

## **Jumping Rules and Rules for Championships and Games**

*Refer to GA Annex 15.3 for the final version of all proposed modifications presented for approval at the General Assembly. For convenience all articles and annexes that have been modified are listed below with an indication whether the alteration was a clarification, a correction and/or a modification. See page two for the compilation of the feedback received from stakeholders on the first draft of proposed modifications to the rules, and the Jumping Committee's position on the proposals received.*

### **List of Articles/Annexes Modified**

#### **JUMPING RULES**

Article 201	ARENA, SCHOOLING AREAS AND PRACTICE OBSTACLES - Modification
Article 203	BELL - Clarification
Article 208	OBSTACLES – GENERAL - Modification
Article 211	WATER JUMP, WATER JUMP WITH VERTICAL AND LIVERPOOL - Modification
Article 225	UNAUTHORISED ASSISTANCE - Clarification
Article 234	SPEED - Modification
Article 235	FAULTS - Clarification
Article 239	TABLE C - Modification
Article 240	FINES AND YELLOW WARNING CARDS - Correction
Article 241	ELIMINATIONS - Modification
Article 242	DISQUALIFICATIONS - Modification
Article 246	OBSTACLES IN THE JUMP-OFF- Modification
Article 249	INVITATIONS TO CSIOs - Clarification
Article 250	INVITATIONS TO CSIs - Clarification
Article 251	ENTRIES - Clarification and Modification
Article 252	STARTING ORDER - Clarification
Article 254	PARTICIPATION AND NUMBER OF HORSES - Clarification and Modification
Article 255	PARTICIPATION OF MINOR ATHLETES IN SENIOR COMPETITIONS - Clarification
Article 256	DRESS, HEADGEAR AND SALUTE - Correction, Clarification and Modification
Article 257	SADDLERY - Modification
Article 259	OFFICIALS - Modification and Clarification
Article 261	NORMAL COMPETITIONS AND GRAND PRIX COMPETITIONS - Clarification and Modification
Article 262	POWER AND SKILL COMPETITIONS - Modification and Clarification
Article 269	ACCUMULATOR COMPETITION - Modification
Article 273	COMPETITION OVER TWO ROUNDS - Modification
Article 276	COMPETITION WITH WINNING ROUND - Modification and Clarification
Article 280	VETERINARY EXAMINATIONS, HORSE INSPECTIONS AND PASSPORT CONTROL - Modification
Annex V	CSI Invitation Rules - Modifications
Annex VI	CSI/CSIO Requirements - Modifications
Annex IX	Rules for Under 25 (U25), Young Riders and Juniors - Modifications and Clarifications
Annex X	RULES FOR VETERAN ATHLETES - Modifications, Clarifications and Corrections
Annex XI	Rules for Pony Riders - Modifications and Clarifications
Annex XII	Rules for Children's Events - Modifications and Clarifications
Annex XIII	Rules for Amateur Owner Category - Correction
Glossary of Terms Specific to Jumping	- Modification

#### **RULES FOR JUMPING CHAMPIONSHIPS AND GAMES**

Article 313	THIRD COMPETITION (INDIVIDUAL FINAL COMPETITION) - Modifications
Article 315	PRIZES AND MEDALS - Modification
Article 325	FIRST COMPETITION (TEAMS AND INDIVIDUALS) - Clarification
Article 326	SECOND COMPETITION (TEAM FINAL COMPETITION, SECOND INDIVIDUAL) - Correction
Article 327	THIRD COMPETITION (INDIVIDUAL FINAL) - Correction and Modifications
Article 328	PRIZES AND MEDALS - Modification
Annex I	RULES FOR THE PAN-AMERICAN GAMES - Modifications and Clarifications
Annex II	RULES FOR THE CENTRAL AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN GAMES - Clarification

## Comments Received from Stakeholders on First Draft of Proposed Modifications to the JRs

The following is a compilation of the feedback received from stakeholders on the first draft of proposed modifications to the Jumping Rules, and the Jumping Committee's position on the proposals received. Only those articles to which comments were received are included below. (Refer to GA Annex 15.3 for the final version of all proposed modifications presented for approval at the General Assembly.)

### RULES FOR JUMPING EVENTS

#### ARTICLE 203 BELL [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

1. The bell is used to communicate with the Athletes. One of the members of the Ground Jury is in charge of the bell and responsible for its use. The bell is used:

(...)

- 1.2. to give the signal to start and to activate a 45-seconds countdown shown in the timing equipment in the scoreboard or in another display beside the arena.

The 45-seconds countdown sets the time that the Athlete can spare before commencing his round. The Ground Jury has the right to interrupt the 45-seconds countdown if unforeseen circumstances occur. Incidents such as, but not limited to, disobediences and falls, occurring between the signal to start and up to the moment ~~the Athlete crosses the starting line in the correct direction immediately prior to the Horse breaking the beam of the photocells at the starting line~~, are not penalised (see JRs Art. 235.3). After the bell has rung, crossing the starting line in the correct direction for a second time before jumping the first obstacle is counted as a Disobedience.

However, the Ground Jury, in its discretion if the situation so warrants, has the right not to activate the start or to cancel the starting procedure, give a new signal to start and restart the countdown.

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed change.

**NF IRL:** We suggest that the wording to Art.203.1.2 should not be changed as same will conflict with Art.226.2 wherein a clear definition of a round is stated.

**IJOC:** We do not support the new text. We would propose to keep the original wording but add "...the Athlete/Horse crosses the starting line in the correct direction." For the purpose of clarification, we would also propose to add after above sentence "... (see JRs Art 235.3) However, in the event of a fall, the countdown will not be interrupted."

**Jumping Committee:** The Committee supported the proposal of the IJOC an updated Art. 203.1.2 accordingly.

#### Article 208 OBSTACLES [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

7. The limits on the height and spread of obstacles set forth by these JRs and in the definite Schedules must be observed with the greatest care. However, if it should happen that a maximum dimension has been marginally exceeded as a result of the material used for construction and/or by the position of the obstacle on the ground, the maximum dimensions set forth will not be considered as having been exceeded, providing every effort has been made to not exceed the maximum dimensions specified in the Schedule with the material available. In Competitions for which the Schedule indicates a maximum height of 1.45 m or more, the height of obstacles in the Competition may, at the discretion of the Course Designer, exceed the height indicated in the Schedule by maximum 3 cm.

**NF AUT:** We agree to the proposed rule change and suggest on top it that the published course plan should also include the dimensions (height and spread). In our opinion, it would be a step forward in transparency.

**NF BEL:** We do not understand the reasoning behind this modification. Rules as they are currently outlined are clear and are authorizing "marginal" increases which is clear enough.

**NF NED:** WE recommend to modify the proposal as follows:

In Competitions for which the Schedule indicates a maximum height of 1.45 m or more, the height of obstacles in the Competitions may, at the discretion of the Course Designer, exceed the height indicated in the Schedule by maximum 3 cm, and 3-5 cm for a maximum of three single vertical obstacles. This modification should not apply for obstacles in combinations.

**NF NOR:** This change seems too rigid and reduces the CDs possibility to do necessary alterations. We strongly support the old practice and keep the margin to 5 cm.

**Jumping Committee:** The original proposal of 3 cm was included to allow the Course Designer to cope with small variations in the ground and/or obstacle material without changing the conditions of the competition. The proposal to allow 5 cm was not supported as this would in effect mean the height of an obstacle could be raised one notch as most keyhole strips for supporting the cups are set with holes 5 cm apart.

**Article 211 WATER JUMP** [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

3. At Olympic and Regional Games, FEI Championships, CSIOs and CSIs the landing side of the water jump must be defined by a lath, at least six centimetres in width and not exceeding eight centimetres, covered with a bed of contrasting coloured plasticine (~~i.e. white plasticine if grass footing, coloured plasticine if sand~~), about one centimetre thick. This plasticine must be replaced each time a Horse touches it. Several spare laths must be provided together with extra plasticine so that a lath, which has been marked by a Horse, may be replaced at any time. The lath must be completely submerged and placed at the edge of the water, properly fixed to the ~~ground base of water jump (i.e. directly on the sand or grass footing)~~.

(...)

5. It is a Fault at the water jump:

- 5.1. when a Horse puts one or several feet on the lath defining the limit of the water jump. It is a Fault when the foot or the shoe touches the lath and leaves an impression; ~~impression of the fetlock joint or boot does not constitute a fault.~~

**NF BEL:** Whilst we understand somewhat the reasoning, this rule will be very difficult to apply on the field. How are we going to put plasticine in the water? We propose to keep the rule as is.

We have a remark concerning the use of the water jump at competitions. We should re-think how many times horses need to jump the water jump (open water, not overbuild). We need to avoid our horses get tired of jumping this type of jump so it can stay a very technical obstacle. During championships a horse should jump the water jump maximum 2 times. During 2 rounds of a Nations Cup it should only be present in one round. The same should be applied during GPs with 2 rounds.

We also want to draw the attention on the safety of the water jumps. There are in the top-level circuit still some very dangerous water jumps with concrete underground. These should be taken away in the light of the horse welfare.

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed change.

**NF ESP:** New proposal for the position of the lath brings many new unforeseen circumstances:

- It becomes impossible to judge consistently or accurately, if the water covers the lath, especially when the water is coloured, as it normally is.
- There is also a reasonable doubt that it will no longer be possible to construct the water jump correctly with variables such as water level due to leakage, rain etc)

All these things will open new problems that, at the moment, we are not ready to answer. We propose to keep the original rule.

**NF GER:** We support to delete the specification "White if grass, coloured if sand". It is important that the plasticine is of a contrasting colour well visible for the horses.

Lath in the water: It is practically impossible. It must be secured that the plasticine cannot move in its position. It will be hard for the Judge to tell where the horse landed and, in the coloured water, find the respective part of the touched plasticine.

**NF IRL:** We do not agree with this proposal. The practical issues arise from placing the plasticine lath in the water, it may float, become dislodged and the level of water in the water jump is not always at a consistent level. The IRL NF suggest that the FEI consider an alternative method of assessing the water jump penalty. The IRL NF would suggest the use of a technology system such as *Hawk-Eye*. This is a computer system used officially in numerous sports such as Cricket, Tennis, Gaelic Football, Badminton, Hurling, Rugby Union, Association Football and Volleyball, to visually track the trajectory of the ball and display a record of its statistically most likely path as a moving image. The FEI may consider such system for Championships and FEI Nations Cups in the first instance.

**NF ISR:** How can the horse's foot or shoe make an impression that can be seen by the water jump judge if the water jump is built of steel-enforced concrete and covered by a rubber or coconut-type mat, and the lath is on the floor of the water jump and under the water? Judges have keen sight, but not such keen sight!

We suggest that laths no longer be used on water jumps in international events, and all mention of laths be deleted from the FEI Jumping rulebook.

Our suggested wording: Delete current articles 211.3, 211.5.1 and 211.5.2, renumber and reword Art. 211 as follows:

~~4.3.~~ If the bottom of the water jump is made of concrete or hard material, it must be covered with a softer material such as a coconut or rubber mat.

~~5.4.~~ It is a Fault at the water jump ~~when a Horse touches the water with one or several feet.~~

Our suggested wording for Art. 211.10:

10. Only a vertical obstacle of not more than 1.50 m in height having any number of poles but with the use of FEI-approved safety cups may be placed over open water. The vertical obstacle must not be placed further than two metres from the front of this obstacle. This obstacle is judged as a vertical obstacle and not as a water jump. For this reason it is not necessary to use a lath or other arrangement to define its limits (~~apart from the flags. See JRS Art. 211.7~~). ~~If a lath is used it is to be considered a visual aid only; Penalties will not be incurred for any imprints on the lath. The same applies. No penalties are incurred~~ if the take-off element is displaced. Only poles with a minimum length of 3.50 m may be used for a vertical placed over a water jump.

**NF NED:** Please add some guidelines which the water jump must meet:

- The maximum spread should not exceed 4.00 m.
- No obstacles may be placed in front of a water jump (at least six strides with a minimum of 26 m in between).

**NF NOR:** It is just practically possible that the lath has to be completely submerged. It's also unwise as the plasticine actually can float around. The lath should follow the water line, as per the CDs practice today.

**NF USA:** The U.S. supports and agrees with the need for the continued debate over the water jump, but cannot support the proposal as written for two reasons. First, it will be challenging to secure the lath under the water, as it is buoyant, but more importantly it will be difficult for the judges to see the lath as the water many times is colored dark using latex paint or colored dye. Timeliness of determining a fault at the water is critical for both the athlete and the spectator and this recommendation would not help this issue. We recommend that the lath sit outside of the water (not submerged); however, the lath must touch the edge of the water across the entire face of the water jump. We would fully support looking at an electronic or pressure pad system that could be devised similar to Hawk-Eye.

**IJOC:** We do not support the new proposal for the position of the lath because it becomes impossible to judge consistently or accurately. There is also concern that it will no longer be possible to construct and maintain the water jump correctly (variable water level due to leakage, rain etc). We propose to keep the original rule for 211.3 and 211.5.

**Jumping Committee:** As the proposals relating to specifications for the water jump, number of times it can be used, use of camera or Hawk-Eye technology at the water jump and removal of all references to the lath are new proposals they will be considered for the 2019 rules. The initial proposal to submerge the lath has been withdrawn and replaced by the requirement that the entire length of the lath must touch the water at the time of the Ground Jury's inspection of the course. The related modification to Art. 211.5.1 has therefore also been withdrawn.

#### Article 216 PENALTIES – GENERAL [NO MODIFICATION PROPOSED]

During a round, Penalties are incurred for:

1. Knocking down an obstacle (see JRs Art. 217) and a foot in the water or an imprint of the foot or the shoe on the lath defining the limits of the water jump on the landing side;

**NF ISR:** Delete "or an imprint of the foot or the shoe on the lath defining the limits of the water jump on the landing side". The reference to an imprint or foot on the lath should also be deleted from Art. 236.1 (iii) and 239 (i). We also suggest to delete references to "lath" in the diagram of the water jump in JRs Annex VII.

**Jumping Committee:** As this is a new proposal it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

#### Article 219 DISOBEDIENCES [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

1. The following are considered as Disobediences and are penalised as such (see JRs Art. 236 and 239):

(...)

- 1.4. a more or less regular circle or group of circles no matter where they occur on the course or for whatever reason. It is also a Disobedience to circle around the last obstacle jumped unless the track of the course so requires. A correction to a deviation from the course in which the line taken by the Athlete passes behind the last obstacle jumped but does not circle around the last obstacle jumped is not considered a Disobedience; circling around the last obstacle jumped to avoid riding a related distance to the next obstacle is considered a Disobedience.

**NF GER:** We understand the practical problem behind this claim. But the clause does not solve the problem.

**NF IRL:** We suggest that the additional wording is confusing and the 2017 Article should remain.

**NF NOR:** New wording is confusing (riders don't understand it). Keep the rule as it is, it functions OK.

**IJOC:** In principle we support the proposal. However, a clear definition of what is a related distance is required as otherwise this becomes open to interpretation and leads to inconsistency.

**Jumping Committee:** The proposed wording has been withdrawn.

#### Article 225 UNAUTHORISED ASSISTANCE [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

4. Earphones and/or other electronic communication devices are strictly prohibited in FEI Jumping Competitions, and such usage is penalised by elimination. Furthermore, Athletes grooms or any other person may not wear earphones in both ears at any time while mounted, but may wear a single earphone in one ear; this applies everywhere within the grounds of the Event (see JRs Art. 256.1.10).

**NF IRL:** We consider this amendment as ambiguous. A position should be decided upon whether earphones are prohibited or not. The one ear compromise is confusing.

**NF ISR:** Suggested wording:

4. Earphones and/or other electronic communication devices are strictly prohibited in FEI Jumping Competitions, and such usage is penalised by elimination. FurthermoreFor the avoidance of any doubt, (...)

**Jumping Committee:** Art.225.4 has been reworded accordingly.

**Article 235 FAULTS** [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

3. Disobediences, falls, etc., occurring ~~between the signal to start and the Athlete crosses the starting line in the correct direction~~ immediately prior to the Horse breaking the beam of the photocells at the starting line, are not penalised.

**IJOC:** We suggest the same modifications as per our comments to 203.1.2.

**Jumping Committee:** Art. 235.3 has been reworded in alignment with Art. 203.1.2.

**Article 236 TABLE A** [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

1. Faults are penalised in Penalty points or by Elimination according to the tables set out in this Chapter.

FAULT	PENALTY
(i) First Disobedience	Four Penalties
(ii) Obstacle knocked down while jumping	Four Penalties
(iii) One or more feet in the water jump or an imprint made by the foot or shoe on the lath defining its limits on the landing side	Four Penalties
(iv) Fall of Horse or Athlete or both in all Competitions	Elimination
(v) Second Disobedience or other infringement set forth under JRs Art. 241	Elimination
(vi) Exceeding the time limit	Elimination
(vii) Exceeding the time allowed in the first and second rounds and jump-offs not against the clock	<b>One</b> Penalty for every four seconds commenced
(viii) Exceeding the time allowed in a jump-off against the clock	One Penalty for each second or commenced fraction of a second

At the discretion of the OC, a cut-off Score of 16 Penalties may be applied to any given Competition, providing this is clearly stipulated in the Schedule. For Competitions in which the cut-off Score is applied, as soon as any Athlete reaches a Score of 16 Penalties, the Ground Jury will ring the bell in accordance with JRs Art. 203.1.5 to signal the Elimination of the Athlete.

Athletes who are eliminated for reaching a Score of 16 Penalties in any such Competition must stop after the bell is rung but are authorised to jump one single obstacle before leaving the arena, providing the obstacle is part of the course of that Competition (see JRs 241.2).

If the Athlete reaches a Score of 16 Penalties at the beginning of a combination or if the bell is rung when the Athlete is too close to the next obstacle to safely stop immediately, he will not be penalised for jumping the remainder of the combination, respectively the obstacle in question, after the bell is rung.

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed change.

**NF GER:** We disagree to this proposal. It would be better to have a clear definition for "not up to standard". This will give the Ground Jury the possibility to eliminate an Athlete/Horse combination that does not meet the requirements.

**NF ITA:** Instead of indicating the elimination (a piece of data that would harm the CV of a horse) it would be more appropriate to add a specific wording for indicating the "16 pen. cut-off".

**NF NOR:** We have for years had Fault and Out in our rules, and it hasn't been used since the early 80s due to pressure from the riders. This is a suggestion following the same intentions, and we know a lot of riders do not appreciate the idea. As the number of shows has increased and the riders have a possibility to choose between shows, we can accept to try it as long as it is stated in the schedule. But there is no need for this alternative if OCs are not going to use it.

**NF USA:** The U.S. does not believe that this rule is necessary. It has the potential to create a negative habit for a horse if it understands that it stops jumping after having several faults. There are times when it may be beneficial for a horse to complete the course. While we understand that this is not the norm, we do not believe it needs to be regulated. While there are situations where this could be useful, it is felt Organizers could abuse it.

**IJOC:** We do not support this proposal if the aim is to save time. We would support something similar for horse welfare reasons when the performance is not up to standard. This should be defined as it would then allow the GJ to eliminate based on that.

**Jumping Committee:** The proposal to introduce a cut-off score of 16 penalties as an optional format under Table A was originally intended as a potential format for the 2020 Olympic Games. The Committee has in the meantime decided not to include it for the Olympics; the proposal has therefore been withdrawn from Art. 236.1.

**Article 238 METHODS OF DETERMINING THE SCORES UNDER TABLE A [INITIAL PROPOSAL]**

**1. Competitions not against the clock**

1. Competitions not against the clock
  - 1.1. The Athletes with equality of Penalties share the prizes. Depending on the conditions of the Schedule, there may be one or two jump-offs not against the clock for those with equality of Penalties for first place.

**2. Competitions against the clock**

- 2.1. Athletes with equality of Penalties for any place are placed in accordance with the time taken to complete the round. In the event of equality of Penalties and time for first place, there may be a jump-off over a shortened course over obstacles, which may be increased in height and/or spread in accordance with the provisions of the Schedule.
- 2.2. This is a Competition against the clock, but in the event of equality of Penalties for first place, there will be one jump-off against the clock. Other Athletes are placed according to their Penalties and time in the first round. For minor Competitions (see GRs) the jump-off may be run according to table C, if thus provided in the Schedule.

**IJOC:** Please add as first sentence in 238.1.1: "This is a Competition not against the clock with a time allowed." This wording is absent from the current rule and has led to endless, futile discussions. Cross-reference with Art 261.2.

**NF ITA:** The starting order of the jump-off in the World Cup qualifier (run under 238.2.2) should be:  
Reverse order of penalties in the 1st round; Athletes retain their drawn order in case of equality of penalties

**Jumping Committee:** The title of Art. 238.1 already states "Competitions not against the clock", so a change is not considered necessary.

The Jumping Rules (Art. 245.5.1) already allow for the starting order of the jump-off in the World Cup competition run under 238.2.2 to be in reverse order of penalties in the first round; the Committee does not feel that this should be mandatory.

**Article 239 TABLE C [INITIAL PROPOSAL]**

1. Faults under Table C are penalised in seconds which are added to the time taken by the Athlete to complete his round or by Elimination.
2. Penalties under Table C

FAULT	PENALTY
(i) Obstacle knocked down while jumping, one or more feet in the water jump or on the lath defining its limits on the landing side;	Four seconds (three seconds for two-phase Competitions, knock-out Competitions and for any jump-off under table C) <del>An exception may be permitted by the FEI Jumping Director allowing indoor Competitions to be run with two seconds added for a knock down.</del> For indoor Competitions the following penalties apply: Height of obstacles up to 1.40 m: four seconds Height of obstacles 1.45 m: three or four seconds, at the discretion of the OC Height of obstacles 1.50 m: two, three or four seconds, at the discretion of the OC

**NF GER:** It is OK to scratch the possible exception, but the whole paragraph (i) is confusing and of no technical value. We propose to delete it.

**NF NOR:** No need to change the rule for indoor competitions. At the moment permission can be sought from the Jumping Director, which is stated in the schedule.

With regard to 239.2 (iii), the NOR NF will recommend to the FEI/EEF to make an assessment of the time correction after a 1<sup>st</sup> disobedience with a knockdown. The current 6 second time correction seems unreasonable compared to the time actually spend. The NOR NF will not put a lead whether a correction should be 10, 12 or 15 seconds, but an approach to time spent in practice should be considered.

**IJOC:** We do not support this proposal as it could have a negative impact on horse welfare. We propose to keep original

rule.

**Jumping Committee:** The proposal to establish a pre-determined number of seconds depending on the height of the competition was included to avoid the need for exceptions to be made on a case by case basis with no clear criteria; a clarification has been added that the time penalty (2, 3 or 4 seconds) to apply must be specified in the Schedule.

### Article 241 ELIMINATIONS [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

3.29. Athlete wearing earphones and/or other electronic communication devices during a Competition (see JRs Art. 225.4);

3.30 blood on the Horse's flank(s) caused by the Athlete's leg. NB: Minor cases of blood on the flank(s) as described in the Jumping Stewards Manual do not incur elimination.

**NF ESP:** This rule, by definition, will be a judgement call. This situation will lead to many different possible problems because there is no clear guideline.

What is a minor case of blood on the flank? How those cases are going to be identified? Where is the border line between a minor and a major case? In our opinion, this rule SHOULD STAY AS IT IS NOW.

**NF ISR:** It's very unlikely that the athlete's leg could cause blood to be shed. Do you mean the athlete's boot or his spur? Proposed wording: "blood on the Horse's flank(s) caused by the Athlete's ~~leg~~boot/spur. NB: Minor cases of blood on the flank(s) as described in the Jumping Stewards Manual ~~do~~will not incur elimination.

**IJOC:** Decisions taken by Officials must be objective, comprehensible, follow clear principles and be applied uniformly worldwide. Rules that determine whether or not an athlete is disqualified/eliminated or wins a competition - the two extremes of possible outcomes - must not be left open to interpretation or subjectivity.

The IJOC represents FEI Jumping Officials from over 50 nations, and all of the feedback we have received on the proposed changes to the rule have expressed doubt and concern over how it would work in practice and the liability that we would be exposed to. While, in principle, we understand the reasons behind the proposal for changes to the sanction, we are extremely reluctant to accept changes to the catalyst of the sanction.

Under the current rule and even in the clearest cases, the decision to disqualify an athlete is often hotly - not to mention publicly - contested. The proposed introduction of Art 241.3.30 and the change to the wording of Art 242.3.1 open the door for the athlete and his/her entourage to legitimately challenge any decision to eliminate or disqualify not only in situ and within the FEI legal system, but also to bring civil law suits against the officials who have taken those decisions.

We therefore kindly ask the Jumping Committee to reconsider the current proposals for changes to Art. 231.3.30 & 242.3.1.

**NOTE FROM FEI HQ:** See also comments under Art. 242 as many NFs combined their comments to 241 and 242.

**Jumping Committee:** The Committee agreed that there should be no ambiguity and that the penalty for blood on the flank(s) should be elimination. Art. 241.3.30 has been revised accordingly; relevant modifications were also made to Art. 242.3 to address cases of abuse of the horse.

### Article 242 DISQUALIFICATIONS [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

3. Disqualification is mandatory in the following cases:

3.1 ~~Horses bleeding~~Marks and/or blood on the flank(s) as a result of excessive use of spurs;

3.2 ~~Marks and/or blood anywhere on the Horse indicating as a result of~~ excessive use ~~of spurs or~~ of the whip ~~anywhere on the Horse;~~

**A. Ylänne:** I understand the need to change the rule, but with this new wording it will put judges in difficult situation judging what is caused unintentionally by the athlete's leg or excessive use of spurs. Especially if this happens in big outdoor arena.

**H. Haring to EEF:** Any softening of the current rule is extremely dangerous. On one hand we have to explain why we ask for performances of horses that apparently can only be achieved when accepting to inflict injury to a horse. On the other hand we need to ensure that stewards and judges are able to make comprehensible and consistent decisions. If this can be guaranteed then I have no more concerns.

**NF BEL:** Much more emphasis should be given on prevention instead of sanction. This is paramount to safeguard our sport and to protect the welfare of the horse. As a result, the Belgian NF suggests to embed following protocol in the rules.

- Before entering the arena, stewards check the horse making sure that no blood is detected on the horse. Horses that have blood on the flanks are not allowed to enter the competition arena and will be ranked as withdrawn. If the blood is there because of excessive use of spurs or whip, sanction should be given. The stewards have an important role to play in this decision.
- If the Ground Jury does not notice any excessive use of spurs or whip or any other unauthorized behaviour, no sanction will be given for blood on the flanks when leaving the competition arena as we can assume it to be accidental.
- If the Ground Jury however does notice any excessive use of spurs or whip or any other unauthorized behaviour whether or not it is resulting in blood on the flanks, elimination must be applied for the round during which this happened. If needed, additional sanctions like outlined in the General Rules can always be applied if needed and appropriate.

By installing this rule, the Ground Jury will have the means to intervene in all cases of bad behaviour in the arena and eliminate a rider in such cases.

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed change.

**NF ESP:** Again, is a judgement call that is strictly relates with Rule 241. SHOULD STAY AS IT IS NOW.

In summary for both Rules when there is blood on the flank can be one of the following possibilities:

- Nothing
- Elimination
- Disqualification

This Rule, leaves a lot of room for interpretation and, we believe there a very high risk of not being applied in the same way every week at different shows.

**NF FIN:** We oppose the proposed new Art. 241.3.30 and the proposed changes to Art. 242.3.1 & 242.3.2.

Art. 242.3 in its current form provides the best set of rules (in combination with the Stewards Manual Annex XVI) to guarantee horse welfare and fair play. It also gives Officials an opportunity to implement sanctions objectively and based on evidence rather than having to make a subjective assessment of intentional behavior or excessive use of spurs.

**NF FRA:** Blood Rule: We are in favour of a change of denomination in order to avoid extreme negative interpretations generated by the actual wording.

Of course excessive use of spurs has to be sanctioned but we do feel that minor blood marks caused by unintentionally athlete's leg should not be penalised.

**NF GER:** Any decision taken by an Official must be comprehensible and follow precise guidelines, he or she cannot be left alone with it and we cannot vote for a wishy-washy rule. It has to be clear that Athletes must be eliminated whenever there is blood. That way the results of the performance delivered up to then are acknowledged.

A disqualification should be made in serious cases of abuse.

Horse welfare and horsemanship must have utmost priority. We are responsible for the horse, no horse may be harmed and if it happens, we must act. We must not forget that we must explain ourselves to the public. This topic is a very emotional one and we are at risk to discredit horse sport's reputation.

Some examples of comments received from the equestrian community: "profit prevails animal welfare", "it is all about the riders' greed no matter if the horse is doing well", "a horse is not a piece of sports equipment", "this would be a step back in horse welfare", "horse sport is stuck somewhere in the 19th century", "FEI loses its credibility - no wonder laymen think all of us riders are animal torturers", "we may not look away".

**NF IRL:** We do not agree with the proposed modification to Art 241 & Art 242. The IRL NF have considered the proposed changes and consider the changes to be ambiguous and subjective. The IRL NF suggest that the 2017 rule remain but that the FEI are proactive in ensuring that a consistent approach is taken in the uniform application of Art. 242 by FEI Stewards, Chief Stewards and ultimately the FEI Ground Jury Members.

The IRL NF considered the FEI Jumping Stewards Manual (March 2017), Annex XVI, concerning blood in the context of the above proposal.

We note that under paragraph 3 (a) is states that

"On his arrival, the Chief Steward will:

a) *Examine the area in question making sure that he is wearing an unused latex glove.*

And under paragraph 3 (f) it states that

*"The Chief Steward will then report the incident to the Ground Jury member designated to handle such cases and show him the photographs"*

The IRL NF note that there is no reference to veterinary involvement in this section but Article 1047 (6) of the Veterinary Regulations states:

*"The examination involves: (f) the Steward contacting the Veterinary Delegate, who, in turn, must notify the Ground Jury, should the presence of blood be identified".*

Furthermore, the Foreword to the Veterinary Regulations says:

*"From January 1<sup>st</sup> 2018, if there is a conflict between the VRs, Discipline Rules and Guidance Notes, the VRs will prevail"*

The IRL NF suggest that the ambiguity should be removed from the FEI Jumping Stewards Manual, in favour of the Veterinary Regulations. The IRL NF would consider this practice as consistent with the procedures for Head Injury Assessment in Rugby and fitness issues at the start of a horse race, where the medics and the vets are the ones advising the referee or the Chairman of the Stewards.

It would be our position that the Blood Protocol has equal standing to the Limb Sensitivity Protocol (Art. 1048.1) VR's, in terms of its objectives which are (i) safeguard the welfare of the horse, according to the Code of Conduct for the Horse, and (ii) to ensure a level playing field for all athletes. As such, we would suggest that the Veterinary Delegate should be present to provide a professional recommendation to the Ground Jury Member. The decision that follows therefore is an informed decision grounded on veterinary opinion, the expertise knowledge of the Ground Member and clear unbiased application of the Rule.

Furthermore, the IRL NF would agree with the sentiment put forward by the Belgian NF wherein more emphasis should be placed on prevention rather than sanction in the context of the 'Blood Rule'. It is noteworthy that [Rules for Pony Riders]

Art. 19 Dress and Salute, indicates the type of spur permitted. The IRL NF suggest that a proactive approach is taken to focus on the type and size of the artificial aid. The IRL NF note that 'Rowel' spurs are not permitted and again would suggest that this rule is actively enforced. Furthermore, the IRL NF would respectfully suggest that the FEI Stewards are provided with the clear remit to put athletes on notice that an existing spur mark is present, and that the athlete has the option to use a body bandage for the duration of the event in order to mitigate any marks which may arise in the warm-up or field of play.

**NF ITA:** We propose the adoption of the yellow card system (against the disqualification) and the establishment of a shorter period with respect to the current yellow card deadline (e.g. 3 months) period of time during which the rider incurs a 2nd offence.

It should be appropriate that a Veterinarian be present together with the Steward for the evaluation of the situation.

**NF NED:** We believe that for the public opinion it would be better to use a friendlier word/description for "blood", as we use "banned medication" instead of "doping". We also believe that, despite the discipline-specific differences the "blood rule" should be equal for all disciplines and therefore needs to be included in the GRs. Practical issues can be placed in discipline rules. To ensure that stewards and judges are able to make comprehensible and consistent decisions we recommend involving an FEI veterinarian in the procedure when checking the horses.

Art. 241.3.30: What are the criteria for a "minor" case of blood on the flank(s)?

Art. 242.3: What are the criteria for "excessive" use of spurs/whip?

The criteria for these should be clear, transparent and objective.

**NF NOR:** The new wording is NOT sensible or workable. The FEI should be proactive and deal with the source of the problem (SPURS) and not keep trying to put a patch over the result of the problem. The new wording refers to the Steward Manual (this is not a rule book and current text does not clarify anything).

We support the idea of elimination instead of the new wording, as long as other sanctions and abuse of horse is not the cause. Then leave the wording as it is at present. Any relaxing of the current rule would be dangerous and potentially disastrous towards the public. Introduction of any subjective assessment would be a nightmare, as it is open to interpretation by different officials. It also carries the danger of accusations of bias or unfair influence. To explain why two different officials had made what seem to be conflicting opinions in cases that appear very similar would be impossible.

The perception of the "non-horsey" public must be taken into account as they are increasingly intolerant of anything that can be considered animal abuse. This aspect must be given serious consideration by the FEI and athletes alike if we are to avoid adverse publicity for our sport. Is it ever justifiable to puncture a horse's skin with a piece of equipment the athlete chooses to wear with the express intention of enhancing the performance of that horse, whether it was done intentionally or not?

One could argue that the fact the athlete chooses to wear a spur that can puncture a horse's skin signifies intent. A change to the rules allowing only blunt spurs would almost completely remove the problem while still allowing athletes to compete on a level playing field. We strongly suggest the only spurs allowed should be the same as in the Pony Rules. Include in the rules exactly the shape of spurs allowed and all manufacturers will quickly adapt to this.

Also be aware of the use of remote controlled electrical spurs, in which case disqualification from the event should be mandatory and reported to the FEI tribunal for further sanctions.

**NF SUI:** As already written by the EEF, any softening of the current rule is for various reasons not recommendable and has some inherent risks. It has to be clearly defined and applied the same way for everybody. There should be no room for interpretation for the official. This to have a fair application. We also think that this rule should be the same principle for all disciplines and not only for show jumping and therefore should be incorporated in the GR as a general rule with potential differentiations in the discipline rules (possibly Art. 141/142). Why should something be not ok in one discipline but in another one? Then we share the opinion that we should rethink the title of this rule. "Blood Rule" as mentioned in the eventing rules already sounds quite cruel.

We think that only injuries created by the rider should be sanctioned.

An option might be to check if there is any blood before the horse goes into the arena. If everything is fine then, the result should count anyway. If there is blood when coming out of the arena there could be a punishment with different levels: for example using the existing yellow/red card system.

For severe cases a sanction of the rider should be considered and enforced. But for cases without a fault of the rider a sanction would not be necessary and too tough.

**NF SWE:** Horse welfare must have utmost priority! We are responsible for the horse. The general public are becoming increasingly intolerant of anything that can be considered animal abuse. We think that it's too difficult for an Official not to have precise guidelines to follow regarding minor cases of blood. We support the new wording of elimination instead of disqualification whenever there is blood on the Horse's flank. A disqualification should be made in serious cases of abuse as described in Art. 242.

**NF USA:** The U.S. is very much in favor with the distinction between elimination and disqualification in the cases where blood is found on a horse's flank(s). This distinguishes between the intentional and unintentional and is a welcome addition to the rules. However, there is some concern with the language in 241.3.20 ".....N.B. Minor cases of blood on the flank(s) as described in the Jumping Stewards Manual do not incur elimination." Although we support the language as written, we hope that the FEI provides enough guidance to the officials so there can be a uniform approach as to how an official determines whether a case is "minor." There is concern that it will vary from Official to Official and that it may not be a level playing field or will cause antagonist disagreement between athletes and FEI Officials.

**IJRC:** The IJRC asks the FEI to:

- introduce a yellow card, effective for 1 or 2 months, only at the second time there should be a disqualification
- consider that a veterinary should be part of the decision
- find a clear proceeding, a clear protocol
- change the name of the rule, (i.e. "spurs rule")

**Jumping Committee:** Art. 242.3 has been updated further to the decision that all cases of blood on the flank(s) incur elimination (Art. 241.3.30). Reference to blood on the flank(s) has been removed from Art. 242.3 and the original text relating to marks indicating excessive use of the spurs or whip has been reinstated, with a cross-reference to Art. 243 and the mention that additional sanctions may apply. The protocol in the Stewards Manual will be revised in accordance with the updates to Art. 241 & 242 and in consultation with the Veterinary Department.

As the proposals to sanction with a yellow warning card related to the current penalty of disqualification for blood on the flank, the Committee felt that they were no longer relevant, in view of the revised modifications to Art. 241.3.30 and 242.3. As the proposal to regulate spurs is a new proposal it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

#### **Article 243 ABUSE OF HORSES (see also GRs Art. 142) [NO MODIFICATION PROPOSED]**

2. The following are considered to be abuse of a Horse (see also GRs Art. 142):

2.3 Other Forms of Abuse

Abuse of a Horse in any other form (such as, but not limited to, hypersensitising or desensitising the limbs, the use of banned schooling methods, excessive use of spurs and other cases as specified in the GRs, VRs or any other FEI rules and regulations) is also prohibited and must be penalised appropriately under these rules.

**NF NOR:** It needs to be made clear in the rules if there is a positive case of limb sensitivity, what the situation is regarding substitutions. Horses tested early could be in the substitution timeframe. That needs to be made clear in the Jumping Rules.

**IJOC:** We would like to submit for your consideration the situation where a horse is not allowed to compete following an abnormal limb sensitivity procedure. In team competitions, is it possible for such a horse to be substituted? If not, this needs to be covered by a rule as there is currently none. If possible, on the other hand, then the time frame for substitution also needs to be reviewed, because, depending on the time that a horse undergoes the procedure and has to be withdrawn, one decision might be within the time frame for substitutions while another might not be, and this would skew the level playing field concept.

**Jumping Committee:** For CSIOs substitutions to the teams can only be made in case of accident or illness. A positive case of limb sensitivity is not considered an accident or illness.

#### **Article 244 BOOT AND BANDAGE CONTROL [NO MODIFICATION PROPOSED]**

**IJOC:** We propose that the Hind Boot Check protocol becomes part of the JRs, and not only a protocol in the Jumping Stewards Manual.

**Jumping Committee:** The Committee was not in favour of including the protocol in the rules as this would make it difficult to update the protocol between General Assemblies if needed.

#### **Article 246 OBSTACLES IN THE JUMP-OFF [INITIAL PROPOSAL]**

7. A maximum of two additional single obstacles may be added to the course of a jump-off. Both obstacles must be on the course during the course inspection or will be built from obstacles of the previous round or rounds; **if obstacles from the previous round(s) are rebuilt with new obstacle material for the jump-off, they will not count as extra obstacles for the jump-off, providing the change of material has been approved by the Ground Jury and notified to Athletes in the course plan.** These **two additional** obstacles may consist of two spread or two vertical obstacles or one spread and one vertical.

**IJOC:** We support this proposal but would like to add the following wording:

"...if obstacles from the previous round(s) are rebuilt **differently or** with new obstacle material for the jump-off..."  
This would cover, for example, a pole being moved up as the top element the JO to replace a plank, and the plank being moved down to where the pole was originally.

**Jumping Committee:** The proposed modification was accepted.

#### **Article 247 ELIMINATION OR WITHDRAWAL FROM A JUMP-OFF [NO MODIFICATION PROPOSED]**

1. An Athlete who is eliminated in a jump-off will be placed last of the Athletes who have completed the jump-off.

**NF GER:** For the avoidance of doubt, add: "...or Second Round" in the header and in line 1:

An Athlete who is eliminated in a jump-off or **second round** will be placed last of the Athletes/**Teams** who have completed the jump-off/**second round**.

Likewise, add the same for winning round (Art. 276).

**Jumping Committee:** As this is a new proposal it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

## Article 251 ENTRIES (see also GRs Art. 116) [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

1. All Athletes and Horses must be registered with the FEI, their own NF, and where appropriate with their host NF (CSI1\* and CSI2\* Events), before they can be permitted to take part in International Events, with the exception of the FEI World Challenge Competitions (see also GRs Art. 113).
2. The number of Horses that may be entered for an Event must be in accordance with the Schedule and the JRs.
3. ~~All Athletes invited or nominated for an International Event or FEI Championship may only be entered by their NF. It is the NF's responsibility to ensure that Athletes are of the required age for the Event in which they are entered. All Athletes selected by their NF, in accordance with the JRs and as specified in the Schedule, must be accepted by the OC. OCs may not accept any other entries other than those received from NFs.~~ All Athletes invited or nominated for an FEI Event may only be entered by their NF. Refer to JRs Annex V for details relating to the procedure for NFs to confirm entries of Athletes invited through the FEI online invitation system for CSI2\*/3\*/4\*/5\* Events at which the CSI Invitation Rules apply; for all other Events NFs must make the entries through the FEI Entry System.
4. NFs are responsible for selecting and entering qualified Horses and Athletes. This includes the fitness and capability of the Horses and the Athletes to participate in the Competitions for which they are entered. It is the NF's responsibility to ensure that Horses and Athletes are of the required age for the Event in which they are entered.
5. The number of teams and individual Athletes allowed to be entered to take part is set forth in the JRs.
6. ~~All Athletes invited or nominated for an International Event or FEI Championship may only be entered by their NF. It is the NF's responsibility to ensure that Athletes and Horses are of the required age for the Event.~~ Championship in which they are entered. All Athletes selected by their NF, in accordance with the JRs and as specified in the Schedule, must be accepted by the OC. OCs may not accept any other entries for Championships other than those received from NFs. NFs may only enter Athletes for Continental Championships, World Championships and Olympic Games who are qualified under conditions decided by the Jumping Committee and approved by the Bureau and, where appropriate, the IOC.
7. If NFs enter more Athletes and Horses than the number allowed in the official team, the Chef d'Equipe must designate the Athletes and Horses selected for the official team at the latest following the first Horse inspection.
8. Under no circumstances may the OC limit the number of entries of eligible Athletes or teams for a Championship. The Bureau may limit the number of entries if deemed necessary.
9. Entry Deadlines
  - 9.1 Entries for FEI Championships and Games must be made following the compulsory two phases outlined under GRs Arts. 116.2.3(i) and 116.2.3(ii):
    - Nominated entries must be made at least four weeks before the Event. See GRs Art. 116.2.3(i)
    - Definite entries must be made at the latest four days preceding the beginning of the Event. See GRs Art. 116.2.3(ii)
  - 9.2 For all other Events including CSIOs definite entries must be made within the deadlines indicated below; other deadlines for NFs to indicate their intent to participate may be requested by the NF/OC in the Schedule.

Definite entries must be made by the date mentioned in the Schedule. This date may not be earlier than four weeks prior to the beginning of the Event and later than four days preceding the beginning of the Event. These represent the final selection of Athletes and Horses that will travel to the Event. The definite entries may not exceed the number listed and represent the final selection of Athletes and Horses that may participate in the Event. Following receipt of the definite entries, substitutions of Horses and/or Athletes may only be made with the express permission of the OC. The OC must print in the Schedule the latest date for substitution of Horse (s) and Athlete(s), which may not be later than the day of the Horse inspection.

**NF GER:** Where is the difference to the meaning of the old wording? No entries possible if the FEI online invitation system is not used?

Art. 251.9 Entry Deadlines: Entries in principle should remain in the Rules but should be made optional.

Art. 251.9.1 We propose:

- Nominated entries must be made at least four weeks **and maximum eight weeks** before the Event.
- Definite entries must be made at the latest four days **and maximum four weeks** preceding the beginning of the Event.

**Jumping Committee:** Art. 251 has been further revised to cover entries under the currently applied CSI Invitation Rules and the implementation of the new CSI Invitation Rules during the course of 2018.

As entries in principle have been removed from the GRs, provision was added last year to JRs Art. 251.9.2 that other deadlines for NFs to indicate their intent to participate may be requested in the Schedule.

As the proposed modification to the deadlines for nominated and definite entries for Championships and Games is a new proposal and would also involve a modification to the GRs it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

### Article 253 DECLARATION OF STARTERS [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

1. At CSIOs, on the day before the first Competition, the Chefs d'Equipe will designate in writing to the OC the members of their team (Athletes and Horses) and the names of individuals Athletes together with the names of their Horses (see JRs Art. 249). In the event of accident or illness preventing an Athlete and/or his Horse being declared as a starter in the team, Chefs d'Equipe may substitute for him/them from among the individuals Athletes (if there are any), one hour at the latest before the start of the first Competition of the Event. An Athlete or a team Horse, which has been substituted, may not start as an individual. At all Events, Chefs d'Equipe (CSIOs) or individual Athletes (CSIOs, CSIs) will declare to the OC at a time fixed by the OC the starters for the next day's Competitions.

#### NF AUT: Suggested modification:

1. At CSIOs, on the day before the **first Competition Nations Cup**, the Chefs d'Equipe will designate in writing to the OC the members of their team (Athletes and Horses) and the names of individuals Athletes together with the names of their Horses. It is important for the Chef d'Equipe to evaluate the horses and riders on the first day and therefore we suggest to move the date of declaration to the day before the Nation Cup.

**Jumping Committee:** As this is a new proposal it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

### Article 254 PARTICIPATION AND NUMBER OF HORSES [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

1. Age of Horses
- 1.2.2. International Competitions for Young Horses (five\*/six /seven/eight year olds)  
\*Competitions for five year old Horses may only be held at the FEI World Breeding Jumping Championships for Young Horses, unless special authorisation has been granted by the FEI.

**NF BEL:** We propose to allow CSI Young Horses as of the age of 5 years. However, as of the level of a CSI2\*, horses should be at least 6 years and the other age restrictions should remain all the same.

**NF ITA:** We suggest the possibility to add competitions reserved for 5 year old horses within the CSI-YHs.

**Jumping Committee:** The first proposal above to integrate CSI YH competitions for 5 year old horses was received prior to this year's revision but was not supported by the Committee; it was felt that the FEI should reserve the right to refuse or limit such competitions. As a new proposal was received from a second NF it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

2. The Schedule must specify the number of Horses allowed for each Athlete at CSIOs and CSIs but this number must be limited to a maximum of three. CSI or CSIO Events may include Competitions for Young Horses open only to the Athletes entered in the CSI or CSIO; for these Competition Athletes may enter two Horses in addition to the three Horses allowed for the CSI or CSIO. Participation of these additional Horses is limited to the Young Horses Competitions only. At Events where several CSIs of different categories are organised on the same weekend the number of Horses per Athlete must be limited to three per Category. Separate CSIs for Young Horses (CSIYH) may be organised at these Events; Athletes entered in the CSIYH are allowed to enter three Horses specifically for the Young Horses Competitions.

The above does not apply to CSI Events held at the same venue over several consecutive weekends; for these Events each Athlete may start a maximum of four Horses in each category (Small/Medium/Big Tour) during each CSI. At these Events a maximum of ~~six~~nine Horses per Athlete may be entered for the CSIYH Competitions, of which maximum three may start in each age category per CSI. At stand-alone CSIYH Events, that is CSIYH Events that are not organised concurrently with another CSI at the same venue on the same weekend, Athletes may enter three Horses per YH age category. If the Schedule of a CSI or a CSIO includes a Puissance Competition, a Derby and/or a special Competition for stallions, the Schedule may allow an additional Horse for each of these Competitions. Participation of these additional Horses is limited to these Competitions only. The Schedule may also allow extra Athletes to be invited solely for the Puissance Competition and/or a special Competition for stallions.

**NF GER:** The numbers of horses should be specified in the schedule and should be left to the decision of the OCs. OCs do not understand why OCs with two consecutive events are allowed to admit up to 12 horses per CSI "a maximum of four Horses in each category (Small/Medium/Big Tour)" whereas if they schedule a single event they are allowed to admit max. 3 horses. Maybe for single events the wording could be altered to 3 per Tour instead of 3 per CSI.

**Jumping Committee:** A similar proposal that the number of horses allowed should be at the discretion of OCs was received prior to this year's revision but was not supported by the Committee; it was felt that there should be clear rules relating to the number of horses per athlete. The proposal to allow 3 horses per tour will be considered for the 2019 rules.

3. At CSIOs the Chefs d'Equipe have the right to make changes to the Horses belonging only to the official team throughout the duration of the Event, on condition that each Athlete rides the maximum number of Horses as specified in JRs Art. 254.2. A change made in this manner is irreversible.
4. Changing Horses by individuals at CSIOs and CSIs is allowed only if they belong to the same NF, and conform to the number of Horses each individual Athlete is allowed to ride during the Event in accordance with the provisions of the Schedule. A change made in this manner is irreversible.

**NF BEL:** We would propose to allow changes of riders WITHOUT being of the same NF, naturally in accordance with the provisions of the schedule. We notice our sport becoming more and more global and would like to see this reflected in this article.

**Jumping Committee:** The above proposal was received prior to this year's revision but was not supported by the Committee as it was felt that there was no practical solution to make the athlete's entry with a horse from another NF; it would require the agreement from the other NF during the event, which could be closed if it was over the weekend. Additionally the Committee was not in favour of changing the rules for what was considered more or less an exception.

5. At CSIOs each Athlete may ride only one Horse in the Grand Prix or, if there is no Grand Prix, in the Competition with the highest prize money. If there is a Grand Prix Competition and another Competition with the same prize money as the Grand Prix or with higher prize money, the Athlete may ride only one Horse in each of these Competitions, except when this Competition is a Derby, in which case more than one Horse per Athlete may be ridden.
6. The above paragraph also applies at CSIs. However, if in the Grand Prix or in similar Competitions listed in paragraph 5 above, there are 50 Athletes or less entered, the OC may allow each Athlete to ride two Horses in the Competition concerned, provided that the total number of starters does not exceed the maximum allowed for the Grand Prix or Competition in question. These provisions do not apply to CSI-Amateur Events, at which the OC may allow Athletes to ride more than one Horse in all Competitions.

**NF GER:** Art. 254.5 & 254.6 Number of Horses in the Grand Prix

If there is more than one CSI held at the same dates and venue, we would welcome to have the restriction to one horse per competitor in the GP being applied only to the CSI with the highest level of the overall event.

**Jumping Committee:** As this is a new proposal it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

## **Article 255 Participation OF MINOR ATHLETES IN SENIOR COMPETITIONS (refer also to Annexes IX, XI and XII) [INITIAL PROPOSAL]**

2. Before the year in which they reach their 18<sup>th</sup> birthday Athletes may not take part in:
  - a Grand Prix at a CSI3\* to CSI5\*;
  - a Grand Prix at a CSIO1\* to CSIO5\*;
  - a Nations Cup Competition at CSIO1\* to CSIO5\*;
  - an FEI World Cup™ Competition;
  - a Power and Skill Competition;
  - a Derby;
  - the Competition with the highest prize money at a CSI3\* to CSI5\* and CSIO1\* to CSIO5\* if this is not one of the Competitions listed.
- 2.1 From the year in which they reach their 12<sup>th</sup> birthday until the end of the year in which they reach their 13<sup>th</sup> birthday Athletes may take part in certain Competitions at CSI and CSIO 1\* to 5\* Events (excluding those listed above) providing the height of obstacles in the initial round does not exceed 1.30 m.
- 2.2 From the year in which they reach their 14<sup>th</sup> birthday until the end of the year in which they reach their 15<sup>th</sup> birthday Athletes may participate in all Competitions at CSI1\* Events (excluding those listed above), and in certain Competitions at CSI2\* to CSI5\* and CSIO 1\* to 5\* Events providing the height of obstacles in the initial round does not exceed 1.40 m.
- 2.3 From the year in which they reach their 16<sup>th</sup> birthday, Athletes may participate in all Competitions at CSI1\* and CSI2\* Events (excluding those listed above). From the year in which they reach their 16<sup>th</sup> birthday until the end of the year in which they reach their 17<sup>th</sup> birthday Athletes may take part in certain Competitions at CSI3\* to CSI5\* and CSIO1\* to CSIO5\* Events.

**NF BEL:** We notice in the current level of show jumping that the quality of the horses increases, as well as the competency level of younger athletes. As a result we propose to change this article with regards to the restrictions of younger athletes. These changes would also align the rules with the heights as they are being constructed at for instance European Championships for these Athletes. We propose increasing the height in 255.2.1 to 1.35 m, and 255.2.2 to 1.45 m.

**NF GBR:** Art. 255.2.2 Junior Age Limit for FEI Shows and Grand Prix:

We suggest for the age to be reduced for Juniors competing in the higher level FEI shows and ranking classes. It would need to include a caveat that the NF would need to provide a certificate of ability or proven record that they had successfully competed gaining at minimum two double clears at the specific height prior to the FEI competition to ensure the riders were

capable. For example 2\* Grand Prix age to be 15 years old so would have gained at minimum two double clears at 1.40m level before progressing to 1.45m. 3-4\* Grand Prix being 16 years old and so on. This would allow the up and coming younger riders to start moving up the ranking lists earlier and be able to develop to compete against the older riders much earlier in their careers.

**Jumping Committee:** The proposal to increase the height restrictions in Art. 255.2.1 and 255.2.2 were received prior to this year's revision but was not supported; younger athletes were riding very good horses and therefore wanted access to higher competitions but the Committee youth needed to develop through the level of competition for the various age categories. As the proposal to lower the age restriction on Juniors competing at higher level events if they had a Certificate of Capability from their NF is a new proposal it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

### Article 256 DRESS, HEADGEAR AND SALUTE [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

3. Advertising on Athletes and Horses (See GRs Art. 135)

(...)

3.1.3 Athlete's National Identification

3.1.3.1 While present in the Competition area and during the prize-giving ceremonies the name or logo of the Athlete's nation, its national symbol and/or its national flag, and/or the Athlete's NF logo or name may appear on a surface area not exceeding:

(i) a reasonable size on each of the two sides of jackets or top garments, at the height of breast pockets, and on the collar;

(ii) 200 cm<sup>2</sup> on each side of the saddle cloth

(iii) vertically in the middle part of the Headgear (see specifications JRs Art. 256.3.1.2.1.e)

(iv) eighty square centimetres (80 cm<sup>2</sup>) (maximum 20 centimetres long, maximum four centimetres wide) only once lengthwise on the left leg of the riding breeches.

(v) seventy-five square centimetres (75 cm<sup>2</sup>) for the logo on fly bonnets.

In any case, the Athlete's national identification may be combined in the same surface area with the name and/or logo of the Athlete's sponsor(s), his team sponsor(s) and/or the NF's sponsor(s) as long as their presence and visibility are in compliance with the surface areas mentioned in Art. 3.1.2.1 and 3.1.3.1.

**NF ITA:** We propose to reconsider the limitations regarding the measures of the logos for the Nation's identity and Sponsors.

**Jumping Committee:** A provision has been added regarding the nation's identity to allow athletes to wear the flag or IOC abbreviation for their country on the back of the jacket; as the limitations on the size of logos for identification of the nation and sponsors concern the GRs it will be referred to the FEI Legal Department and considered for the 2019 rules.

### Article 257 SADDLERY [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

2. Anywhere within the grounds of the Event (restricted area) under control of the OC, the following provisions apply:

2.5 For implementation on 1 January 2019: Only boots used solely for protective purposes, as described in the FEI Jumping Stewards' Manual, may be used in FEI Competitions for Pony Riders, Children, Amateur Owners and Veterans.

For implementation as of 1 January 2020: Only boots used solely for protective purposes, as described in the FEI Jumping Stewards' Manual, may be used in FEI Competitions for Juniors, Young Riders and U-25.

For implementation on 1 January 2021: Only boots used solely for protective purposes, as described in the FEI Jumping Stewards' Manual, may be used in FEI Jumping Competitions.

**H. Haring to EEF:** The prohibition is correctly justified by the argument that the use of it as an aid is, for various reasons, wrong and thus has to be forbidden. I fully agree with this.

Then, however, the proposed rule changes suggest different timeframes. It would start in 2019 for Ponies, Children, etc. then 2020 for U25 etc. and 2021 for all categories. This means in short: Using hind boots as an aid, which we consider as being unacceptable today, will be prohibited only in 3.5 years! I am not able to explain this to anyone, not even to myself. Although I can understand the FEI Jumping Committee's tactical considerations we will need to advocate for a reduction of the timeframe related to this rule change. I propose: Step 1: 2018; Step 2 (all categories): 2019.

**AUT NF:** We are not in favor to introduce to ban hind boots or limit them to the young horses' ones. A correctly used hind boot is an equipment like a saddle or a bridle. A correctly used spur is a fine tuning tool. All leads to a better performance of the horse. All tools that are against the welfare of the horse must be strictly forbidden. We suggest implementing a procedure to approve hind boots.

**BEL NF:** We suggest to have the new rules start from 2018 for all the different age categories. It is a wrong message to do this in different stages because if we think things need to change, then we need to do it for everybody at once.

An FEI panel of veterinaries and professional riders should come up with a limited number of standard models of boots that need to be authorized. These boots will then be "FEI-approved" and if a new type comes on the market it first need to be examined by the panel before receiving or not the FEI-approval. Protection is key in the boot discussion and we need to make sure that the protective usage of boots remains authorized.

Similar to the approach of the blood rule, more focus needs to be given on prevention instead of sanction. A sanction always comes after the fact and as a result is not the best approach to work on horse welfare. We propose the following:

- Random boot checks can and should be performed in all classes just like we know them now.
- For the classes during which a mandatory boot and bandage control is required, the protocol should be altered putting more emphasis on prevention instead of sanction. Therefore we propose to extend the hind boot check in the warm-up (when horses are more calm and starting the preparation) and control all boots. Whenever something is changed (other boots...), a steward must supervise this and also a change in boots needs to be checked by the steward.
- If all boots are checked properly before entering the arena, no check is needed after the round in the competition arena.

This approach is much more beneficial for the horses and the riders. All necessary checks are done upfront which creates a better level playing field.

**NF CAN:** We do not support the proposed change. We oppose further altering this rule, We feel the current application of this rule is sufficient and meets the intent. We oppose eliminating hind boots that may impact performance, though we agree with the current level of oversight as to their use.

**NF GBR:** Hind boots were originally introduced where the straps were elastic and were fastened to a popper on the side of the boot. This in turn meant the boot could not be overtightened. Unfortunately there have been alterations to these boots which are now more severe for instance ones which have Velcro pull straps on to cause the hind leg to over react. Therefore boots with elastic that only fasten to a designated popper on the side of the boot should be acceptable.

These boots help a horse with a slightly holding technique behind, they are not to frighten or abuse the horse. An example in the world is Nick Skelton who rode his 3 best horses in this type of boot through training to competing and produced these horses successfully in this way. An example of a different aid would be in the bridle such as if a horse is too strong and holds his head too high in a snaffle, you can put a double bridle or Pelham on with a curb chain. This changes the shape of the horse through pressure but is acceptable as is not to frighten or abuse the horse.

Therefore the suggestion would be for boots with elastic that only fasten to a designated popper on the side of boot to be acceptable. [Proposal also submitted by Graham Fletcher and Peter Charles.]

**NF GER:** We agree to the rationale behind it that aims at improving sporting fairness. We support the proposal to restrict the use of hind boots provided it is clearly defined what is allowed. Please propose the details for the Stewards' Manual. We also agree to the proposed timeline because we understand it will be too difficult and not practicable to implement the alterations right away.

In our national rules for those competitions where the jumping manner is judged (young horses), we allow only ankle boots with broad velcro straps for the hinds because certain strap techniques can influence the movements. We are working on introducing a better control of the straps for other competitions.

**NF IRL:** We agree with the proposal put forward by the European Equestrian Federation in that timeframe for phasing out of performance enhancing hind boots is too long. The IRL NF strongly supports the rationale that this proposal is to protect the integrity of the sport. However, the IRL NF suggest that the FEI Jumping Committee take the appropriate time to consider the definition of 'performance enhancing' and the type of boot that will be considered as same. During this consideration period, it is suggested that the FEI consider the evidence that the FEI Jumping Committee will rely upon in defining a performance enhancing boot.

**NF ITA:** Since the measure is taken considering the welfare of the horse as paramount, as a consequence it should be put in place within a shorter period of time. We suggest that it be applied to ALL categories from 1st Jan. 2019 on, in order to enable the industry, adjust their products catalogues accordingly.

We reckon that it is difficult to describe the permitted hind boots so we suggest that a specific FEI approved label be established.

Pastern bands/fetlock rings should not be allowed during the competition.

The control over boots/bandages should be carried out before the horse enters the competition arena not afterwards.

**NF NED:** In our opinion there are two options:

- The FEI decides to accept only the use of hind boots worn in CSI-YH competitions, or;
- The FEI approves some different kinds of hind boots.

In both cases the following should apply: The boots may be used for protective purposes only and the inside of the protection must be smooth, that is, the surface must be even and there may not be any pressure points on the inside of the boot.

Furthermore a good description of the hind boot is needed: type, weight, size.

**NF NOR:** We are in favour of this change, but cannot see the reason for a staircase implementation. In principle a lot of professionals will fight against all changes making their business more transparent. We support to make this change enforced for all groups asap (2018).

**NF SUI:** We support the proposal of the EEF and think that it is necessary to prohibit the use of these hind boots. We agree as well with the timeline proposed from the EEF as you can't explain why to wait such a long time. Either they should be prohibited, and that means as quickly as possible, or not prohibited.

**NF SWE:** We fully agree with the comments from the Jumping Committee and support the timeline for restriction of hind boots.

**NF USA:** There is some belief, within the U.S., that this rule is premature and that the implementation of the recent rules regarding the boot checks have had a positive impact on the abuse of hind boots and that it may not be necessary to add these new Rules. However, there is strong support for creating a level playing and not rewarding performances that are enhanced by artificial aides and therefore, we support the rules and timelines as proposed.

**Jumping Committee:** Although opinions varied on the proposal, the majority of respondents were in favour of introducing restrictions on hind boots but differed on the timeline for implementation. As the Committee's proposal was to implement restrictions starting in 2019, to allow time to develop a clear and comprehensive description of the type of boots permitted, the Committee did not feel that it could at this late stage impose implementation of the restrictions in 2018. The rationale for proposing implementation of restrictions for the Senior category only as of 2021 was because the Committee did not wish to change the conditions of the sport during the Olympic cycle. The Committee recognises that restricting the type of hind boots allowed will change the sport, and as qualification for the 2020 Games will start in 2018 (WEG), changing conditions during the Olympic cycle would not be consistent with providing a level playing field for all nations trying to earn qualification. The Committee felt that implementation of the restrictions should start in 2019 with the Pony Riders, Children, Amateurs and Veterans categories, for which there are no qualification criteria for the relevant Championships, then follow with Juniors, Young Riders and U25 in 2020, as a number of Children and Pony Riders will have transitioned to the Junior, Young Rider and/or U25 category by that time, and finally for Seniors in 2021, i.e. after the 2020 Olympics, for the reasons stated above.

## Article 259 OFFICIALS [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

### 1. Ground Jury

Events	Number of Judges <sup>1</sup>	President Ground Jury	Members	Additional Members	President of Competition	Water Jump Judge	Foreign Judge
	Minimum	Minimum Qualification	Minimum Qualif.	Minimum Qualif.	Minimum Qualif.	Minimum Qualif.	Minimum Qualif.
Olympic Games / Youth Olympic Games (YOG) / World Championship	(**) President + (**) <sup>3</sup>	Level 4 <b>Compulsory from foreign nation</b>	Min. two Level 4	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3 (water jump not applicable for YOG)	<u>If appointed, (**)<sup>3</sup> Level 4</u> <u>(PGJ must be foreign and may act as FJ)</u>
Pan-Am Games / Continental Championship Senior / World Cup Final / Nations Cup Final	(**) President + (**) <sup>3</sup>	Level 4 <b>Compulsory from foreign nation</b>	Min. two Level 3	Level 3	Level 3	Level 3	<u>If appointed, (**)<sup>3</sup> Level 4</u> <u>(PGJ must be foreign and may act as FJ)</u>
CSIO5*	President + 3	Level 4	Min. two Level 3	National or Level 1	Level 3	Level 2	(**) Level 3
Regional Games / Other Championships / CSIO 1* - 4*	President + 3	Level 3 <b>Preferably from host nation</b>	Min. two Level 3	National or Level 1	Level 3	Level 2	(**) Level 3
CSI5*, CSI4*, CSI3*	President + 2 (*)	Level 3 <b>Preferably from host nation</b>	Min. two Level 3	National or Level 1	Level 3	Level 2	(**) Level 3
CSI2* / CSIYH2* CSIU25 Cat. A & B CSIY/J/Ch/V/Am Cat. A CSIP	President + 2 (*)	Level 3 <b>Preferably from host nation</b>	Min. one Level 2	National or Level 1	Level 2	Level 2	Level 2 <u>As of 1/1/2018 the FJ must be Level 3</u>
CSI1* / CSIYH1* CSIY/J/Ch/V/Am Cat. B	President + 2 (*)	Level 2 <b>Preferably from host nation</b> <u>As of 1/1/2018 the PGJ must be Level 3</u>	Min. one National		National or Level 1	National or Level 1	Recommended but not compulsory, Level 2 <u>As of 1/1/2018 recommended Level 3</u>
Events that are part of Tours (any star level)	As per the star level of the Event	As per the star level of the Event	As per the star level of the Event	As per the star level of the Event	As per the star level of the Event	As per the star level of the Event	Level as required for the star level of the Event Appointed by FEI (**)

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed change.

**NF GER:** Why is there no division of labour between the President of the Ground Jury and the Foreign Judge at the most important events? We propose to share responsibility.

Alterations to min. qualification for CSI\*\* FJ, for CSI\* FJ and President of GJ: The education system has been developed based on the existing rule. There is no need for a step back to level 2, and it would require to amend all job descriptions etc.

**IJOC:** We do not support this proposal. We do not feel that L2 judges have enough experience to fulfil the role of PGJ or FJ at any level especially because more and more NFs are requesting equivalency of their own education system which means that candidates for promotion would expect to begin their international career as L2 judges and not go through the L1 course.

**Jumping Committee:** The reason for the clarification added to the Foreign Judge column for the major Championships and Games was because the FEI appoints the President of the Ground Jury (who must be foreign) for these events and he/she therefore acts as FJ, whereas for all other events the OC appoints the PGJ, usually from the host nation. The Committee supported the position of the GER NF and the IJOC that for all events the PGJ and FJ must be minimum Level 3 and has revised Art. 259.1 accordingly.

(...)

#### Art. 259.6. Stewards

##### 6.2 Assistant Stewards

All Assistant Stewards appointed to international Events must hold the status of Level 1 Steward at least. A minimum of four Assistant Stewards must be appointed for each Event; additional Assistant Stewards may need to be appointed, depending on the number of Events running concurrently at the same venue and/or the number of competitions per day and/or the number of arenas operating at the same time.

**NF FRA:** From OCs point of view the regulation is too excessive regarding the need and the cost involved.

We propose that in case of NFs who have an effective Steward education system (to be validated by FEI education & jumping departments), OCs may be authorized to nominate national stewards as assistants. It would keep the standard of the steward team thanks to the experience of our national stewards from the higher national level and limit the cost for the OCs.

**IJOC:** We support the proposal, but would like to add at the end of this sentence:

"...and/or the number of horses entered for the Event and/or the size and layout of the venue."

The number of stewards required also needs to be based on the type of venue and the number of horses competing.

**Jumping Committee:** The Committee did not support the proposal to allow countries with a national stewarding programme to appoint national stewards as it was important to have the same international standard for all events. The Committee supported the IJOC's recommendation and has revised Art. 259.6.2 accordingly.

### Article 261 NORMAL COMPETITIONS AND GRAND PRIX COMPETITIONS [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

#### 4. Qualification for Grand Prix

(...)

**4.4** All Athletes taking part in a Grand Prix at a CSIO or a CSI must have completed, with their Grand Prix Horse, the initial round of at least one FEI competition prior to the Grand Prix. If an Athlete/Horse combination has completed the initial round of an FEI Competition prior to the Grand Prix, and the Athlete is subsequently eliminated from the Competition in question, the Athlete may take part in the Grand Prix (if qualified), with the same Horse, as the Horse is deemed to have fulfilled the eligibility requirement of completing the initial round of an FEI Competition prior to the Grand Prix. If the Grand Prix takes place on the first day of the Event, or if it is the only Competition at the Event, regardless on which day it is held, the Organising Committee must schedule a training session to provide Athletes with the opportunity to jump their Horse in the arena prior to the Grand Prix.

**NF NOR:** Add "or disqualified": ...and the Athlete is subsequently eliminated or disqualified from the Competition (...)

**IJOC:** If Art 241.3.30 is not implemented there is no requirement for this addition. However, in light of past experience and in order to dispel any doubts, we propose that this would be a good place to indicate what happens in the case of DISQUALIFICATION...

**Jumping Committee:** The Committee agreed to the proposed modification and added clarification that the same provisions applied also to the FEI World Cup™ Competition, as it is considered a Grand Prix.

(...)

**6.** For all CSI5\* and CSIO5\* Events the Schedule must indicate a height of obstacles of 1.60 m for the Grand Prix. For CSI-W Events, the Schedule may indicate a maximum height of 1.65 m for the FEI World Cup™ Competition.

**IJOC:** Fully supported. However, please cross-reference to Art 208.5: "Under no circumstances, except in Six-Bar, Puissance and Power and Skill Competitions may any obstacle exceed 1.70 m in height."

**Jumping Committee:** A cross-reference to Art. 208.5 has been added to Art. 261.6.

#### Article 262 POWER AND SKILL COMPETITIONS [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

4. Masters

(...)

4.2 In case of all Athletes being eliminated in any one of the first three jump-offs, the Athletes eliminated in the last jump-off held will take part in another jump-off against the clock, without altering the height of the obstacles, to decide the classification. Athletes ~~not qualified for the jump-off to decide the qualification eliminated in any jump-off~~ are placed equal in that jump-off, and are placed ahead of Athletes eliminated in the previous jump-off and/or the initial round.

The maximum height and spread in the 4<sup>th</sup> and final jump-off are: Height: 1.70m maximum – Spread: 2m maximum; Triple bar : 2.20m maximum.

**NF ISR:** You must include the case where two or more athletes go clear in the third jump-off.

We suggest changing the word "eliminates" to "knocks ...out" and "eliminated" to "knocked out" in Art. 262.4:

4.1 The first fault ~~eliminates~~knocks the Athlete ~~out of the Competition.~~

4.2 In case of all Athletes being ~~eliminated~~knocked out in any one of the first three jump-offs, the Athletes ~~eliminated~~knocked out in the last jump-off held will take part in another jump-off against the clock, without altering the height of the obstacles, to decide the classification. Athletes ~~not qualified for the jump-off to decide the qualification knocked out in any jump-off~~ are placed equal in that jump-off, and are placed ahead of Athletes ~~eliminated~~knocked out in the previous jump-off and/or the initial round.

**Jumping Committee:** The proposal has been slightly modified for more clarity but the Committee did not support changing "elimination" to "knocked out" as in reality the athletes not going forward to the next jump-off were eliminated.

#### Article 264 NATIONS CUP [NO MODIFICATION PROPOSED]

8. Elimination and retirement

8.1. If two or more Athletes of a team, participating with four Athletes in the first or second round, are eliminated or retire, the whole team is eliminated.

**NF GER:** For the avoidance of doubt, delete "second round" in paragraph 8.1:

If two or more Athletes of a team, participating with four Athletes in the first ~~or second~~ round, are eliminated or retire, the whole team is eliminated.

**Jumping Committee:** A team is still eliminated in the second round if two or more of their four athletes are eliminated or retire; however, teams eliminated in the 2<sup>nd</sup> round are entitled to receive prize money; reference to JRs 264.1.5 has therefore been added.

#### Article 269 ACCUMULATOR COMPETITION [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

5. For the last obstacle of the course, an alternative obstacle may be provided, of which one element may be designated the Joker. The Joker must be more difficult than the alternative obstacle and carry double points. If the Joker is knocked down, these points must be deducted from the total points obtained so far by the Athlete. At the discretion of the Course Designer, two Jokers may be included instead of one as alternatives to the last obstacle jumped. In this case, the first Joker will carry 150% of the points of the last obstacle on the course; the second Joker must be more difficult than the first Joker and will carry 200% of the points of the last obstacle on the course. The Athlete may jump one of the two Jokers as an alternative to the last obstacle. If the Joker is correctly jumped, the Athlete earns 150%, respectively 200%, of the points of the last obstacle on the course. If the Joker is knocked down (JRs Art. 217.1), 150%, respectively 200%, of the points of the last obstacle of the course must be deducted from the total points obtained so far by the Athlete.

**NOR NF:** We are happy with two Jokers; however, using a % is confusing. We suggest whichever the fence the Joker is an alternative to, the points are double that fence, e.g. fence 6 – Joker 12 points.

**Jumping Committee:** The Committee felt the proposal was clear and that the two options for Jokers, one at 150% (= 1.5 times the points) and another, more difficult at 200% (= double the points) allowed for a more interesting competition.

**Article 273 COMPETITION OVER TWO ROUNDS** [INITIAL PROPOSAL]

2. All the Athletes have to take part in the first round. The following go forward to the second round according to the conditions of the Schedule:
  - 2.1 either all Athletes; or
  - 2.2. a limited number of Athletes (at least 25%, the exact percentage to be mentioned in the Schedule) return for the second round in accordance with their placing in the first round (Penalties and time or Penalties only, according to the conditions of the Schedule):
    - ~~2.2.1 in any case, when~~If the first round is not against the clock, all Athletes tied on Penalties for first place, plus any Athletes tied on Penalties for the last qualification place, return for the second round even if this is not mentioned in the Schedule.
    - 2.2.2 If the first round is against the clock, the OC may select either of the following options (the OC must indicate in the Schedule which option will be used):
      - (i) at least 25%, the exact percentage to be mentioned in the Schedule, return for the second round, based on their Penalties and time in the first round; or,
      - (ii) at least 25%, and in any case all Athletes without penalties in the first round, return for the second round.

**NF AUS:** One of the main issues encountered by non-European or American World Cup OCs is that the numbers of World Cup competitors are generally quite limited and this has led to OCs (in an attempt to provide their spectators with as much jumping as possible) to run World Cup competitions under Article 273. The requirement under Art 273 for Organisers to state in their schedule the exact percentage of competitors to return creates a very difficult situation if, at the time of publishing the schedule, the total number of starters are unknown or very small. For example, a 25% return percentage may be quite reasonable in a field of 36 horses but totally unsatisfactory if the field is only eleven. In an attempt to ensure that a reasonable number of Athletes return for the second round (irrespective of the numbers entered in the class) it is suggested the following be adopted in the new rules:

- 2.2. a limited number of Athletes (at least 25% **or a set number**, the exact percentage **or number** to be mentioned in the Schedule) return for the second round (...)
  - 2.2.1 If the first round is not against the clock, all Athletes tied on Penalties for first place, plus any Athletes tied on Penalties for the last qualification place, return for the second round even if this is not mentioned in the Schedule.
  - 2.2.2 If the first round is against the clock, the OC may select either of the following options (the OC must indicate in the Schedule which option will be used):
    - (i) at least 25% **or a set number**, the exact percentage **or number** to be mentioned in the Schedule, return for the second round, based on their Penalties and time in the first round; **or,**
    - (ii) at least 25% **or a set number**, the exact percentage **or number** to be mentioned in the Schedule, return for the second round, based on their penalties and time in the first round; in any case all Athletes without penalties in the first round return for the second round.

**Jumping Committee:** The Committee agreed that a set number can be established in the Schedule, providing it is at least 25% of athletes who took part in the first round; Art. 273.2.2 has been updated accordingly.

**Annex V CSI INVITATION RULES [INITIAL PROPOSAL]**

**Invitation Rules for CSI2\*/CSI3\*/CSI4\*/CSI5\* Events (Worldwide)**

The following rules apply for all CSI2\*/CSI3\*/CSI4\*/CSI5\* Events at which the number of invited Athletes as indicated in the Schedule is restricted, except for ~~CSI5\* - W Events in the FEI World Cup™ Western European League, where invitations are regulated by Art. 654 of the FEI World Cup™ Jumping Rules~~ CSIs that are part of an FEI-approved series for which the invitation rules have been explicitly approved by the FEI Bureau. The CSI Invitation Rules do not apply to any other category of CSI Events or to CSIOs.

For all Events at which the CSI Invitation Rules apply, a certain percentage of Athletes must be invited in descending order of the Longines Ranking, a certain percentage of Athletes ~~will be~~ home Athletes selected by the host NF and a certain percentage ~~will be~~ Athletes invited by the Organising Committee (OC); ~~the percentages for each invitation group are established for each star level as follows: For the purpose of invitation of Athletes in descending order of the Longines Ranking, the Longines Ranking list established three months prior to the Event is to be used. The OC must indicate in the Draft Schedule the number of the Longines Ranking list which applies for the invitation of Athletes.~~

Event Level	Athletes from the Longines Ranking	Athletes selected by the host NF	OC Invitations
CSI5*	60%	20%	20%
CSI4*	50%	25%	25%
CSI3*	40%	30%	30%
CSI2* Compulsory for "stand-alone" CSI2* (CSI2* that are not combined with CSI3*, 4* or 5*)	30%	30%	40%
CSI2* with no Longines Ranking Competitions (available only for CSI2* that are combined with CSI3*, 4* or 5*)	0%	20%	80%

**H. Haring to EEF:** This is the most critical issue. However, I am glad to be able to make the statement that the FEI Jumping Committee made the best from all proposals, discussions and put a proposal on the table which is acceptable in general. I only have one remark: The NFs (Athletes selected by the host NF) lost a bit too much. Above all in 5\* events we should consider a higher percentage range from about 25-30%. However, the NFs are strong enough to go for this.

**NF BEL:** The Belgian NF advises to make another adjustment for the lower level events (CSI2\*). Whilst we support the approach to use the online platform for invitations based on the Longines Ranking, we feel an important constraint, specifically for the CSI2\*. Because of the growing number of events, the administration and follow-up of invitations will be more complex for these events\*. Therefore we propose to review the quota per group as follows, whether or not the CSI2\* is linked towards a higher level event.

Event Level	% Longines Ranking	% Host NF	% OC Invitations
CSI5*	60%	20%	20%
CSI4*	50%	25%	25%
CSI3*	40%	30%	30%
CSI2*	10%	20%	70%

In this approach naturally, ranking points need to be attributed as currently outlined in the Longines Ranking Rules. Additionally, we have the following remarks:

- It should be absolutely compulsory that each schedule is communicated in time (so before the first invitations have been sent out through the online platform) and that it is complete (containing all the information about entry fees, prize money etc). The athletes do not want unpleasant surprises once they have entered a competition. It is very important for a rider to know the details of the event to assess whether or not he wants to accept an invitation for a show.
- Regarding the % Host NF invitations: If a rider that was entered by the Host NF cancels his entry this place should go back to the Host NF. If the Host NF does not replace the rider, than this entry can go to the OC invitation %.
- Special arrangements need to be possible for Tours. Therefore we propose to apply the percentage levels as suggested for the CSI2\* also for all tours (max CSI3\* level). This is very important for an organizer for practical reasons as they want to be able to give a higher priority to riders that are participating in subsequent events at a tour.

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed changes.

**FRA NF:** As explained since the beginning of the discussions on that subject, we support the application of the invitation system ONLY for 3\* events and higher. Invitation system must not be applied for 2\* events.

Our sport need to grow respecting fundamental values and especially horse welfare and accessibility to compete for riders on a fair basis. We support the following percentages to have a sustainable balance in the interest of the sport.

Event	LR	Host NF	OC
CSI5*	60%	20%	20%
CSI4*/CSI3*	50%	35%	25%

Regarding the % Host NF invitations: If a rider that was entered by the Host NF cancels his entry this place should go back to the Host NF. If the Host NF does not replace the rider, than this entry can go to the OC invitation %.

**NF GER:** For a complete understanding, we need to know what those "any other category of CSI events" are for which the invitation rules do not apply. They should all be listed.

CSI4\*: we ask that Athletes selected by the host NF are given a higher percentage of invitations, in a corridor of 25-35 % instead of a fixed 25 %. The number of Athletes from the Longines Rankings should be modified accordingly from strictly 50% to 40-50 %.

CSI2\* and CSI3\*: Likewise the quota should be increased to 30-50 % for NFs.

There are OCs who suffer from Athletes' high quota in descending order because there are late withdrawals. The OC has to chase for riders at last minute. Therefore we propose that NFs make their choice.

**NF ITA:** We would rather suggest for the invitation system an increase of the 5% to the NF quota and relevant decreasing of the OC:

Event	LR	Host NF	OC
CSI5*	60%	25%	15%
CSI4*	50%	30%	20%
CSI3*	40%	35%	25%
CSI2*	20%	30%	50%

Compulsory for all CSI2\*:

We also propose that the vacant places following a withdraw/cancellation of a rider's entry in the NF quota will revert first to the NF and in case the NF cannot fill the quota such place reverts to the "Longines Ranking" quota.

**NF NED:** In general we agree with the proposal, but we advise to increase the % of athletes selected by the host NF for CSI5\* to at least 25%. Furthermore we advise to make an adjustment for CSI2\*. Due to the growing number of events, the administration and follow-up of invitations will be more complex for these events whether or not the CSI2\* is linked to a higher level event. We therefore suggest the following quotas per group:

Event Level	% Longines Ranking	% Host NF	% OC Invitations
CSI5*	50%	25%	25%
CSI4*	50%	25%	25%
CSI3*	40%	30%	30%
CSI2*	20%	40%	40%

Additionally, we would like to provide the following remarks:

- Complete schedules (with all info on entry fees, prize money, etc) must be communicated in time (before the first invitations are sent through the online platform). Athletes do not want unpleasant surprises once they have entered a competition. It is very important for a rider to know the details of the event before accepting an invitation to a show.
- If a rider entered by the host NF cancels his entry, the place should revert to the host NF; if the host NF does not replace the rider, the invitation can go to the OC.
- The FEI ranking list should be a "horse/rider combination" and not a riders ranking list only. This will create a fair invitation system for riders, events and spectators.
- Maximum 2 ranking competitions per rider/show may count for the FEI ranking.
- Only a qualification for the Grand Prix, the Grand Prix and the Nations Cup can count for ranking points.
- There should be no different/special agreements for series.

**NF SUI:** We all know that this is a critical issue. We think that the NFs (Athletes selected by the host NF) lost too much influence. Above all in 5\* events we should consider a higher percentage range from about 25-30%, 4\* then 30%, 3\* and 2\* (stand-alone) 35% for NFs.

Please reconsider how the invitation system for the GCT works. We would prefer if GCT events receive less ranking points.

Further, the schedules generally should be published early enough that the riders really know what is to be expected. Not that they have to accept or deny an invitation without knowing what else is going on during the same weekend.

**NF SWE:** The rules are designed for a normal show with 40-60 athletes. CSI4\* Stockholm has had the same concept for 25 years with only 18 riders of which 50% are home athletes. This formula is very appreciated among the spectators to see good riders in a competition for about 45 minutes; it's good for the sport. The suggested rules make it very difficult for Stockholm. We suggest an addition to the rules for shows like Stockholm:

If the total number of invited riders are 20 or less, 15% are compulsory invitations, 50% how athletes and 35% OC invitations. The compulsory invitations have to include all extra compulsory athletes such as reigning champions and athletes nominated by the FEI.

We hope that it is also in the interest of the FEI not to ruin what has been laboriously built up during many years.

**NF USA:** The U.S. supports the CSI Invitation Rules as proposed and believes that this is an excellent proposal. However, there needs to be consideration given and/or guidance with regard to the timeline for implementation of these new rules and the online system as it has a significant impact on OCs, Athletes and NFs.

- OCs - If these invitation rules are to be in effect for January 1, 2018, OCs with events in January 2018 should submit their FEI Schedules 16 weeks ahead of the event which is September 2017 (now!). As the new Rules are still in the proposal stage and will not be approved until November, OCs must move forward with building their FEI Schedules with the Rules and Schedule templates that are currently in effect. Asking OCs to adjust their Invitation System and update their FEI schedules weeks before their Events, is not reasonable or practicable.

- Athletes and NFs will need to be prepared 8 weeks ahead of the event (November 1, 2017) to begin using the Online System. The new Online Entry system itself will take a great deal of adjustment for both Athletes and NFs. There needs to be time to educate the stakeholders as to how the new system works as well as give the NFs enough lead time to adjust staffing levels in order to manage the work load that the new system will require of NFs.

It is the U.S. recommendation that the FEI give clear direction *at this moment (not wait until the GA)* that the CSI Invitation Rules and Online Entry will be in effect for events starting after May 1, 2018 at the earliest. This will provide clear direction for those OCs with events early in the year as well as give NFs and Athletes time to adjust to the new Online Entry System once the Rules have been approved and published after the General Assembly.

**IEOA/AJO:** We are pleased to be able to support in principle, and give conditional agreement to, the proposed modifications as detailed in the "red line" document supplied by the FEI. Our review, and the reasoned feedback received from our membership and other vested interests, including riders and NFs, has, however, resulted in a small number of important concerns and recommendations that we believe merit further discussion and consideration going forward.

A primary concern with many European organizers relates to the existence of an apparent double standard and a resulting disparity in the invitation protocols and rules applicable to certain series.

We believe that this disparity is punitive to many organizers resulting in some organizers, their rights, rules and operational criteria being material different than those of others.

The IEOA/AJO also recommends that all CSI 2\* be allowed to adopt the same invitation rules in order to bring consistency and equity to organizers. We request that the Jumping Committee kindly consider a blended solution for all 2\* organizers allowing for 20% (LWR), 20% (hosting NF) and 60 % (O/C) invitation allocations, with 100% Longines ranking points.

**IJRC:** The main problem that effects the sport at the moment is that many events require the athletes to contribute in a financial way (direct or indirect) in order to compete in the event. This situation could kill our sport and its best athletes. After a long discussion and the vote during the IJRC General Assembly in Gothenburg we kindly ask you to consider our proposed modifications:

The following rules apply for all CSI2\*/CSI3\*/CSI4\*/CSI5\* Events at which the number of invited Athletes as indicated in the Schedule is restricted, except for CSIs that are part of an FEI-approved series for which the invitation rules have been explicitly approved by the FEI Bureau, **and where the participants are selected by team chefs of NF.** (The CSI Invitation Rules do not apply to any other category of CSI Events or to CSIOs.

*or alternatively*

**with the only exception of Series approved by FEI Bureau where the 60% of the participants are selected by team chefs of NFs, 20% by home NF, 20% by OC and where no financial contribution, apart from entry fees as for the CSI/CSIO requirements, are requested.**

In our opinion the Invitation rules must be the same for all riders and organisers and all athletes must be treated equally (GRs Art. 115).

**Jumping Committee:** The main theme in the comments received was that a number of stronger NFs wished to have more quota places for the home NF at higher level events. The Committee felt that the right balance had been found with the initial percentages proposed and did not support allocating more quota places for the host NF as this would be a problem for countries that did not have so many riders at a high level; the stronger NFs would also have additional home riders selected from the top of the rankings. The Committee felt that it was important to maintain the proposal for a second type of CSI2\* with no ranking competitions as an option for OCs that might want to issue a lot of personal invitations. The Committee did not support the proposal that no invitation rules apply for CSI2\*, or that one invitation system with 60% OC invitations apply to all CSI2\*, as this was the first level of CSIs where ranking points could be earned; a certain number of invitations must be guaranteed to home riders and riders selected in descending order from the Longines Rankings so that they could have the opportunity to improve their position on the list in order to gain access to higher level events. The Committee did not support the request that an exception be made for events with fewer than 20 riders as this could lead to other requests for exceptions for various reasons.

The Committee wished to maintain the invitation quotas as presented as it was felt that this was the best compromise based on the conclusions of the CSI Invitations / CSI Requirements working group meeting at which all stakeholder groups were represented. The Committee recommended that FEI HQ determine the timeline for implementation of the invitation rules to ensure that NFs/OCs could meet the deadlines for providing the information required for the online invitation system. Annex V has been updated accordingly.

Regarding the proposals that an invitation declined by a home rider revert first to the home NF and then to the OC, according to the Invitation Rules the host NF has 5 weeks to fill the quota of home riders. If the quota is not filled by the 4<sup>th</sup> Sunday before the event (approx. 3½ weeks before), or if a home rider withdraws during the following week, the remaining invitations revert to the Longines Rankings. If the quota is not filled by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Sunday before the event (approx. 1½ weeks before), or if a rider withdraws after the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sunday before the event (approx. 2½ weeks before), the invitation reverts to the OC.

The proposals relating to Longines Rankings competitions were also raised at the CSI Invitations / CSI Requirements Working Group and referred to the Longines Rankings Working Group; the Longines Rankings Rules for 2018 have in the meantime been approved and published on the website.

The IJRC proposal did not appear workable from a practical standpoint. The rationale for proposing new invitation rules, applicable worldwide and managed through an online invitation system was to address the issue of pay cards. The only way that invitations can be effectively controlled is through a transparent and enforceable invitation system.

---

**Invitation Rules Section 6      General**

OCs may invite a limited number (exact number to be indicated at the latest by Monday 16 weeks prior to the Event) of additional Athletes only for the small and/or medium tour Competitions at their Event; Athletes invited only for the small and/or medium tour Competitions are not included in the total number of Athletes used for the calculation of percentages for the invitation of Athletes under sections 1-3, and may not participate in any Competitions counting for the Longines Ranking. The Horses of Athletes invited for the small/medium tour Competitions are not counted in the maximum number of Horses that may be entered for the CSI; if any of the Athletes invited for the small/medium tour Competitions do not enter the maximum number of Horses permitted per Athlete, the OC may not invite additional Athletes for the CSI to fill the vacant stable places of small/medium tour Horses.

**NF ITA:** It could be specified better what "CSI" refers to above as in this case it is not immediately clear whether it refers to the Big Tour or the Small/Medium Tour.

**Jumping Committee:** Clarification will be added to the Draft Schedule template regarding athletes invited for small and medium tours.

## Annex VI CSI/CSIO REQUIREMENTS

**NED NF:** We are delighted to see that the global harmonization concerning the requirements are reconsidered.

**IEOA/AJO:** We are pleased to be able to support in principle, and give conditional agreement to, the proposed modifications as detailed in the "red line" document supplied by the FEI.

(...) We appreciate the FEI's understanding of the very real regional disparities and market sensitivities that exist while trying to implement fair governance, invitation and regulatory model. Our support of the model proposed -and with it our conditional agreement- weighs in large part in how we see things unfold in the short to medium terms with our very real concerns relating to certain organizers having separate and distinct invitation and regulatory requirements and agreements in place which appear to be punitive to the majority.

**IJOC:** In Annex VI, Art. 1 it states that FEI Horse passport is not required for home horses at CSI Amateur and CSI1\*/CSI2\*. What is the definition of "home horse" or "country of residence"? As in GRs 137.2:

"Notwithstanding the paragraph above, Horses taking part in CIMs (see Appendix E) and in CSI- P in their **country of residence** are not required to have a FEI Passport or FEI Recognition Card as mentioned in paragraph 1"

**Jumping Committee:** "Home horse" refers to horses of home athletes and residing in the "home" country, that is the country in which the event is taking place.

### 1. ~~CSI REQUIREMENTS WORLDWIDE FOR EUROPE~~ — ~~CSIO REQUIREMENTS WORLDWIDE~~

Requirement	Amateur Owner	CSI 1* + 2*	CSI 3*	CSI 4*	CSI 5*
Max. N° of starters per competition	Maximum 100 starters per Competition other than the GP (see below). If more than 100 declared starters, the Competition must be split and additional prize money provided for the additional Competition. <sup>2</sup>				

<sup>2</sup> Maximum 100 starters per Competition other than the GP. If more than 100 starters are declared, the OC must provide the following percentages of additional prize money for every ten declared starters, up to 130 declared starters:

101 to 110 declared starters: 133% of the original Competition prize money must be provided;

111 to 120 declared starters: 166% of the original Competition prize money must be provided;

If more than 120 starters are declared, the OC must split the class and provide the equivalent amount of prize money for the additional Competition. OCs may apply either of the following methods for splitting the Competition:

The competition is split into two groups before it starts. There may be a different number of starters in each group. There may be athletes with multiple horses in each group but all horses of any one athlete must be in the same group.

or

The competition is run as one single competition and split afterward into two groups and the classification established as follows: the athlete with the best score is the winner of the first group, the athlete with the second best score is the winner of the second group and so on until prizes have been allocated to 25% of the total number of starters. NB: In this case separate results must be sent to the FEI for each of the two groups, e.g. results for Competition 1a and for Competition 1b.

In both cases above each group must offer the same amount of prize money as indicated for the original Competition. For the avoidance of doubt, it is the number of declared starters in the Competition, not the final number of starters, that determines whether the Competition must be split.

**NF GER:** Proposal relating to additional prize money for every ten declared starters:

Modify "declared" to "final number of" starters in that para and amend second last paragraph accordingly. The number of prizes distributed should depend on the number of those who actually competed.

**NF ITA:** We are glad that a different management of over 100 quota is established. We suggest though that the calculation is made on the number of horses that actually competed instead of "Declared":

Maximum 100 starters per Competition other than the GP. If more than 100 starters are declared, the OC must provide the following percentages of additional prize money for every ten ~~declared~~ **started** starters, up to 130 ~~declared~~ **started** starters:

101 to 110 ~~declared~~ **started** starters: 133% of the original Competition prize money must be provided;

111 to 120 ~~declared~~ **started** starters: 166% of the original Competition prize money must be provided;

**IJOC:** We support the proposal but believe that there is a mistake in the first paragraph where it states up to 130 starters whereas the subsequent paragraphs refer to up to 120 starters.

**Jumping Committee:** The number of starters must be based on the declared starters rather than final number of starters, to avoid the risk of OCs paying athletes not to start.

The relevant correction from 130 to 120 has been made to the first paragraph; clarification has also been added as to how a competition must be split if there are more than 240 declared starters.

## Entry Fees and Other Fees

<b>2. ADDITIONAL CSI REQUIREMENTS FOR EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA</b>				
<u>2.1 Additional Requirements for Europe</u>	<b>CSI1* + CSI2*</b>	<b>CSI3*</b>	<b>CSI4*</b>	<b>CSI5*</b>
Maximum Entry Fee* per Horse VAT excluded	€ <del>350</del> 400 per Horse	€ <del>400</del> 450 per Horse	€ <del>500</del> 550 per Horse	CSI5* No entry fee CSI5*W WEL € <del>410</del> 450 per Horse
	The Entry Fee <del>includes the stabling covers the costs for stabling of one Horse for the duration of the Event, use of all facilities at the Event, the right to participate in all Competitions in accordance with the conditions in the Schedule and Administrative fees. The Entry Fee does not include Compulsory Fees (for services not covered under the Entry Fee) or Discretionary Fees (for optional commodities). Refer to definitions of fees in the Glossary of the JRs. Compulsory Fees and Discretionary Fees as defined in the Glossary may be charged in addition to the Entry Fee; no other fees may be charged.</del>			

**NF BEL:** The BEL NF truly supports the free market approach. Cost of living in countries differ and by setting a fixed amount, this difference in cost is not reflected and is creating a commercial disadvantage for organisers in "high cost" countries compared to "low cost" countries.

As a result, the BEL NF would like to launch the attached revised proposal which should enable organisers to level out this difference.

### 2.1. Entry Fee

We agree with the MAX entry fee proposed by the FEI but we also propose an entry fee for the CSI5\* competitions. For these CSI5\* naturally, accommodation rules should stay as before. It is not logical that there is an entry fee for CSI5-W and CSIO5\* but not for CSI5\*. Equality is an important aspect in this proposal.

	<b>CSI1* + CSI2*</b>	<b>CSI3*</b>	<b>CSI4*</b>	<b>CSI5*</b>
<b>Max. Entry Fee (VAT excl.)</b>	€ 400	€ 450	€ 550	€ 500

### 2.2. Service Fee

On top of the entry fee, a compulsory "service fee" should be possible for organisers in high cost countries, organisers that have a higher standard accommodation or provide additional services. This "participation fee" or "organisation fee" should come on top and above the entry fee and is to be defined by the OC in agreement with the NF who can make the correct judgment whether or not this fee can be authorized yes or no. Ideally extra fees such as parking and electricity fees are included in this fee so that in both amounts (entry and service fee) the athletes have a clear view of what needs to be paid. No "service fees" can be demanded for CSI5\* events.

	<b>CSI1* + CSI2*</b>	<b>CSI3*</b>	<b>CSI4*</b>	<b>CSI5*</b>
<b>Max. Service Fee (VAT excl.)</b>	€ 250	€ 350	€ 400	€ 0

**NF ITA:** We propose to establish a maximum amount for the **Entry fee** also for all CSI5\* (not only CSI5W + CSIO5\*).

**Compulsory fee:** shall include only: EADCMP fee+manure disposal+electricity and a maximum amount shall be fixed.

**Discretionary fee:** under this name all facultative and optional fees shall fall – these shall be though clearly stated in the Schedule.

**Jumping Committee:** When the CSI Requirements were first introduced they applied only to Europe; it had been agreed at the time that CSI5\* events should not charge an entry fee as it was felt that because of the standing of the event and the prize money offered, the OC did not need to charge an entry fee and considered it a privilege to invite the top riders. In addition there was a strong consensus at the CSI Invitations / CSI Requirements Working Group that CSI5\* in Europe should not charge an entry fee. CSI-W in the Western European League and CSIO5\* events have been allowed to charge an entry fee because the invitations at these events are mostly not under the control of the OC (invitations according to FEI World Cup™ rules for CSI-W WEL events and according to NFs' selection of riders for CSIOs) and pay cards have not been an issue.

The Committee did not support the introduction of the proposed service fee on the one hand because it was unlikely that an NF would not agree to allow an OC to charge it, making it in effect a compulsory fee, and on the other hand because it was felt that the new definitions of fees provided a more transparent solution and would help to regulate costs.

The Committee did however support the proposal to include the manure disposal fee (max €40 per horse/per week, including for Tours, applicable worldwide) in the compulsory fees rather than the entry fee. The Committee did not wish to establish maximum amounts for electric hook-up or parking for lorries as this would lead to all OCs charging the maximum.

## Requirements for OCs in Europe and North America

<u>2.1 Additional Requirements for Europe</u>	<b>CSI1* + CSI2*</b>	<b>CSI3*</b>	<b>CSI4*</b>	<b>CSI5*</b>

Meals for Grooms	At own expense	At own expense	At own expense ( <del>b/fast + 1 meal</del> )	OC expense (b/fast + 1 mesal)
Meals for Athletes	At own expense	At own expense	At own expense ( <del>b/fast + 1 meal</del> )	At OC expense (b/fast + 1 meal)
<u>Accommodation for Grooms</u>	<u>At own expense</u>	<u>At own expense</u>	<u>At own expense</u>	<u>At OC expense</u>
Accommodation for Athletes	At own expense	At own expense	CSI: At own expense	At OC expense; Hotel minimum 3* standard for all Athletes

**NF GER:** Why should the OC of a CSI5\* in Europe bear the accommodation costs while those in North America shall not? This requirement must be the same in both continents.

**P. Bollen/AJO:** In the CSI requirements working group, there was clear consensus that there should be no entry fee in Europe for CSI 5\* events, However the market between USA and Europe becomes very unfair now for OC's:

USA: No free bedding, no free meals for riders and grooms, No accommodation cost for riders, nor for Grooms, with a possible entrée fee of more than 3.000 € per Horse (1% of a 1.000.000 Show = 10.000 € for 3 horses)

EUROPE: The OC has to pay free bedding, meals for grooms and athletes, accommodation for athletes and grooms. The OC can charge no entry fee.

This is unfair and not acceptable for European Organizers

I propose that the OC in Europe has the choice not to offer accommodation for athletes and grooms, as they all live in very beautiful and expensive trucks these days, often far more beautiful than a Hotel room. Of course if an OC of a CSI 5\* decides not to offer accommodation for athletes and grooms this will have a negative implication in the ECS System for the OC.

**Jumping Committee:** The Sports Forum discussion on harmonisation of CSI requirements led to the conclusion that requirements aside from those relating to safety and horse welfare should not be harmonised, as different continents operated under different economic models. In light of this the Committee had decided to withdraw the requirement for North American OCs to cover accommodation and meal costs as of 2018.

As the proposal that requirements be the same for both continents and the proposal that European OCs should have the choice to offer accommodation or not are new proposals they will be considered for the 2019 rules.

<u>2.2 Additional Requirements for North America</u>	<b>CSI1* + CSI2*</b>	<b>CSI3*</b>	<b>CSI4*</b>	<b>CSI5*</b>
<p><u>Mandatory Entry Fees* per Horse (compulsory fees; e.g. Entry fee/Admin. fee/Nomination fee/NF fee/Stabling fee, etc)</u> <b>VAT excluded</b> *Do not include fees for optional items such as extra-stall for tack, large box at Athlete's request, VIP parking, etc.</p>	<p>The sum of the <u>Entry Fees for 3 Horses and all Compulsory Fees charged may not exceed Max. 4% of PM per Athlete (based on entry of 3 Horses)</u></p>	<p>CSI: The sum of the <u>Entry Fees for 3 Horses and all Compulsory Fees charged may not exceed Max. 3% of PM per Athlete (based on entry of 3 Horses)</u> <u>CSI-W: Acc. to World Cup Rules</u></p>	<p>CSI: The sum of the <u>Entry Fees for 3 Horses and all Compulsory Fees charged may not exceed Max. 2% of PM per Athlete (based on entry of 3 Horses)</u> <u>CSI-W: Acc. to World Cup Rules</u></p>	<p>CSI: The sum of the <u>Entry Fees for 3 Horses and all Compulsory Fees charged may not exceed Max. 1% of PM per Athlete (based on entry of 3 Horses)</u> <u>CSI-W: Acc. to World Cup Rules</u></p>
<p><u>The Entry Fee per Horse must be indicated in the Schedule. Athletes entering fewer than three Horses must be charged the Entry Fee for the number of Horses entered. The Entry Fee covers the costs for stabling of one Horse for the duration of the Event, use of all facilities at the Event, the right to participate in all Competitions in accordance with the conditions in the Schedule and Administrative fees. The Entry Fee does not include Compulsory Fees (for services not covered under the Entry Fee) or Discretionary Fees (for optional commodities). Refer to definitions of Fees in the Glossary of the JRs. Compulsory Fees and Discretionary Fees as defined in the Glossary may be charged in addition to the Entry Fee; no other fees may be charged.</u></p> <p><u>All mandatory fees, including entry fee, nomination fee, stabling fee, etc. must be listed in detail in the Schedule; the total of all mandatory fees may not exceed the relevant percentage of total prize money for the Event.</u></p> <p><u>Nevertheless, the sum total of all fees that may be charged per Athlete at a CSI, that is, all mandatory fees (based on the Athlete entering three Horses), plus the starting fee of each Competition at the Event, may not exceed the relevant percentage (as established above for the star level of the Event) allowed to be charged based on the overall prize money (PM) of the event.</u></p>				
<p><b>Maximum starting fee per horse <u>VAT excluded</u></b></p>	4% of PM of competition*	3% of PM of competition*	2% of PM of competition*	1% of PM of competition*
<p><i>* The starting fee for any international Competition at a CSI may not exceed the applicable percentage (as established above for the category of the Event) of the prize money for that Competition.</i></p>				

Maximum manure disposal fee	<del>€ 40. per horse</del>	<del>€ 40. per horse</del>	<del>€ 40. per horse</del>	<del>€ 40. per horse</del>
	<del>For Events at same venue over consecutive weekends ("Tours") max. € 40 per horse may be charged for the first Event of the Tour and max. € 20 per horse may be charged for each subsequent Event.</del>			
Bedding – Shavings	All bedding will be charged	All bedding will be charged	All bedding will be charged	US\$ 50 per horse credit, then will be charged
Meals for Grooms	At own expense	At own expense	At own expense	At <del>Own</del> expense effective <del>1 January 2018</del>
Meals for Athletes	At own expense	At own expense	At own expense	At <del>Own</del> expense effective <del>1 January 2018</del>
Accommodation for Grooms	At own expense	At own expense	At own expense	At <del>Own</del> expense effective <del>1 January 2018</del>
Accommodation for Athletes	At own expense	At own expense	At own expense	At <del>Own</del> expense effective <del>1 January 2018</del>

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed changes.

**NF USA:** The U.S. believes that this proposal provides far more clarity and is great improvement from the 2017 Proposal.

- In terms of the implementation, we again hope the FEI will give consideration to events that are early in 2018 as it is a great burden for them to adjust after they have already submitted their FEI schedules in order to meet the current Rules. We again recommend a delayed implementation.
- "Bedding" 2.2 (N America) – "US \$50 per horse credit will be charged"; please can further clarification be given around this as to how this would work or how this would apply in Canada (i.e. US \$).

**Jumping Committee:** The Draft Schedule template for 2018 will be published before the last week of October and will be based on the proposed modifications to the rules for 2018, with the mention "pending approval at the GA".

The Committee agreed to include an amount in Canadian dollars (CAD 65) alongside the US \$50 per horse credit for bedding.

## **2.3 CSIO REQUIREMENTS WORLDWIDE**

**P. Bollen/AJO:** During the NC Division 2 meeting in Vienna last week, there was a strong demand for CSIO1 and CSIO2\* to cancel the accommodation fee. This way there would be more CSIO1 and CSIO2 organisers in the eastern countries.

**NF USA:** A minor formatting recommendation to help with the clarity would be to renumber 2.3 CSIO Requirements to "3".

**Jumping Committee:** As the proposal to cancel the accommodation requirements for CSIO1-2\* is a new proposal it will be considered in 2018.

Annex VI Art. 2.3 "CSIO Requirements" has been renumbered Art. 3.

## Annex IX Rules for Under 25 (U25), Young Riders and Juniors

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed changes.

### Article 4 International Events (See GRs Article 102)

1. The following types of Jumping Events for U25 Athletes, Young Riders and Juniors are established: International Events Category A and B (CSIU25, CSII and CSIJ Cat. A respectively CSIU25, CSII and CSIJ Cat. B); ~~Official International Events (CSIOY or CSIOJ) and Championships~~ may be organised for Young Riders and Juniors but may not be organised for the U25 category.

**NF GER:** We agree that U25 competitions only serve as transition to Senior level and do not need their own CSIOs and Championships.

**Youth CSIOs and CDIOs:** (CSIOY/CSIOJ/CSIOY/CSIOCh and CDIOY/CDIOJ/CDIOY/CDIOCh)

In Europe, many "O" events in the youth categories are used by NFs for selecting their teams for the European Championship. Thus their desire is to enter more riders than the rules provide for. The OCs are willing to satisfy their wish, but do not want to schedule additional "I"s because then they would have too many competitors.

Thus the proposal is to allow those European OCs who organise at least three CSIOs/CDIOs in youth categories at the same weekend to extend personal invitations in addition to the teams, i. e. for 3 Jumping riders and for 2 Dressage riders (preferably 3 to have it the same as in Jumping) per age category.

For Jumping, this was discussed among Chefs d'Equipe on the occasion of the European Championships in Samorin.

**NF ITA:** For **Youth CSIOs** we propose the following: (also applicable to CSIOY and CSIOCh)

1. We propose to increase the number of Individual invitations for the NFs represented with a team in order to enable NFs to use these events for selecting their teams for the CH-EU.
2. At the parties organized during the CSIOs for Youngsters the selling of any alcoholic drinks should be forbidden.

**NF USA:** The U.S. welcomes the addition of rules for U25; however, we are disappointed that U25 Nations Cups have not been included in the proposed rules. We hope that the FEI will reconsider this in the future as we believe that the addition of the CSIO-U25 category will only help grow both the Sport and as well support and excitement of riding for your country on a Nations Cup Team. The U25 Nations Cup should be seen as an addition to the sport not as an alternative to existing competitions; growing and maintaining the importance of the Nations Cup has often been cited as vital by all stakeholders – we fail to see why it should not be given the opportunity to succeed or otherwise. It also seems to be somewhat of a dichotomy that there is now a U25 European Championships in one Olympic Discipline (Dressage) while U25 Nations Cup competitions are not allowed in another.

We are supportive of all of the changes regarding Young Rider and Junior Championships and look forward to implementing them at the North American Children, Junior & Young Rider Championships.

**Jumping Committee:** As the proposals relating to additional invitations for youth CSIOs are new proposals they will be considered for the 2019 rules.

Laws on the sale of alcohol existed in all countries and must be followed; furthermore Chefs d'Equipe were responsible for the behaviour of their riders at events.

7. Certificates of Capability for FEI European Jumping Championships for Young Rider and Juniors
- 7.3.2 A horse that has taken part in a Nations Cup or Grand Prix competition at a CSIO1\* to CSIO5\* Event in the year of the Championship is not eligible to take part in the Junior Championship. (See JRs Annex IX, Art. 15.1.2: A Championship for Juniors is open to Horses which have not competed in a Nations Cup or Grand Prix at a CSIO for Seniors during the current year.)

**NF TUR:** Either delete this rule or apply the restriction also to Grand Prix at CSI3\* to CSI5\*.

Countries like Germany, France, Great Britain, Netherlands, Belgium, etc., where the sport is performed at its best standards and breeding is an industry, are producing a large number of horses that may compete at Nations Cup or GP level; whereas countries like Turkey have one or two horses at that level, finding themselves in a position to make a choice whether to allocate the horse to a Senior, Children or a Junior rider is also an unfair competition.

The same comment applies to Annex XII (Rules for Children's Events), Art. 21.

**Jumping Committee:** As this is a new proposal it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

### Article 10 Schooling of Horses

1. Under penalty of disqualification, it is not permitted for an Athlete's Horse to be schooled by anyone else other than the Athlete himself mounted in the saddle, in or outside the town where an Event or a Championship is held, as from 18.00 hours on the day preceding the commencement of the first Competition of an Event or Championship until the conclusion of the whole Event or Championship. However, lunging, work in hand, etc. by someone other than the Athlete, under the supervision of the stewards, are permitted.

**IJOC:** Could you please confirm whether or not the intention is for U25s also to be included in this rule?

**Jumping Committee:** Clarification has been added to Art. 14 that it does not apply to U25 category.

#### Article 14 Declaration of Starters **and Substitutions**

1. The Chefs d'Equipe must declare the composition of their team (four Athletes/Horses) to the OC in writing, before 18.00 hours, on the day preceding the team Competition.
2. ~~The fifth pair (Athlete/Horse) may only be eligible to start as a member of the team in case of an accident or illness either to one of the four team Athletes or to one of the four Horses, provided the Chef d'Equipe obtains the approval of the Ground Jury. Between the submission of the declaration of team members and one hour before the start of the first round of the Team Competition, the Chef d'Equipe may substitute the 5<sup>th</sup> Athlete/Horse combination for any one of the four Athlete/Horse combinations declared for the Team Competition. Substitution of any Athlete/Horse combination may also be made following the first round of the Team Competition up until one hour before the second round (Team Final).~~
3. If the Championship is held during a CSI the OC may allow the Athletes participating in the Championship to take part with different Horses in the Competitions of the CSI (Article 7 above). The Horses to be ridden in the Championship must, however, be declared before arrival at the Event and may not be substituted.

**Jumping Committee:** The Committee further reviewed the proposal that for all Youth championships declaration of teams should be made after the 1<sup>st</sup> competition and that substitutions may be made for any reason prior to the 1<sup>st</sup> and/or 2<sup>nd</sup> rounds of the team competition and agreed that substitutions to teams should only be allowed for medical/veterinary reasons up to one hour prior to the start of the first round of the Team Final, as per the rules for Seniors.

#### Article 15 Age Requirements

1. Horses
- 1.2. A Championship for Juniors is open to Horses which have not competed in a Nations Cup or Grand Prix in a CSIO for Seniors during the current year.

**TUR NF:** Either delete this rule or apply the restriction also to Grand Prix at CSI3\* to CSI5\*. [see comment to Art. 6.7.3.2]

**Jumping Committee:** As this is a new proposal it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

---

## Annex X RULES FOR VETERAN ATHLETES

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed changes.

### Article 2 Definition of a Veteran Athlete

The following may compete as Veteran Athletes:

1. ~~Ladies from the year in which they reach their 45th birthday and gentlemen~~ Athletes may compete in the Veteran's category from the beginning of the year in which they reach their 49th birthday.

**AJA:** Instead of raising the age for women to 49, lower the age for men to 45 (this is the age applied for Veterans in France, Italy and Spain), otherwise a number of women currently competing in CSI-Vs but who are not yet 49 will not be able to compete over the next three years. If the Committee wishes to maintain the age of 49 for all Veteran riders, the following options are proposed:

- In 2018, women may compete as a Veteran from the year they reach 46
- In 2019, women may compete as a Veteran from the year they reach 47
- In 2020, women may compete as a Veteran from the year they reach 48
- Thereafter, all riders may compete as a Veteran from the year they reach 49

*Or*

- Give a special status to AJA female members currently under age 49, allow all female members of AJA in 2017 to participate in CSI-Vs organized by the AJA.

**Jumping Committee:** It was agreed that the minimum age for Veterans should be 45 for men and women.

## Annex XI RULES FOR PONY RIDERS

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed changes.

**NF ITA:** For **Youth CSIOs** we propose the following:

1. We propose to increase the number of Individual invitations for the NFs represented with a team in order to enable NFs to use these events for selecting their teams for the CH-EU.
2. CSIOP: we propose to add a class reserved to "UNDER 14" pony rider with a lower height of fences in order to spur the participation of pony riders otherwise the very high technical level prevents the participation of a larger number of riders.
3. At the parties organized during the CSIOs for Youngsters the selling of any alcoholic drinks should be forbidden.

**NF TUR:** With regard to the proposal from the ITA NF: We would like to contribute our views about the development of the Sport for us in Turkey and perhaps the Eastern part of the Europe, the Balkans. It is the TUR NF that hosted the first two CH-EU-S starting in 2006 after two years of hard work and opposition. The reason why we insisted to start the Children Category with Horses in Europe was simple:

- a) it was being done successfully in South America and North America (where also Pony Sport was for the children to get ready to ride horses not to compete in the Continental Championship level.....)
- b) There was nearly no Pony Sport in many of the Eastern European Countries and the Balkan countries.

Today we are proud to see that what has been achieved is right and 125 riders participating from over 20 nations prove our point. Many of the children riders of those days have become integrated to the Top Sport and are ranking among the top 100 World Rankings.

Strong nations in Pony Sport like France, Germany, Holland, UK, Ireland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark were miles and miles ahead of the other nations in Eastern Europe and Balkans and the gap was impossible to close as these few 149cm Ponies who jump 140 were extremely special animals and were at exorbitant prices that nobody who has a modest budget for a horse could reach to have. Thus these nations were unable to make the bridge for integration to the Horse Sport for Juniors and YR Seniors.

Also we have to mention that to have a grown up 15-16 year old near adult rider with a height between 170-180cm riding a "questionable" 149cm Pony over 135-140 challenging courses does not look fair and appropriate from the spectators point of view. Please kindly be fair and value these very special Ponies; Majority have "six figure" values and none of the countries that don't participate today, do not participate, not because the sport is not being made in those countries but because in general they don't have and cannot afford these special Ponies which only change hands when the riders grow older.

We feel Pony riding is for starting to be involved and orientating to the sport which is done with Horses in the top level. Pony riding is a must as a Pre School and is incredibly beneficial and necessary when you think about Pony Riding for this purpose.

However jumping 125-130 for 12-13 year olds or 130-135 for 15-16 year olds still have the same obstacle, thus it will be very difficult to achieve due to not being able to find and achieve this level Ponies due to economic reasons. Instead in countries like ours it brings another challenge to parents who start their children in a very reasonable Pony sport as Pre School and fun for orientating their children to the sport will become another expensive route for them to follow at a sport branch which has "no future" when they grow up a few years rather than helping the riders to grow up to be Junior, YR and Seniors. It will probably help the Pony breeders and sellers in the 4-5 plus countries but it will not help the Sport to develop apart from the 10 Nations that can participate at the CH-EU-S-P. There were over 125 riders this year who competed in CH-EU-S-Ch at Samorin, 28 nations were represented. It is easy to see where the sport is growing and where new ideas for more development should be made. Perhaps like organising one Children Grand Prix at the top CSIs so the Children riders breathe the same air with their brother and sister riders.

Instead of making younger children ride Ponies and jump slightly smaller fences, we even feel Pony riding should be limited to ages 12-13.

The first reason is economical. Finding great Ponies for jumping over a same challenging course an average Pony Price is at least three four times more expensive and very difficult to find.

Second Reason: Children who ride Horses "Think whilst Riding". Children who ride Ponies "pilot" on these special creatures. (Own words of a legend of our sport David Broome who especially came to see our organisation in 2007 and made this statement with astonishment after the show. And fully supported UK Children Team to participate to the CH-EU-S-Ch.)

We hope that our views do not offend the Pony organisations. However it truly reflects the truth behind the problem and our honest opinion about the Pony Sport. Rather than to push the Pony Sport that is not going anywhere and that does not embrace the riders of 15 plus nations, we should try and propose ideas to develop the Horse Sport that has a future in 25 nations as Juniors and Young Riders and Seniors. Pony Sport in the top level is performed by a privileged group of people, it is not helping the Sport to develop apart from few participating Nations.

**Jumping Committee:** As the above proposals are new proposals they will be considered for the 2019 rules.

## Article 9 Prizes

1. Prize money and/or prizes in kind must be awarded in Pony Jumping Events. The total amount of prize money that may be offered at a CSIP, ~~or~~ a CSIOP or a Pony Jumping Championship is limited to EUR 8'000. At Events where prizes in kind are offered ~~the~~ the approximate value of the prizes in kind must be stated in the Schedule.

3.6. OCs should award as many extra prizes as possible, for example:

3.6.1. Athletes with the best style (possible division as 3.6.2. and 3.6.3. below);

- 3.6.2. best girl Athletes;
- 3.6.3. best boy Athletes;
- 3.6.4. sportsmanship.

**NF FRA:** We are against the idea of giving prize money for Pony Riders and Children's categories. In regards to the age of the rider it should not be allowed. Even without prize money this categories can work and contribute in an efficient way to the future of our sport. This would also be damageable from OCs point of view.

**NF GER:** Regarding paragraph 3.6.1 "Athletes with the best style (possible division as 3.6.2 and 3.6.3 below)" - We do not think this is necessary, but nice to have. Then why not simply say: "possible division in girls and boys"?

**Jumping Committee:** OCs of Pony Riders' and Children's events are not obliged to offer prize money; prizes in kind may be offered instead.

The Committee did not see the need to reword Art. 9.3.6.1 but will consider the proposal for the 2019 rules.

## Article 22 Continental Jumping Championships

### 6. Competition Format

- 6.1. The Championship comprises three Competitions, each taking place on a different day. The total Penalties incurred by the three best placed Athletes of each Nation in the first Competition and in each round of the second Competition count towards the team placing and the total Penalties incurred in each of the three Championship Competitions count towards the individual placing.

(...)

### 7. Declaration of Starters

- 7.1. The declaration of starters will take place after the training session, which must be provided on the day preceding the first qualifying Competition. At a time fixed by the OC, the Chefs d'Equipe will designate in writing the four members of their team and/or their individual Athletes and the names of their Ponies (a single and same Pony for each Athlete for the three Competitions of the Championship) as starters in the Competitions of the Championship. The fifth pair (Athlete/Pony) may take part in the first and second Competitions as an individual and in the individual Final Competition if qualified.
- 7.2. ~~The substitution of a team member by the fifth pair (Athlete/Pony) may only be allowed in case of an accident or illness either to one of the four team Athletes or to one of the four Ponies, up until one hour before the start of the first qualifying Competition, provided the Chef d'Equipe obtains the approval of the Ground Jury. Between the submission of the declaration of team members and one hour before the start of the first round of the Team Competition, the Chef d'Equipe may substitute the 5<sup>th</sup> Athlete/Horse combination for any one of the four Athlete/Horse combinations declared for the Team Competition. Substitution of any Athlete/Horse combination may also be made following the first round of the Team Competition up until one hour before the second round (Team Final).~~
- 7.3. If the Championship is held during a CSI the OC may allow the Athletes participating in the Championship to take part with different Ponies in the Competitions of the CSI. The Ponies to be ridden in the Championship must, however, be declared before arrival at the Event and may not be substituted.

**Jumping Committee:** Refer to comments under Annex IX, Art. 14 (declaration of teams after the first competition, substitutions to teams only for medical/veterinary reasons up to one hour before the team Final).

## Annex XII RULES FOR CHILDREN'S EVENTS

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed changes.

**NF FRA:** We are against the idea of giving prize money for Pony Riders and Children's categories. In regards to the age of the rider it should not be allowed. Even without prize money these categories can work and contribute in an efficient way to the future of our sport. This would also be damageable from OCs point of view.

**Jumping Committee:** OCs of Pony Riders' and Children's events are not obliged to offer prize money; prizes in kind may be offered instead.

The Committee did not see the need to reword Art. 9.3.6.1 but will consider the proposal for the 2019 rules.

### Article 3 Definition of Children

1. ~~A child~~**An Athlete** may compete in the Children's category from the beginning of the calendar year in which he reaches the age of 12 until the end of the calendar year in which he reaches the age of ~~14~~**15**.

**NF GER:** We do not think it is necessary in Jumping, but we agree. We have to have the same age limits in all disciplines.

**NF ITA:** We are against the increasing of the age limit for the Children up to 15 years, because the current technical level of children aged 14 years is already outstanding (at 2017 CH-EU Samorin there were 8 Children with 0 penalties in the Final competition's jump-off).

**NF SUI:** We do not agree to open the Children classes up to 15 years. If this is the case, then we will have to increase the level of the Children classes again or we will have too many clear rounds. This would mean that we have a disadvantage again for the younger ones, for whom this category has been created and we will only have 15 year olds competing in Children classes. We think that the Children on a good level already now make the switch to the Juniors, therefore we propose to leave the age the way it is now. We strongly recommend to have the same age limits for all disciplines.

**NF USA:** The U.S. is very pleased that the FEI has accepted the proposal to extend the age of Children until the year in which athletes reach the age of 15. We believe this will have a positive impact on the growth of the sport. However, we ask that the implementation of this Rule be delayed until January 1, 2019 as we have already published and began qualifying for the 2018 North American Children's Championship. It is not fair to athletes to retroactively publish criteria. It is with this in mind that we request that the extension of the Children's age be implemented in 2019.

**Youth Chefs d'Equipe:** There is no consensus on raising the age limit to 15. At the CH-EU 7 children rode all the classes clear. If 15 year olds are allowed, classes will have to be built bigger and 12 & 13 year olds will no longer have a chance.

**Jumping Committee:** The feedback in Dressage on raising the age limit for the Children's category was also mixed and it had been decided not to increase the age to 15. The proposal has therefore been withdrawn.

## Chapter IV CONTINENTAL AND REGIONAL JUMPING CHAMPIONSHIPS

### Article 20 Declaration of Starters

1. The declaration of starters will take place after the training session, which must be provided on the day preceding the first qualifying Competition. At a time fixed by the OC, the Chefs d'Equipe will designate in writing the four members of their team and/or the names of their individual Athletes and the names of their Horses (a single and same Horse for each Athlete for the three Competitions of the Championship) as starters in the Competitions of the Championship.
2. ~~The substitution of a team member by the fifth pair (Athlete/Horse) may only be allowed in case of an accident or illness either to one of the four team Athletes or to one of the four Horses, up until one hour before the start of the first qualifying Competition, provided the Chef d'Equipe obtains the approval of the Ground Jury. Between the submission of the declaration of team members and one hour before the start of the first round of the Team Competition, the Chef d'Equipe may substitute the 5th Athlete/Horse combination for any one of the four Athlete/Horse combinations declared for the Team Competition. Substitution of any Athlete/Horse combination may also be made following the first round of the Team Competition up until one hour before the second round (Team Final).~~
3. The fifth pair (Athlete/Horse) may take part in the first and second qualifying Competitions as an individual and in the individual Final Competition if qualified.

**Jumping Committee:** Refer to comments under Annex IX, Art. 14 (declaration of teams after the first competition, substitutions to teams only for medical/veterinary reasons up to one hour before the team Final).

### Article 21 Eligibility of Horses

- 1.2 The Championship is open to Horses which have not competed in a Nations Cup or Grand Prix in a CSIO for Seniors during the preceding and/or current year.

**NF TUR:** Either delete this rule or apply the restriction also to Grand Prix at CSI3\* to CSI5\*.

Countries like Germany, France, Great Britain, Netherlands, Belgium, etc., where the sport is performed at its best standards and breeding is an industry, are producing a large number of horses that may compete at Nations Cup or GP level; whereas

countries like Turkey have one or two horses at that level, finding themselves in a position to make a choice whether to allocate the horse to a Senior, Children or a Junior rider is also an unfair competition.

**Jumping Committee:** As this is a new proposal it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

## Article 22 Competitions

3. Third Day – Second Qualifying Competition (Team Championship, 2<sup>nd</sup> Individual Qualifying Competition)
- 3.1. This Competition is run in two identical rounds according to Table A, not against the clock, with a possible jump-off against the clock, in case of equality of first, second and/or third place.  
  
This Competition is open only to those Athletes and Horses which have taken part in the first Competition (see paragraph 2 above). The team classification only affects the members of the teams declared to start.

**Youth Chefs d'Equipe:** Include the option that "the two rounds may be identical or different, with the same degree of difficulty in the second round." For all Youth CHs.

**Jumping Committee:** It was agreed that this option could be included, in alignment with other Championships.

## Article 23 Obstacles and Courses

2. The course for the team final Competition and for the second qualifying Competition of the individual Championship consists of 12 to 14 obstacles, including one double and one triple or three doubles. If the water jump is used in the team Competition, a vertical obstacle must be placed over the water jump in the second round; this obstacle is judged as a vertical obstacle, not as a water jump (see JRs Art. 211.10).  
  
Height 1.25 m maximum (both rounds) with a proportional spread between 1.00 m and 1.30 m. Speed 350 m/min.

**Youth Chefs d'Equipe:** The height of obstacles in the team competition should be updated in accordance with Art. 14. It does not make sense that CSIs and CSIOs for children can be built up to 1.30m but the team championship is at 1.25m.

**Jumping Committee:** The Committee agreed that the height of the team Championship should align with the maximum height allowed for CSIch/CSIOCh and the relevant correction has been made to Art. 23.

- 4.2. Third Competition (Individual Final)

(...)

- 4.2.2. Starting order

The starting order for round A will follow the reverse order of Penalties incurred in the first and second qualifying Competitions of the Championship. In the event of equality of Penalties for any placing, the result of the first qualifying Competition will be the deciding factor for the starting order of the Athletes. The lowest placed Athlete qualified will therefore start as number one.

The starting order for round B will follow the reverse order of the Penalties incurred in the first and second qualifying Competitions as well as round A. The Athlete with the greatest number of Penalties will start first, the Athlete with the least Penalties will start last. In the event of Athletes with equal Penalties, the time of the first qualifying Competition will be the deciding factor for the starting order.

**A. Ylänne:** In the last sentence of paragraph 4.2.2 "time" should be corrected to "result". This is corrected in all other categories, but hasn't been noticed here.

**Jumping Committee:** The Committee agreed and the relevant correction has been made to paragraph 4.2.2.

---

## Annex XIII Rules for Amateur Owner Category

### Article 2 International Events

1. International Events for "Amateur Owners" can be organised for a Category A group consisting of Competitions with a height of between 1.30 m and 1.40 m maximum and a width of 1.55 m maximum (except the triple bar), and a Category B group consisting of Competitions with a height of between 1.15 m and 1.25 m maximum and with a width of 1.40 m maximum (except the triple bar).

**NF GER:** Apart from the height, there is no difference between CSIAm A and B. Most Athletes are not even aware of the fact that CSIAm and B events are two different events so there are often mistakes in the entries. Is it necessary at all to have two categories? If so, the categories should be in line with Juniors/Young Riders etc, i.e. that Cat. A is with prize money and Cat. B without prize-money. Or simply use the star system.

It should be possible to schedule more than two obstacle heights within one CSI, without a minimum height.

**Jumping Committee:** As this is a new proposal it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

## RULES FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS AND GAMES

### CHAPTER I WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP

#### Article 313 Third Competition (Individual Final Competition)

1. Conduct, Table, Speed

The third Competition is conducted under Table A not against the clock over two different successive ~~courses-rounds~~ at a speed of 400 m per minute, without a jump-off in the event of equality of Penalties for first place in the classification of the Competition; in the event of equality of Penalties for first place in the overall classification for the Championship, there will be one jump-off against the clock (see Art. 314.2). At the discretion of the Technical Delegate, depending on the size of the arena, the speed may be reduced to 375 m per minute.

2. Obstacles, Length of the courses

Round A and Round B are approximately equal in the number of obstacles and the length of the course, Round B having an increased level of difficulty.

2.1. Round A

~~Ten to Twelve~~Eleven to thirteen obstacles, including one double and one treble or three doubles. Height 1.65 m maximum with a spread in proportion, not exceeding ~~two metres~~2.00 m (2.20 m for the triple bar). A maximum of two spread obstacles with a width of ~~one metre~~1.00 m or less may be used. At least two vertical obstacles which must be minimum 1.60 m in height. Sloping walls do not count as compulsory vertical obstacles. At least six other obstacles of at least 1.40 m in height. Water jump, if used (see Art. 308.3): ~~four metres~~4.00 m including the take-off element.

Length: ~~500-450~~ m minimum, 600 m maximum.

2.2. Round B

A different course from Round A comprising a maximum of 12 obstacles including ~~only one~~two combinations (one double ~~or and~~ one treble or two doubles). Height 1.65 m maximum with a spread in proportion not exceeding ~~two metres~~2.00 m (2.20 m for the triple bar). A maximum of two spread obstacles with a width of ~~one metre~~1.00 m or less may be used. At least two vertical obstacles, which must be minimum 1.60 m in height. Sloping walls do not count as compulsory vertical obstacles.

A water jump may not be included, but an obstacle with water beneath, in front or behind (a so-called "Liverpool") may be included in the course.

Length: 400 m minimum, ~~500-550~~ m maximum.

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed changes.

#### Article 315 Prizes and Medals

- Prizes must be awarded for individual placing in each Competition. The allocation of prizes must follow the provisions of the GRs.
- Prize money must be awarded for the overall individual placing in the Championship, and must be distributed in accordance with the prize money distribution table published in the Schedule, to the 12 best placed Athletes in the overall classification of the Championship providing they have taken part in Round B of the third Competition. If fewer than 12 Athletes take part in Round B the prize money foreseen for the 12 placings will be redistributed among those who do take part. Athletes who do not take part in Round B of the third Competition are not entitled to receive prize money for the overall classification.
- FEI gold, silver and bronze medals will be awarded to each member of the three best placed teams in the Team Final and to the individuals placed first, second and third in the Individual Final.

**Jumping Committee:** The details on distribution of prizes for the third competition and for the overall individual classification have been amended in alignment with the prize money distribution for the individual final at the European Championship; refer to the comments under Art. 328. Prize money for the overall classification will be distributed to all 25 starters in the third competition, with the largest portion distributed to the top 12 in the second round, as well as prizes in kind for the classification in the third competition based on the results of rounds A and B.

### CHAPTER II CONTINENTAL CHAMPIONSHIP (TEAMS AND INDIVIDUALS)

#### Article 319 ENTRIES

3. Teams

A team comprises at least three Athletes and three Horses and at most five Athletes and 10 Horses. Each qualified NF may enter a maximum of 10 Athletes and 20 Horses with its nominated entries and a maximum of five Athletes and 10 Horses with its definite entries; however, each NF may only send a maximum of five Athletes, of whom four may

participate in the Championship, and ten Horses. Each NF may in addition send a Chef d'Equipe to whom will be accorded the same privileges as the Athletes.

4. Individuals instead of a team

An NF, which cannot send a full team, may enter one or two individual Athletes with two Horses each.

4.1. Additional Athlete and Horse

The additional Athlete (5<sup>th</sup> Athlete) and his Horses plus the Horses of team members and individuals not taking part in the Championship Competitions may compete in the non-Championship Competitions.

**NF ITA:** We propose that the 5th rider of each Team may participate at the Championship as an individual.

**Jumping Committee:** As this is a new proposal, it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

### Article 327 THIRD COMPETITION (INDIVIDUAL FINAL)

3. Participation

3.1 Round A

Round A of the third Competition is compulsory for the 25 best-placed Athletes and Horses (including those with equality of Penalties for 25<sup>th</sup> place) according to the cumulative Penalties over the first and second Competitions or according to the cumulative Penalties over the first Competition and first round of the second Competition as well as the round replacing the second round of the team Competition for individuals and members of teams not qualified for the second round of the team Competition. Athletes must have taken part in the first Competition (completed or not) and have completed the second Competition (without having been eliminated or having retired) or have taken part in the first Competition (completed or not) and have completed the first round of the second Competition as well as the round replacing the second round of the team Competition for individuals and members of teams not qualified for the second round of the team Competition (without having been eliminated or having retired). If for any reason one or more of these 25 best placed Athletes are unable to start, they will be replaced by the next best placed Athlete(s) from the reserve list of Athletes.

3.2 Round B

Round B of the third Competition is open to the 12 best placed Athletes and Horses according to the cumulative Penalties over the first and second Competitions and Round A of the third Competition. In case of Athletes with equality of Penalties for 12<sup>th</sup> place, the result in Round A of the third Competition will be the deciding factor. In case of further equality of Penalties, the time of Round A will be used to break the tie. If less than 12 Athletes take part in Round B the prize money foreseen for the 12 placings will be redistributed among those who do take part; Athletes who do not take part in Round B are not eligible to receive prize money.

**A. Kistler:** Rethink the Individual Final Day – second round maybe all who wants with 3rd place plus 8 points or something (theoretically a chance for a medal). Or only 18 riders, but all are allowed for both rounds. Prize money for the Final like all the other days.

**Jumping Committee:** As this is a new proposal, it will be considered for the 2019 rules.

### Article 328 PRIZES

1. Prizes must be awarded for individual placing in each Competition. The allocation of prizes must follow the provisions of the GRs.
2. Prize money must be awarded for the overall individual placing in the Championship, and must be distributed in accordance with the prize money distribution table published in the Schedule, to the 12 best placed Athletes in the overall classification of the Championship providing they have taken part in Round B of the Individual Final. If fewer than 12 Athletes take part in Round B the prize money foreseen for the 12 placings will be redistributed among those who do take part. Athletes who do not take part in Round B of the Individual Final are not entitled to receive prize money.
3. FEI gold, silver and bronze medals will be awarded to each member of the three best placed teams in the Team Final and to the individuals placed first, second and third in the Individual Final.

**NF GER:** In Gothenburg the final was fully focused on the Championship ranking - so only the 12 best riders according to the current standing in the Championship (after competitions 1, 2 and round A of competition 3) could return to round B. The prize-money of 420,000 EUR was split among the riders after the class according to the final standing in the Championship. So the complaint was: why should we start in the final if we have no chance to jump into the best 12? In Aachen 2015 the situation was the other way around. 25 riders were qualified for the final, all of them returned for round B and got prize-money for the class (ranking after round A and B 400,000 EUR) and the three medal winners got 20,000 EUR for the Championship ranking. So the complaint after Aachen was: the Championship classification is not honoured well enough. We propose to modify the way the amount of 420,000 EUR is distributed and that

- all 25 riders qualified for the final can return to round B and receive a prize-money of 200,000 EUR according to the final ranking of the competition,
- the best 12 riders in the overall ranking of the Championship receive a prize-money of 220,000 EUR.

Assuming that the best 12 in the final ranking of the Championship normally perform well in the last competition, they can get money twice. But also riders who for example have a double clear in the final but according to their Championship points are not among the best 12 could receive money as well. So this should be a reason to start in the final. Furthermore, the 16 best placed in the final competition have the chance to obtain Group AA ranking points.

**NF ITA:** All 25 finalist athletes should have access to the class prize money (rounds A+B), as otherwise the last 5/10 athletes would not start in the Final. We propose to modify the PM distribution for the Final Individual competition as follows:

- 1/3 of the PM should be allocated as class PM (i.e. round A+B results)
- 2/3 of the PM should be allocated to the overall rankings of the championships

**Jumping Committee:** The details on distribution of prizes for the third competition and for the overall individual classification have been amended; prize money for the overall classification will be distributed to all 25 starters in the third competition, with the largest portion distributed to the top 12 in the second round, as well as prizes in kind for the classification in the third competition based on the results of rounds A and B.

## ANNEX I RULES FOR THE PAN-AMERICAN GAMES

**NF CAN:** We support the proposed changes.

**NF USA:** The U.S. fully supports bringing the Pan American Games in line with the European Championships.