africa, Asia, Middle East and Americas
B.05	814.4	SUD	We agree with the proposal but we recommend to keep the current rule for Number of loops for CEI3*
B.05	826.4.2	SUD	We don't agree with this proposal and recommend maintaining the current Rules because: 1. The Endurance sport is practiced in many countries in the world and in different geographical areas, some areas are characterized by extreme cold, moderate and rainy climate whereas some with high temperature, therefore the need for continuous crewing of horses in events vary in different regions. In countries where heat and humidity are high, the horses need to be crewed continuously throughout the loops for the horse welfare. therefore, we recommend that the current situation of continuous crewing should remain. For example, at the Tryon World Equestrian Games, where heat and humidity were high, there were few places to cool the horses, which led to many horses being eliminated. 2. The sport is growing tremendously in Asia and Africa where the weather condition is hot. 3. Study and recommendations presented by Dr. David Marlin at the FEI Sport Forum 2019 for the countries participating in the Olympics - Tokyo 2020, advises the participants countries to do continuous cooling of horses during training periods and competition in order to maintain the health and safety of horses because the period of the Olympics is characterized by high temperatures and humidity and this situation is similar to the climate in many regions of the world that are similar in climate including Africa, Asia, Middle East and Americas

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.05	814	EEF	EEF WG position : we recommend to let the possibility of 5 or + loops for 160km competitions. Reasoning : No automatic/universal benefits have been shown to do 160km rides on 6 loops over 5 loops, and the current flexibility offered by 5 or 6 loops in the design of a course may helps Organizing Committees and FEI Officials to find the best solution. Some events will benefit from as many loops as possible while others will be better with 5 loops, taking into account that loops will no longer be lower than 20km. In addition with remind our position in favor of natural tracks, technicals without artificials modifications of the surface. Depending of the areas courses may be more flat than others but may never be artificially build flat and not using all the natural opportunities as slopes, turns... Without controlling that low level of riding skills from the rider and excessive speeds are encouraged.
B.05	814	AUT	EEF WG position : we recommend to let the possibility of 5 or + loops for 160km competitions. Reasoning : No automatic/universal benefits have been shown to do 160km rides on 6 loops over 5 loops, and the current flexibility offered by 5 or 6 loops in the design of a course may helps Organizing Committees and FEI Officials to find the best solution. Some events will benefit from as many loops as possible while others will be better with 5 loops, taking into account that loops will no longer be lower than 20km. In addition with remind our position in favor of natural tracks, technicals without artificials modifications of the surface. Depending of the areas courses may be more flat than others but may never be artificially build flat and not using all the natural opportunities as slopes, turns... Without controlling that low level of riding skills from the rider and excessive speeds are encouraged.
B.05	814.4	LBY	We agree with the proposal but we recommend to keep the current rule for Number of loops for CEI3*
B.05	826.4.2	LBY	We don't agree with this proposal and recommend maintaining the current Rules because: 1. The Endurance sport is practiced in many countries in the world and in different geographical areas, some areas are characterized by extreme cold, moderate and rainy climate whereas some with high temperature, therefore the need for continuous crewing of horses in events vary in different regions. In countries where heat and humidity are high, the horses need to be crewed continuously throughout the loops for the horse welfare. therefore, we recommend that the current situation of continuous crewing should remain. For example, at the Tryon World Equestrian Games, where heat and humidity were high, there were few places to cool the horses, which led to many horses being eliminated. 2. The sport is growing tremendously in Asia and Africa where the weather condition is hot. 3. Study and recommendations presented by Dr. David Marlin at the FEI Sport Forum 2019 for the countries participating in the Olympics - Tokyo 2020, advises the participants countries to do continuous cooling of horses during training periods and competition in order to maintain the health and safety of horses because the period of the Olympics is characterized by high temperatures and humidity and this situation is similar to the climate in many regions of the world that are similar in climate including Africa, Asia, Middle East and Americas
B.06	817.4.1	AUS	The published research indicates a higher risk of subsequent elimination and metabolic compromise for horses with heart rate over 60 beats per minute (bpm), therefore EA believe this rule should be further altered to reflect that, ie that heart rate parameters should be 60 bpm within 15 minutes at all vet gates, and 60 bpm within 20 minutes at the final inspection.
B.06	817.4.3	AUS	The athlete should know and manage the horse sufficiently well to assess when that horse should be presented for inspection.
B.06	817.4.3	BEL	Belgium does not agree with this change. Current rule is OK.
B.06	817.4	ARG	We don't agree with this proposal. Maintain the current rule.
B.06	817.4	CAN	We agree with these proposals. We also recommend that if a horse presents to the vets within these parameters, with a heart rate less than 40 bpm, and speeds over 20 km per hour, the horse should be targeted for medication control testing.
B.06	817.7	CAN	We agree with the proposals
B.06	817.4	CHI	Reduce the recovery time (20 min) to 15 min. It would be necessary to make a study considering the opinion of veterinarians. There was no consensus on that point.
B.06	817.4	CRO	NF Croatia is not in favour of the proposed rules that at the first vet gate after halfway point in a ride, Horses that present with a heart rate greater than 68 bpm at the first presentation will not have the opportunity for a heart rate re-presentation and will be designated FTQ-ME. Namely, such raise in the hear rate can be caused by some outside event that frightened the horse or the horse reacts to the horse next to it. NF Croatia proposes that opportunity for re-presentation remains as it is currently prescribed.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.06	817	CRC	CRC Comments: The implementation of "horses that present with a heart rate greater than 68 bpm at the first vet gate after the halfway point on the course or third vet gate (whichever comes first)..." this new proposal might just be too difficult to enforce for those of us who do not have sophisticated timing devices. It might just be best to apply the no greater than 68 bpm or higher elimination at all distances in all phases.
B.06	817.4.3	BRA	The BRA NF agrees with 64 BPM in 15 min and 20 min for the final presentation, but we believe that the rule of 68 BPM after 50% of the distance is not reasonable as for any reason a horse could startle (f.i. drone) and have his heartbeat go up without being necessarily a metabolic issue.
B.06	817.5	BRA	Not clear the way it is written. Hold time only starts at the time the horse meets the HR parameters??? The time keeping system takes note of the time when the horse enters the veterinary control area, but the way it is written hold time is linked to heart rate parameter means there must be another link to the Time keeping to keep control of the exact time of heart rate check???
B.06	817.4	BRN	We recommend maintaining the Current Endurance Rules.
B.06	817.4	ESP	We believe that Presentation Times changes are enough to begin with and to review the situation over a long period to see its impact. Considering that the current Heart Rate monitors that are mainly used in Europe and the Middle East have quite wide error ranges, we believe it is very dangerous to the competition to consider 68 a number upon which to eliminate directly without the chance for a Re-inspection and would like to see this idea removed, or at least increased by a very high margin like 80 bpm
B.06	817.4.3	IRL	The standard accepted by the EEF was 70 BPM not the proposed 68.
B.06	817.4.5	IRL	The reason for the disqualification / elimination FTQ ME needs to be stated as it has implications for MOOCP.
B.06	817.5.6	IRL	At all CEI 2** and 3*** rides there will be a minimum of one CRI at the last inspection.
B.06	817.4	ITA	Proposal: Remove the specific proposal concerning "Re inspection HR" for Vet Gates in the 2nd half of the course distance. Reasoning: We believe that Presentation Times changes are positive and effective. We should all time to review the situation over a longer period to see its impact and see if further changes are needed. Moreover, being conscious that the current Heart Rate monitors that are mainly used have quite wide error ranges, we believe it is very dangerous to the competition to consider 68 a number upon which to eliminate directly without the chance for a Re-inspection. Before making any change, we would request the guarantee of an higher reliability of the heart rate monitors. At the current stage if there is the wish to keep a maximum heart rate it may be increased by a very high margin up to 80 bpm.
B.06	817.4.3	JPN	Is the protocol for assessing the heart rate the same as theothers? Please clarify.
B.06	817.4.1	ECU	<input type="checkbox"/> There are no studies done at high altitude. Running at sea level is not the same as running at 3000 meters as is the case in Ecuador. <input type="checkbox"/> By lowering the recovery time, the horses that run in high altitude can be affected much more than the horses in countries that run at sea level. <input type="checkbox"/> Horse mortality occurs in flat places where horses recover faster, as in the Emirates. <input type="checkbox"/> An Endurance horse has never died during competitions in Ecuador.
B.06	817.4.3	ECU	<input type="checkbox"/> The Heart rate measurement proposed is not validate at the altitude in wich we run in Ecuador. <input type="checkbox"/> A well-trained and well-runned horse, which at the minute of arriving drops to 64 beats per minute and that for any reason (scare, stress, pressure, etc.) when measuring it has risen 4 beats per minute, is eliminated; while a poorly trained and poorly run horse is presented to the check-up at 14 minutes and passes with 64 (this does not mean that the second horse is healthier). <input type="checkbox"/> This punishes the attempt to be more competitive, who wants to enter faster to save time in the race; that benefits horses and binomials that may have a lower level of training, due to the risk of being eliminated due to the difference of 4 beats per minute.
B.06	817.4	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> 68bpm elimination penalises excitable horses or those that have been spooked by something in the vetting <input type="checkbox"/> Is it too complex for the HRMs and officials to cope with? <input type="checkbox"/> G7 horses easily reach the heart rate parameters so it won't slow them down <input type="checkbox"/> Shortening presentation times may disadvantage native types <input type="checkbox"/> There should be stronger penalties for those that don't present in time
B.06	817.4	KSA	We recommend maintaining the current Rules: At lower level events younger, less experienced horses may well take longer to achieve the required HR at vet gates throughout the competition. It is part of a learning curve for both horse and athlete and adds to the development of their competencies. A reduction to the time for HR compliance will result in the increase in disqualifications of athletes, reducing their ability to increase their experience and skill
B.06	817.4.3	KSA	We recommend maintaining the current Rules because: • Some horses can still be nervous with higher heart rate which does not indicate a metabolic problem. • at Low Level events younger, less experienced horses may well record higher than normal HR at vet gates throughout the competition. It is part of a learning curve for both horse and Athlete. The requested recovery inspection is always available as is the CRI to check if a horse required two presentations to initially meet the max 64 is fine to continue
B.06	817.4	NAM	Regardless of star level? Would this also for novice horses? This seems to be unfair. Young horses tend to be more jittery and not accustomed to the noise etc. at rides. This may have a negative effect on them. In essence we agree for horses out of the novice phase.
B.06	817.4.1	NAM	Agree for horses out of Novice
B.06	817.4.3	NED	We don't agree with the rule that horses with a heart rate greater than 68bpm may not be presented for the second time within the time of article 817.4.1.
B.06	817.4	NOR	Heart rate parameter will be 64 beats per minute in a presentation time of 15 minutes at all vet gates, 64 bpm in 20 minutes at the final Horse Inspection Both are ok. Regarding; At the first vet gate after the halfway point in a ride (based on distance covered), Horses that present with a heart rate greater than 68 bpm at the first presentation will not have the opportunity for a heart rate re-presentation and will be designated FTQ-ME. We don't approve on this proposal, in principle it's a good idea, but in practices we think it will be a lot of misunderstanding with lots of starters, different classes, length etc. and to keep trac of who are in the first halfway in the ride and who are not. We believe it will be difficult to manage this in a good and fair way.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.06	817.4	NZL	We believe that the proposed amendment is workable. We would prefer that horses be allowed a second re-inspection for heart rate at all except the final Vet Gate as it is possible for a horse to become agitated when in the Vet Ring due to outside disturbances and for the HR to be elevated even though the horse is not metabolically compromised. We suggest that the rule be re-worded that any horse requiring a second HR inspection in the second half of the course distance be automatically be given a re-inspection before commencing the next loop. This would further safeguard the welfare of the horse. If all vets would allow an agitated horse a chance to settle so the HR may come down, this would also minimise the chance of a horse that was coping with the event being eliminated. We would prefer to see a change in wording as suggested but we would vote for this rule in its present form.
B.06	817.4	OMA	We support to maintaining the current Rules : Younger new horses will take longer time to get the required HR in vet gates in lower events. It is a part of their learning hub for improving their competencies. Reduced timing for recovery will affect their skill to attain more experience and sporting ability.
B.06	817.4.3	OMA	We recommend maintaining the current Rules because: • Nervous horses show still high heart rate ,doesn't indicate its metabolic ability and endurance
B.06	817.7	POR	We don't agree with the presentation time for the final Inspection. There are many horses in perfect conditions that, after the final sprint don't recover in less than 30 minutes.
B.06	817.4	RUS	WE RECOMMEND MAINTAINING THE CURRENT RULES BECAUSE AT EVENTS FOR THE BEGINNERS (YOUNG AND LESS EXPERIENCED HORSES) THEY NEED LONGER TIME SO TO ACHIEVE THE REQUIRED HR. IT IS PART OF TRAINING LIFE FOR BOTH HORSE AND RIDER.
B.06	817.4.3	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULES WITH THE ADDITIONS AS FOLLOWS: 1) AT ALL THE CHAMPIONSHIPS AND OFFICIAL COMPETITIONS VIDEO REGISTRATION AT TROT CONTROL SHOULD BE STRICTLY RECOMMENDED IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO CONVINCINGLY APPEAL IN CASE OF DOUBT AT SPORTSMAN, HORSE OWNER OR OTHER INTERESTED PERSON (QUITE OFTEN VETERINARIANS ALLOW TO CONTINUE THE COMPETITION TO OBVIOUSLY LAME HORSE AND ELIMINATE THE HEALTHY ONES); 2) TO PRESCRIBE IN RULES ALL THE SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE HORSE MAY BE WITHDRAWN FROM THE COMPETITION, NAMELY: 1. Evident lameness; 2. Pulse over 64 beats per minute (or the pulse indicated in the Statute) measured before the trot control; 3. Evident colics; 4. Open wounds which can cause a real threat to the life of the horse 5. In all other cases, the Commission may recommend to the team vet, trainer or rider to remove the horse for metabolic reasons. Veterinarian, trainer or rider of the national team has the right to remove the horse from the competition or to continue based on knowledge of her/his physiological characteristics, and assign, if necessary, for the treatment and have being taking full personal responsibility for further state of the horses taking into account possible personal disqualification at any time. 3) TO ESTABLISH THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY OF VETERINARIANS (EVEN THE EXCLUSION FROM THE LIST OF FEI VETS) FOR THE WRONGFUL ELIMINATION OF THE HORSE FROM THE COMPETITION. SO TO ACHIEVE THIS AIM – TO RECORD THE VOTING RESULTS OF EACH VETERINARIAN IN THE DECISION TO ELIMINATE THE HORSE FROM THE COMPETITION WITH A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE REASON FOR THE REMOVAL. EVERY VETERINARIAN HAS TO WRITE A PERSONAL NOTE WITHOUT ANY DISCUSSION WITH OTHER VETS IN THE CASE OF LAMENESS AND TO INDICATE ON WHICH LEG THE HORSE IS LAME. CURRENTLY, ANY VETERINARIAN CAN ANONYMOUSLY REMOVE FROM THE COMPETITION JUST ANY RIDER AND HORSE WITHOUT EXPLANATION WHICH IS CLEARLY SUBJECTIVE WHILE THE VETERINARIAN DOES NOT BEAR ANY
B.06	817.4	SLO	Times for represent herat rate should remain 20 minutes for loops and 30 minutes for final vet check.
B.06	817.4.3	SLO	Young and unexpernsed horses could be just nervous and that would stop them from racing?
B.06	817.4.3	SWE	We think that a heart rate greater than 72 bmp will secure a more correct heart rate. Though we feel that this article can be very hard to handle and could create a lot misunder-standing specially when there is huge amount of participants and a lot of different classes, length of courses at the same time.
B.06	817.4.1	URU	1. Uruguay considers that lowering the presentation time would not benefit the horse welfare. Through an analysis of the different events all over the world, we can see that the horses that run faster or the places where there are more fatalities or more abuse is where there is a short recovery time period. Therefore, this measure would not result in the desired effect.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.06	817.4.3	URU	We emphasize that we do not agree with this article. By Establishing that "68 "will not allow a new presentation opportunity does not benefit the welfare of the horse at all, but only attempts against those who, in their eagerness to save time, present their horse as quickly as possible. For example: We wonder how would it improve the horse welfare the fact that a rider presents his/her horse one minute after trespassing the arrival line and has more than 68 and is therefore penalized and presents the horse again 2 minutes later and is under 64? Which is the difference with another that delays the entry to the Vet Gate let's say 14 minutes and has also 64? Could someone assure that one of the horses is metabolically better than the other?
B.06	831.1	URU	Uruguay does not agree to change the horse minimum age. We consider that with the age established in the current regulation the horses have the appropriate maturity for the required requirements.
B.06	817.4	UAE	We recommend maintaining the current Rules : At lower level events younger, less experienced horses may well take longer to achieve the required HR at vet gates throughout the competition. It is part of a learning curve for both horse and athlete and adds to the development of their competencies. A reduction to the time for HR compliance will result in the increase in disqualifications of athletes, reducing their ability to increase their experience and skill
B.06	817.4.3	UAE	We recommend maintaining the current Rules because: <input type="checkbox"/> Some horses can still be nervous with higher heart rate which does not indicate a metabolic problem.
B.06	817.4	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current Rules : At lower level events younger, less experienced horses may well take longer to achieve the required HR at vet gates throughout the competition. It is part of a learning curve for both horse and athlete and adds to the development of their competencies. A reduction to the time for HR compliance will result in the increase in disqualifications of athletes, reducing their ability to increase their experience and skill
B.06	817.4.3	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current Rules because: <input type="checkbox"/> Some horses can still be nervous with higher heart rate which does not indicate a metabolic problem.
B.06	817.4	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current Rules : At lower level events younger, less experienced horses may well take longer to achieve the required HR at vet gates throughout the competition. It is part of a learning curve for both horse and athlete and adds to the development of their competencies. A reduction to the time for HR compliance will result in the increase in disqualifications of athletes, reducing their ability to increase their experience and skill
B.06	817.4.3	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current Rules because: <input type="checkbox"/> Some horses can still be nervous with higher heart rate which does not indicate a metabolic problem.
B.06	817.4	SUD	We recommend maintaining the current Rules : At lower level events younger, less experienced horses may well take longer to achieve the required HR at vet gates throughout the competition. It is part of a learning curve for both horse and athlete and adds to the development of their competencies. A reduction to the time for HR compliance will result in the increase in disqualifications of athletes, reducing their ability to increase their experience and skill
B.06	817.4.3	SUD	We recommend maintaining the current Rules because: <input type="checkbox"/> Some horses can still be nervous with higher heart rate which does not indicate a metabolic problem.
B.06	817.4	SUD	We recommend maintaining the current Rules : At lower level events younger, less experienced horses may well take longer to achieve the required HR at vet gates throughout the competition. It is part of a learning curve for both horse and athlete and adds to the development of their competencies. A reduction to the time for HR compliance will result in the increase in disqualifications of athletes, reducing their ability to increase their experience and skill
B.06	817.4.3	SUD	We recommend maintaining the current Rules because: <input type="checkbox"/> Some horses can still be nervous with higher heart rate which does not indicate a metabolic problem.
B.06	814.4	EEF	EEF WG position : we do support the proposal of presentation times but not the specific proposal concerning "Re inspection HR" for Vet Gates in the 2nd half of the course distance that we would remove. Reasoning : We believe that Presentation Times changes are positives and effectives. It will allow to review the situation over a long period to see its impact and see if further changes are needed. Moreover being conscious that the current Heart Rate monitors that are mainly used have quite wide error ranges, we believe it is very dangerous to the competition to consider 68 a number upon which to eliminate directly without the chance for a Re-inspection. Before to make any change we would request the guarantee of an higher reliability of the heart rate monitors. At the current stage if there is the wish to keep a maximum heart rate it may be increased by a very high margin up to 80 bpm.
B.06	814.4	AUT	EEF WG position : we do support the proposal of presentation times but not the specific proposal concerning "Re inspection HR" for Vet Gates in the 2nd half of the course distance that we would remove. Reasoning : We believe that Presentation Times changes are positives and effectives. It will allow to review the situation over a long period to see its impact and see if further changes are needed. Moreover being conscious that the current Heart Rate monitors that are mainly used have quite wide error ranges, we believe it is very dangerous to the competition to consider 68 a number upon which to eliminate directly without the chance for a Re-inspection. Before to make any change we would request the guarantee of an higher reliability of the heart rate monitors. At the current stage if there is the wish to keep a maximum heart rate it may be increased by a very high margin up to 80 bpm.
B.06	817.4	LBY	We recommend maintaining the current Rules : At lower level events younger, less experienced horses may well take longer to achieve the required HR at vet gates throughout the competition. It is part of a learning curve for both horse and athlete and adds to the development of their competencies. A reduction to the time for HR compliance will result in the increase in disqualifications of athletes, reducing their ability to increase their experience and skill

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.06	817.4.3	LBY	We recommend maintaining the current Rules because: <input type="checkbox"/> Some horses can still be nervous with higher heart rate which does not indicate a metabolic problem.
B.05	814.4	RSA	Agree that there should be 6 loops for CEI 3*
B.05	817.4	RSA	Maintain rule as is
B.07	819.1	AUS	In principle EA agree with this restriction, which makes it more equitable for those riders who do not have a large team, and limits the opportunity for horses to be hidden behind people, therefore ensuring better transparency in the field of play. The team veterinarian and Chef d'Equipe should be additional to the 3 crew per horse. Suitable viewing areas outside the field of play will allow spectators and family members to watch carefully while remaining safe.
B.07	819.1.2	BEL	Belgium agrees with 5 people around the horse on the field of play (4 grooms + 1 rider).
B.07	819.1	ARG	We don't agree with this proposal, We believe that officials must ensure that the current rule is fulfilled. Maintain the current rule.
B.07	826.4	ARG	We don't agree with this proposal, We believe that officials must ensure that the current rule is fulfilled. Maintain the current rule.
B.07	819	CAN	We disagree with the proposals to reduce down to 3 – we recommend that number of grooms allowed in the vet gate be 3, and that 2 additional crew members also be allowed in the field of play. Also, specific rules be put in place to ensure that the number of people around a specific horse does not exceed 3, so that the issue of excessive crew crowding a horse is addressed – at present there are no rules that the officials can use to limit excessive crowding of a horse. If the crew of a horse are delayed getting back to the vet gate, and the athlete is unable to trot the horse, what mechanism will be in place for somebody else to present the horse?
B.07	826	CHI	The binomial can be assisted at any time if the rider falls or if the horse loses one or more horseshoe. We agree in case of an accident, not so if loses a horseshoe since it can be taken as undue assistance. And it is difficult to control on track. It would have to go with a steward.
B.07	819.2.1	CRC	We fully agree that rider and horse must be clearly marked and identified. We would like to suggest that support personnel should wear bibs in rides of 50 horses or more. Bibs are an additional cost to OCs.
B.07	822.3.1	CRC	CRC Question: In our part of the world (tropical countries) hard surface roads are as bad as deep mud unmodified terrains that are detrimental to the welfare of the horse as well. What is the definition of unmodified terrain? How will FEI interpret this?
B.07	819.1	BRN	We recommend maintaining the Current Endurance Rules where 5 persons are allowed in the Field of Play per Horse and which allows the FEI Endurance Officials to reduce this number if needed.
B.07	826.4	BRN	We recommend maintaining the Current Endurance Rules where 5 persons are allowed in the Field of Play per Horse and which allows the FEI Endurance Officials to reduce this number if needed.
B.07	819.1	ESP	The reasoning of the proposal makes it look like 5 people around a horse is a mob with safety risks to them and impossible for officials to control, against all common sense and as proven in the last European Championships where the Officials could easily keep 5 crews per horse all the time, with absolutely no accidents known to have happened in the recent times. We cannot find the logic behind this change and would like to keep the sport accessible for families and friends, which make up the biggest components of the sport in our country. Lowering the amount of crews will reduce the possibility of this being a family sport. The current rule itself is only rarely enforced at certain high caliber events, so it seems like a rule for something that is generally disregarded in the majority of competitions.
B.07	819.1.2	FRA	We do support the FEI ETC proposal by reducing the crew members from 5 to 3 because it would be very positive in terms of horse welfare and fairness of the sport. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It will be an efficient way avoid cheating by facilitating the job of officials who will have less persons to control. It will tackle those who are hiding wrong behaviors with crew members in between the horse and officials. ● This proposal, still means up to 4 persons to take care of a single horse. There is no reasonable motivations to have more. As we want to encourage a sport of horse/rider combination, it means also that the rider may be part of the persons caring the horse. In the case the rider have to rest without caring is horse, 3 persons are still able to fully assume it. ● This new rule will also contribute of the equity between riders and nations from budget perspective. Currently there are only some nations able to assume a full team of crew members.
B.07	819.1.2	IRL	The proposal is for three per horse on the field of play. This needs to be amended to read only Crew Members wearing the same number as the horse may crew it. However it also means that only those three people can crew the horse out on course. This may prove very difficult in some cases. However this compliment has to be measured against other factors such the number of starters., vet gate size etc.
B.07	819.1	ITA	We fully support stricter controls in order to stop current drifts. As there is no full consensus for 3 instead of 5 we may support 4 as a compromise.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.07	819.1	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> It will affect the family/communal nature of the sport where everyone helps each other, and penalises the single horse owner <input type="checkbox"/> Some riders think more crew should be allowed, some less <input type="checkbox"/> Crews would need to have bibs <input type="checkbox"/> Impossible to restrict access to field of play on public land/RoW <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to manage when groups of horses are riding in teams with teams of crew <input type="checkbox"/> Penalises disabled riders who need extra help <input type="checkbox"/> For team competitions, shared Team Farriers and Team Physiotherapists should be considered in addition to Chefs d'Equipe and Team Veterinarians
B.07	819.1.2	KSA	We recommend maintaining the current Rules that allow 5 people as crew members because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature of the climate and weather condition requires continuous cooling on the horses and therefore needs a crew to do the job for the welfare of the horse, and the current rule allows the officials to reduce the number if needed. • When the restriction on crew numbers was first introduced, five was established to allow the inclusion of family members. Endurance has always prided itself on being a family sport at all levels as this is not purely a spectator sport. The existing rule allows to reduce numbers if needed in any event.
B.07	819.1.2	NAM	Three is adequate. Agree.
B.07	819.1.2	NED	We advise that the maximum number of crew members allowed on the recovery and hold area is four per horse.
B.07	819.1	NOR	This is ok
B.07	819.1	NZL	We would like to see up to 5 crew plus the rider allowed to work with the horse in crewing areas (before entering the Vet Gate). We do not believe that 3 crew plus the rider is sufficient to manage the horse, particularly with the proposed changes to heart rate parameters and presentation times. The Vet Gate crewing area should be sufficiently large to manage the number of crew per horse. The Chef d'Equipe and team vet should be part of the 5 crew allowed. We do not believe that 5 crew is excessive or could shield a horse from the officials. We would prefer that this rule be voted on separately. We would reluctantly vote for this rule under its current wording.
B.07	819.1.2	OMA	Support to maintaining the current Rules that allow 5 people as crew members because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate and weather condition needs the continuous cooling of horses requires more grooms to manage the situation
B.07	819.1	POR	AGREE
B.07	819.1.2	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULES THAT ALLOW 5 PEOPLE AS CREW MEMBERS BECAUSE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • THE NATURE OF THE CLIMATE AND WEATHER CONDITION VERY OFTEN REQUIRE CONTINUOUS COOLING ON THE HORSES AND THEREFORE NEED A CREW TO DO THE JOB FOR THE WELFARE OF THE HORSE. ALSO, THE CURRENT RULE ALLOWS THE OFFICIALS TO REDUCE THE NUMBER IF NEEDED. • ALSO, ENDURANCE IS VERY OFTEN A FAMILY SPORT, AND NUMBER OF FIVE ALLOWS TO INCLUDE FAMILY MEMBERS. ENDURANCE HAS ALWAYS PRIDED ITSELF ON BEING A FAMILY SPORT AT ALL LEVELS AS THIS IS NOT PURELY A SPECTATOR SPORT. THE EXISTING RULE ALLOWS TO REDUCE NUMBERS IF NEEDED AT ANY EVENT.
B.07	819.1	SLO	Some field of play are really big and riders and horses need help for water and everything! Just imagine 3 people carrying everything 300m or more?
B.07	819.1.2	UAE	We recommend maintaining the current Rules that allow 5 people as crew members because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The nature of the climate and weather condition requires continuous cooling on the horses and therefore needs a crew to do the job for the welfare of the horse, and the current rule allows the officials to reduce the number if needed. <input type="checkbox"/> When the restriction on crew numbers was first introduced, five was established to allow the inclusion of family members. Endurance has always prided itself on being a family sport at all levels as this is not purely a spectator sport. The existing rule allows to reduce numbers if needed in any event.
B.07	819.1.2	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current Rules that allow 5 people as crew members because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The nature of the climate and weather condition requires continuous cooling on the horses and therefore needs a crew to do the job for the welfare of the horse, and the current rule allows the officials to reduce the number if needed. <input type="checkbox"/> When the restriction on crew numbers was first introduced, five was established to allow the inclusion of family members. Endurance has always prided itself on being a family sport at all levels as this is not purely a spectator sport. The existing rule allows to reduce numbers if needed in any event.
B.07	819.1.2	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current Rules that allow 5 people as crew members because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The nature of the climate and weather condition requires continuous cooling on the horses and therefore needs a crew to do the job for the welfare of the horse, and the current rule allows the officials to reduce the number if needed. <input type="checkbox"/> When the restriction on crew numbers was first introduced, five was established to allow the inclusion of family members. Endurance has always prided itself on being a family sport at all levels as this is not purely a spectator sport. The existing rule allows to reduce numbers if needed in any event.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.07	819.1.2	SUD	We recommend maintaining the current Rules that allow 5 people as crew members because: <input type="checkbox"/> The nature of the climate and weather condition requires continuous cooling on the horses and therefore needs a crew to do the job for the welfare of the horse, and the current rule allows the officials to reduce the number if needed. <input type="checkbox"/> When the restriction on crew numbers was first introduced, five was established to allow the inclusion of family members. Endurance has always prided itself on being a family sport at all levels as this is not purely a spectator sport. The existing rule allows to reduce numbers if needed in any event.
B.07	819.1.2	SUD	We recommend maintaining the current Rules that allow 5 people as crew members because: <input type="checkbox"/> The nature of the climate and weather condition requires continuous cooling on the horses and therefore needs a crew to do the job for the welfare of the horse, and the current rule allows the officials to reduce the number if needed. <input type="checkbox"/> When the restriction on crew numbers was first introduced, five was established to allow the inclusion of family members. Endurance has always prided itself on being a family sport at all levels as this is not purely a spectator sport. The existing rule allows to reduce numbers if needed in any event.
B.07	819.1	EEF	EEF WG position : as there is no full consensus for 3 instead of 5 we may support 4 as a compromise. Reasoning : We support the reduction of crew members and recommend stricter controls in order to facilitate controls and stop current drifts.
B.07	819.1	AUT	EEF WG position : as there is no full consensus for 3 instead of 5 we may support 4 as a compromise. Reasoning : We support the reduction of crew members and recommend stricter controls in order to facilitate controls and stop current drifts.
B.07	819.1.2	LBY	We recommend maintaining the current Rules that allow 5 people as crew members because: <input type="checkbox"/> The nature of the climate and weather condition requires continuous cooling on the horses and therefore needs a crew to do the job for the welfare of the horse, and the current rule allows the officials to reduce the number if needed. <input type="checkbox"/> When the restriction on crew numbers was first introduced, five was established to allow the inclusion of family members. Endurance has always prided itself on being a family sport at all levels as this is not purely a spectator sport. The existing rule allows to reduce numbers if needed in any event.
B.08	828	AUS	Agree that no creams should be applied prior to veterinary inspection. However, for on track use, there are some creams and products which are safe and limit abrasions to lower limbs from sand and other soil, thus maintaining horse welfare, and these should be allowed.
B.08	828	BEL	Belgium does not agree. These products are not to dope or to hide something but are used to prevent injuries.
B.08	829	ARG	Agree
B.08	829	CAN	We agree with the proposed changes, except; We seek clarification of what is included in Barrier Cream, and if its ban is from vet gate or field of play (eg zinc oxide cream) Note: Annex 5 references back to rule 828 talks about any topical ointment must be removed prior to presentation at the vet gate. We recommend that in 829.3.1 "rein" be replaced with "rein or equipment" to ensure that tie-downs are covered. Also, to the prohibited list 829.3 add tie-downs.
B.08	828	CRC	CRC Comment: We do not support this new proposal. Sometimes horses need, for their welfare, barrier creams and therefore should not be prohibited.
B.08	828	BRN	We agree to prevent using Dye & Barrier Cream and recommend the use Henna as it is a natural material extracted from plants which helps the horse in a salty terrain.
B.08	828	ESP	We support the review on tack and equipment, but see no explanation in the MEMO on why Dye, Henna and Creams are being banned for Endurance where they can have multitude of benefits in favor of the welfare of the horse.
B.08	829	ESP	We support the review on tack and equipment, but see no explanation in the MEMO on why Dye, Henna and Creams are being banned for Endurance where they can have multitude of benefits in favor of the welfare of the horse.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.08	829.2.3	IRL	Martingales: In order to have a standard for martingale length it is suggested that the following be included in this para "A martingale should be able to reach the attachment points on the saddle.
B.08	829.3.3	IRL	Metal Chain Nosebands: Add "Curb chains"
B.08	828	ITA	Proposal: We support the review on tack and equipment, but we do not support that henna and creams be banned. Reasoning: There is no explanation in the Memo on the reason why henna and creams should be forbidden, but please find below our remarks. Henna and cream have therapeutical attributes. In Endurance it is used especially on the legs to prevent skin cracks and dermatitis troubles which can appear quite often as this discipline is a continuous long exercise over an entire day on natural tracks. Type of horse skin, type of footing, heat and dryness/humidity are parameters which have an influence on the use of this protection. If the reason to propose to forbid it was to not alter the horse identification, we remind you that thanks to the microchip it is easy to be sure of the horses identification if there is any case of doubt. If the reason was to prevent a visual barrier to not see an injection we would more recommend an higher vigilance of stewards and judges. Moreover, we are fully supporting the project of hyposensitivity tests which would tackle abuses without prohibiting the good use of henna and cream by those who use it as a protection and so positive in terms of horse welfare.
B.08	828	JPN	We recommend that the clear reason of forbidding these materials should be included and explained in the Notes of Guidance
B.08	829.2.7	JPN	We'd prefer more specification, e.g. size.
B.08	829.2.8	JPN	We are reluctant to support this proposal, considering the welfare of horse. Blinkers are not allowed in other disciplines, why should they be allowed in Endurance? If blinkers are to be allowed, the phrase "Full forward vision" is too vague, please specify the size, for example "not more than XX% of the vision could be covered".
B.08	829.3.5	JPN	Ear bonnets/hoods should be allowed; they are allowed at other disciplines.
B.08	Annex 8	JPN	We'd prefer more diagrams to be included.
B.08	828	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> A ban on barrier creams would prevent many horses from competing and would lead to an increase in cracked heels and mud fever <input type="checkbox"/> Subject to the standard requirement that it is removed prior to each veterinary inspection the continued use of barrier cream should not be banned <input type="checkbox"/> Some were concerned about the ban on shanked bits, as they suit some horses
B.08	829	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> Some of the tack proposals are over-prescriptive and inappropriate tack could be picked up under existing horse abuse rules <input type="checkbox"/> How would tack be monitored at a large ride? <input type="checkbox"/> Members were generally in favour of tighter tack rules
B.08	828	KSA	We agree to prevent using Dye & Barrier Cream and recommend to use Henna because henna is a natural material extracted from plants used to keep horses' limbs from salty soil and the high humidity which can cause big damage The colour of Henna is much different than the blood.
B.08	828	NAM	The rule should read may not cover the whole leg – ointment on minor skin lesions is only a sign of good horsemanship
B.08	828	NED	In this article it is not clear whether a horse may appear at a competition with dyed legs. Suggestion is that the products may be used before the competition (with the effects still visible at the competition), but not during the competition.
B.08	828	NOR	We do not agree with the prohibition of Barrier Cream, some zinc cream is used to prevent irritation, and some other creams to soften, etc. Prohibiting Barrier Cream in general (which can be very common including zinc ointment), we do not agree. Our proposal is that FEI need to specify which barrier cream to ban, rather than just saying Barrier Cream, so that products that only contribute to the horse's wellbeing are still allowed.
B.08	829	NOR	This is ok
B.08	829	NZL	We have concerns with how this will be monitored and enforced at rides but we agree with the rule in principle. We would vote for this rule.
B.08	828	NZL	We just wish to clarify whether this would preclude the use of thick sunblock preparations; these are primarily used on the non-pigmented areas (particularly noses). For a small number of horses, it could be a welfare concern if it was not allowed. Perhaps this could be further stipulated that these substances cannot be applied to the limbs of horses?
B.08	828	OMA	Supporting to prevent usage of Dye & Barrier Cream but recommend to use Henna Because Henna is a natural herbal extract supporting to prevent salty soil and humidity to skin.
B.08	828	POR	AGREE
B.08	828	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULES
B.08	828	SLO	agree
B.08	828	USA	USEF Comment: Approve in concept however clarification is needed on the definition of barrier cream. There are a number of barrier creams (i.e. Desitin) or balms which are designed to safely prevent and treat irritated skin created by the elements or from the wet and mud. It is recommended that further education is provided to athletes and officials on tack. Blinkers should be prohibited at all times except for approved veterinary reasons. Additionally, it is further recommended for the FEI to create a Useful Documents to explain how to measure a bit and with diagrams of tack which is allowed or prohibited.
B.08	828	UAE	We agree to prevent using Dye & Barrier Cream and recommend to use Henna because henna is a natural material extracted from plants used to keep horses' limbs from salty soil and the high humidity which can cause big damage to the skin. thus, the use of henna is to protect the health and safety of horses The colour of Henna is much different than the blood.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.08	828	LBN	We agree to prevent using Dye & Barrier Cream and recommend to use Henna because henna is a natural material extracted from plants used to keep horses' limbs from salty soil and the high humidity which can cause big damage to the skin. thus, the use of henna is to protect the health and safety of horses The colour of Henna is much different than the blood.
B.08	828	LBN	We agree to prevent using Dye & Barrier Cream and recommend to use Henna because henna is a natural material extracted from plants used to keep horses' limbs from salty soil and the high humidity which can cause big damage to the skin. thus, the use of henna is to protect the health and safety of horses The colour of Henna is much different than the blood.
B.08	828	SUD	We agree to prevent using Dye & Barrier Cream and recommend to use Henna because henna is a natural material extracted from plants used to keep horses' limbs from salty soil and the high humidity which can cause big damage to the skin. thus, the use of henna is to protect the health and safety of horses The colour of Henna is much different than the blood.
B.08	828	EEF	EEF WG position : we support the review on tack and equipment, but we do not support that henna and creams are being banned. Reasoning : There is no explanations in the Memo on the reason why henna and creams may be forbidden, but please find below our remarks. Henna and cream have therapeutical attributes. In endurance it is used especially on the legs to prevent skin cracks and dermatites troubles which can appear quite often as this discipline is a continuous long exercise over an entire day on natural tracks. Type of horse skin, type of footing, heat and dryness/humidity are parameters which have an influence on the use of this protection. If the reason to propose to forbid it was to not alter the horse identification, we remind that thanks to the chip it is easy to be sure of the horse identification in case of doubt. If the reason was to prevent a visual barrier to not see an injection we would more recommend an higher vigilance of stewards and judges and of course we are not supporting a perverse or abusive use of these substances as all others. We remind that we are fully supporting any project of hyposensitivity tests which would tackle abuses without prohibiting the good use of henna and cream by those who use it as a protection and so positive in terms of horse welfare.
B.08	828	AUT	EEF WG position : we support the review on tack and equipment, but we do not support that henna and creams are being banned. Reasoning : There is no explanations in the Memo on the reason why henna and creams may be forbidden, but please find below our remarks. Henna and cream have therapeutical attributes. In endurance it is used especially on the legs to prevent skin cracks and dermatites troubles which can appear quite often as this discipline is a continuous long exercise over an entire day on natural tracks. Type of horse skin, type of footing, heat and dryness/humidity are parameters which have an influence on the use of this protection. If the reason to propose to forbid it was to not alter the horse identification, we remind that thanks to the chip it is easy to be sure of the horse identification in case of doubt. If the reason was to prevent a visual barrier to not see an injection we would more recommend an higher vigilance of stewards and judges and of course we are not supporting a perverse or abusive use of these substances as all others. We remind that we are fully supporting any project of hyposensitivity tests which would tackle abuses without prohibiting the good use of henna and cream by those who use it as a protection and so positive in terms of horse welfare.
B.08	828	LBY	We agree to prevent using Dye & Barrier Cream and recommend to use Henna because henna is a natural material extracted from plants used to keep horses' limbs from salty soil and the high humidity which can cause big damage to the skin. thus, the use of henna is to protect the health and safety of horses The colour of Henna is much different than the blood.
B.08	828	RSA	Don't agree with the ban of Barrier Cream
B.09	830.2	AUS	Agree in principle; however, recommend that the 30 days should be increased to 90 days for horses transferred to a new trainer when the original trainer has been suspended. Otherwise a trainer can be suspended, then a new trainer appointed and the horses continue to race 4 weeks later. This is not a big enough penalty for infringing trainers/owners.
B.09	832.3	BEL	Belgium recommends keeping the current rules. This article concerns essentially UAE.
B.09	830.2	ARG	Agree
B.09	832	ARG	Agree
B.09	830.2	CAN	We agree with this proposal, trainers should be of legal age.
B.09	830.2	BRN	We recommend maintaining the Current Endurance Rules because a majority of stables have more than 1 trainer for their horses as a back to back training exercise so that the competitiveness of the horse is not affected if one trainer is absent. We do not believe that the delay of 30 days has any emphasis to the welfare of the horse if the trainer is changed before an event.
B.09	830.2	ESP	agree
B.09	830.2	ITA	We do support this proposal which is in the best interest of the trainer to know his horses better and can also prevent last minute changes in order to transfer/spread responsibilities in case of potential sanctions.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.09	832.3	JPN	We believe 30 days is too long, especially if this rule is going to be applied to ANY change in the Trainer. For example, if a Trainer is killed at an accident, would the horse, with a new Trainer, need to wait for 30 days to participate in the next
B.09	830.2	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> How would young owner/riders be affected? <input type="checkbox"/> How would the FEI know that records had been updated correctly? <input type="checkbox"/> Would prefer a 7 day ban to start with to assess the impact <input type="checkbox"/> Trainers in this country have a different type of role – a delay after swapping trainers would not be necessary <input type="checkbox"/> Should be no change of trainer after definite close of entries
B.09	832.3	KSA	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the sport developed, stable with a big number of horses have more than one trainer for each stable who help in horse training and therefore have knowledge and experience in dealing with horses in the event of changing the current Trainer 2. The horse suspension period for participation is very long compared to the short season period. 3. There is little evidence to support this 30day competition ban because the Trainer has changed. If the rules are considered to be protecting the horse what difference will a 30day competition ban, make? <p>We suggest having pledge/ commitment from the new Trainer that he/she is fully responsible for a horse after changed to his/her supervision</p>
B.09	832.3	NAM	agree
B.09	832.3	NED	We don't support this rule. It should only apply to CEI2* and above. Competing in a CEI1* event is an excellent way to get to know a horse. The new rules for qualification including speed caps will sufficiently protect the horse. Only the responsible federation may change this.
B.09	830.2	NOR	This is ok
B.09	830.2	NZL	Whilst it would be uncommon for a horse to have a change in trainer in New Zealand during the season, that may be required in some instances e.g. injury or illness of the trainer. If this rule was introduced, it may preclude horses competing at some events if the trainer had to be changed. Generally though, we could work with this rule and aim that most changes in horse ownership (and hence trainer) occur outside the competitive season. We would vote for this rule.
B.09	832.3	OMA	We supporting to maintain the current rules
B.09	829	POR	AGREE
B.09	830.2	POR	AGREE
B.09	832.3	RUS	<p>WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULES BECAUSE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stables with a big number of horses have more than one trainer for each stable as they assist in horse training and therefore have knowledge and experience in dealing with horses in case if changing the current Trainer is needed. 2. The horse suspension period for participation is very long compared to the short season period. 3. There is little evidence to support this 30-days competition ban due to the reason if the Trainer has changed. <p>We suggest having pledge/ commitment from the new Trainer that he/she is fully responsible for a horse after changed to his/her supervision</p>
B.09	832.3	SLO	agree
B.09	832.3	UAE	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the sport developed, stable with a big number of horses have more than one trainer for each stable who help in horse training and therefore have knowledge and experience in dealing with horses in the event of changing the current Trainer 2. The horse suspension period for participation is very long compared to the short season period. 3. There is little evidence to support this 30day competition ban because the Trainer has changed. If the rules are considered to be protecting the horse what difference will a 30day competition ban, make? <p>We suggest having pledge/ commitment from the new Trainer that he/she is fully responsible for a horse after changed to his/her supervision</p>
B.09	832.3	LBN	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the sport developed, stable with a big number of horses have more than one trainer for each stable who help in horse training and therefore have knowledge and experience in dealing with horses in the event of changing the current Trainer 2. The horse suspension period for participation is very long compared to the short season period. 3. There is little evidence to support this 30day competition ban because the Trainer has changed. If the rules are considered to be protecting the horse what difference will a 30day competition ban, make? <p>We suggest having pledge/ commitment from the new Trainer that he/she is fully responsible for a horse after changed to his/her supervision</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.09	832.3	LBN	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the sport developed, stable with a big number of horses have more than one trainer for each stable who help in horse training and therefore have knowledge and experience in dealing with horses in the event of changing the current Trainer 2. The horse suspension period for participation is very long compared to the short season period. 3. There is little evidence to support this 30day competition ban because the Trainer has changed. If the rules are considered to be protecting the horse what difference will a 30day competition ban, make? <p>We suggest having pledge/ commitment from the new Trainer that he/she is fully responsible for a horse after changed to his/her supervision</p>
B.09	832.3	SUD	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the sport developed, stable with a big number of horses have more than one trainer for each stable who help in horse training and therefore have knowledge and experience in dealing with horses in the event of changing the current Trainer 2. The horse suspension period for participation is very long compared to the short season period. 3. There is little evidence to support this 30day competition ban because the Trainer has changed. If the rules are considered to be protecting the horse what difference will a 30day competition ban, make? <p>We suggest having pledge/ commitment from the new Trainer that he/she is fully responsible for a horse after changed to his/her supervision</p>
B.09	832.3	SUD	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the sport developed, stable with a big number of horses have more than one trainer for each stable who help in horse training and therefore have knowledge and experience in dealing with horses in the event of changing the current Trainer 2. The horse suspension period for participation is very long compared to the short season period. 3. There is little evidence to support this 30day competition ban because the Trainer has changed. If the rules are considered to be protecting the horse what difference will a 30day competition ban, make? <p>We suggest having pledge/ commitment from the new Trainer that he/she is fully responsible for a horse after changed to his/her supervision</p>
B.09	830.2	EEF	<p>We do support this proposal which is in the interest of the trainer knowledge of his horses and can also prevent late changes which may not help to adopt adequate sanctions on the right person in case of need.</p>
B.09	830.2	AUT	<p>We do support this proposal which is in the interest of the trainer knowledge of his horses and can also prevent late changes which may not help to adopt adequate sanctions on the right person in case of need.</p>
B.09	832.3	LBY	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the sport developed, stable with a big number of horses have more than one trainer for each stable who help in horse training and therefore have knowledge and experience in dealing with horses in the event of changing the current Trainer 2. The horse suspension period for participation is very long compared to the short season period. 3. There is little evidence to support this 30day competition ban because the Trainer has changed. If the rules are considered to be protecting the horse what difference will a 30day competition ban, make? <p>We suggest having pledge/ commitment from the new Trainer that he/she is fully responsible for a horse after changed to his/her supervision</p>
B.09	832.3	RSA	<p>Maintain existing rule</p>
B.10	834	AUS	<p>Agree with the additional 7 days for horses completing at higher speed. EA are concerned that the MOOCP for FTQ-ME are reduced and not linked to the need for invasive treatment, and that the additional time out of competition has been removed for horses on their first and second FTQ-GA. EA would recommend reconsidering all the MCOOPs to ensure coverage of the variety of conditions horses develop.</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.10	834	ARG	We don't agree with the proposal to include additional 7 days for Horses exceeding the average of 22kph, not all venues have the same type of terrain. We propose more rest time between races: 0-46 KM 7 days 46-86 KM 14 days 86-126 KM 30 days 126-146 KM 45 days 146 KM or more 2 months We agree with the additional day for Me/Gait and for MOOCs specifically targeted to musculoskeletal or metabolic serious injury and no longer related directly to immediate invasive treatment.
B.10	834	CAN	We agree with the proposals, except; We recommend that the standard MOOCP for 120-160 km should be 26 days. <input type="checkbox"/> Essentially, at present, if you pull at the last hold in a 160 (before 90 miles) it's just under 4 weeks, if you complete it's just under 5. We don't think that extra week's rest for 10 miles is scientifically justified; <input type="checkbox"/> 5 weeks off after a 160 seriously impacts the ride season in northern climates and does nothing to protect the horse because it doesn't address training. Also, we believe it may be founded on a false assumption. In most other sports, once you've reached a certain level you no longer compete at lower levels; in fact, in many sports this isn't allowed. There may be an underlying assumption that, following a 160 ride your next competition would be another 160, this is not necessarily true for us. Most people might do an 80 next as part of a training program.
B.10	834	CHI	Increased mandatory rest (additional rest) after races with speeds exceeding 22 km / hr, 2 successive eliminations FTQ-ME, 3 successive eliminations FTQ-GA. We agree.
B.10	834	CRC	CRC Comment: If national events are taken into consideration for MOOCP, national events should also be considered to meet other criteria. We do not believe National Events should only be used for sanctions, if they are to be used for negative, they must also be used for positive. We propose that National Events help break a lameness streak or help meet qualification criteria if these events are approved by the NF, have less than 25 horses and; there is at least 1 FEI official and 1 FEI Vet on the panel and where results are public and transparent.
B.10	834	BRA	MOOCP based on an average speed of 22 kph up, this issue should be readdressed from a different angle as an average speed on a flat trail or in the mountains under different climatologically circumstances is a totally different matter
B.10	834	BRN	We recommend maintaining the Current Endurance Rules as more studies on Mandatory Out-of-Competition Periods (MOOCP) are required.
B.10	834	ESP	We have noted during this time that the amount of consecutive FTQ-GA are being reduced from five to four in order to ban a horse from Endurance for life, taking into account both International and National competitions. However, currently, National competitions are only taken into account when the Horse is eliminated but not when the Horse completes the ride successfully, which seems very edged. We would like that National competitions are taken into account for the entire rule, or not at all, not just for eliminations.
B.10	834	IRL	There is no additional MOOCP for for first Lameness or Metabolic failure. This should be retained as per the current rules.
B.10	834	IRL	Addition MOOCP based on Speed Caps: This is virtually impossible to manage for most rides. It is strongly disagreed with
B.10	834	ITA	Proposal: In addition to the proposal we suggest taking into account national competitions for the entire rule, elimination, successful ride ... not only for the eliminations. Reasoning: We note that the amount of consecutive FTQ-GA are being reduced from five to four in order to ban a horse from Endurance for life, taking into account both International and National competitions. However, currently, National competitions are only taken into account when the Horse is eliminated but not when the Horse completes the ride successfully, which seems not fair.
B.10	834.2.1	JPN	Four Consecutive FTQ-GA ---- in a rolling year?

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.10	834	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> Will help horse welfare <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear definition of serious metabolic injury <input type="checkbox"/> Is the rule about a sound national ride not breaking a consecutive string of FEI lamenesses still there? <input type="checkbox"/> 4 consecutive lamenesses should be a 2 year ban and then vet check before re-entry <input type="checkbox"/> May be difficult to monitor/enforce and add an administrative burden <input type="checkbox"/> An average loop speed doesn't address the issue of a fast single loop (ie the last loop) <input type="checkbox"/> We need to protect national multi day rides <input type="checkbox"/> 22kph is still too fast <input type="checkbox"/> Consecutive lamenesses may not be a recurrent problem
B.10	834.2	KSA	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The nature of the tracks in many countries are flat tracks, thus, the speed of 22 km is the normal speed of the horses during the transition from Trot to Canter in flat tracks while it is much less in mounting and stony tracks. - The speed must be compared with the track nature: speed varies according to geographical regions and event tracks where sometimes in some areas the speed is 15 km/h, but compared to the effort exerted by horses in these areas, it is equivalent to a speed of more than 22 km /h. - The results of the scientific and practical study by "Equi-rating", an equestrian research analytics company that has conducted several FEI studies, by analyzing 62,288 results, 618 competitions and 13280 horses show the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Horses seriously injured are those who have returned to competition after a long break (When assessing rest periods for horses, the most significant increase in risk to horse welfare are those horses who have not competed within the last 365 days) ▪ Horses that are constantly involved in Endurance events develop fewer injuries. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While research shows that speed is undoubtedly a risk factor, a finding that we do not dispute in any way, the reality in the sport is that horses with faster completion rates have higher qualification rates in their next competition, this is simply because those capable of producing high levels of performance are more likely to be successful in future competitions. This evidence suggests that elite horses should not be required to rest for longer periods between competitions as they are already producing higher qualification rates than lower-performing horses. ▪ Horses with poor performance in past competitions have low qualification rates in future competitions. ▪ Horses with faster completion speeds have higher qualification rates in their next competition. - In addition, we all know that the endurance season in most countries of the world is very short. Accordingly, adding additional rest period will impact the fitness and health of the horses and the growth and development of the endurance sport in the world. - In 2018, The proposed rule was to apply an additional 7 days rest period for Horses exceeding the average of 20 kph, and this year the proposed speed became 22 km kph which indicates that there is no field-based study that clearly shows what exactly the average speed require an additional mandatory rest period. This suggests that more field studies should be conducted before an extra mandatory period is imposed
B.10	834.2	NAM	YES
B.10	834.2.1	NED	<p>We would like to propose to add an additional 7-days to all MOOCs. This rule better protects horse welfare while keeping the cost acceptable as can be seen in the graph in the Guidance note.</p> <p>Has the influence of the several different courses been taking into account in the research?</p>
B.10	834	NOR	This is ok
B.10	834	NZL	In general, we support this rule change. However, we do not believe it is in the best interests of horse welfare to remove the additional MOOCP for a horse on its first, or second consecutive FTQ-GA. We would strongly recommend reintroducing the MOOCs for any FTQ-GA. We would vote for this rule change.
B.10	834.2	OMA	<p>Supporting the Rules</p> <p>Flat tracks in many countries is helping the horses transition from Trot to Canter with 22km normaiiy and the speed has to be compared with nature of tracks .Horses participate regularly in endurance races have fewer injuries than with horses returned to competition after a long break.</p> <p>We supporting the new proposals. But how can the FEI determine the MOOCP of national events.</p>
B.10	834	POR	AGREE
B.10	834.2	POR	The Portuguese NF agrees with all the additional MOOCP, exception made in what concerns the "Four consecutive FTQ-GA" where ETC propose that the horse be banned from endurance competitions. We thing that banning the horse is a very excessive rule. We propose 210 days
B.10	834.2	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULES
B.10	834.2	SLO	Speed kills! We want endurance, no endurance flat race.
B.10	834.2.1	URU	We believe that establishing a rest period based only on speed is not considering the several different factors that are related to the effort of the horse in a competition. All the countries have different weather conditions and topography. While 22 km / h speed in a flat and terrain with dry climate can be a perfectly suitable speed for a horse yet it can be very harmful in a mountainous terrain and under a humid weather conditions.
B.10	834	USA	<p>USEF Comments:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Approve however it is recommend for consistency to not use both subsequent and consecutive within the same Table (Art. 834.2.1). <input type="checkbox"/> Furthermore, it is requested for national competitions to be removed from the rule as the MOOCP is not being applied fairly or uniformly across all NFs and the FEI is not in a position to "check" national results. <p>Observation – The MOOCs have become so complex that there is an obvious risk that those not intimately involved with Endurance on a day in day out basis are going to struggle to understand them.</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.10	834.2	UAE	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The nature of the tracks in many countries are flat tracks, thus, the speed of 22 km is the normal speed of the horses during the transition from Trot to Canter in flat tracks while it is much less in mounting and stony tracks. - The speed must be compared with the track nature: speed varies according to geographical regions and event tracks where sometimes in some areas the speed is 15 km/h, but compared to the effort exerted by horses in these areas, it is equivalent to a speed of more than 22 km /h. - The results of the scientific and practical study by “Equirating”, an equestrian research analytics company that has conducted several FEI studies, by analyzing 62,288 results, 618 competitions and 13280 horses show the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Horses seriously injured are those who have returned to competition after a long break (When assessing rest periods for horses, the most significant increase in risk to horse welfare are those horses who have not competed within the last 365 days) <input type="checkbox"/> Horses that are constantly involved in Endurance events develop fewer injuries. <input type="checkbox"/> While research shows that speed is undoubtedly a risk factor, a finding that we do not dispute in any way, the reality in the sport is that horses with faster completion rates have higher qualification rates in their next competition, this is simply because those capable of producing high levels of performance are more likely to be successful in future competitions. This evidence suggests that elite horses should not be required to rest for longer periods between competitions as they are already producing higher qualification rates than lowerperforming horses. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with poor performance in past competitions have low qualification rates in future competitions. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with faster completion speeds have higher qualification rates in their next competition. - In addition, we all know that the endurance season in most countries of the world is very short. Accordingly, adding additional rest period will impact the fitness and health of the horses and the growth and development of the endurance sport in the world. - In 2018, The proposed rule was to apply an additional 7 days rest period for Horses exceeding the average of 20kph, and this year the proposed speed became 22 km kph which indicates that there is no field-based study that clearly shows what exactly the average speed require an additional mandatory rest period. This suggests that more field studies should be conducted before an extra mandatory period is imposed
B.10	834.2	UAE	<p>We agree with this proposal Does FEI now record the national events on their platform? How can the FEI determine the MOOCP of a national event?</p>
B.10	834.2	LBN	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The nature of the tracks in many countries are flat tracks, thus, the speed of 22 km is the normal speed of the horses during the transition from Trot to Canter in flat tracks while it is much less in mounting and stony tracks. - The speed must be compared with the track nature: speed varies according to geographical regions and event tracks where sometimes in some areas the speed is 15 km/h, but compared to the effort exerted by horses in these areas, it is equivalent to a speed of more than 22 km /h. - The results of the scientific and practical study by “Equirating”, an equestrian research analytics company that has conducted several FEI studies, by analyzing 62,288 results, 618 competitions and 13280 horses show the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Horses seriously injured are those who have returned to competition after a long break (When assessing rest periods for horses, the most significant increase in risk to horse welfare are those horses who have not competed within the last 365 days) <input type="checkbox"/> Horses that are constantly involved in Endurance events develop fewer injuries. <input type="checkbox"/> While research shows that speed is undoubtedly a risk factor, a finding that we do not dispute in any way, the reality in the sport is that horses with faster completion rates have higher qualification rates in their next competition, this is simply because those capable of producing high levels of performance are more likely to be successful in future competitions. This evidence suggests that elite horses should not be required to rest for longer periods between competitions as they are already producing higher qualification rates than lowerperforming horses. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with poor performance in past competitions have low qualification rates in future competitions. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with faster completion speeds have higher qualification rates in their next competition. - In addition, we all know that the endurance season in most countries of the world is very short. Accordingly, adding additional rest period will impact the fitness and health of the horses and the growth and development of the endurance sport in the world. - In 2018, The proposed rule was to apply an additional 7 days rest period for Horses exceeding the average of 20 kph, and this year the proposed speed became 22 km kph which indicates that there is no field-based study that clearly shows what exactly the average speed require an additional mandatory rest period. This suggests that more field studies should be conducted before an extra mandatory period is imposed
B.10	834.2	LBN	<p>We agree with this proposal Does FEI now record the national events on their platform? How can the FEI determine the MOOCP of a national event?</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.10	834.2	LBN	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The nature of the tracks in many countries are flat tracks, thus, the speed of 22 km is the normal speed of the horses during the transition from Trot to Canter in flat tracks while it is much less in mounting and stony tracks. - The speed must be compared with the track nature: speed varies according to geographical regions and event tracks where sometimes in some areas the speed is 15 km/h, but compared to the effort exerted by horses in these areas, it is equivalent to a speed of more than 22 km /h. - The results of the scientific and practical study by “Equirating”, an equestrian research analytics company that has conducted several FEI studies, by analyzing 62,288 results, 618 competitions and 13280 horses show the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Horses seriously injured are those who have returned to competition after a long break (When assessing rest periods for horses, the most significant increase in risk to horse welfare are those horses who have not competed within the last 365 days) <input type="checkbox"/> Horses that are constantly involved in Endurance events develop fewer injuries. <input type="checkbox"/> While research shows that speed is undoubtedly a risk factor, a finding that we do not dispute in any way, the reality in the sport is that horses with faster completion rates have higher qualification rates in their next competition, this is simply because those capable of producing high levels of performance are more likely to be successful in future competitions. This evidence suggests that elite horses should not be required to rest for longer periods between competitions as they are already producing higher qualification rates than lowerperforming horses. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with poor performance in past competitions have low qualification rates in future competitions. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with faster completion speeds have higher qualification rates in their next competition. - In addition, we all know that the endurance season in most countries of the world is very short. Accordingly, adding additional rest period will impact the fitness and health of the horses and the growth and development of the endurance sport in the world. - In 2018, The proposed rule was to apply an additional 7 days rest period for Horses exceeding the average of 20 kph, and this year the proposed speed became 22 km kph which indicates that there is no field-based study that clearly shows what exactly the average speed require an additional mandatory rest period. This suggests that more field studies should be conducted before an extra mandatory period is imposed
B.10	834.2	LBN	<p>We agree with this proposal Does FEI now record the national events on their platform? How can the FEI determine the MOOCP of a national event?</p>
B.10	834.2	SUD	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The nature of the tracks in many countries are flat tracks, thus, the speed of 22 km is the normal speed of the horses during the transition from Trot to Canter in flat tracks while it is much less in mounting and stony tracks. - The speed must be compared with the track nature: speed varies according to geographical regions and event tracks where sometimes in some areas the speed is 15 km/h, but compared to the effort exerted by horses in these areas, it is equivalent to a speed of more than 22 km /h. - The results of the scientific and practical study by “Equirating”, an equestrian research analytics company that has conducted several FEI studies, by analyzing 62,288 results, 618 competitions and 13280 horses show the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Horses seriously injured are those who have returned to competition after a long break (When assessing rest periods for horses, the most significant increase in risk to horse welfare are those horses who have not competed within the last 365 days) <input type="checkbox"/> Horses that are constantly involved in Endurance events develop fewer injuries. <input type="checkbox"/> While research shows that speed is undoubtedly a risk factor, a finding that we do not dispute in any way, the reality in the sport is that horses with faster completion rates have higher qualification rates in their next competition, this is simply because those capable of producing high levels of performance are more likely to be successful in future competitions. This evidence suggests that elite horses should not be required to rest for longer periods between competitions as they are already producing higher qualification rates than lowerperforming horses. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with poor performance in past competitions have low qualification rates in future competitions. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with faster completion speeds have higher qualification rates in their next competition. - In addition, we all know that the endurance season in most countries of the world is very short. Accordingly, adding additional rest period will impact the fitness and health of the horses and the growth and development of the endurance sport in the world. - In 2018, The proposed rule was to apply an additional 7 days rest period for Horses exceeding the average of 20 kph, and this year the proposed speed became 22 km kph which indicates that there is no field-based study that clearly shows what exactly the average speed require an additional mandatory rest period. This suggests that more field studies should be conducted before an extra mandatory period is imposed

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.10	834.2	SUD	We agree with this proposal Does FEI now record the national events on their platform? How can the FEI determine the MOOCP of a national event?
B.10	834.2	SUD	We recommend maintaining the current Rules because: - The nature of the tracks in many countries are flat tracks, thus, the speed of 22 km is the normal speed of the horses during the transition from Trot to Canter in flat tracks while it is much less in mounting and stony tracks. - The speed must be compared with the track nature: speed varies according to geographical regions and event tracks where sometimes in some areas the speed is 15 km/h, but compared to the effort exerted by horses in these areas, it is equivalent to a speed of more than 22 km /h. - The results of the scientific and practical study by “Equirating”, an equestrian research analytics company that has conducted several FEI studies, by analyzing 62,288 results, 618 competitions and 13280 horses show the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Horses seriously injured are those who have returned to competition after a long break (When assessing rest periods for horses, the most significant increase in risk to horse welfare are those horses who have not competed within the last 365 days) <input type="checkbox"/> Horses that are constantly involved in Endurance events develop fewer injuries. <input type="checkbox"/> While research shows that speed is undoubtedly a risk factor, a finding that we do not dispute in any way, the reality in the sport is that horses with faster completion rates have higher qualification rates in their next competition, this is simply because those capable of producing high levels of performance are more likely to be successful in future competitions. This evidence suggests that elite horses should not be required to rest for longer periods between competitions as they are already producing higher qualification rates than lowerperforming horses. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with poor performance in past competitions have low qualification rates in future competitions. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with faster completion speeds have higher qualification rates in their next competition. - In addition, we all know that the endurance season in most countries of the world is very short. Accordingly, adding additional rest period will impact the fitness and health of the horses and the growth and development of the endurance sport in the world. - In 2018, The proposed rule was to apply an additional 7 days rest period for Horses exceeding the average of 20 kph, and this year the proposed speed became 22 km kph which indicates that there is no field-based study that clearly shows what exactly the average speed require an additional mandatory rest period. This suggests that more field studies should be conducted before an extra mandatory period is imposed
B.10	834.2	SUD	We agree with this proposal Does FEI now record the national events on their platform? How can the FEI determine the MOOCP of a national event?
B.10	834	EEF	EEF WG position : we do support the proposal with 1 exception as we suggest to take in account national competitions for the entire rule, elimination, successful ride ... not only for the eliminations. Reasoning : We note that the amount of consecutive FTQ-GA are being reduced from five to four in order to ban a horse from Endurance for life, taking into account both International and National competitions. However, currently, National competitions are only taken into account when the Horse is eliminated but not when the Horse completes the ride successfully, which seems very edged.
B.10	834	AUT	EEF WG position : we do support the proposal with 1 exception as we suggest to take in account national competitions for the entire rule, elimination, successful ride ... not only for the eliminations. Reasoning : We note that the amount of consecutive FTQ-GA are being reduced from five to four in order to ban a horse from Endurance for life, taking into account both International and National competitions. However, currently, National competitions are only taken into account when the Horse is eliminated but not when the Horse completes the ride successfully, which seems very edged.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.10	834.2	LBY	<p>We recommend maintaining the current Rules because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The nature of the tracks in many countries are flat tracks, thus, the speed of 22 km is the normal speed of the horses during the transition from Trot to Canter in flat tracks while it is much less in mounting and stony tracks. - The speed must be compared with the track nature: speed varies according to geographical regions and event tracks where sometimes in some areas the speed is 15 km/h, but compared to the effort exerted by horses in these areas, it is equivalent to a speed of more than 22 km /h. - The results of the scientific and practical study by “Equirating”, an equestrian research analytics company that has conducted several FEI studies, by analyzing 62,288 results, 618 competitions and 13280 horses show the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Horses seriously injured are those who have returned to competition after a long break (When assessing rest periods for horses, the most significant increase in risk to horse welfare are those horses who have not competed within the last 365 days) <input type="checkbox"/> Horses that are constantly involved in Endurance events develop fewer injuries. <input type="checkbox"/> While research shows that speed is undoubtedly a risk factor, a finding that we do not dispute in any way, the reality in the sport is that horses with faster completion rates have higher qualification rates in their next competition, this is simply because those capable of producing high levels of performance are more likely to be successful in future competitions. This evidence suggests that elite horses should not be required to rest for longer periods between competitions as they are already producing higher qualification rates than lowerperforming horses. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with poor performance in past competitions have low qualification rates in future competitions. <input type="checkbox"/> Horses with faster completion speeds have higher qualification rates in their next competition. - In addition, we all know that the endurance season in most countries of the world is very short. Accordingly, adding additional rest period will impact the fitness and health of the horses and the growth and development of the endurance sport in the world. - In 2018, The proposed rule was to apply an additional 7 days rest period for Horses exceeding the average of 20 kph, and this year the proposed speed became 22 km kph which indicates that there is no field-based study that clearly shows what exactly the average speed require an additional mandatory rest period. This suggests that more field studies should be conducted before an extra mandatory period is imposed
B.10	834.2	LBY	<p>We agree with this proposal Does FEI now record the national events on their platform? How can the FEI determine the MOOCP of a national event?</p>
B.10	834.2	RSA	<p>About additional 7 days rest for Horses exceeding the average of 22kph over completed phases: This is ridiculous - how can all rides be 22kmp? Some terrain lends itself to quicker times</p>
B.11	837	AUS	Agree with the principle that successful completions should be rewarded
B.11	838	AUS	Agree with the principle that successful completions should be rewarded
B.11	839.1	AUS	<p>EA recommend maintaining the current rule as: Horses & Athletes who have accumulated a minimum of 240 km in a maximum of three events of 80km or higher in a 36 months period, can be granted an exemption. EA believe that this is a suitable novice qualification system, as has been in operation in Australia for some decades. However, EA are pleased to have exemptions retained in the rules.</p>
B.11	839.2	AUS	<p>EA recommend maintaining the current rule as: Horses & Athletes who have accumulated a minimum of 240 km in a maximum of three events of 80km or higher in a 36 months period, can be granted an exemption. EA believe that this is a suitable novice qualification system, as has been in operation in Australia for some decades. However, EA are pleased to have exemptions retained in the rules.</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	840.4	AUS	<p>EA cannot agree to the qualification rules, which we believe will seriously limit or stop FEI competition in Australia. The majority of endurance rides conducted in Australia are conducted under national rules, and the costs and distance in the country make it very difficult to conduct multiple FEI events.</p> <p>Therefore there are insufficient opportunities for athletes and horses to progress through the star rating, in the time allowed. The inclusion of these new qualifying rules will make it virtually impossible for Australia to retain any engagement with the FEI endurance competition.</p> <p>These rules therefore incentivise people to fly to other countries and ride leased horses with which they do not have strong connections or knowledge of. Any rule that disincentivises riders to ride their own horse that they train and know will result in a significant horse welfare risk. This is less the case in other equestrian disciplines but in endurance intimate knowledge of, and emotional connection with your horse is paramount to achieve good horsemanship and animal welfare outcomes.</p> <p>EA propose that either:</p> <p>A) national rides also be included in the main rules, while ensuring that athletes and horses are experienced</p> <p>OR</p> <p>B) countries with strong national endurance competitions but few FEI rides be allowed additional exemptions and dispensations, as per those exemptions provided for novice qualifying under 839.2</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>840.4.2 (a) Athletes and Horses must successfully complete five competitions of distance from 80-119km including a minimum of one CEI 1* Competition at a maximum speed of 18 km/hour or at the speed linked to their Completion Rate, whichever is lower.</p> <p>EA also propose that continued successful performance rides of 80-119 km (national and CEI 1*) be allowed in combination with CEI2* completion to qualify a rider to compete at the 3* level:</p> <p>840.6.1 Qualifying to compete at CEI 3*:</p> <p>Horses and Athletes must successfully complete a minimum of two CEI 2* Competitions within a rolling three-year period, the first at a speed cap that complies with Article 840.5.2(a), and the second at a speed cap that complies with Article 840.5.2(b). OR a minimum of one CEI 2* and three competitions of distance 80-119 km (CEI1* or CEN), complying with the speed cap.</p>
B.11	841.2.4	AUS	EA disagree with the requirement for 2 combination qualifying rides, due to the difficulty and expense for Australian riders to take their own horses to other countries to compete. With the removal of elite status, this proposal decreases the options for our riders, and makes it much more difficult especially for young riders who may not have the funds for repeated international trips or to send their own horse overseas.
B.11	839.2	BEL	Belgium wants to maintain the current rule. "Horses & Athletes who have accumulated a minimum of 240 km in a maximum of three events of 80km or higher in a 36 months period, can be granted an exemption".
B.11	841	BEL	Belgium ok with concerning athletes. Concerning horses, the current rule is enough.
B.11	862	BEL	Belgium recommends decreasing the number of CEI3* to obtain the Elite Status (10>7 by example) and to oblige all participants for a World Championship (not continental) to be Elite. But the definition of an elite athlete needs to be clarified!
B.11	840	BEL	<p>Belgium disagrees completely.</p> <p>This ETC proposal has been already rejected by the participating NF during the 2019 Sport forum (April, Lausanne).</p> <p>This ETC proposal has been massively rejected (70%) by the Endurance Community in a questioner conducted by Tarek Taher (rider representative in the ETC).</p> <p>Belgium proposes:</p> <p>Novice Qualification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 x CEN 40 k - 2 x CEN 60 k - 2 x CEN 80 k <p>CEI to Championship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CEI 1* = 100 k (1 x) - CEI 2* = 120 k (1 x) - CEI3* = 140 k (1 x) - CEI4* = 160 k (1 x) <p>These proposals have a constant progression of 20 k steps.</p> <p>These proposals are simple and increase the level of experience of horses and riders.</p> <p>These proposals don't increase costs for riders, owners and organizers</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	841	BUL	<p>Bulgarian Equestrian Federation would like to make one comment about Qualification System for Championships.</p> <p>We agree that the "fast track" which allows athletes and horses to compete at Championship is not acceptable any more. But our understanding is that most of the problems are coming from the "big" nations with a lot of horses and athletes.</p> <p>The immediate implementation of the new qualification system will reflect on the small nations with limited horses and athletes.</p> <p>Theoretically the new qualification system could limit participation of a horse who has completed European Championship in 2019 from participation at World championship in 2020, which is not acceptable.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Our proposal is the Qualification system for Championships to be approved with Endurance rules 2020, but to be implemented in 2021.</p> <p>This will give to the athletes, trainer and national federations period of one year to adapt their strategies for qualification for championships.</p> <p>We believe that our proposal is fair enough as it serves the interest of our sport globally.</p>
B.11	837	ARG	we don't agree with this proposal. It is a very complex system to implement. It does not contribute to the growth of sport, on the contrary, it will become almost impossible, especially in countries where there are not enough Fei races.
B.11	838	ARG	we don't agree with this proposal. It is a very complex system to implement. It does not contribute to the growth of sport, on the contrary, it will become almost impossible, especially in countries where there are not enough Fei races.
B.11	840	ARG	<p>We propose the following:</p> <p>Horse must have completed two CEI1* to be able to compete in CEI2* Horses must have completed two CEI2* to be able to compete in CEI3*.</p> <p>We believe that increasing the rest times as we proposed above gives the horse more time for its evolution</p>
B.11	841.2.3	ARG	<p>For Regional Championships, we agree, for Young Horse Championships we propose:</p> <p>Only two events CEI2* or below one of which must have been in combination with the nominated Athlete/Horse completed no more than two years prior to (and no later than) the deadline for Nominated Entries for the Championship or 60 days prior to the Championship (whichever comes first).</p>
B.11	841.2.4	ARG	<p>We propose the following: for the Young Rider/Junior and Championships: Three CEI2* events or higher, one event must have been as a combination with the nominated Athlete/Horse completed no more than two years prior to (and no later than) the deadline for Nominated Entries for the Championship or 60 days prior to the Championship (whichever comes first) and for the Senior Championships:</p> <p>Five CEI 2* Events or higher (including a minimum of one CEI 3* for Senior 3* Championships) which must have been (i) the same or greater distance as the Championship (in a single-day event), and (ii) completed no more than two years prior to (and no later than) the deadline for Nominated Entries for the Championship or 60 days prior to the Championship (whichever comes first).</p>
B.11	831.1	ARG	<p>We don't agree with this proposal.</p> <p>Maintain the current rule.</p>
B.11	839.2	ARG	<p>We don't agree with this proposal.</p> <p>Maintain the current rule.</p>
B.11	862	ARG	We agree with this rule, although the Elite rider must be recognized in some way, to encourage the sport and reward those who are professionals.
B.11	839.1.2	CAN	<p>We agree with the proposal, except;</p> <p>That the two 40-79 km novice events be allowed to be done as 4 year old.</p> <p>And that "80-90 km (in one day)" be changed to "80-90 km (in one day, or two day)".</p> <p>And for National event we recommend that the rest period start at the end of the event to allow horses to compete in back to back 40 km, 80 km and other combinations not to exceed 160 km over the event.</p> <p>Is the FEI going to provide excel spread sheets for organizers and official to monitor the speeds during the events? And will the FEI Entry system provide speed cap information?</p>
B.11	838	CHI	<p>Speed regulation for racehorses finished according to the following table for each lap:</p> <p>Lower average of completion at 25% 14 km / hr Average higher completion at 25%, but less than 50% 16 km / hr Average higher completion at 50%, but less than 66% 18 km / hr Average higher than or equal to 66% No speed limit</p> <p>If the established speed limit is exceeded, the binomial is rated FTQ-SP (Speed).</p> <p>Is difficult to implement and control administratively. We consider it appropriate, as long as the same protocols are formulated for all by the Fei regarding control and administration.</p>
B.11	862	CHI	<p>The elite rider classification no longer serves to directly classify championships. Rider and horse must classify together.</p> <p>We agree.</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	Chapter V	CRO	<p>NF Croatia is not in favour of the proposal to change Art. 840 regarding qualification for CEI 2*, namely successful completion of three CEI1* Competitions. This change would disqualify less wealthy and less developed federations to even attempt to achieve all FEI qualifications due to high costs. Also, having 3 CEI1* Competitions as precondition to reaching the next level would invalidate the national qualification level, where the riders and horses gain first and most important experience and knowledge.</p> <p>NF Croatia does not agree with the qualification criteria for Championship for young horses. Namely, according to this proposal, considering when the young horse can start competing at specific level of the Competition, it would mean that the young horse is expected to achieve 7 (5 FEI + 2 national) CEI1* competitions in one year + CEI2* competition (the Championship). We do not consider that this helps the welfare of the horse and would suggest qualification to change to not more than 3 CEI1* qualification Competitions.</p> <p>Regarding the Completion Rate system and Speed linked to Completion Rate we would propose that FEI provides to NFs software that would enable national competitions to be included as well into Completion Rate System and designated speed cap. Also, how will speed cap be determined for the athletes and horses competing for the first time at FEI competition, if there is no link to completion rate at national levels.</p> <p>NF Croatia also supports proposition that qualification at national level are 2x 40, 60 and 80 km, so slower increase of distance is again introduced at national level, which would benefit the horses as well as prepare the athletes better for international level competitions.</p> <p>As a general not NF Croatia would like to point out that next year we have World Championship and Athletes and Horses are preparing for long period for this event. Therefore, we find that it would not be in line with rules to apply possible changes of the Qualification for Championship to the World Championship in 2020. Our suggestion is that, in case the new rules are passed and applicable as of 1 January 2020, qualification criteria according to the current rules applies to World Championship 2020.</p>
B.11	837	CRC	<p>We agree that completion rates are a clear picture of the history of a rider and horse. For those of us who have such few FEI rides we would like for national events to count only if: these events are approved by the NF, have less than 25 horses and where there is at least 1 FEI official and 1 FEI Vet on the panel and where results are public and transparent.</p>
B.11	838.1	CRC	<p>We agree that horse welfare is paramount in our sport and will accept proposals that will help in the process. The rule as written is just too difficult to understand. We understand the concept but only because it has been explained in person to us. Some of the questions we have are: does this statement refer to national rides as well? Who is responsible for managing the completion rates of horses and riders. Where will this information be available? Will FEI be proving OCs with a timing system that will allow OCs to control this information at every event, after completion of every phase? Will speed caps be enforced at Championships.</p>
B.11	840	CRC	<p>We believe the qualification process to qualify for CEI events is too much. To pass from CEI 1* to CEI 2* - since novice is still in place this means that horses and riders have already done 2. Two successfully completed CEI 1* should be enough to meet criteria to advance to CEI2*.</p>
B.11	841.2.2	CRC	<p>CRC Comments and questions: Requirement of 3 events for a 1* Regional Championship is too many. One is enough for the 1* level. How will the qualification process for WEC 2020 be affected with the implementation of the proposal? Some people will qualify with the old rules and some people with the new rules? We believe the current qualification process should be maintained for WEC 2020 qualification in order to make it fair to all.</p>
B.11	843	CRC	<p>What records are being referred to in this article. If it is National records that the NFs will have to upload then our point of allowing national rides with less than 25 horses and with some FEI officials count for qualifications and to break negative streaks makes even more sense.</p>
B.11	841	BRA	<p>Qualification though we agree on a stricter qualification for WCHs we believe that qualifying through the different categories should be 2 x CEI 1* instead of 3 x 1*competitions and not be linked to the newly suggested speed cap system. The Speedcap system is confusing for both riders and Organizers and only gives room for confusion.</p> <p>On top of it the riders don't have a clue against who they are competing.</p>
B.11	Chapter V	BRN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We disagree this proposal and recommend maintaining the Current Endurance Rules for Novice Qualification to Championships. ▪ We disagree with the latest rules proposed for Qualifications from CEI 1* to Championships as it goes against the competitive spirit of Endurance events. ▪ We recommend modifying the current rule for Novice Qualification and Exemption of Novice Qualification with the following suggestions, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The Athlete will be granted the exemption only if he has successfully completed a minimum of 240 km in Competitions over 80 km or more in the three years prior to the request. ✓ FEI ER Art. 816.1.4 For 8 years old Horses and older, dispensation of art. 816.1.2 and 816.1.3 can be granted the exemption only if (i) it is eight years or older at the time of the request, and (ii) in the three years prior to the request it has successfully completed a minimum of 240 km in Competitions over distances of 80 km, including at least one competition of 80km or more at the age of eight or older. ▪ We also recommend to cancel the Young Horse Championships for 7 years old Horses. The welfare of the young horse is put under distress in an open speed environment.
B.11	862.1	BRN	<p>Elite Athlete Status will not result in automatic qualification for any Championships, we recommend keeping the current rule because the Elite Athlete Status is considered as a reward of excellence for FEI Endurance riders. Rules are meant to nurture rather than destroy motivation. Hence, the Elite Athlete Status should result in automatic qualification for any championships.</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	Chapter V	ESP	<p>We oppose this proposal and concept entirely. o We oppose to the application of such a complicated system that will make the entire competition and rules extremely difficult to understand not only for experts and Officials who will have to control them, but to all Athletes and those interested in Endurance. This system is poorly explained even in the MEMO and we see extreme difficulty in it's application worldwide, even more so taking into account that the majority of CEI events in the world do not have automatic timekeeping systems to help elaborate the results and stay on top of the competition. These speed caps simply do not take into account different type of terrains and regions and risk in marginalizing the practice of Endurance in different areas. We believe that Endurance is a competition and should remain a competitive sport, the Horse discipline with the highest amount of veterinary control and care for the Horse, which is where focus should be stressed on making sure Officials are properly trained and can work in conditions allowing them to be effective.</p> <p>Any system that when applied would limit the participation of top recognized Athletes such as Jean-Philippe Frances or Alex Luque is a system that has not been properly studied and thought of from theory to implementation. We believe the application of this system is dangerous for the discipline and it's growth and should scratched.</p> <p>We believe that the objective of increasing the education of horsemanship for Athletes is good and further scaling the system will be good for the discipline, while remaining conscious of making sure the competition can be practiced everywhere and by anyone while having fun and enjoying the practice of horse riding, which this system clearly does not allow. As an example of scaling, we believe Athletes should add more rides under their belt at the lower level by adding two 60km rides to the national Qualification (and 2x 40km and 2x 80km) and increasing the 1* length from 80 to 90-100km.</p> <p>We believe that the amount of rides and competitions Horses have to do in order to reach a Championship and maintain itself at Championship "ready" status is enourmous, which is very much contrary to the concepts that the ETC and FEI have been explaining they were after in protecting horse welfare or the MOOCP system. The reallity of this system and the elimination of Elite status is that Horses, in the real world, will do a lot more rides, be under a lot more stress, and rest a lot less, with all the increased risk factors the FEI has already told us about. We do not think this whole system has been carefully thought and studied because of this and feels like a last minute drop-in.</p> <p>After taking a look the use of Elite status in the last few Championships, we note that it is rare for a Horse to have issues with Elite riders that have not ridden that Horse before, and generally injuries are related to Horses that had done already combination rides with the Rider, especially Horses that were pushed during a season to do many rides to qualify with many different riders (as mentioned above). We think that the Elite status should be reinforced instead of removed, as it does not cause welfare issues and may in fact be preventing them.</p> <p>Finally we are concerned about the amount of rides (5 1*) required to participate in a YH Championship. It seems like it will reduce the number of participants to 0, and if that's the intention, should remove the Championship itself.</p>
B.11	836	IRL	<p>This proposal has been dismissed out of hand. It is proposed that the old rule be retained with the rider having to do one additional ride in combination for Championships.</p>
B.11	841	IRL	<p>As above comments.</p>
B.11	846.3	IRL	<p>Entries will not be accepted after the close of the definite entry list. Substitute horses must be on the definite entry list.</p>
B.11	Chapter V	ITA	<p>In line with the EEF Endurance WG, and as they already stated at previous steps of the consultation process, we are opposed to the proposed concept: completion rate, cap speed, CEI events qualification. We do not support it as it is far from the concept of the Endurance sport from European and many other stakeholders perspectives.</p> <p>Endurance may be a real sport like it is practised in most cases, in the only possible way: fair, progressive from the access level to the highest standard (sport value must not decrease), with a key combination of an educated rider and a well-trained horse. The sport must be fair, simple to understand/control, taking in mind that the competition may be practiced in most parts of the world.</p> <p>The proposed system is excessive, complicated and non-realistic. Even within the memo and the rules it is complicated to understand, so it would be very difficult/impossible to apply, not respected and so not fair and ineffective.</p> <p>It would place Endurance in a counterproductive situation, forcing the ones (large majority) who are currently respecting the rules to change due to the incorrect behaviour of the few who are not respecting the rules ... Again, to tackle the drifts we may first apply strongly the sport regulation (based on the current one + some updates) and apply stronger sanctions for any case of cheating/doping/corruption.</p> <p>Any other changes would be useless as the core of the problem may not be reached.</p> <p>We believe that Endurance is a competition and should remain a competitive sport. Horse discipline with the biggest number of veterinary controls and, in most cases, high level of horse caring, which is where focus should be stressed on making sure Officials are properly trained and can work in conditions allowing them to be effective.</p> <p>The speed cap concept would be inadequate. It is not taking in account the location, terrain, weather which from one show to another may evolve critically. A same speed may be the winner's speed by one hilly event and really low for a flatter one. As it is average speed cap it will not tackle the excessive speeds and horses stopping or walking just before to cross the line in order to decrease their speed data. It is also forgetting that with a worldwide approach most of CEI organizers do not have automatic timekeeping systems to help elaborate the result. It would marginalise the practice of Endurance in different areas with a negative effect either on development and on top sport.</p> <p>The Completion rate proposal, cannot be implemented at this stage. It does not differentiate the type of eliminations which would be required in case of potential use of this tool in the future. compulsory. Using athlete examples as Jean Philippe Frances or Alex Luque, any system like this that when applied would limit their participations even if they are respected athletes by their results and behaviour. By consequence we suggest studying more in detail in the coming seasons how it could become a positive asset, if this can be the case ...</p> <p>In order to settle a more progressive competition pathway which is with the correct application of the rules and a stronger sanctions system the only way to build a sustainable future for the discipline of endurance, we recommend to put in place the following concept. this proposal is coming from a large consultation process of all groups of endurance stakeholders in Europe which are aware of the need to evolve to help the worldwide balance and growth of their discipline. By no means the FEI ETC proposal for qualification referring: cap speed, completion rate, competition levels, number of rides..</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	841	ITA	We are aware that the current elite status may evolve, nevertheless as we dressed from last winter, we would be in favour of modifying it but not to make it honorary. We suggest using it as an additional requirement to participate in the championships, for all riders willing to compete in a championship. Taking in account that depending on the part of Europe and of the world, the access to the international competition may be +/- challenging we recommend decreasing from 10 to 5 the number of successful 160km rides. We support the rider's qualification proposal, the combination ride but not the horses qualification proposal which is inadequate and excessive.
B.11	841.2.2	ITA	Young Horse Championships requiring five 1 * events to be completed makes it highly unrealistic that any Horse will be available to compete in this Championship.
B.11	837.3.2	JPN	should be "entered" in order to be legit.
B.11	838	JPN	We basically recommend and support this proposal. However, it is concerned in losing competitiveness of the sport if adapting this new system.
B.11	844	JPN	What happens if a combination earns Certificate of Capability for World Endurance Championship, scheduled in 2020, by 31 December 2019? Would that CoC be retained?
B.11	838.2	ECU	<input type="checkbox"/> This rule detracts from the competition. <input type="checkbox"/> Limits the speed of participation by groups, which makes competing less interesting. Before the start, there are couples that because of the maximum speed, they have limited winning options. This turns an Endurance race into an organized parade of horses and riders, in which if a couple speeds up is removed from the competition.
B.11	840.4.2	ECU	<input type="checkbox"/> This rule extends the process of running FEI 1 * to 2 *, making it more expensive to move forward, longer and less motivating. <input type="checkbox"/> Instead of being only one race of 80 km race, with the new rules has to be three races. This requires 3 times more effort than the current process. <input type="checkbox"/> In countries with few FEI races like ours, this reduces the few possibilities we have of competing outside our country. In addition to the fact that horses must run more, which can also be harmful.
B.11	Chapter V	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> National 80kms should be able to be used instead of FEI 1*s – this would give more options to qualify <input type="checkbox"/> Too many 1*s required <input type="checkbox"/> Too complicated to understand and enforce <input type="checkbox"/> Should be more national rides required before reaching FEI level in the first place – it is too easy to get to advanced <input type="checkbox"/> Will make FEI only a sport for rich owners of multiple horses, and may mean the UK will not be able to field a team <input type="checkbox"/> Speed caps are a good idea, but should be relative to the course. Some feel all rides should have a speed cap
B.11	839.1	GER	Blinkers and visors should not be allowed at all
B.11	838	GER	<p>Leave the Novice Qualifications as they are, they are working.</p> <p>Star Qualification: as proposed or based on the proposals suggested by TEIRA with the following additional comments: 2 consecutive CEI* to qualify for CEI**. This is a good idea and is equivalent to 66 % or more. In addition, the first of the two consecutive rides for a rider and/or horse should have a capped speed of maximum 18 kph 2 consecutive CEI **. In addition, the first of the two consecutive rides for a rider and/or horse should have a capped speed of maximum 18 kph First CEI*** with a maximum speed of up to 18 kph</p> <p>The present proposal with Ride Caps and percentage completion rates means that the horses have to do too many rides to qualify. This is not in the interest of horse welfare and is too costly for the participants. This proposal is difficult for the OCs, NFs and FEI to manage. The proposals from TEIRA are much simpler and can be managed much more easily, especially for smaller countries with fewer rides per annum. It would mean the horses and riders would not have to travel so far to qualify.</p>
B.11	841	GER	<p>Junior Championships: 3 CEI** or higher for horses and athletes Senior Championships: 3 CEI** and 2 CEI*** for horses and athletes (2 of these rides as a combination for Seniors and Juniors)</p> <p>Qualification Young Horse Championship: 2 consecutive CEI* and one CEI** (as a combination!)</p> <p>The proposed suggestion means that a 7 y.o. horse has to do too many rides in one season to qualify too much for a young horse</p>
B.11	839	KSA	We recommend maintaining the current rule as: Horses & Athletes who have accumulated a minimum of 240 km in a maximum of three events of 80km or higher in a 36 months period, can be granted an exemption
B.11	841	KSA	We recommend maintaining the current rule
B.11	862	KSA	We recommend keeping the current rule because - There must be a rewarding system for the Elite riders compare to other disciplines, for example, in showjumping Elite rider receive a special invitation to big events even with a free entry and travel costs - Rewarding Elite riders will encourage another rider to reach this status which we believe it will promote the horse welfare. - It can't be that most of the proposed rules are just restriction and sanction but has to be rewarding as well.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	840	KSA	<p>We don't agree with this proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It does not serve sports and does not contribute to its development, rather it will hinder the current development and growth in the Endurance discipline. 2. it has been rejected by the endurance community (70% of the society) Where it proved through the questioner conduct By Mr. Tareq Taher (Rider representative in Endurance technical committee) 3. was rejected by the practicing countries during 2019 FEI Sport forum. 4. Increase the time for the riders and horses to qualify that can be extended for years, especially in countries where there are not enough FEI events 5. This system will be very expensive for the riders, owners and organizing committees as they have to do many events to finish the qualification. 6. Too short a notice to implement in the field as a proper system needs to be devised including all the required changes> (example: IT system to do all the calculations). 7. In many countries, they don't have Electronic Timing System but they used the Manual system which will be more difficult to record the speed of the combination, and more difficult for the official to control it. 8. This system requires Advance Electronic Timing System which will increase the cost for NF/OC 9. The proposed system is quite ambiguous as it allows the riders/horses compete with 16/h in Novice qualifications and at the same time preventing it to do a higher level of competitions with a lesser speed(in case of horse/rider with less than 25% completion rate where the speed limit is 14/h) <p>We recommend keeping the current rule until proper system is studied and tested including the endurance community.</p>
B.11	839.2.2	NAM	agree
B.11	839.2.3	NAM	agree
B.11	841	NAM	however countries with less rides then will not be able to meet the bar.
B.11	862	NAM	• Don't agree – suggestion to consider 15 rides, as Elite status shows that you are a good rider. What motivation will there be to achieve Elite status? • This is a more achievable goal than it is to pay for three or more times to go overseas and ride rides to qualify. This gives Group IX also a chance to qualify.
B.11	840	NAM	<p>We don't agree with this proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regions/countries with very little events will take ages to qualify. Resting periods have been increased. 2. We must find a way to ensure the delicate situation in our smaller NF's – whilst the sport needed to have a good review, it will be unfortunate to completely stop the sport for us. 3. 120 is only one loop more than 80. 4. Suggest that you consider adding rides to the Novice Phase. 5. Rule making should be in such a way to still encourage growth in smaller NF's.
B.11	840	NED	<p>We don't agree with this rule. During the EEF meeting there have been made several proposals for qualification from CEI1* to Championships. We go for proposal number two from the EEF meeting:</p> <p>2x CEN 40km, 2x CEN 60km, 2x CEN 80km, 1x CEI1* 100km, 1x CEI2* 120km, 1x CEI3* 160km.</p>
B.11	841.2	NED	We don't support this rule. We go for the proposal from the EEF meeting.
B.11	840	NOR	<p>In principle, we do not disagree with the rule change, in terms of controlled speed and more experience before climbing up different levels, it is good horse welfare. However, for Norway and many other small countries, with few if any FEI rides a year and with a long / expensive travel to Europe (where the FEI rides go) only to qualify for next level will be very expensive and time consuming.</p> <p>Our proposal is:</p> <p>From CEI 1* to CEI 2* - 2 x CEI 1*, the first ride with speed cap of max 18 km/h</p> <p>From CEI 2* to CEI 3* - 2 x CEI 2*, the first ride with speed cap of max 18 km/h</p> <p>Regarding the Completion Rate, we don't want this now, mostly since we don't know how this should be handled / controlled. Especially since this is to be used on national rides as well. (if we have understood this correctly).</p> <p>We assume that the FEI will have a database where all data will be recorded and calculated, but what about the national rides, who will record and calculate those, will that be the National Federation's responsibility, and how will FEI be able to control that?</p> <p>Our recommendation is that the controlled speed as proposed above regarding qualification from one lever to another are fine, however no completion rate now. We believe that it must be clarified who will register / keep track of national rides and how can FEI be sure that this is done correctly before we change the rule.</p>
B.11	841	NOR	<p>We agree that FEI elite status should be removed, and that the rider/horse must have several rides as a combination. But for Senior there is a significant increase in the number of rides for the horse and it will be much more difficult to qualify.</p> <p>Our proposal;</p> <p>Horse - 1 x CEI 3* plus 3 x CEI 2* or higher</p> <p>Athlests - 2 x CEI 3* plus 3 x CEI 2* or higher</p> <p>Cominations - 1 x CEI2* and 1 x CEI3*</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	Chapter V	NZL	<p>Whilst we are comfortable with the proposed speed caps during the qualifying stages, the requirement to qualify multiple rides at each level before progressing will make CEI events untenable in New Zealand and a number of other countries.</p> <p>The costs involved in putting on CEI events, particularly in a country like New Zealand with a small base of competitors and long travel times for people to get to competitions (and particularly the difficulty in getting between the North and South Island) means that there may be only two to three events at 1* or 2* each year that you could attend and only one or two at 3*.</p> <p>Alternative proposals (TEIRC) requiring consecutive completions are also untenable when the opportunities to compete are so few and we have completion rates in the range of 40-85% at most events. Nearly all current CEI competitors in New Zealand would return to riding just CEN and it would not be feasible to continue with CEI competitions for the couple of riders who may wish to remain FEI registered in the hopes of representing New Zealand at international level.</p> <p>If the costs of putting on CEI event (the fees paid to FEI, the costs of having the number of veterinarians required, and the requirement for foreign vets and officials at certain levels) were significantly reduced, or were subsidised in some instances – then it may be possible to move part-way towards what is proposed. Alternatively, if CEN rides of 80 km or longer were able to count towards qualification (for example if the vet(s) and judges at the event were FEI qualified) then that may make the proposed criteria feasible.</p> <p>As the proposed rules stand, we would not vote for them. We strongly recommend splitting this rule change out from the others so that some or most of the others have a better chance of being agreed upon in November.</p>
B.11	844.1	NZL	We strongly support the transition provisions if the new qualifying criteria are introduced.
B.11	841	OMA	NF support to maintain the current rule
B.11	862	OMA	<p>We are supporting to keep the current rule.</p> <p>Compare to other discipline, there should be rewarding system for Elite riders and it will encourage another rider to attain this dream level and it will definitely improve the horse welfare.</p>
B.11	840	OMA	<p>We are not agreeing with this proposal</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It does not support sports and does not improve its development and it will drawing back the current development and growth in the Endurance . 2. it has been rejected by the endurance community. 3. Already rejected by the practicing countries during 2019 FEI Sport forum. 4. It will increase more time for the riders and horses to qualify that can be extended for years, especially in countries where there are not enough FEI events 5. It will be very expensive for the riders, owners and organizing committees as they have to do many events to finish the qualification. 6. Very short notice to implement in the field 8. This system is quite uncertain as it allows the riders/horses compete with 16/h in Novice qualifications and at the same time preventing it to do a higher level of competitions with a lesser speed(in case of horse/rider with less than 25% completion rate where the speed limit is 14/h) <p>We are supporting to keep the current rule until an adequate system is studied and tested with endurance community.</p>
B.11	837	POR	No, we don't agree. Doesn't make sense and we don't understand how this will improve this sport
B.11	862	POR	AGREE
B.11	844	POR	No, we don't agree. Doesn't make sense and we don't understand how this will improve this sport
B.11	838	POR	AGREE

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	840	POR	<p>Competing at CEI1* once qualified for that level</p> <p>a) Athletes and horses must successfully complete three CEI1* competitions at a maximum speed of 18Km/hour or at a speed linked to their Completion Rate, whichever is lower. We don't agree. It adds nothing to animal welfare, rather on the contrary once it increases the number of Kms that the horse has to run, to get to the next stage. There is no longer competition in CEI1* which, in small countries like Portugal can take to the lack of interest in this sport and contributes to the end of the endurance discipline. This qualification process is very expensive. The beginning of the qualification process must be carried out by the NF's</p> <p>b) The speed cap for any subsequent CEI1* will be determined by the Completion Rate of the Athlete/Horse We do not agree. It's absurd</p> <p>Competing at CEI2* once qualified for that level:</p> <p>a) Athletes and horses must successfully complete one CEI2* at a maximum speed of 18Km/hour or at a speed linked to their Completion Rate, whichever is lower. We don't agree for the same reasons than mention previously.</p> <p>b) The speed cap for any subsequent CEI2* will be determined by the Completion Rate of the Athlete/Horse We do not agree. It's absurd</p> <p>Competing at CEI3* once qualified for that level:</p> <p>a) If the Athlete and horse have not successfully complete a CEI2* together as a combination within three years of the date of the CEI3 competition they wish to participate in:</p> <p>(i) They must successfully complete one CEI3 at a maximum speed of 18Km/hour or at a speed linked to their Completion Rate, whichever is lower; and</p> <p>(ii) Any subsequent CEI3* will be subject to a speed cap based on the Completion Rate of the Athlete/Horse.</p> <p>Following what was mention previous we don't agree. A horse to do a CEI3* (160 kms) must have done already 600 Kms of competitions which doesn't fit with the horse's welfare.</p>
B.11	841	POR	AGREE
B.11	839	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULE
B.11	841	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULE
B.11	862	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULE
B.11	840	RUS	<p>WE ARE NOT AGREE WITH THIS PROPOSAL BECAUSE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IT DOES NOT SERVE SPORTS AND DOES NOT CONTRIBUTE TO ITS DEVELOPMENT, RATHER IT WILL HINDER THE CURRENT DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH IN THE ENDURANCE DISCIPLINE. 2. IT HAS BEEN REJECTED BY THE ENDURANCE COMMUNITY (70% OF THE SOCIETY) WHERE IT PROVED THROUGH THE QUESTIONER CONDUCT BY MR. TAREQ TAHER (RIDER REPRESENTATIVE IN ENDURANCE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE) 3. was rejected by the practicing countries during 2019 FEI Sport forum. 4. Increase the time for the riders and horses to qualify that can be extended for years, especially in countries where there are not enough FEI events 5. This system will be very expensive for the riders, owners and organizing committees as they have to do many events to finish the qualification. 6. Too short a notice to implement in the field as a proper system needs to be devised including all the required changes> (example: IT system to do all the calculations). 7. In many countries, they don't have Electronic Timing System but they used the Manual system which will be more difficult to record the speed of the combination, and more difficult for the official to control it. 8. This system requires Advance Electronic Timing System which will increase the cost for NF/OC 9. The proposed system is quite ambiguous as it allows the riders/horses compete with 16/h in Novice qualifications and at the same time preventing it to do a higher level of competitions with a lesser speed(in case of horse/rider with less than 25% completion rate where the speed limit is 14/h) <p>We recommend keeping the current rule until proper system is studied and tested including the endurance community.</p>
B.11	839.2.2	SLO	Maintaining the current rule.
B.11	841	SLO	Maintaining the current rule. EWith change you will just stop normal riders and give profesional riders more power!
B.11	862	SLO	Again, why should be profesional riders granted? All riders should be the same.
B.11	840	SLO	To complicated, again you will punish normal (non profesional) riders!
B.11	840	SWE	We refer to, and fully support the proposal written by the EEF Endurance working group (B.11)
B.11	841	SWE	We refer to, and fully support the proposal written by the EEF Endurance working group
B.11	838.2	URU	<p>In line with what we expressed in the previous paragraph - that we do not agree with the speed caps- we neither agree with this article.</p> <p>We believe that starting a competition with a certain number of starters and with different speed caps, apart from being confusing does not contribute at all to the interest of the competition itself.</p>
B.11	840.4.2	URU	<p>We think that the proposed system is very long and cumbersome and that in the end, it will end up threatening the welfare of the horse, which is what we want to preserve.</p> <p>Currently, most of the trainers and the riders do not compete with their horses immediately after the rest period ends in order to preserve their welfare but they compete every two or three months to give them the appropriate rest. With this proposed system that would require three (3) CEIs 1 * to be able to move to 2 * level it would only promote that a rider or a trainer would make his/her horses compete as many times as possible in order to reach the next category. For example, if nowadays the average for a horse is to compete three or four times per year, this change would encourage the participation in at least twice the number of competitions in order to move to the next category.</p>
B.11	840.5.2	URU	The same opinion as for the previous article applies.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	841.2.2	URU	In addition to all of the above, we consider that this extremely long qualification system will limit or restrict the possibilities of many countries to attend to the Championships. Worth to mention that many countries do not have enough FEI events in a year in order to be able to fulfil these requirements. In fact, reaching a Seniors Championship it would imply at least, and in the best case, to participate in eight (8) events (CEIs) while in the present the participation is in four (4) events. We believe that this measure seriously undermines the development and the growth of the sport. Hereunder we present a list of the countries that due to the low number of events they usually organize, we think that could have difficulties: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, The Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Ecuador, Australia, New Zealand.
B.11	837	USA	USEF Comments: <input type="checkbox"/> Levels of Competition. Approve in concept however both rules refer to either "all levels of competition" or "at any level of competition." Clarification is needed as to whether the completion rate and speed cap proposals must also be calculated for FEI athletes or horses competing at the CN level. If CNs are not used to determine a completion rate or speed cap, it is recommended that "Star" be added to both rules to clearly state that all calculations are based on FEI competitions only. <input type="checkbox"/> Practicality of Implementation. Additionally, it will be very difficult and prohibitively expensive for many OCs and / or NFs to provide timing systems to ensure real time electronic tracking of speeds during a competition or event. It is requested for the FEI to provide assistance with obtaining timing systems and further information on how to implement the speed caps for competition purposes if a timing system is unavailable. Maybe as an alternative the FEI only require this to be implemented at Events that have recorded average speeds in excess of a stated KPH.
B.11	840	USA	USEF Comments: Approve in concept however the USEF has two concerns, specifically around qualification for 2*, and recommend what is seen as simple solutions. 1. The financial constraints placed upon athletes and owners to meet the additional star level requirements and 2. The fiscal and human resource constraints placed on OCs due to the proposed requirements for the number and level of officials required. The proposed solution for the FEI to consider would be additional options for qualifying at the Novice and 1* levels. It is recommended to allow the option for athletes or horses to compete in back to back 40km competitions. It is also recommended for athletes or horses to have the option of competing back to back 1* competitions during the same event. To ensure horse welfare, the horse would be required to present for a second horse inspection prior to being allowed to start the second 1* competition. It would be up to the NFs to determine the parameters for allowing a horse to compete in back to back 40km competitions at the novice level.
B.11	841	USA	USEF Comment: Approve as presented however clarification is needed on how the proposed qualifications will affect the 2020 Championship. The reason being is there are many athletes and horses who have met the qualifications based upon the current Rules. It would be wrong, and in some parts of the world easily challenged (legally) to change the Qualification system half way through the Qualification Period.
B.11	839.2	UAE	We recommend maintaining the current rule as: Horses & Athletes who have accumulated a minimum of 240 km in a maximum of three events of 80km or higher in a 36 months period, can be granted an exemption
B.11	841	UAE	We recommend maintaining the current rule
B.11	862	UAE	We recommend keeping the current rule because - There must be a rewarding system for the Elite riders compare to other disciplines, for example, in showjumping Elite rider receive a special invitation to big events even with a free entry and travel costs - Rewarding Elite riders will encourage another rider to reach this status which we believe it will promote the horse welfare. - It can't be that most of the proposed rules are just restriction and sanction but has to be rewarding as well.
B.11	840	UAE	We don't agree with this proposal because: 1. It does not serve sports and does not contribute to its development, rather it will hinder the current development and growth in the Endurance discipline. 2. it has been rejected by the endurance community (70% of the society) Where it proved through the questioner conduct By Mr. Tareq Taher (Rider representative in Endurance technical committee) 3. was rejected by the practicing countries during 2019 FEI Sport forum. 4. Increase the time for the riders and horses to qualify that can be extended for years, especially in countries where there are not enough FEI events 5. This system will be very expensive for the riders, owners and organizing committees as they have to do many events to finish the qualification. 6. Too short a notice to implement in the field as a proper system needs to be devised including all the required changes> (example: IT system to do all the calculations). 7. In many countries, they don't have Electronic Timing System but they used the Manual system which will be more difficult to record the speed of the combination, and more difficult for the official to control it. 8. This system requires Advance Electronic Timing System which will increase the cost for NF/OC 9. The proposed system is quite ambiguous as it allows the riders/horses compete with 16/h in Novice qualifications and at the same time preventing it to do a higher level of competitions with a lesser speed(in case of horse/rider with less than 25% completion rate where the speed limit is 14/h) We recommend keeping the current rule until proper system is studied and tested including the endurance community.
B.11	839.2	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current rule as: Horses & Athletes who have accumulated a minimum of 240 km in a maximum of three events of 80km or higher in a 36 months period, can be granted an exemption
B.11	841	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current rule

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	862	LBN	We recommend keeping the current rule because - There must be a rewarding system for the Elite riders compare to other disciplines, for example, in showjumping Elite rider receive a special invitation to big events even with a free entry and travel costs - Rewarding Elite riders will encourage another rider to reach this status which we believe it will promote the horse welfare. - It can't be that most of the proposed rules are just restriction and sanction but has to be rewarding as well.
B.11	840	LBN	We don't agree with this proposal because: 1. It does not serve sports and does not contribute to its development, rather it will hinder the current development and growth in the Endurance discipline. 2. it has been rejected by the endurance community (70% of the society) Where it proved through the questioner conduct By Mr. Tareq Taher (Rider representative in Endurance technical committee) 3. was rejected by the practicing countries during 2019 FEI Sport forum. 4. Increase the time for the riders and horses to qualify that can be extended for years, especially in countries where there are not enough FEI events 5. This system will be very expensive for the riders, owners and organizing committees as they have to do many events to finish the qualification. 6. Too short a notice to implement in the field as a proper system needs to be devised including all the required changes> (example: IT system to do all the calculations). 7. In many countries, they don't have Electronic Timing System but they used the Manual system which will be more difficult to record the speed of the combination, and more difficult for the official to control it. 8. This system requires Advance Electronic Timing System which will increase the cost for NF/OC 9. The proposed system is quite ambiguous as it allows the riders/horses compete with 16/h in Novice qualifications and at the same time preventing it to do a higher level of competitions with a lesser speed(in case of horse/rider with less than 25% completion rate where the speed limit is 14/h) We recommend keeping the current rule until proper system is studied and tested including the endurance community.
B.11	839.2	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current rule as: Horses & Athletes who have accumulated a minimum of 240 km in a maximum of three events of 80km or higher in a 36 months period, can be granted an exemption
B.11	841	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current rule
B.11	862	LBN	We recommend keeping the current rule because - There must be a rewarding system for the Elite riders compare to other disciplines, for example, in showjumping Elite rider receive a special invitation to big events even with a free entry and travel costs - Rewarding Elite riders will encourage another rider to reach this status which we believe it will promote the horse welfare. - It can't be that most of the proposed rules are just restriction and sanction but has to be rewarding as well.
B.11	840	LBN	We don't agree with this proposal because: 1. It does not serve sports and does not contribute to its development, rather it will hinder the current development and growth in the Endurance discipline. 2. it has been rejected by the endurance community (70% of the society) Where it proved through the questioner conduct By Mr. Tareq Taher (Rider representative in Endurance technical committee) 3. was rejected by the practicing countries during 2019 FEI Sport forum. 4. Increase the time for the riders and horses to qualify that can be extended for years, especially in countries where there are not enough FEI events 5. This system will be very expensive for the riders, owners and organizing committees as they have to do many events to finish the qualification. 6. Too short a notice to implement in the field as a proper system needs to be devised including all the required changes> (example: IT system to do all the calculations). 7. In many countries, they don't have Electronic Timing System but they used the Manual system which will be more difficult to record the speed of the combination, and more difficult for the official to control it. 8. This system requires Advance Electronic Timing System which will increase the cost for NF/OC 9. The proposed system is quite ambiguous as it allows the riders/horses compete with 16/h in Novice qualifications and at the same time preventing it to do a higher level of competitions with a lesser speed(in case of horse/rider with less than 25% completion rate where the speed limit is 14/h) We recommend keeping the current rule until proper system is studied and tested including the endurance community.
B.11	839.2	SUD	We recommend maintaining the current rule as: Horses & Athletes who have accumulated a minimum of 240 km in a maximum of three events of 80km or higher in a 36 months period, can be granted an exemption
B.11	841	SUD	We recommend maintaining the current rule
B.11	862	SUD	We recommend keeping the current rule because - There must be a rewarding system for the Elite riders compare to other disciplines, for example, in showjumping Elite rider receive a special invitation to big events even with a free entry and travel costs - Rewarding Elite riders will encourage another rider to reach this status which we believe it will promote the horse welfare. - It can't be that most of the proposed rules are just restriction and sanction but has to be rewarding as well.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	840	SUD	<p>We don't agree with this proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It does not serve sports and does not contribute to its development, rather it will hinder the current development and growth in the Endurance discipline. 2. it has been rejected by the endurance community (70% of the society) Where it proved through the questioner conduct By Mr. Tareq Taher (Rider representative in Endurance technical committee) 3. was rejected by the practicing countries during 2019 FEI Sport forum. 4. Increase the time for the riders and horses to qualify that can be extended for years, especially in countries where there are not enough FEI events 5. This system will be very expensive for the riders, owners and organizing committees as they have to do many events to finish the qualification. 6. Too short a notice to implement in the field as a proper system needs to be devised including all the required changes> (example: IT system to do all the calculations). 7. In many countries, they don't have Electronic Timing System but they used the Manual system which will be more difficult to record the speed of the combination, and more difficult for the official to control it. 8. This system requires Advance Electronic Timing System which will increase the cost for NF/OC 9. The proposed system is quite ambiguous as it allows the riders/horses compete with 16/h in Novice qualifications and at the same time preventing it to do a higher level of competitions with a lesser speed(in case of horse/rider with less than 25% completion rate where the speed limit is 14/h) <p>We recommend keeping the current rule until proper system is studied and tested including the endurance community.</p>
B.11	839.2	SUD	<p>We recommend maintaining the current rule as: Horses & Athletes who have accumulated a minimum of 240 km in a maximum of three events of 80km or higher in a 36 months period, can be granted an exemption</p>
B.11	841	SUD	<p>We recommend maintaining the current rule</p>
B.11	862	SUD	<p>We recommend keeping the current rule because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There must be a rewarding system for the Elite riders compare to other disciplines, for example, in showjumping Elite rider receive a special invitation to big events even with a free entry and travel costs - Rewarding Elite riders will encourage another rider to reach this status which we believe it will promote the horse welfare. - It can't be that most of the proposed rules are just restriction and sanction but has to be rewarding as well.
B.11	840	SUD	<p>We don't agree with this proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It does not serve sports and does not contribute to its development, rather it will hinder the current development and growth in the Endurance discipline. 2. it has been rejected by the endurance community (70% of the society) Where it proved through the questioner conduct By Mr. Tareq Taher (Rider representative in Endurance technical committee) 3. was rejected by the practicing countries during 2019 FEI Sport forum. 4. Increase the time for the riders and horses to qualify that can be extended for years, especially in countries where there are not enough FEI events 5. This system will be very expensive for the riders, owners and organizing committees as they have to do many events to finish the qualification. 6. Too short a notice to implement in the field as a proper system needs to be devised including all the required changes> (example: IT system to do all the calculations). 7. In many countries, they don't have Electronic Timing System but they used the Manual system which will be more difficult to record the speed of the combination, and more difficult for the official to control it. 8. This system requires Advance Electronic Timing System which will increase the cost for NF/OC 9. The proposed system is quite ambiguous as it allows the riders/horses compete with 16/h in Novice qualifications and at the same time preventing it to do a higher level of competitions with a lesser speed(in case of horse/rider with less than 25% completion rate where the speed limit is 14/h) <p>We recommend keeping the current rule until proper system is studied and tested including the endurance community.</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	Chapter V	EEF	<p>As we already stated at previous steps of the consultation process, we are opposed to the proposed concept : completion rate, cap speed, CEI events qualification. We do not support it as it is far from the conception of the endurance sport from european and many other stakeholders perspectives.</p> <p>Endurance may be a real sport like it is practised in most cases, in the only possible way : fair, progressive from the access level to the highest standard (sport value must not be decrease), with a key combination of a an educate rider and a well trained horse. The sport must be fair, simple to understand/control, having in mind that the competition may be practiced in most parts of the world.</p> <p>The proposed system is excessive, complicated, non realistic. Even within the memo and the rules it is complicated to understand, so it would be very difficult/impossible to apply, not respected and so not fair and ineffective. It would place endurance in a counter productive situation, forcing the ones (large majority) who are currently respecting the rules to change due to incorrect behaviours of the few who are not respecting the rules... Again, to tackle the drifts we may first apply strongly the sport regulation (based on the current one + some updates) and apply stronger sanctions for any case of cheating/doping/corruption.</p> <p>Any other changes would be useless as the core of the problem may not be reached.</p> <p>We believe that Endurance is a competition and should remain a competitive sport. Horse discipline with the biggest amount of veterinary controls and in most cases high level of horse caring, which is where focus should be stressed on making sure Officials are properly trained and can work in conditions allowing them to be effective. The number of kilometers asked for the qualification process of a horse is excessive and damageable in term of horse welfare. The proposal of 3 CEI1* after the novice qualification is an example of the failures of the proposal. Please refer to our proposal much more progressive from the novice qualification to the highest levels.</p> <p>Speed cap concept would be inadequate. It is not taking in account the location, terrain, weather which from one show to another may evolve critically. A same speed may be the winner's speed by one hilly event and really low for a more flat one.</p> <p>As it is average speed cap it will not tackle the excessive speeds and horses stopping or walking just before to cross the line in order to decrease their speed datas. It is also forgetting that with a worldwide approach most of CEI organizers do not have automatic timekeeping systems to help elaborate the result. It would marginalize the practice of Endurance in different areas with a negative effect either on development and on top sport. Completion rate proposal, cannot be implemented at this stage. It does not differentiate the type of eliminations which would be required in case of potential use of this tool in the future. compulsory. Using athlete examples as Jean Philippe Frances or Alex Luque, any system like this that when applied would limit their participations even if they are respected athletes by their results and behaviors. By consequence we suggest to study more into details in the coming seasons how it could be positive asset, if it can be ... In order to settle a more progressive competition pathway which is with the correct application of the rules and a stronger sanctions system the only way to build a sustainable future for the discipline of endurance, we recommend to put in place the following concept :By proposing this we are aware of the need to adjust the qualification system to help the worldwide balance and growth of the discipline. By no means the FEI ETC proposal for qualification referring : cap speed, completion rate, competition levels, number of rides... will find our support.</p>
B.11	841	EEF	<p>EEF WG position:</p> <p>We support the riders qualification proposal, the combination ride but not the horses qualification proposal.</p> <p>New Elite status as extra championships requirement.</p> <p>Reasoning :</p> <p>We are aware that the current elite status my evolve, nevertheless as we dressed from last winter, we would be in favor of modifying it but not to make it honorary.</p> <p>We suggest to use it as a additional requirement to participate to the championships, for all riders willing to compete in a championship. Taking in account that depending of the part of Europe and of the world, the access to the international competition may be +/- challenging we recommend to decrease from 10 to 5 the number of successful 160km rides. Horse qualification proposal is inadequate and excessive.</p>
B.11	841.2.2	EEF	<p>Young Horse Championships requiring five 1* events to be completed makes it unrealistic that any Horse will be available to compete in this Championship.</p> <p>Timing and hearth rate system In order to stop discussions and suspicions, we insist that FEI may :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - label and closely control timing and hearth rate systems used on international events. - control itself all championships with an FEI system, totally independent from any involved endurance stakeholders.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	Chapter V	AUT	<p>As we already stated at previous steps of the consultation process, we are opposed to the proposed concept : completion rate, cap speed, CEI events qualification. We do not support it as it is far from the conception of the endurance sport from European and many other stakeholders perspectives.</p> <p>Endurance may be a real sport like it is practised in most cases, in the only possible way : fair, progressive from the access level to the highest standard (sport value must not decrease), with a key combination of an educated rider and a well trained horse. The sport must be fair, simple to understand/control, having in mind that the competition may be practiced in most parts of the world.</p> <p>The proposed system is excessive, complicated, non realistic. Even within the memo and the rules it is complicated to understand, so it would be very difficult/impossible to apply, not respected and so not fair and ineffective. It would place endurance in a counter productive situation, forcing the ones (large majority) who are currently respecting the rules to change due to incorrect behaviours of the few who are not respecting the rules... Again, to tackle the drifts we may first apply strongly the sport regulation (based on the current one + some updates) and apply stronger sanctions for any case of cheating/doping/corruption.</p> <p>Any other changes would be useless as the core of the problem may not be reached.</p> <p>We believe that Endurance is a competition and should remain a competitive sport. Horse discipline with the biggest amount of veterinary controls and in most cases high level of horse caring, which is where focus should be stressed on making sure Officials are properly trained and can work in conditions allowing them to be effective. The number of kilometers asked for the qualification process of a horse is excessive and damageable in terms of horse welfare. The proposal of 3 CEI1* after the novice qualification is an example of the failures of the proposal. Please refer to our proposal much more progressive from the novice qualification to the highest levels.</p> <p>Speed cap concept would be inadequate. It is not taking into account the location, terrain, weather which from one show to another may evolve critically. A same speed may be the winner's speed by one hilly event and really low for a more flat one.</p> <p>As it is average speed cap it will not tackle the excessive speeds and horses stopping or walking just before to cross the line in order to decrease their speed data. It is also forgetting that with a worldwide approach most of CEI organizers do not have automatic timekeeping systems to help elaborate the result. It would marginalize the practice of Endurance in different areas with a negative effect either on development and on top sport. Completion rate proposal, cannot be implemented at this stage. It does not differentiate the type of eliminations which would be required in case of potential use of this tool in the future. compulsory. Using athlete examples as Jean Philippe Frances or Alex Luque, any system like this that when applied would limit their participations even if they are respected athletes by their results and behaviors. By consequence we suggest to study more into details in the coming seasons how it could be a positive asset, if it can be ... In order to settle a more progressive competition pathway which is with the correct application of the rules and a stronger sanctions system the only way to build a sustainable future for the discipline of endurance, we recommend to put in place the following concept :By proposing this we are aware of the need to adjust the qualification system to help the worldwide balance and growth of the discipline. By no means the FEI ETC proposal for qualification referring : cap speed, completion rate, competition levels, number of rides... will find our support</p>
B.11	841	AUT	<p>EEF WG position:</p> <p>We support the riders qualification proposal, the combination ride but not the horses qualification proposal.</p> <p>New Elite status as extra championships requirement.</p> <p>Reasoning :</p> <p>We are aware that the current elite status may evolve, nevertheless as we discussed from last winter, we would be in favor of modifying it but not to make it honorary.</p> <p>We suggest to use it as an additional requirement to participate to the championships, for all riders willing to compete in a championship. Taking into account that depending on the part of Europe and of the world, the access to the international competition may be +/- challenging we recommend to decrease from 10 to 5 the number of successful 160km rides. Horse qualification proposal is inadequate and excessive.</p>
B.11	841.2.2	AUT	<p>Young Horse Championships requiring five 1* events to be completed makes it unrealistic that any Horse will be available to compete in this Championship.</p> <p>Timing and heart rate system In order to stop discussions and suspicions, we insist that FEI may :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - label and closely control timing and heart rate systems used on international events. - control itself all championships with an FEI system, totally independent from any involved endurance stakeholders.
B.11	839.2	LBY	<p>We recommend maintaining the current rule as:</p> <p>Horses & Athletes who have accumulated a minimum of 240 km in a maximum of three events of 80km or higher in a 36 months period, can be granted an exemption</p>
B.11	841	LBY	We recommend maintaining the current rule
B.11	862	LBY	<p>We recommend keeping the current rule because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There must be a rewarding system for the Elite riders compare to other disciplines, for example, in showjumping Elite rider receive a special invitation to big events even with a free entry and travel costs - Rewarding Elite riders will encourage another rider to reach this status which we believe it will promote the horse welfare. - It can't be that most of the proposed rules are just restriction and sanction but has to be rewarding as well.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.11	840	LBY	<p>We don't agree with this proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It does not serve sports and does not contribute to its development, rather it will hinder the current development and growth in the Endurance discipline. 2. it has been rejected by the endurance community (70% of the society) Where it proved through the questioner conduct By Mr. Tareq Taher (Rider representative in Endurance technical committee) 3. was rejected by the practicing countries during 2019 FEI Sport forum. 4. Increase the time for the riders and horses to qualify that can be extended for years, especially in countries where there are not enough FEI events 5. This system will be very expensive for the riders, owners and organizing committees as they have to do many events to finish the qualification. 6. Too short a notice to implement in the field as a proper system needs to be devised including all the required changes> (example: IT system to do all the calculations). 7. In many countries, they don't have Electronic Timing System but they used the Manual system which will be more difficult to record the speed of the combination, and more difficult for the official to control it. 8. This system requires Advance Electronic Timing System which will increase the cost for NF/OC 9. The proposed system is quite ambiguous as it allows the riders/horses compete with 16/h in Novice qualifications and at the same time preventing it to do a higher level of competitions with a lesser speed(in case of horse/rider with less than 25% completion rate where the speed limit is 14/h) <p>We recommend keeping the current rule until proper system is studied and tested including the endurance community.</p>
B.11	Chapter V	RSA	<p>Qualification from 1* to Championships: The extra requirements to qualify a horse are going to make the costs of riding very expensive and take longer than is needed. Keep requirements as they are.</p>
B.11	862	RSA	<p>Elite Riders: What is the use of Elite riders if they are not exempt from qualifying for World Champs Athletes from SA will be unable to participate in WC if they have to qualify overseas. The funding is not there.</p>
B.12	Chapter VII	AUS	<p>Attention to the appointment of officials needs to consider developing and isolated nations such that the cost of hosting FEI competition is not increased through the requirement of specific officials.</p>
B.12	Annex 6	AUS	<p>EA protest at the increased star rating requirement for officials, particularly the requirement for 3 star officials for CEI1* events, and the requirement for 3* Chief Stewards from CEI1* up. These requirements increase the cost to conduct the ride requiring officials of higher star rating to be brought in from other regions, while decreasing the chances that officials have to perform and qualify. Veterinary Officials for CEI3*: proposal that: At least half of the members of the Veterinary Commission (including the President and Foreign Veterinary Delegate) must be 'Foreign', in accordance with Article 849</p> <p>EA protest against this proposal, on the grounds that it will substantially increase the costs for conducting CEI3* events within Australia, to require foreign veterinarians as half the veterinary commission, including both President and Foreign Veterinary Delegate. International and interstate travel to and in Australia covers extreme distance, compared to most other regions in the world, and therefore imposes substantial increase in costs to conduct the ride. With most CEIs in Australia run with very small numbers of riders, there are limited opportunities for officials to work at rides, and the requirements for imported veterinarians, at high star rating, will seriously limit the engagement and opportunities for local veterinarians to contribute to the sport. EA support our NZ colleagues in their proposal to allow NZ veterinarians from the different (South and North) NZ Islands to be considered as foreign to each other.</p>
B.12	850	BEL	<p>Belgium does not agree. Belgium recommends applying the same systems as in other disciplines of the FEI. The proposed rule will increase the costs for OC and NF.</p>
B.12	Annex 6	ARG	<p>Regarding the officials appointment, we suggest to maintain the current rule.</p>
B.12	850	ARG	<p>We don't agree with this proposal, the OC t are going to incur in a large expense.</p>
B.12	854	ARG	<p>We agree with this proposal.</p>
B.12	857	ARG	<p>We agree with this proposal.</p>
B.12	849	ARG	<p>Maintain the current rule. Although we believe that some rules must be modified or updated there are others that are a matter for officials to enforce and respect the rules and be sufficiently trained to exercise their role. Increasing the number of stars, especially for the lower category events, means an additional cost for the OC.</p>
B.12	Annex 6	CAN	<p>We agree with the proposals, except; We are concerned with FEI appointing the 3* officials, think it should be OC with FEI approval. We are concerned with the OC appointing the Regional Championship officials, think it should be FEI. We recommend that the Chief Steward for a CEI 1* be a level 2. We recommend that the President and Foreign Judge for a 3* be a 4*.</p>
B.12	Annex 6	CHI	<p>We agree with this change, but the rule will have to be reviewed because for a 2* judge is mandatory to be PGJ once to be a 3* judge.</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.12	850	CHI	President of Ground Jury, Technical Delegate and Chief Steward should not be repeated within three months (although they could change positions with each other). We agree as long as the number of authorized officers exists in the country.
B.12	850	CRO	Considering the article No 1121 of the Veterinary regulation, the maintenance of status for EOVs has become extremely demanding for veterinarians from countries with no or a small number of events (a need of 4 events/2 years, a 3 years break after 3 consecutive years of officiating). Since the Officials Exchange Programme is not meant for status maintenance purposes we would like to propose an early implementation of a rotatory system giving the EOVs from the Balkan region a fair chance to maintain their status.
B.12	Annex 6	CRC	CRC Comments and suggestions. We are assuming on these charts that the minimum rate refers to the star/level of officials. Stewarding Team: Currently Stewards in Endurance are up to level 3. Why does it show Minimum Rate: 4 for WEGs Championships, regional games. Having to have a level 3 Steward at a CEI1* will increase organizing costs even more. Currently there are very few level 3 Stewards around the world. We believe for a CEI1* a Level 1 Steward should be authorized to serve as a Chief Steward and level 2 stewards for CEI2* and CEI3*. Ground Jury: The term ground jury as presented in this table includes the President, Foreign Judge and members. Throughout these rules it seems that ground jury refers to one person and in other articles the term Ground Jury implies all members. Some articles require that it be clear that the PGJ is the person responsible for the decision. Some examples 853.2 / 854. It is extremely important that it be clear who will be held accountable. Veterinary Commission: Note 3. We do not agree with the statement that at a CEI3*: at least half of the members of the Veterinary Commission (including the President and Foreign Veterinary Delegate) must be a Foreign in accordance with article 849.4. If FEI appoints the President of the Vet Commission or other members, when a country has a veterinarian with the required experience and star rating for a 3* event, does this mean that FEI will cover their transportation costs?
B.12	850	BRA	Rotation of officials in regions where they have few local officials might become a heavy financial burden. We believe it should be based on criteria by the FEI where the FEI can interfere if the OC invites always the same officials even if the OC has the means to diversify. South America is not Europe where you can invite someone easily/cheaply from a neighbour country
B.12	850	BRN	We agree to this proposal.
B.12	854	BRN	We agree to this proposal.
B.12	857	BRN	We agree to this proposal.
B.12	849	BRN	We agree to this proposal.
B.12	Annex 6	BRN	We agree to this proposal.
B.12	857	ESP	We believe the IGA system needs to be reinforced and a lot more public so that there is an evident perception from the community and officials about what happens during competitions. There should no one be afraid of the truth being public, which will go a long way towards demonstrating corruption or neglect is not tolerated.
B.12	850.1	IRL	If it is felt that with the shortage of Treatment Vets, they should be left out of this rotation proposal. Three months needs to be clearly defined.
B.12	857	ITA	Proposal: We support the concept and would see some evolution especially regarding the IGA. Reasoning: IGA reports seem to be very ineffective and their true independence limited. We would like to see bigger independence and transparency being applied in the IGA system, by making these reports public so that public scrutiny can be certain they are acted upon and their contents reflect the events that arrive in competitions. Age of Officials 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.
B.12	850.1	JPN	May an official who was appointed as one of the listed officials, be appointed as another official on the list, within the three-month time frame, e.g. appointed as PGJ and then TD? If not, NFs with limited number of FEI officials will see difficulties in organizing Endurance events
B.12	857.2.2	JPN	We strongly agree with and support this proposal of creating a veterinary IGA.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.12	Annex 6	JPN	<p>We do not agree with FEI HQ appointing all of TD/ChiefSteward/PGJ/FJ/PVC/FV/President of TVC for CEI3*, that is too much. The Organiser / NF of the nation(s) may not be able to afford to cover the expenses, especially where the discipline is under development and has small number of entries. MINIMUM RATE for TD for CEI1* should be 2 or 2*.</p> <p>OFFICIALS REQUIRED FOR EVENTS: Stewarding Team --- It is very confusing since there are only 3 levels of Endurance Stewards, Level 1, 2, and 3. However, in this chart, there are Rate 2, 3, and 4. It means Level 1 = Rate 2, Level 2 = Rate 3, and Level 3 = Rate 4, correct? Please clarify. WEG/Regional/Continental Games/Championships, we recommend Steward to be at least Rate 3 or Level 2.</p> <p>OFFICIALS REQUIRED FOR EVENTS: Ground Jury --- We believe a member of GJ for WEG/Regional/Continental Games/Championships must be a 4* (Rate 4) Judge. On the other hand, PGJ of CEI 1* must be 2* (Rate 2), since under current promotion regulations for FEI Endurance Officials, a 2* Judge must have an experience as PGJ at a CEI1*. The proposed rule here contradicts with the promotion criteria.</p>
B.12	850	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> More rotation needed – some officials never get opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> May struggle to find officials, particularly for EP where the events are concentrated in a three month period <input type="checkbox"/> May be better to use officials who can do the role well than swap in officials who cannot <input type="checkbox"/> 150.1 – 6 months would be better
B.12	850	KSA	<p>We recommend to apply the rule of appointment of officials to be the same applied in FEI other disciplines: In Endurance proposed Rules 2020 we note that the Endurance Technical Committee has amended many Rules to be in line with FEI General Regulations for other disciplines which we support. The proposed educational and evaluation system for the officials at the 2019 FEI sports forum is the solution to assure the implementation of the rules during the event. Example: The proposed rule of the responsibility to appoint the key officials for CEI3* is given to FEI headquarters, while the appointment of the officials for the FEI regional competition was given to the OC in consultation with FEI. This indicates to maintain the general officials appointing system across all FEI disciplines. The proposed rules will increase the cost for the OC and NFs</p>
B.12	850	NAM	<p>In Group IX we are not able to offer many events thus our OC's will struggle to keep the events profitable – too expensive to fly officials in from other countries. Please do not forget that in the Endurance sport we have Africa, Australia, NZ and the Americas. For EU this is easy – not for rest of the world. Distances and exchange rates do hamper the progress here. We agree that rotation is necessary, must even be compulsory, however please consider drawing from the same Regional group. Alternately find a way to offer exchanges under development.</p>
B.12	854.4	NAM	agree
B.12	849	NED	<p>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 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.</p>
B.12	Chapter VII	NOR	This is ok
B.12	Chapter VII	NZL	We have no concerns with this proposal and would vote for it.
B.12	849.4	NZL	<p>This is also not a rule change but commenting on the current system; if one of the aims of having foreign officials is to ensure transparency and adherence to the rules, then having officials from within the same NF but from a different time zone does not really assist with this. Whilst it may help to keep costs down in some instances e.g. Australia which has several time zones and some parts of Australia observe daylight savings and other parts don't which means even more time zones. However, New Zealand is also remote and is surrounded by oceans; having two main islands means that even some national vets and officials must fly to get to an event. If some countries have the exemption from foreign with different time zones, we would like to return to the situation where the North Island was considered foreign to the South Island. The current system also makes it harder for New Zealand vets and officials to gain overseas experience as Australia does not need to bring in truly foreign vets and officials when they can use someone from elsewhere in the country.</p>
B.12	Annex 6	NZL	<p>It appears that the requirement for the number of veterinarians on the Veterinary Commission and Treatment Veterinarians is being slightly increased. This will further increase the cost of running CEI events. Of greater concern is the requirement at 3* level for at least half of the Veterinary Commission to be foreign. Unless the FEI is going to assist with the extra travel costs, this will probably make running a 3* event in New Zealand cost prohibitive. At our own championship events we may run other classes on the same day as a 3* competition; sometimes this may be a CEN 40 km or even Competitive Trail Rides. The requirement for the number of treatment veterinarians being based on horses competing in classes that day rather than the number of horses in the 3* classes means that more Treatment Vets need to be at the ride base with very few horses needing treatment. It would be helpful if the number of treatment vets was based on both the number of horses in the CEI event(s) on the day as well as the prediction of speed and elimination rate for that event. Many of our CEI events are at venues which have been used before and we know that very few horses will need treatment or be requested to have rehydration fluids. At most of our CEI events, the Treatment Vet would only treat 0-4 horses each day.</p>
B.12	850	OMA	<p>We support to apply the rule of officials appointment to be the same ruled in FEI other disciplines. The new rules will increase the cost for the Organizing committee and National Federations</p>
B.12	854.4	OMA	We support this proposals
B.12	Annex 6	POR	<p>Introduce rotation of officials, as per the recommendation of the FEI Official's Working Group, and direct appointment of officials by the FEI in certain circumstances. No, it's very expensive. It's unbearable</p>

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.12	Annex 6	POR	To be in line with the other disciplines, the President of the Ground Jury and the Foreign Judge will have to submit official reports to the FEI as discussed during the Sports Forum. AGREE specifies the Officials required for events, star level, appointments and the ratio of Officials to starters according to the new Education System for Endurance Officials.
B.12	857.4	POR	AGREE In a update to the Independent Governance Advisors (IGA) rule, the cost of accommodation will now be covered by the FEI to ensure full independence and the number of IGAs will no longer be limited to four
B.12	850	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULES
B.12	854.4	RUS	WE AGREE WITH THIS PROPOSAL
B.12	850	SLO	agree
B.12	854.4	SLO	agree
B.12	Annex 6	SWE	Steward teams Comment: Up to now a Chief Steward officiating at a CEI*, CEI**, CEI*** could be a 2* Level Steward. The new suggestions is that a Chief Steward must have a 3* level already when officiating at a CEI*. We suggest that a Steward Level 2* can officiate as a Chief Steward at CEI* and CEI**, oth-erwise it will be very hard for Stewards in small Countries with few events to get the experi-ence and eventually have the possibility to officiate at Events with a higher status. Ground Jury 3* Comment: The proposal is that FEI Headquarter should appoint officials for all CEI***. When appointing Officials, please take into consideration the cost of travel otherwise it will effect small Countries with Events with less number of starters.
B.12	850	USA	USEF Comments: <input type="checkbox"/> Reports. Approve however it is recommended for TD reports to be rewritten so that they are substantive regarding the reporting of the competition, safety and welfare of the horses and competitors, any abnormalities that occur during the competition, etc. In other words, we would like to see a narrative of how the competition was run and relating to any occurrences, rather than a "box ticking" Report. <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Officials at minor Events. Please note the official's star level requirements for 1* events (President of Ground Jury, Technical Delegate and Chief Steward) are all currently sitting at the 2* level. The proposed changes for 2020 require officials to all be 3* level. Based upon the proposed Annex 6 chart, it appears that it would be impossible for an official to be promoted from the 2* to 3* level. It is recommended that for 1* level competitions that the Chief Steward, President of the Ground Jury and the TD remain as 2* officials instead of increasing to the 3* level, thereby the language of promotion does not need to be revised as it will provide 2* officials the experience they need at the 1* level.
B.12	850	UAE	We recommend to apply the rule of appointment of officials to be the same applied in FEI other disciplines: In Endurance proposed Rules 2020 we note that the Endurance Technical Committee has amended many Rules to be in line with FEI General Regulations for other disciplines which we support. The proposed educational and evaluation system for the officials at the 2019 FEI sports forum is the solution to assure the implementation of the rules during the event. Example: The proposed rule of the responsibility to appoint the key officials for CEI3* is given to FEI headquarters, while the appointment of the officials for the FEI regional competition was given to the OC in consultation with FEI. This indicate to maintain the general officials appointing system across all FEI displaces The proposed rules will increase the cost for the OC and NFs
B.12	854.4	UAE	We agree with this proposal
B.12	850	LBN	We recommend to apply the rule of appointment of officials to be the same applied in FEI other disciplines: In Endurance proposed Rules 2020 we note that the Endurance Technical Committee has amended many Rules to be in line with FEI General Regulations for other disciplines which we support. The proposed educational and evaluation system for the officials at the 2019 FEI sports forum is the solution to assure the implementation of the rules during the event. Example: The proposed rule of the responsibility to appoint the key officials for CEI3* is given to FEI headquarters, while the appointment of the officials for the FEI regional competition was given to the OC in consultation with FEI. This indicate to maintain the general officials appointing system across all FEI displaces The proposed rules will increase the cost for the OC and NFs
B.12	854.4	LBN	We agree with this proposal

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.12	850	LBN	<p>We recommend to apply the rule of appointment of officials to be the same applied in FEI other disciplines: In Endurance proposed Rules 2020 we note that the Endurance Technical Committee has amended many Rules to be in line with FEI General Regulations for other disciplines which we support. The proposed educational and evaluation system for the officials at the 2019 FEI sports forum is the solution to assure the implementation of the rules during the event. Example: The proposed rule of the responsibility to appoint the key officials for CEI3* is given to FEI headquarters, while the appointment of the officials for the FEI regional competition was given to the OC in consultation with FEI. This indicate to maintain the general officials appointing system across all FEI displaces</p> <p>The proposed rules will increase the cost for the OC and NFs</p>
B.12	854.4	LBN	We agree with this proposal
B.12	850	SUD	<p>We recommend to apply the rule of appointment of officials to be the same applied in FEI other disciplines: In Endurance proposed Rules 2020 we note that the Endurance Technical Committee has amended many Rules to be in line with FEI General Regulations for other disciplines which we support. The proposed educational and evaluation system for the officials at the 2019 FEI sports forum is the solution to assure the implementation of the rules during the event. Example: The proposed rule of the responsibility to appoint the key officials for CEI3* is given to FEI headquarters, while the appointment of the officials for the FEI regional competition was given to the OC in consultation with FEI. This indicate to maintain the general officials appointing system across all FEI displaces</p> <p>The proposed rules will increase the cost for the OC and NFs</p>
B.12	854.4	SUD	We agree with this proposal
B.12	850	SUD	<p>We recommend to apply the rule of appointment of officials to be the same applied in FEI other disciplines: In Endurance proposed Rules 2020 we note that the Endurance Technical Committee has amended many Rules to be in line with FEI General Regulations for other disciplines which we support. The proposed educational and evaluation system for the officials at the 2019 FEI sports forum is the solution to assure the implementation of the rules during the event. Example: The proposed rule of the responsibility to appoint the key officials for CEI3* is given to FEI headquarters, while the appointment of the officials for the FEI regional competition was given to the OC in consultation with FEI. This indicate to maintain the general officials appointing system across all FEI displaces</p> <p>The proposed rules will increase the cost for the OC and NFs</p>
B.12	854.4	SUD	We agree with this proposal
B.12	857	EEF	<p>EEF WG position : we do support the concept and would see some evolution especially regarding the IGA. Reasoning : IGA reports seem to be very ineffective and their true independence limited. We would like to see bigger independence and transparency being applied in the IGA system, by making these reports public so that public scrutiny can be certain they are acted upon and their contents reflect the events that arrive in competitions.</p>
B.12	857	AUT	<p>EEF WG position : we do support the concept and would see some evolution especially regarding the IGA. Reasoning : IGA reports seem to be very ineffective and their true independence limited. We would like to see bigger independence and transparency being applied in the IGA system, by making these reports public so that public scrutiny can be certain they are acted upon and their contents reflect the events that arrive in competitions.</p>
B.12	850	LBY	<p>We recommend to apply the rule of appointment of officials to be the same applied in FEI other disciplines: In Endurance proposed Rules 2020 we note that the Endurance Technical Committee has amended many Rules to be in line with FEI General Regulations for other disciplines which we support. The proposed educational and evaluation system for the officials at the 2019 FEI sports forum is the solution to assure the implementation of the rules during the event. Example: The proposed rule of the responsibility to appoint the key officials for CEI3* is given to FEI headquarters, while the appointment of the officials for the FEI regional competition was given to the OC in consultation with FEI. This indicate to maintain the general officials appointing system across all FEI displaces</p> <p>The proposed rules will increase the cost for the OC and NFs</p>
B.12	854.4	LBY	We agree with this proposal

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
B.12	850	RSA	Rotation of Officials: This rule is going to be very difficult to implement in the smaller countries eg. South Africa as there are not that many officials and it is very expensive to get International officials. We live far from Europe and airfares are very expensive. The officials in SA have to travel far distances as the events can be 2000km apart.
B.13	Annex 5	AUS	The inclusion of the word "verbally" in how the veterinarians will communicate to the ground jury should be removed; silent written voting ensures the votes are independent, and also protects the vets from being overheard.
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	ARG	We agree with this proposal, as long as it is taken in account the type of injury and if it prejudice in any way the horse ability to continue.
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	CAN	We agree with this proposal because we believe that all sources of blood on a horse should be reviewed to be determined if it safe for the horse to continue. There are times that a horse with blood may be identified in the field of play, and there are no veterinarians available for many kilometers, so other officials should be given some authority to deal with these situations – a scratch that is clotting, vs a gaping wound are the easy ones, the situations in-between would require some sort of guidance and or protocol.
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	BRN	We agree with this proposal
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	ESP	We agree with this proposal, although we find that in practice this already happens, and as such it seems like it is a rule making official what already happens in the field, which makes it a great, truly and tested rule as all should be.
B.13	Annex 5	IRL	Part B 8.6 Final Inspection The criteria for the Final Inspection must be "Fit to Continue". This should be one of the cornerstones of the sport. It will ensure that more considered riding will take place on the last loop, instead of an "emptying the tank" attitude. Part B 9.3 (a) (iii) No kneeling, feeding, twitching, pulling down on the horses head or touching the horses during the taking of the heart rate. At the expense of losing the first Inspection. Part B 9.3.(d) The use of a second heart rate reader should only be confirmatory i.e. for 15 seconds to confirm the first reader. To allow a horse a full 60 secs on the second reader is to give it an unfair advantage time wise. Part B 10.1 The Ground Jury, Stewards and Vets are responsible for enforcing the Horse Inspection decorum.
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	ITA	Proposal: We do support the FEI ETC proposal.
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	GBR	<input type="checkbox"/> There would need to be a reporting system for crews and other riders to report horses with visible blood <input type="checkbox"/> Not a practical rule for injuries on course – would a panel of three be expected to go out on course to look at a scratch? <input type="checkbox"/> Would work in vetgates <input type="checkbox"/> It would need re-wording for tiny spots of blood eg fly bites
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	NOR	This is ok
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	NZL	We support this rule as long as elimination is based on veterinary opinion as to the significance of the bleeding and that it isn't an automatic elimination. We would vote for this rule.
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	POR	AGREE
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	SLO	Veterinary inspection in case of visible blood.
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	EEF	EEF WG position: we do support the FEI ETC proposal. Reasoning : The way of control and decision making process corresponds to what we expect.
B.13	Annex 5 - 8.7	AUT	EEF WG position: we do support the FEI ETC proposal. Reasoning : The way of control and decision making process corresponds to what we expect.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
C.1		ITA	Proposal: we do support FEI ETC recommendation and so disagree with the FEI Bureau position. Reasoning: As explained by the FEI ETC the specificity of the discipline may be taken in account for this point.
C.1		NOR	This is ok
C.1		NZL	Whilst we support this rule in principle, we believe that how rule violations will be considered once the Ground Jury have left the event will become difficult. The costs associated with defending yourself at the FEI make it prohibitively expensive. We agree that this rule proposal not be put forward for voting.
C.1		POR	AGREE
C.1		EEF	EEF WG position : we do support FEI ETC recommendation and so disagree with the FEI Bureau position. Reasoning : As explained by the FEI ETC the specificity of the discipline may be taken in account for this point.
C.1		AUT	EEF WG position : we do support FEI ETC recommendation and so disagree with the FEI Bureau position. Reasoning : As explained by the FEI ETC the specificity of the discipline may be taken in account for this point.
C.2		ESP	We believe sanctions should be reviewed for Endurance and the effects of MCP violations greatly discouraged.
C.2		ITA	Proposal: We do support FEI ETC recommendation and so disagree with the FEI Bureau position. Reasoning: As we consider stronger sanctions system as a key lever to tackle specific drifts of the discipline we do not see the FEI multidisciplinary proposal as sufficiently strong and adequate with endurance situation. We disagree with the fact that an efficient lever facing the core of the problems would not be fully activated or be postponed, especially when in the meantime some changes not facing it are promoted.
C.2		NOR	This is ok
C.2		NZL	We would support increased sanctions for horse abuse. This rule proposal is not being put forward however.
C.2		POR	AGREE
C.2		EEF	EEF WG position : we do support FEI ETC recommendation and so disagree with the FEI Bureau position. Reasoning : As we consider stronger sanctions system as a key lever to tackle specific drifts of the discipline we do not see the FEI multidisciplinary proposal as sufficiently strong and adequate with endurance situation. We disagree with the fact that an efficient lever facing the core of the problems would not be fully activated or be postponed, especially when in the meantime some changes not facing it are promoted.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
C.2		AUT	EEF WG position : we do support FEI ETC recommendation and so disagree with the FEI Bureau position. Reasoning : As we consider stronger sanctions system as a key lever to tackle specific drifts of the discipline we do not see the FEI multidisciplinary proposal as sufficiently strong and adequate with endurance situation. We disagree with the fact that an efficient lever facing the core of the problems would not be fully activated or be postponed, especially when in the meantime some changes not facing it are promoted.
D.1		NZL	We support these clarifications and also the new format of the Endurance Regulations which are clearer and simplified compared to previous versions.
D.1	847	POR	AGREE
D.3	866	CRC	Currently the yellow cards can be issued by the PGJ, TD, CS and President of the Appeal Committee. Is the President of the Appeal Committee being deliberately left out. If so why?
D.3	867.1	BRN	If an Athlete or Trainer incurs 100 or more penalty points, the Athlete/Trainer will receive an automatic two-month suspension. After the suspension is served, the Athlete's/Trainer's penalty points total will be reduced by 100 points. We disagree with the Athlete and Trainer Penalty Points proposal as Trainers might have many horses participating in the same event. There should be a system to analyze the trainers and their horses before subjecting them to a penalty for a single horse.
D.3	867.1	KSA	We recommend increasing the penalty points to 300 instead of 100 for the trainer because the trainers have many horses participating in the same event. - there should be a ratio between the number of horses under trainer and the total penalty points. - If the horse is eliminated because of higher pulse only and not a metabolic, the 10 penalty points should not be applied as it does not compromise the horse welfare.
D.3	867	NAM	agree
D.3	867	OMA	We are supporting the recommendations.
D.3	867	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULES
D.3	867	SLO	agree
D.3	867	UAE	We recommend increasing the penalty points to 300 instead of 100 for the trainer because the trainers have many horses participating in the same event. - there should be a ratio between the number of horses under trainer and the total penalty points. - If the horse is eliminated because of higher pulse only and not a metabolic, the 10 penalty points should not be applied as it does not compromise the horse welfare.
D.3	867	LBN	We recommend increasing the penalty points to 300 instead of 100 for the trainer because the trainers have many horses participating in the same event. - there should be a ratio between the number of horses under trainer and the total penalty points. - If the horse is eliminated because of higher pulse only and not a metabolic, the 10 penalty points should not be applied as it does not compromise the horse welfare.
D.3	867	LBN	We recommend increasing the penalty points to 300 instead of 100 for the trainer because the trainers have many horses participating in the same event. - there should be a ratio between the number of horses under trainer and the total penalty points. - If the horse is eliminated because of higher pulse only and not a metabolic, the 10 penalty points should not be applied as it does not compromise the horse welfare.
D.3	867	SUD	We recommend increasing the penalty points to 300 instead of 100 for the trainer because the trainers have many horses participating in the same event. - there should be a ratio between the number of horses under trainer and the total penalty points. - If the horse is eliminated because of higher pulse only and not a metabolic, the 10 penalty points should not be applied as it does not compromise the horse welfare.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
D.3	867	SUD	We recommend increasing the penalty points to 300 instead of 100 for the trainer because the trainers have many horses participating in the same event. - there should be a ratio between the number of horses under trainer and the total penalty points. - If the horse is eliminated because of higher pulse only and not a metabolic, the 10 penalty points should not be applied as it does not compromise the horse welfare.
D.3	867	LBY	We recommend increasing the penalty points to 300 instead of 100 for the trainer because the trainers have many horses participating in the same event. - there should be a ratio between the number of horses under trainer and the total penalty points. - If the horse is eliminated because of higher pulse only and not a metabolic, the 10 penalty points should not be applied as it does not compromise the horse welfare.
	Annex 5	BEL	The general veterinaire rules are in contradiction. There are 2 options for the use of perfusions before the competition: - Either: 1h before the preliminary vetcheck - Or: 12h before the start of the competition Both rules are used in competitions, so it's not clear which one stands. Belgium would like a clarification on this point.
	811	CRC	CRC Comment and question: The new rule states that attendance is mandatory for all CEI events. What happens if someone does not attend? What will be the consequences and how will this be enforced?
	Annex 1	CRC	CRC Suggestion: Definition of Retirement: Please clarify if a horse can retire after passing the vet inspection and before the start of the next phase. Must the horse pass another vet inspection? There is a difference in the use of this code in different parts of the world.
	Annex 3	CRC	CRC Suggestion: Definition of Retirement: Please clarify if a horse can retire after passing the vet inspection and before the start of the next phase. Must the horse pass another vet inspection? There is a difference in the use of this code in different parts of the world.
	General	CRC	"In one day" term used throughout these rules. Please take into consideration that in some countries we run events at night and therefore are still competing at midnight when a new day starts. Competitions begin one day and finish the next so the "in one day" term does not apply.
	809.4.4	BRA	Why should the entire team result null, if one team member for instance makes an error on the course and is disqualified, this should be only applied like it used to be for positive doping
	General	ESP	We note that there are absolutely no proposals yet regarding the certification of timekeeping and heart rate systems at competitions, specially at Championship levels. Certification is only a first step towards making sure that proper control and validity exists in our sport, not only for protection of Horses and making sure values presented are correct, but to make sure the sport is clean and truly a clean sport. We have seen proposals to start a process where Officials must be the actors of fairplay and protection of sportmanship, however nothing is being proposed towards the professionals which ultimately control all technical data of a competition. In a world where we keep seeing great hacking incidents and governments looking at the protection of democratic elections, we somehow are not looking at the very base of our data handling.
	858.2	FRA	We would like to have the whole riders of the team on the podium including the ones who may be eliminated. This would be an harmonization with other disciplines. There is no extra cost for the OC as the whole teams start so currently the OC is already prepared to distribute medals to all riders.
	827.4	IRLmay require..... This should read shall require
	802.6	ITA	National competitions should remain a viable way for O.C.s to fund their events. An O.C. cannot request that a National event to be held 4 days before the competition starts, since most National Federations require their calendars to be in place since the previous year, and competitors must train their horses and plan for these competitions. It is completely unrealistic for the FEI to propose that a National ride be organised only after definite entries have been declared.
	808.4	JPN	Please clarify and/or give examples of "electronic" time-keeping systems?
	811.2	JPN	For Championships and test events For Championships , thepre-ride...
	840.4.2	JPN	We'd recommend two instead of three.
	Annex 5 - 9.5	JPN	How high is "abnormally high?" Please specify. We assume thatwe need to measure the temperature, are we correct?
	Annex 5 - 9.6	JPN	We recommend to delete the term "verbally" from thesearticles. There is no "verbally" in the Article 1045 in the currentVRs as well as the proposed 2020 VRs.
	807.7.1	NAM	This will be really difficult to govern in our countries because here all distances use the same track, so an 60km starter may end up with a 120km rider on his third loop etc. They will off course not ride the whole ride together but can be together for a part of a loop. We host CEN rides together with CEI rides, so off course there will be novice riders as well as advanced riders sharing the same loops on various times throughout the ride.
	831.1	NAM	agree
	802.6.1	NOR	20 are too low, we don't want any limit of riders to ask for an approval from FEI, that the FEI Event being combined with at National Evet. The reason is that Norway and many other small countries need the national riders to be able to organize the FEI event, due to financial matters. I addition, if we must wait until we see that there are only 20 riders entered, it's already too late to announce the national ride, it will not be in accordance with our national rules and not predictable for the national riders.

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
	802.6.1	NZL	States that the NF can request that National and CEI classes be combined when 20 or fewer combinations are entered in the Event. If this means that there have to be fewer than 20 combinations across all classes at the event then that would preclude us holding any combined CEI /CEN classes. That would negatively impact the sport in New Zealand where entries in the longer distances are relatively low (and particularly at J/Y level). By combining CEI and CEN classes, we are able to have a better competition. Not being able to hold combined classes would reduce the likelihood of continuing to hold CEI events. We would like to see this rule modified to come into effect if there are more than 20 combinations in a particular class.
	831.2	NZL	Whilst there is no rule change proposed, the worldwide use of January 1st for a horse's birthday makes a mockery of the minimum age rules that are applied to protect horse welfare. The official horse birthday in the Southern Hemisphere is 1st August. Many horses in the southern hemisphere are born from September to December and thus can be categorised as almost one year older than they actually are. At CEI level, horses compete with documentation which should make it possible to know whether the horse was born in the southern or northern hemisphere.
	852.1.4	NZL	We would like to clarify what time the next morning these individuals need to be present until – "until the morning" could be immediately after midnight. It could be specified as a certain number of hours beyond sunrise. The wording of this rule should be clarified to achieve its goal.
	Annex 5 - 9.6	NZL	We have serious concerns about the statement that veterinarians must "verbally communicate" their vote directly to a member of the GJ. This makes it more difficult for the votes to be independent when other vets might overhear what is being said and is also of concern if the PR or others overhear the votes. For many years, we have used voting slips which clearly show whether the veterinarian has voted to pass or fail a horse. These are handed to a GJ member and they, along with a second GJ member or a Steward, confirm the outcome of the vote.
	831.1	OMA	We supporting to maintain the current rules
	831.1	RUS	WE RECOMMEND KEEPING THE CURRENT RULES
	831.1	SLO	agree
	803.1	SUI	We suggest for 1* competitions to change the distance from 80-119km to 100 to 119km as this distance is less subject to go fast.
	831.1	UAE	We recommend maintaining the current Rules
	831.1	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current Rules
	831.1	LBN	We recommend maintaining the current Rules
	831.1	SUD	We recommend maintaining the current Rules
	831.1	SUD	We recommend maintaining the current Rules
			EEF WG position : 60 kg as the minimum weight. Reasoning : After reviewing population studies made between 2000 and 2018 for children between 0 and 18 years old, based on 6743 subjects, the EEF Endurance Working Group has seen that the most typical weight for females at 16 to 18 years old is 58kg while for males it is 65 kg at 16 and 71 kg at 18. It is quite common in Endurance to see nowadays more and more athletes with much lower weight in this class of competition going as low as 35 kg in some cases, and as such, our proposal is to put a minimum weight of at least 60 kg in YR/Junior competitions which serves as a double function : firstly ensures that speed is lowered for horses, and secondly, it helps protect the health of athletes by ensuring there exists a manageable range where they know that reducing their weight further will have no impact on their performance. Minimum rider weight for all Senior 2* and 1* competitions. EEF WG position : 70 kg as the minimum weight. Reasoning : This minimum will contribute to a more normal evolution through the different competition levels and will be also positive in terms of speed management. Minimum rider weight for 3* Championships Reasoning : We fully agreed on the fact to keep the minimum weight for Championships but there is no consensus for 70kg or 75kg. Depending of the validation and the efficiency of the new general rules proposed for pony measurements, we would suggest in the future to take in account 2 different minimum rider weights for horses (75kg) and ponies (70kg). Minimum rider weight for 3* Championships (other writing based on your email feedbacks) EEF WG position : we do not support the proposal of reducing the weight from 75 kg to 70 kg. Reasoning : Depending of the validation and the efficiency of the new general rules proposed for pony measurements, we would suggest in the future to take in account 2 different minimum rider weights for horses (75kg) and ponies (70kg).

Ref, Memo	Art. Number / July 2019	NF	NF Comment
			<p>EEF WG position : 60 kg as the minimum weight. Reasoning : After reviewing population studies made between 2000 and 2018 for children between 0 and 18 years old, based on 6743 subjects, the EEF Endurance Working Group has seen that the most typical weight for females at 16 to 18 years old is 58kg while for males it is 65 kg at 16 and 71 kg at 18. It is quite common in Endurance to see nowadays more and more athletes with much lower weight in this class of competition going as low as 35 kg in some cases, and as such, our proposal is to put a minimum weight of at least 60 kg in YR/Junior competitions which serves as a double function : firstly ensures that speed is lowered for horses, and secondly, it helps protect the health of athletes by ensuring there exists a manageable range where they know that reducing their weight further will have no impact on their performance. Minimum rider weight for all Senior 2* and 1* competitions. EEF WG position : 70 kg as the minimum weight. Reasoning : This minimum will contribute to a more normal evolution through the different competition levels and will be also positive in terms of speed management. Minimum rider weight for 3* Championships Reasoning : We fully agreed on the fact to keep the minimum weight for Championships but there is no consensus for 70kg or 75kg. Depending of the validation and the efficiency of the new general rules proposed for pony measurements, we would suggest in the future to take in account 2 different minimum rider weights for horses (75kg) and ponies (70kg). Minimum rider weight for 3* Championships (other writing based on your email feedbacks) EEF WG position : we do not support the proposal of reducing the weight from 75 kg to 70 kg. Reasoning : Depending of the validation and the efficiency of the new general rules proposed for pony measurements, we would suggest in the future to take in account 2 different minimum rider weights for horses (75kg) and ponies (70kg).</p>
			<p>The number of kilometers asked for the qualification process of a horse is excessive and damageable in term of horse welfare. The proposal of 3 CEI1* after the novice qualification is an example of the failures of the proposal. Please refer to our proposal much more progressive from the novice qualification to the highest levels. Speed cap concept would be inadequate. It is not taking in account the location, terrain, weather which from one show to another may evolve critically. A same speed may be the winner's speed by one hilly event and really low for a more flat one. As it is average speed cap it will not tackle the excessive speeds and horses stopping or walking just before to cross the line in order to decrease their speed datas. It is also forgetting that with a worldwide approach most of CEI organizers do not have automatic timekeeping systems to help elaborate the result. It would marginalize the practice of Endurance in different areas with a negative effect either on development and on top sport. Completion rate proposal, cannot be implemented at this stage. It does not differentiate the type of eliminations which would be required in case of potential use of this tool in the future compulsory. Using athlete examples as Jean Philippe Frances or Alex Luque, any system like this that when applied would limit their participations even if they are respected athletes by their results and behaviors. By consequence we suggest to study more into details in the coming seasons how it could be positive asset, if it can be ... In order to settle a more progressive competition pathway which is with the correct application of the rules and a stronger sanctions system the only way to build a sustainable future for the discipline of endurance, we recommend to put in place the following concept : By proposing this we are aware of the need to adjust the qualification system to help the worldwide balance and growth of the discipline. By no means the FEI ETC proposal for qualification referring : cap speed, completion rate, competition levels, number of rides... will find our support</p>
	831.1	LBY	We recommend maintaining the current Rules
	831.1	RSA	Agree with UAE comments - maintain the current rules