



IEOC AGM at Burghley Friday 6th September 2013

In attendance: Andy Griffiths (GBR Chairman), Sue Stewart (GBR Secretary General), Jean Mitchell (Retired IEOC Secretary General), Gillian Kyle (IRL), Mark Houghton (GBR), John Lawrence (GBR), Roger Day (GBR), Les Smith (GBR), Jane Holderness-Roddam (GBR), Angela Tucker (GBR), Jane Starkey (GBR), Eric Smiley (IRL), Harry Payne (GBR), Mike Bell (GBR), Dave Thompson (GBR), Pierre Michelet (FRA), Nicky Kelly (IRL), Stuart Buntine (GBR), Anna Buntine (GBR), Lorna Alexander (GBR), Fiona Muirhead (GBR), Philip Surl (GBR), Kerrie Robbins (AUS), Frans van Meggelen (NL), Sally O'Connor (USA), Lindy Young (AUS), Martin Plewa (GER), Polly Ann Huntington (AUS), Ronald Alexander (GBR), Nikki Herbert (GBR), Carolyn Sim (GBR), Jonathan Clissold (GBR), Ingrid C Macaulay (VEN), Mike Etherington Smith (GBR)

Guests present: John McEwen BVMS, MRCVS (First Vice President of FEI and President of FEI Veterinary Commission), Lisa Lazarus (FEI Chief of Business Development & Strategy), Giuseppe Della Chiesa (FEI Eventing Committee), Catrin Norinder (FEI Eventing Committee), Alec Lochore (FEI Eventing Committee), Francis Whittington (ERA)

Apologies: Anne Tylee (NZL), Peter Ponsonby (IRL), Faith Ponsonby (IRL), Mandy Hervieu (GBR), Jutta Koivula (FIN), Kate Green (GBR), Joe Carr (USA), Pattie Biden (GBR), Donald Kear (GBR), Ciska van Meggelen (NED), Jane Tolley (GBR), Annabel Scrimgeour (GBR), Giulio Poggi (ITA), Christina Klingspor (SWE), Wolfgang Mueller (GER), Gina MacPherson (BEL), Tony MacPherson (BEL), Helen Christie (NZL), Gill Makey-Harfield (GBR), Gardie Grissell (GBR), Kate Horgan (IRL), Ninnie Odenrick (IRL), Marion Greene (IRL), Andrew Bennie (NZL), Tim Downes (GBR), Mike Bullen (GBR), Jennie Lorrison-Clarke (GBR), Eamon Holden (IRL), Simon Bere (GBR), Jose Mexia de Almeida (POR), Roger Kane (AUS), Jo Young (CAN), Sue Baxter (GBR), Chris Wallis (AUS), Michael Creber (AUS), Gill Rolton (AUS), Susan O'Brien (NZL), George Bazar (HUN), Christian Landolt (SUI), Mercedes Campdera (MEX), Hugh Thomas (GBR), Katherine Lucheschi (ITA)

1. Chairman's Welcome

- a. The Chairman opened the meeting, thanking:
 - The Burghley President, Miranda Rock and the Burghley Horse Trials Committee for the use of the President's Marquee for the meeting.
- b. The Chairman welcomed John McEwen First Vice President of FEI and President of FEI Veterinary Commission, Lisa Lazarus, FEI Chief of Business Development & Strategy, Giuseppe Della Chiesa, Catrin Norinder and Alec Lochore of the FEI Eventing Committee, and Francis Whittington of ERA.

2. Apologies

- a. The Secretary General advised apologies had been received in advance of the meeting from a number of people.
- b. The Secretary General requested notification of any further apologies.

3. Minutes of the 13th AGM of the IEOC held at Burghley on 31st August 2012

- a. The minutes of the 13th AGM which had already been circulated by email were approved. Proposed by Alec Lochore. Seconded by Jane Holderness Roddam.

4. Report of the IEOC activities from the Chairman – Andy Griffiths

- a. The Chairman confirmed the IEOC currently has around 500 members. Prior to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) being finalised with the FEI, these individuals will all be sent an email confirming their membership of the IEOC and giving them the option to opt out.
- b. Since the last AGM, regional meetings have been held at Badminton and Bromont, and also in New Zealand. These meetings have been very useful, and Giuseppe Della Chiesa and Catrin Norinder's attendance at meetings has been very helpful and much appreciated.

5. Report on the new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the FEI

- a. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the FEI is nearing completion. This MOU will formalise the IEOC's relationship with the FEI.
- b. The Chairman advised a summary of the main points of the MOU will be circulated to members in the next few weeks.

6. Revised Statutes of the IEOC

- a. The revised Statutes were circulated to all members in August. Some minor amendments were received and have all been incorporated.
- b. The Statutes were approved. Proposed by Eric Smilie. Seconded by Les Smith.
- c. The Chairman confirmed the main change to the Statutes is regarding the composition of the Board, which will now comprise of six members rather than eight. The Board will have the option to co-opt other individuals if they feel the elected members don't provide adequate global representation.
- d. A copy of the revised Statutes will be sent to the FEI for approval.

7. Report on Process for Election of Board Members and Nominations

- a. The Secretary General confirmed the following ten nominations have been received:

Nominee	Proposer	Secunder
Andrew Bennie	Gillian Kyle	Nikki Herbert
Andy Bowles	Andy Griffiths	Neil Mosley
Gretchen Butts	Andy Griffiths	Marilyn Payne
Helen Christie	Susan O'Brien	Stuart Bishell
Andy Griffiths	Jane Starkey	Sandor Fulop
David Lee	Sue Baxter	Jane Tolley
Jose Ortelli	Alain James	Pierre Michelet
Gill Rolton	Des Hughes	Jim Dunn
Sue Stewart	Christoph Hess	Nicky Salmon
Dave Thompson	Mike Bell	Les Smith

- b. Jean Mitchell, Sally O'Connor and Christina Klingspor are not standing for re-election. The Secretary General thanked them for all their work and input over the years. Jean Mitchell reiterated her thanks for the presentation made to her earlier this year.
- c. No additional nominations were forthcoming from the floor.
- d. Voting will take place online with the appropriate web address being sent out to members in the next 10-14 days.

8. Report from the Secretary General – Sue Stewart

- a. The Secretary General thanked Jean Mitchell for her ongoing and invaluable support in the role.
- b. Membership of the IEOC is free. Event schedules are regularly trawled and officials automatically registered with the IEOC and added to the mailing list. However, the club is always happy to hear from officials that have been missed via this process. The Secretary General therefore asked all members to send details of anyone who isn't currently on the membership/ mailing list.
- c. The Secretary General reminded the meeting that the club doesn't charge any membership fees, and is totally reliant on sponsorship for maintaining the website. Existing sponsors, Tattersalls and MIMSafe were thanked and suggestions of potential additional sponsors welcomed.
- d. The Secretary General confirmed the IEOC aims to facilitate communication between officials and the FEI; helping officials understand information coming from the FEI, and thanked Giuseppe, Catrin and the Event Committee as a whole for the support they provide.
- e. On behalf of the Treasurer, it was reported that the IEOC bank account is €521 in credit. During the last year sponsorship payments have been received from Tattersalls of €1000, and MIMSafe of €1,190.19. The difference in these amounts is due to fluctuating exchange rates.

9. Report from the Chairman of the FEI Eventing Committee – Giuseppe Della Chiesa

- a. Giuseppe thanked officials for all they do for the sport. He advised the Eventing Committee try to understand what is going on with the sport and to make the rules clear. The IEOC meetings are a useful forum for the Committee to receive feedback, however it's not possible to go into detail during the meetings.
- b. At the moment the sport is going through a consultation process, with this being the first year of implementation of the rule changes.
- c. Some clarifications are being undertaken following feedback received, this includes trying to resolve the problem of confusion over bits, and inconsistencies over decisions being made regarding bits at different events.

10. Report from the Chairman of the FEI Veterinary Committee – John McEwen BVMS, MRCVS, First Vice President of FEI and President of FEI Veterinary Commission

- a. John reported that the vet regs underwent a major review during 2012. The intention was to make them more precise, and regulatory rather than advisory, with the hope this would make them simple and straightforward. Part of the approach to this review was to try and harmonise the vet regs with the disciplinary regs. Some things fell through the gaps, so going into 2014 the Committee hope to tidy these up so everything is in the vet rather than disciplinary regs.
- b. Re holding box vets: the Committee recognise the cost to organisers and difficulty getting an extra vet in, and don't see why any treating vet can't undertake this role. The Committee would appreciate feedback in this regard. They understand there can be a conflict of interest, but it should be possible for this to be dealt with as it is in other areas.

- c. John confirmed treating vets should be able to register in the country where they're practising, not just their country of origin.
 - d. Insurance has been a bit of a problem with veterinary work with the FEI. John confirmed the official FEI vet and testing vet are covered by the FEI insurance. Treating vets are not covered.
 - e. Horse inspections: the Committee feel riders must have the appropriate equipment to present their horses. Whips may be carried, but not used, up to 120cm. The GJ have the power to stop this being abused, but the feeling is that it can make the trot up safer.
 - f. The GJ have a big responsibility for safety at trot ups; eg if a rider turns up in 6" heels, the GJ should have the power to intervene.
 - g. The Committee are trying to improve detection times, this includes working with pharmaceutical companies who may have information that can help in this regard.
- John McEwen's notes on FEI Veterinary Regulations, Review Process for Changes for 2014 are attached.

11. Lisa Lazarus, FEI Chief of Business Development & Strategy

- a. Lisa thanked the IEOC for inviting her to attend the meeting.
- b. For the past four years Lisa was Head of the FEI Legal Department. In that capacity she has been working with the IEOC on the new Memorandum of Understanding which will help formalise the relationship between the FEI and IEOC, and assist with communications.
- c. Lisa starts her new job as FEI Chief of Business Development & Strategy on Monday 9 September. In this role she will try to grow the financial and commercial possibilities of all disciplines.

12. Report from the Event Riders Association [ERA] – Francis Whittington

- a. On behalf of all riders Francis thanked officials and organisers for all the work they do to make competitions happen.
- b. ERA understand that when rules change there are questions from organisers, officials and riders, and they hope that everyone continues to find a way to discuss these in an amicable way on the ground.

13. Any Other Business

- a. The Secretary General advised a number of items had been received for discussion under Any Other Business. These were mostly related to revisions to the rules, were circulated via email and addressed with Catrin in advance of the meeting.
- b. Point raised by John Lawrence (GBR) regarding FEI proposal to replace diagram of bits with written definitions.
 - Catrin confirmed the proposal is to try and simplify the whole bit question, just having diagrams of mouth pieces and cheek pieces that can be used together, focusing on the principle of how the bit is working.
 - Giuseppe advised the Eventing Committee want to provide clarity. They don't want discussions to be taking place with competitors, just before their test, about whether a bit can be used or not. The interpretation of the current rules around the world is always a little different, in some instances they are taken literally; ie if the bit isn't on the list it can't be used; whereas others look at whether the effect is the same.
 - Giuseppe indicated there are two options:

- Follow the dressage rules, which only allow a very limited number of bits. It can be argued that a horse's acceptance of a particular bit is part of the test. However, there are many more bits used in eventing, with new bits coming out each week with slight variations, so if we follow dressage rules, a lot of bits currently used in eventing would be disallowed.
 - Alternatively, provide very simple descriptions, along with some examples of bits, focusing on the effect of the mouth and cheek pieces.
 - John Lawrence (GBR) supported Gillian Kyle's (IRL) comment made prior to the meeting, that diagrams are invaluable when dealing with riders whose first language isn't English. He commented that Stewards would like to have a clear rule that won't put them in the difficult position of having their decision overruled by the TD.
 - The Secretary General read out a comment received via email from Gill Rolton (AUS) which stated Gill believes under the new proposal, if the GJ feel an unusual bit does not fit the diagrams, but fulfils the wording, and does not have an action other than the words describe, then it should be sent to the FEI for clarification and possibly addition to the Stewards list of bits. The question then is "should the bit be allowed for that competition"? This would possibly be the case under the proposed wording of the rule, ie the GJ base their decision on their experience and expertise, with clarification received after the event. Or, would the bit not be allowed at that competition and a photo sent to the FEI for clarification, and then possibly added to the allowed illustrations.
 - Alec Lochore (GBR) indicated he felt this would be impractical as the FEI would receive so many requests for clarification. This view was supported by Giuseppe.
 - Martin Plewa (GER) commented that we allow too many different types of bits in eventing. He would recommend simply allowing two or three bits, and providing diagrams and good explanations in the rules. Riders can obviously use whatever bit they choose at home, but at competitions it would be much easier and fairer if we allowed just a few bits
 - Stuart Buntine (AUS) commented the only way to get rid of inconsistency in the bits allowed is to provide an exact guide.
 - Francis Whittington (ERA) suggested there are certain families of bits that should be acceptable even with slight variations/adjustments to them. It is very difficult to make a black and white rule, because as soon as it is developed there will be someone who will find a bit that can work around it. Francis is concerned from the riders' point of view that a rule could be defined in such a way that it becomes easy to judge, but doesn't allow the rider to get the best out of their horse. He feels rules are guidelines to be interpreted in a sensible way.
 - Eric Smiley (IRL) suggested it should be possible to define the actions that are acceptable. There are only two families that are acceptable, the snaffle and double bridle, but within these there are actions that are not acceptable.
 - Giuseppe commented that the discussions at the meeting show just how complicated this issue is. If diagrams of every permissible bit are to be provided, then the number of bits will have to be limited. Alternatively, certain families of bits can be allowed, with slight variations acceptable.
 - In conclusion Catrin stated the diagrams will stay in one form or another, the rule changes are still up for consultation, and input from the IEOC is welcomed.
- c. Point raised by Hugh Thomas (GBR) regarding FEI proposal to change General Regulations to make it compulsory for all international events to permit whoever is current leader in the (sponsored) rider rankings to wear a distinctive armband.

- Lisa Lazarus advised this is currently only a proposal. Once everyone's feedback is received the rule will be finalised. The FEI feel this proposal provides the sponsor of the rider rankings with very limited exposure, ie just one rider wearing an armband indicating they are currently the No1 in the rankings. The FEI has no intention of taking any other commercial rights away from events. Lisa confirmed there has been a lot of feedback, which will be debated and voted on.
- d. Point raised by Zbigniew Seibt (POL) regarding decision taken by FEI to automatically make all FEI Judges and Technical Delegates automatically Level 1 Stewards
- Comments received prior to the meeting indicate there is concern from some quarters that TDs and Judges haven't been through the appropriate training to fulfil this role, and don't necessarily have the necessary people skills to deal with competitors face to face. Others feel it would be beneficial to have more Stewards available.
 - Giuseppe commented that he feels all Officials have the necessary training to enable them to undertake the role of a Level 1 Eventing Steward. He indicated this is not looking at the 4* level of the sport, which represents less than 2% of events. There is a need to take care of the other 98% of events, where other Officials can very well take on the role of Level 1 Steward.
 - Giuseppe understands some Stewards may feel protective of their role, but the intention is not to try to take the job of these individuals at major competitions.
 - Catrin advised when a questionnaire was sent out to Stewards it became apparent a lot of them that have never seen a horse. Regarding education, she confirmed all current courses for Judges and TDs include a Stewarding module, and courses for Stewards are trying to link them up with TDs. Eventing isn't like other disciplines, it is the only one that has a TD that is in charge of the whole event. She believes the more Stewards can be integrated with the whole event the better.
 - Jane Holderness-Roddam indicated she would be very worried if some Judges were given too much power and started to question technical elements, particularly at 1* and 2* level, particularly as there is a tendency for newer officials to gain promotion very quickly and sometimes without sufficient experience and knowledge.
 - John Lawrence commented that a Level 1 Steward is allowed to be the Chief Steward at 1* and 2* events, which are the majority of events we now have. John fully understands why countries like Poland, Hungary, Argentina etc welcome this idea, but in other countries, fully trained Stewards could be pushed aside.
 - Alec Lochore indicated he doesn't think this change will make a difference in bigger nations who will continue using Stewards rather than employing GJ members to be Stewards. The rule is really designed to support nations who don't have many Stewards. Alec feels it's more important to address this issue than worry about GJ members being used in larger countries
- e. Point raised by Wolf Gunter Müller re short formats
- Catrin confirmed this is still under review. There has been a lot of feedback received from NFs in this regard which will be reviewed by the committee
- f. Point raised by Jose Luis Ortelli re helmets
- The FEI Eventing Committee has been asked to review the rules that determine whether or not a helmet is required being dependent on not only the age of the horse, but also the age of the rider.
- g. Point raised by Emily Sandler regarding vet regs

- John McEwen confirmed that a response to Emily's original communication received on 7 May, was sent on 10 May. John will follow up directly with Emily.
 - Giuseppe advised this item was discussed and some clarifications made following Badminton.
- h. The Secretary General requested clarification on the use of "Focus" cheek pieces, which fix to the bridle with Velcro straps and are 3cm wide.
- The following clarification was received from Catrin Norinder after the meeting:
The "focus" is not allowed in Dressage or Cross Country as Eventing does not allow sheepskin or other material as addition on cheek pieces of the bridle (clear in art 539.3.1)

According to Eventing rules 539.3, this leather (or 3cm sheepskin) addition is not allowed in Jumping test of Eventing (nor XC). The Eventing Rules prevail as specified differently from the Jumping Rules Art 257: Blinkers are forbidden. 1.2 Leather, sheepskin or similar material may be used on each cheek piece of the bridle providing the material does not exceed three centimetres in diameter measured from the Horse's cheek.
 - During discussion on this item at the AGM, John Lawrence (GBR), Roger Day (GBR) and Francis Whittington (ERA) questioned why we follow Show Jumping rules when in certain areas we don't agree with them; eg blinkers and pinch boots.
 - Giuseppe responded that whilst all disciplines are different, they are all part of the same FEI family, and each discipline shouldn't be trying to do their own thing. The policy is to try and be consistent across all disciplines.
 - Catrin confirmed Eventing use the Dressage and Show Jumping rules to try and bring their knowledge into our sport. These disciplines have provided a lot of assistance which has helped raise the level in our sport.
 - Giuseppe further commented that at events there is a whole team of officials – the GJ, Steward, TD etc who work together, and it should be a team decision whether to allow things like the cheek pieces under discussion.
- i. Clarification was requested in respect of fly shields/hoods
- Catrin Norinder confirmed the Dressage Committee are updating the rules to say no sound proofing material can be included, and they must not be used to keep ears straight.
 - The following clarification was received from Catrin Norinder after the meeting:
"Fly hoods – article 539.2.3 will be updated according to the Dressage Rules proposal for 2014: stating that fly hoods must be of thin material and no special material is covered by fly hoods to protect from sound."
- j. A question regarding the rules on the use of rowel spurs received from Zbigniew Seibt (POL) was passed to the FEI for clarification.
- The following clarification was received from Catrin Norinder after the meeting:
"The horizontal rowel spur is not allowed in Dressage. The reason I understand that it has a stronger action on the horse. Spursuader knob spurs is not allowed in Eventing or Dressage. It states on the top of their website the organisations that have allowed them and FEI is not included"
- k. The Secretary General advised that Christian Landolt has expressed concern about the composition of the FEI Eventing Committee, which currently has 3 TDs, 3 CDs, 3

organisers, 1 rider and 1 judge. He feels there is an imbalance with judges not being properly represented.

- Catrin Norinder pointed out that a lot of these committee members perform several roles; ie they're not just an organiser, but also a TD etc. The committee do take this comment on board and keep it at the forefront of their mind when making appointments.
- The Chairman confirmed that following discussions with FEI it has been agreed that the IEOC will have the opportunity to put someone forward via their NF to go forward to the Nominations Committee for inclusion on the Eventing Committee.

14. The meeting concluded at 6:10pm.

15. The next IEOC AGM will take place after the dressage on Friday 5th September 2014 at Burghley.

Appendix 1

AOB Items for IEOC AGM at Burghley on 6 September 2013.

Point raised by John Lawrence [GBR]

I understand that the FEI are to do away with the diagrams of bits, and purely have written definitions. I, and several others think this is a backward step. With a diagram one is able to visualise the bit, and if it is not in a diagram it is not allowed.

A recent response from the FEI indicated they would welcome feedback on how to develop a more consistent approach.

Comments from Gillian Kyle [IRL]

I would also like to express my concern at the FEI decision to do away with the diagrams of bits and purely have definitions.

Working in different countries and having to deal with many different languages I find these diagrams invaluable. When a rider doesn't speak any or very little English one can use the diagrams to explain that a certain piece of equipment is not allowed.

The present diagrams provide a very clear explanation of the type of bits/ equipment allowed, written definitions are important too but can lose the meaning in translation and are far more open to interpretation and subjective opinion.

There are new bits appearing on the market all the time now and at nearly every event where bit checks are done there is a new variations, not always complying with the pictures. For this reason alone it is important that diagrams can be posted on the FEI web as soon as a disallowed bit appears and can be downloaded.

The pictures provide TD/stewards with a clear definition of the type of bits allowed, which is very useful and can be posted on the riders notice board. This enables the riders to check the diagrams themselves

I appreciate it is very difficult to provide a more consistent approach to types of bits mainly due to the fact of the continual development of new types, but these diagrams are our only way of helping officials to recognise these bits quickly when confronted with them.

Maybe add some explanatory text to the pictures but please do not do away with the pictures.

Comments from George Bazar [HUN]

Photos are very good but explanation, clear definition would be necessary since small change in the bit should be made and the rider will immediately have a different tool and can say that the picture is showing something else, however, the mechanism can still be the same. I think, that we should have definite rules (I know it is hard to define the mechanisms of the different bits, but it must be done) and have some example photos, as well. This would be a good rule and example collection both for riders and officials. So I recommend to keep the pictures as comments next to the newly added bit regulations that are essential.

Point raised by Hugh Thomas [GBR]

The FEI is proposing a change to General Regulations to make it compulsory for all international events to permit whoever is the current leader in the (sponsored) rider rankings to wear a distinctive armband. Such armbands currently exist and are being used, but only as a 'voluntary' matter for Organisers.

The point at issue is a possible clash of sponsorship. For example, whoever is the current HSBC Rankings leader would under the new rule have to be permitted to wear it at the Barclays Blair Castle CCI.

To date, it has always been clear that Organisers have complete control over all commercial rights at their events – unless of course they freely enter into an agreement with the FEI or anyone else. I do not think it is acceptable that the FEI should attempt to curtail, limit or diminish those rights. I make it clear that I am talking about 'normal' CIs, not FEI 'Named Events' such as Championships, Games etc, where the FEI in principle hold the commercial rights and release some or all of them to the OC in the agreement to stage the event.

Point raised by Zbigniew Seibt [POL]

Following the recent decision taken by FEI to make all the FEI Judges and Technical Delegates automatically Level 1 Stewards I would like to express my deepest concern.

I appreciate very much the knowledge of people who took their efforts to become the FEI Judge. It is not the easy road. I also know that in many countries to become Steward one does not have to be a Judge. It means that Stewards and Judges were not going the same way. Those Judges who wanted to be Stewards were not stopped to go that way. To my opinion making by the central decision every FEI Judge and Technical Delegate a Level 1 Steward will produce a big number of titular Stewards without any proof if the person would like to be and moreover should be a Steward.

Discussing the problem with my colleagues Stewards we all have the same opinion that Stewards have rather special tasks and must have some special character. The scope of activities is totally different from scope of Judge activities. Therefore we do not understand this decision. We are afraid that those people who were not active Judges due to different reasons can suddenly become active Stewards.

Another aspect is that until this moment all Level 1 Stewards had to pass the course proving in the CVs their Stewards' experience. What is the point of doing it if a person who never was a Steward can suddenly become one without passing the course and without any experience?

In home Federation the situation is reversed. To become a Steward or Technical Delegate one has to be a Judge of a basic level. I know that this rule does not apply in other National Federations. To be a basic level Judge the person gets the general knowledge about the rules and then it can decide either to go as a Steward or Judge or both if there is enough events.

Comments from Jose Luis Ortelli [ARG]

The use of judges or TDs as stewards is a perfect decision from the FEI, in some regions like Central and South America it's very difficult for organizers to find enough stewards to run the event, and all the Officials of FEI List should be ready to do the function or they should be taken off the FEI List.

Comments from George Bazar [HUN]

TD/GJ stewarding issue generates double feelings even in my case:

I am not totally agreeing with those raising against adding TDs and judges to the Level 1 Steward list. First I was very much surprised when I read that they have been added to steward list automatically. My thoughts were that most of the judges do not know anything about the overall (let's say: complex) duties of stewards (harmonizing issues of TD, GJ, Vets, riders, OC, spectators and everyone else who has a pain...). TDs know more, definitely. And I also thought that these people will push me out, although I've attended many courses and worked a lot to get on the list. So, I would say, first I totally agreed with Chris and Zbigniew.

But later I thought it over. In our case, I mean in my country, Hungary, we have very few FEI eventing stewards: one of my colleagues, a young lady and me. So two persons, in total!!! She is level 1, I am level 2. This is all. I used to invite jumping dressage and driving FEI stewards to help us at CCI and CIC events. They know general rules and it is easy to prepare them for eventing. And they know how to work in teams. But they have not had the chance (or money)

to attend eventing course, yet. FEI used to accept them in the schedules as members of the steward team - instead of level 1 eventing stewards. I am happy with this, otherwise there wouldn't be any event at all... I am not able to do anything else. If i invite someone from abroad then the OC gets crazy because the travel costs are high and no OC has enough money - especially not for two three stewards. So. Which is better? To cancel the event because we do not have enough stewards who are required by the rules? Or to work with non eventing stewards? Or to work with eventing officials who are originally not stewards? I don't know the answer. The best would be to have enough FEI eventing stewards in an acceptable distance of each event but it is not the real situation.

I can accept that in a country like Australia the situation is different. Of course if a country has enough officials then the situation is different than in Hungary, for example.

I think that it is good for the developing countries (or let's not diminish anyone, so, for those having less stewards..) that FEI judges and TDs are on the level1 steward list. As i do understand, this doesn't mean that they can work as judge AND steward at the same event. They are on the list, so an OC can invite them to be steward, a member of the steward team (if they are not in any other function at that event). So, this person in this situation has to act as the member of the steward team. Why not? If he/she doesn't want to be the member of a steward team then refuses the invitation. We must admit that steward duties contain many works that can be done by a well educated judge or TD. So they can be a member of a team where they can do exactly those things that they are able to do. Stewarding is a team work, and the team could contain different people with different abilities

And what is more important: they can only be level1 stewards, so "only" members of a steward team, but not chiefs. This is important. Because most of them might really not know the overall duties of stewards. So they are not able to organize and coordinate the team. But can be a useful member of the team, indeed. A judge could be a useful member in the practice area or during the tack checks. A TD as well, and also in the whole organizational tasks. And since they are not really willing to be further educated as a steward, they are not willing to become level2, they will not be "enemies" of "real stewards" in the promotion system. I say again, this is true only for countries with less eventing stewards than needed.

(And i must admit that this action results only one new level1 steward in Hungary, since we have only one FEI judge and no TD. Yes, we are very much a developing country in eventing. But if we join Hungary and Austria, our neighbour, the situation is still not very much different. The extended steward list won't get crowded.)

I think the problem is that FEI wanted to help countries like mine and made a general decision. It would be better to differentiate but it is not always easy to define how to make difference between countries. Why not giving the possibility for the NFs (national steward generals) to consider their own situation and request addition of their FEI judges/TDs (or some of them) to the level1 steward list? They could decide who is ambitious and willing to be added...

I understand Chris' other point with TD and GJ courses attended by stewards to achieve refreshing accreditaion, and the idea is good. It would be nice to be able to attend TD/GJ courses and have it accepted as refresher course. Of course not for promotion but for refresher, why not?? We have just a few possibilities to attend steward courses, so for refresher course any officials' course could be fine.

Points raised by Wolf Gunter Müller [AUT]

1. Compulsory order of tests in Short Formats (as of 2014)

Having many discussions with OCs there is a clear request to keep the option to run Short Formats also in the DR – XC – SJ order (events taking place over 2-3 days) – with a 2nd H Inspection before SJ.

Rationale: There is a clear difference in distances and intensity on efforts to the Long Format now that it is not necessary to have the order of test as diff. factor.

2. Starting order Cross – Short Format (DR – SJumping – XC)

In case of bad weather conditions GJ in cooperation with the TD should have the possibility to decide to run on reverse order of classification for the best 25 per cent of competitors at the beginning of the test followed by the same draw starting order of the Dressage and Jumping Tests for the remaining competitors.

Rationale: the one with the best prospects should not have the worst conditions (see also other sport disciplines like skiing)

3. Soundness of horses after XC in Short Formats

There are always discussions with colleagues AND the public, if a marked lame horse (or even a dead one) after the XC should be classified (getting price money).

We are making successfully a hell of efforts for our commitment to real horsemanship/welfare of horse and athlete (e.g. guidelines for XCs, risk management, clean sport, safety management, education programs etc etc) and then we raise these discussions – a big risk of losing credibility.

BTW a lame horse e.g. 200 m in front of the finish would be eliminated, if it can be realised.

A Horse Inspection at least for the ones taking part at Price Giving Ceremony (getting price money) would be appropriate - at what time “after the finishing line” should be defined by the specialists (level of Adrenaline going down – influence on algaesthesia)

Point raised by Jose Luis Ortelli [ARG]

We have to be clear in the rules about the use of helmets. I was president of the Jury in some events in 1 and 2 star level where 6 year old horses can compete, I had army officers that needed to wear a helmet for dressage, but other officers from the same nation and army could wear their uniform hat. This looks very strange (especially from public point of view) that it's dangerous not to wear a helmet for one rider, but not dangerous for the next rider because the horse is one year older?? I think we must have an Eventing rule, not follow the Dressage rules, making it compulsory for all riders to use a helmet for Dressage day, or free to use a soft hat, but not depending on the age of the horse.

Point raised by Emily Sandler [USA]

We would like to seek clarity on several points regarding the implementation of the 2013 Veterinary Regulations and the 2013 Eventing Rules that became effective 1 January 2013 in reference to CICs.

1. The first inquiry is in regards to “On-site” stabling requirement for a CIC 1* - CIC3* held over multiple days. Article 1023 section 10, clearly provides an exception to required on-site stabling for “1 day Eventing and Endurance competitions.” Does this apply to CICs held over multiple days at a facility with more than enough adequate stabling? If so how?
2. Regarding the arrival examinations: the use of words “Fit to Compete” (Veterinary Regulations Article 1032 1b / Eventing Rules 524.2.3) have, in the past been used in part to describe the horse's soundness and, of course, general health. In the case of the CICs, where there is no horse inspection, should all horses be trotted at the arrival examination? If so, and a horse is not sound, we would assume the Ground Jury should be notified and should participate in the decision regarding whether the horse should be allowed to compete or not? It seems that it may not be fair to trot horses at one CIC and not another, as has been suggested. How should this be handled? We feel the rules should be interpreted and implemented similarly worldwide to allow for a fair playing field and some clarification of minimum requirements in the rules would make this achievable.
3. In light of the recent “Clarification to rules for Eventing Art. 523.3.2 – by the Eventing Committee, dated 16 April 2013” could we pursue an amendment of the rule to clarify what is to be included in the examination at the conclusion of the cross country course? There is a need for defining the term “examination” to include a physical examination, brief lameness examination, or just a visual examination at the end of cross country. If we are not intended to report obviously unsound horses to the ground jury, it would be very helpful for that to be clearly stated in the rules, so it is clear for the Ground Jury and Competitors. Are we only providing this examination to detect cases of abuse or exhaustion? It would be helpful to have clarity on whether cases for pulmonary hemorrhage, rhabdomyolysis, fractures or severe lameness should also be reported to Ground Jury or if for all intensive purposes the competition results are based only on crossing the finish line in a CIC.

Much discussion has come up following the first few spring events here in the US regarding the implementation of the new rules. In our effort to ensure horse welfare and fair play and that the current rules are be implemented and followed, we look forward to your help on clarifying these points. Standardization of these stabling requirements and examination procedures is important for the welfare of the horse during the competition as well as maintaining a level playing field amongst competitors

Appendix 2

John McEwen's notes on FEI Veterinary Regulations, Review Process for Changes for 2014

During 2012 the Veterinary Regulations (VRs) underwent a major revision. This significant revision in approach and format has overall been well received cross all Stakeholders as it used in 2013.

Part of the approach to the 2012/13 review process involves the further harmonisation of the Veterinary Regulations with the Discipline Rules. This is a two way process and the intention is that this would be completed as much as possible during 2013 for 2014; many of the changes proposed for 2014 are therefore in view of this.

HOLDING BOX VETERINARIAN

To enable sourcing officials for events with a small number of participants, the requirement for the Holding Box Veterinarian to be an Official Veterinarian will be change to allow a Permitted Treating Veterinarian to fulfil this role at Events where there is one Veterinary Delegate present only. However, as a result of the a Conflict of Interest in roles, the proposal is currently that the Holding Box Veterinarian cannot be the Veterinary Services Manager or a Treating Veterinarian at the same Event.

PERMITTED TREATING VETERINARIANS

In line with the General Regulations the NF qualification requirements for Permitted Treating Veterinarian should be changed to *country of residence*, in addition to home country. Furthermore, the acronym used throughout the VRs for Permitted Treating Veterinarians is suggested to be changed from PV to the more the clear term of PTV.

INSURANCE OF OFFICIALS

It has been suggested that the VRs should be modified according to the insurance cover provided by the FEI, to ensure that the VRs correctly reflect that cover is not be provided by the FEI for veterinarians treating horses during Events and that they are therefore advised to ensure they have their own suitable coverage.

STABLES AND STEWARDING

Some minor clarifications are suggested regarding the Stable Area, this includes a re-wording of the stable sizes (with no modification of intent), a clearer harmonisation with current Discipline Regulations regarding the requirements for stable security and other provisions. A clear statement in the VR is proposed to ensure that the Designated Treatment Boxes remain open and that stewarding for them is available at all times during the period when the stables are open; this further supports both the role of the (now FEI registered and VRs aware) Permitted Treating Veterinarians and the integrity of our Clean Sport campaign.

Future required briefings of the veterinarians required at an event will ensure that the Chief Steward or their representative is present so that a common approach is understood.

HORSE INSPECTION

At the request of our Disciplines the Veterinary Committee are reviewing the requirements for the equipment and way in which the Horse is presented during the Horse Inspection, the intent being to provide the possibility of safer environment. The proposal is that the Horse must be presented at all times in a controlled and safe manner, wearing the appropriate equipment to achieve this and in view of the FEI Code of Conduct for the Welfare of the Horse. Horses that cannot be presented in a controlled manner should not be permitted to continue at the Horse Inspection, or competition. The Medical Committee has also been consulted with this area in mind.

PASSPORTS AND MICROCHIPS

Passports in the VRs will be revisited this year in light of the expected greater scrutiny that the FEI passport system will be under from the EU and the Public Private partnership undertaken with the OIE.

In support of the biosecurity and integrity requirements at Events, explanation is required regarding the process of identification of Horses and the process for handling the administrative issues and errors detected. As such, some changes are proposed for the Veterinary Delegate in dealing with this and information from the Ground Jury, Person Responsible and National Federation's perspectives. Renewal times will also be made clearer.

ACUPUNCTURE

Due to enquiries received a statement regarding acupuncture is proposed for the 2014 revision, this would simply state that acupuncture is permitted, providing it is administered correctly.

REQUIREMENTS OF ORGANISING COMMITTEES

During the year comments have been received on how Organising Committees can become more responsive to improving standards. This is linked to several other areas of work underway at the FEI such as event specification, and event classification schemes. The Veterinary Services Manager has a large role to play in this area and the Veterinary Committee will remind all Veterinary Officials of their responsibilities to check facilities, report any shortcomings and to refuse to run Events where standards are not suitable.