**Minutes of the EEF Regional Group meeting
Abu Dhabi, 11 November 2024**

**Welcome:**

Theo Ploegmakers welcomes the delegates and stresses the importance of these meetings to share feedback on the key topics for our community.

It is noted the agenda will adapt due to the availability of the FEI delegates available.

1. **Endurance updates**

Christian Lozano and Christina Abu-Dayyeh gave a presentation of Endurance with the improvements made including the ranking systems, the systems to reward or penalise riders in regard to the respect shown to the horse and championships for young horses.

Andrea White (ITA) presented a proposal for nations cup endurance series, moving into a continental final, at 2\* level for Youth and Senior.

FEI (CAD) feedback positively, and updated that they wanted to create a LLN style Series with a sponsor to support and offer prize money. They suggest a working group is formed to work through the priorities and create a Series together.

QS updated that the EEF Endurance WG have previously shared a team competition format to the FEI and there is a strong desire to create a team competition. Their concept laid on the third riders time to encourage team work.

QS as FRA also supported Christians re-election into the FEI Endurance committee.

FEI also feedback their desire to hold endurance seminars and are currently looking into timelines and key discussion topics.

1. **Eventing Nations Cup (Youth)**

David O’Connor (FEI Eventing chair) gave an update, with a current preference for mixed teams as opposed to separate Series for Youth. There is also interest in an U25 championship potentially on a world scale.

GBR asked regarding LA and the experience expected there. The heat management and experience is discussed.

There is also discussion about the re-inspection of the horses, the points awarded and use of reserves in the Olympic format, and the review of flag penalties which is currently still a very lengthy and could involve technology in the future.

1. **EU Championships 2025**

Theo Ploegmakers addresses the championships in CRO and NED that will not host the previously awarded championships in 2025 and there needs to be more proactive work to try and avoid these instances.

The EEF has a desire to work closely with OCs and venues to be potential bidder and support them through the process in the future.

TP also gives an update on the LES series and the potential gap in the Series for the Final, and the need for a long-term partner for this.

1. **Blood Rule**

Klaus Roser; EEF athlete representative – raised the issue of the blood rule in sport, and the difference in the rules between the disciplines. The riders are clear if the blood comes from the riders action, but the other circumstances are less clear.

GER – Soenke Lauterbach – raises it is a complex issue, as it can be difficult to show if things are directly rider error or enforce or not, particularly with differences across the disciplines.

FRA – Quentin – There is room for discussion on this issue, with reference to the USA team in Paris, to offer greater fairness and clarity

TP suggests to discuss this within the EEF board.

1. **Longines Ranking**

Stephane Ellenbruch gave an update on the successful Paris Olympics, the refined LLN rules. The Longines Ranking has not only been an FEI decision, but involved the IJRC and thorough statistical analysis to create the proposals.

EEF present their view, in which the board does not agree with the reduction of points for CSIO 3\* and 4\*. This directly affects the LES and the attractiveness of the Series, the development of the Sport and the ability for non-LLN nations to progress.

The FEI provided an explanation with an example provided that Aachen 5\* grand prix gave 1045 points, while the Kronenberg CSIO 3\* gave away 3600 points which is a big disparity and lead them to feel perhaps the CSIO is too generous. The rounds with 4 faults have been removed, and the emphasis is on the double clears which provide the same number of points as 4th in the Aachen 5\* grand prix would provide.

Peter Bollon – OC representative – Raises that the OCs would like to be part of this process and have not been invited to feedback, and invitation systems are based on the ranking.

EEF raises the question of why to reduce points, and not increase the HH category. The EEF raises two issues for the LES series; the first being that the Final no longer a qualification tool due to the creation of the LLN, and now the ranking points are reduced, which reduces the value of the Series.

The FEI replied that the data analysis showed the points distribution of the 3\* shows was too high, and a reduction allowed friends. The FEI emphasised the process has been very lengthy, with over 12 months of discussion and multiple simulations to come to this conclusion.

EEF President questions again the decision to only reduce numbers in the lower classes instead of increasing the points for the HH category, with reference to the need to support riders in the lower levels and the OCs who need to balance the invitation systems and attract riders to their shows.

GBR – Fields - identifies the needs across attracting riders, promoting organisers and venues while not over-competing horses, but would like clarity on what the core issue the FEI are trying to solve is

Francois Mathy replied that the points system should primarily be about fairness and transparency to allow riders to progress, and the changes have been made it improve the fairness of the system.

GER – Soenke – draws attention to the lower categories (1 or 2\*) still gaining points with 4 faults, yet not in the higher CSIO 3\*

The reply is that 1\* and 2\* CSIO are not common, and therefore, they were not considered.

GER – raises this is not fair within the logic given, that a young rider in a K could receive points for 4 faults and not a rider competing in 3\*

SUI – Michel Sorg states that for Swiss riders, the change in points will not affect their motivation and the attractiveness of competing in the LES. He can support the points change and still see the strong position of the LES as events for the riders.

NED – Raise if there is still an opportunity to comment and change the LES rules.

FEI confirm the rules have been received but currently the jumping committee have not agreed on all the points and as such it has not been put forward for approval by the FEI Board.

EEF confirm a process will be set up for 2025 to improve the feedback process with EEF Members.

1. **European Championships**

EEF gave an update on the current situation of EU-CH, with the number and breadth of categories. There are clear problems with organisers withdrawing or being unwilling to host and the future of the championships must be reviewed.

FEI Aine Power gave an update from the FEI side with reference to hosting fees and requirements for the various Championships. They have reviewed the FEI delegates and potential costs of these alongside the numbers, and would like to review if NFs would take on the costs of athletes and delegates which currently lie with the OCs.

EEF President also raised discussions that have been had with LES organisers who are also taking on considerable costs for accommodation for athletes and NF delegates., which concerns only CSIO and not CSI, making the cost of a CSIO considerably more.

**2hr15 speaker unknown –** The riders and staff should all have to confirm they wish to have a room, so only required rooms are booked, and riders/staff only pay if the room is then unused

**Peter Bollon – OC representative** -  **cannot be heard on audio**

FEI replied, national federations were very clear they wished to have championships every 2years and not every 4yr so this is not under consideration for now.

**FIN** – the OC needs to on time, as there are situations that the timetable is unknown and that changes the requirements and ability to plan

**ITA – Simone Perillo –** SP thanks FEI for actioning some points following the Sports Forum and making some progress. The reduction of FEI delegates and hosting fees is a good step, but as we are facing withdrawals it is perhaps not enough. Raises a question about the ranking points and consider sharing the profit/loss with the OCs.

**NED** – Would it be – for Senior Olympic championships - an idea to make a fixed amount per team

EEF replied – This was discussed by the EEF board but agreed the EEF could not make the decision on behalf of the national federations, but it was felt to be a potential option

Unknown – 2hr 23 – I would agree with the Netherlands and agree something must be done to help support the OCs

**FRA – Quentin** – I do not believe there cannot be full consensus to fully support all our teams accommodation and expenses, but there could be options, when properly managed (OC managed, with best rates)

**ITA** – If there is a step, the meals would be easier to manage

**IRE** – Asks if there is a timeline

FEI confirms this point is still under review but will need to be confirmed by mid-December. There are talks underway with potential organisers and this is a key point for several of them.

**Peter** **Bollon** – cannot be heard on audio 2h28

**GRE –** It is extremely important that we look into the organisation and costs involved in the Championships. These are often the number 1 priority for the NFs in Europe, so we should be prepared to do all we can to support them. We need to decide in advance the dates and priority of championships in the calendars, and we need to schedule Championships as far ahead as possible to allow complete planning.

It is agreed to continue this discussion internally between the EEF members and come back to the FEI.

1. **MER for participation at FEI events,**

**AUT** - Sissy Max-Theurer **–** raises the topic of MER for the horse/rider combination. It is exists in the General Rules and the Jumping Rules that the “NF are responsible for selecting and entering qualified athletes, this includes the fitness and capability of the athletes to compete in the event category that they are entered…[…]..including the correct age”. The problem is that the NF cannot be responsible for the participation of the horses in international competition.

FEI have made an assumption that the NF is aware if a rider or horse can compete at the level, but agrees this is not logical in all cases and can be included in the full review of the Jumping rules next year, but there is no way for the FEI to take responsibility of this and as such it should be part of the NF role

**AUT** clarifies that this is very difficult to place responsibility with the NF, especially in Jumping where it is more common for riders to jump with new horses without the NF having a known result.

**GER** feel this is an issue for the NF to solve, and in GER they ask riders to have completed a national MER before being entered into an international

Klaus Roser – **IDRC** – There is less problem in dressage where combinations tend to be long term, but in jumping this can be an issue. He supports this can have welfare implications and needs to have a solution

**GER** – we should look how many issues this has caused or if this is a larger issue that needs examining

1. **FEI Rules and Regulations Revision 2025**
* **VR Article 1075:** Request not to vote on the proposed alteration to Article 1075 at the FEI General Assembly 2024 or to modify the content.

FEI reply, they will withdraw this proposal following discussion as it has not provided the clarification it was seeking.

* **VR 1081/1084 Pony measurement:** NF responsibility for the pony being fit to compete

**NED** raised this rule as there are two issues; the rules make the NF responsible for the pony to be fit to compete when the NF has no direct relation with the person bringing the pony for measurement (owner/trainer etc) and if the pony is deemed not fit to compete, what the consequences for the NF

**FEI** clarifies this was an issue following a pony measurement case in which the pony was refused measurement due to looking fatigue and not fit to compete. The NFs take responsibility in the rules for a horses fit to compete status when entering, and therefore it is has been applied for the measuring too.

**NED** raises that those in charge of the pony can opt to take other sessions, and if it must now come back to be managed by the NF this adds to the workload. When they are then entered, it is still difficult for the NF to take responsibility when they do not have contact with the pony.

**FEI** will take this discussion to the legal department, but believes there must be a way to check and manage the condition of the ponies.

**FEI** asks if any other countries have experience or feedback on this topic.

**GER** – we understand the principles behind it but there is a challenge to ask NFs to “ensure” the state, and instead a different wording can be provided that asks the NF to take control if the situation

**GBR** – We would recommend only 1 re-measuring, it is now 2

**FEI** notes this for the full rule revision

**GER** – also raises the rule on horse examination on arrival; that the vet on arrival “should” asses the horse. Officials and OCs have feedback that they do not see a need for this and it creates a disruption to the arrival process and asks if this can also be done during the horse inspection where there is more time

**FEI** explains this occurred that there is currently no stipulation to listen to the horses heart so that is why this has been included, and they are aware there needs to be clarity with the officials. FEI feel the horse inspection can be a more challenging time with the amount of horses and time pressures involved.

**GBR** – out of competition testing – asks if there will be more protocol and guidance on this

**FEI** asks to direct this to legal as they will put this guidance in place.

**GBR** – fatalities – will there be a database on fatalities and injuries?

**FEI** are producing a database on the fatalities on FEI horses from 2014 onwards, with all the testing and details. An evaluation will be made for eventing, and used as a template to ask all NFs for their data as well.

**NED** asks for clarification on the data they require

**FEI** confirms it would request all data from national levels, with a post-mortem protocol. The post-mortem will not be compulsory but the FEI would strongly advise they are carried out

**FEI** also raises the international movement of horses and the difficulties of bringing horses from the UK (and third countries) and Europe/France. The FEI are hosting a workshop with the World Organisation of Animal Health to look at this issue

1. **FEI presentation on the FEI Stewards Hub**

Frank Spadinger (FEI) gave an update on the tools available on the FEI for stewards. The last manual was updated in 2012, and now it has been updated to the Stewards Hub.

A discussion followed regarding the stewards' ability to intervene and raise issues of soundness or issues with the horses. It is reminded there are protocols for this, and the point of the stewards’ hub is to educate and reinforce the protocols.

The IJRC will continue the discussion with Frank outside of the meeting.

**SWE** – Compliments the hub and ease it will aid to Stewards

**IJOC** – Ali – This is a very important step for clarification for stewards, but all officials could at some point be a ground jury president. We would like to propose a webinar to spread this document and the new procedures so they are well prepared

**IDRC** – raises AI can be used to help many processes to bring up rules or confirm articles which are often questioned in discussions and ensure clarity on event

**FEI** to look into this, and what is essential is that the AI only takes the most recent rules and does not pull from other of the previous editions.

**EEF** discusses the sustainability of the sport and the importance of officials. There is a large problem with attracting new, younger officials, and the education and development is crucial to change this. The EEF is working on national education training programmes and asks the FEI how they can assist the upcoming officials.

**FEI** has the talent pool and is helping to invite these officials and appoint them into the higher positions with the guidance of the NFs.

**IJOC** – The officials' working group is now operating and looking to find ways to continue supporting the officials. They also highlight again the low numbers of officials coming through the need to recruit into the area.

**DEN** – Its not just a problem in jumping, all disciplines are struggling

**FEI** confirms the officials' working group is across disciplines and functions, with three continents to ensure all voices can be heard. The FEI urges NFs to work on the national level to encourage new officials who can progress into FEI work.

**AUT** – Thanks to the EEF for the national training that was carried out this year, to help national officials improve and engage and urges the other NFs to consider the opportunity

**EEF** confirms this December Eventing will be carried out, with more courses next year also in course designing and endurance.

**EEF** raises why the foreign judge reports cannot be given to the incoming foreign judge ahead of the event the following years.

Frank recognises the question to share with the discipline director for a replied.

**FRA** and **IJRC** both bring up this issue, as there are still problems particularly in the stables and sharing the information from the reports can help bring better awareness to the OCs and the officials.

**IJOC** – raises the point that the foreign judge is representing the FEI, and should be paid by the FEI to complete their task. IJOC also raises a safeguarding issue regarding the reporting system, and a total revision of the forms may be required

**FEI** agrees this is a model we need to discuss and understand if it can be implemented

**AUT** – raises they have previously raised the subject of dressage judge remuneration and this is still not a settled issue

1. **FEI President and Secretary General in attendance:**

The FEI president gives thanks to the UAE hosts for the GA and gave an overview of the success in Paris, but also the status of the horse welfare matter. Following the EEWC’s work and creation of the action plan, and the follow up welfare plan that will be discussed in the main GA. It is emphasised that it is not only an issue for the FEI but also something for the entire community to act on.

An update on the LA Olympic planning was given, in which the same planning as Paris is proposed but is still to be confirmed. The qualification will be discussed at the Sport Forum next year and taken to the GA in 2025, although no major changes are expected to be proposed by the FEI.

The FEI confirmed their continued support for the EEF through the sport development manager and also through a new position to assist the EEF with managing the EU-CH/OCs/LES to offer greater support to organisers.

1. **Horse welfare discussion**

Theo Ploegmakers introduced the discussion, which follows previous smaller conversations regarding the issues, and the desire to move towards actionable points.

**Chair: Jim Eyre**

Jim Eyre (GBR) took the floor to chair the discussion and open the core areas for discussion.

* **Case management process:**

**JE** explained his experience with Dujardin, that it was not instantly clear who should manage the case. The FEI took it up, but this then left the NF without control. There are case-by-case elements, particularly if it felt a horse is in imminent danger, but there is no agreed process.

**FEI** – Mikael Rentsch – responded that it is likely to remain a case by case issue. In DEN it remained in the NF, for the Dujardin, it was agreed for FEI. The rules should be considered, and who can have jurisdiction. It is not necessarily in all NF rules and regulations that allow for management of welfare cases, and the FEI may have the provisions to take action then. By using the FEI, there can be a more impartial position taken.

**SWE** – Shares they have similar experiences as in GBR, and would appreciate a slightly more formalised process to agree the steps. First with a dialogue between the NF and the FEI, to establish the rules, and then provide more clarity on the next steps

**FEI** – would like to do workshops or webinars on the steps and go through the best practice procedure, including the communication process.

**IDRC** – Klaus Roser – Voices that the riders require a clear and concise procedure, so they are fully aware of the steps. The riders would also like to raise a question on the period of limitation, as is standard in most legal systems, not to hide matters but to ensure the system is correct

**FEI**—Responds the statue of limitation needs to be discussed and understood, and some NFs want a stricter rule. However, it should be kept in mind that some people—particularly staff members — are unable to come forward immediately due to the potential consequences, and a delay in coming forward does not remove the potential abuse that has taken place.

**IDRC** – Understand the response but raises it is the same in all workforces or societal life in which there can be reasons that delay someone in coming forward and there should be an agreed period of limitation.

**FEI** – Agrees to look at this, it is currently open, the same for safeguarding cases, and there is an importance to show we are willing and able to act against incidences

**IDTC - Linda** – Suggests a statute could encourage people to act quicker, although it is understood that cases that could not be actioned can be a problem, but in general it creates a message to act fast

**GER** – Understands the idea of a statue to encourage action, but it must be balanced against the outcome of not being able to action cases reported outside of the statues. If there were to be a statue it should be at least 10-15 years

**JE** concludes the workshop would be highly useful and would appreciate dates to follow, with a proper review of the statues of limitation and whistleblower policy

* **Sanctions.**

**FEI**—Explain the general regulations have increased the sanctions for horse abuse—these are for a vote in the GA. They need to be proportionate with other offences, such as the social media policy and bringing the sport into disrepute.

**FEI** would support EU nations bringing their sanctions in line for consistency. Where cases have been challenged, bringing examples from other nations can provide support so if everyone can be in line with the FEI sanctions this could be a strong consistent position,

**FRA** – Explains there is a regulatory context for each country that may cause differences between the NFs, but within this subject, they would support trying to harmonise across the EEF group and would ask the FEI for assistance to discuss this with EEF NF legal representatives

**IRE** – Suggests there are other scenarios where harmonisation would be beneficial, such as abuse of officials

**FEI** – Raises that if a national sanction is applied, it would be beneficial to inform the FEI in case FEI sanctions should also apply and track these matters.

**SWE** – Supports an approach to start this, through the EEF group, and see if can apply and align with other global NFS

* **Horse welfare as part of performance and results evaluation**

**FEI** – Ronan Murphy – Draws attention to EEWC action plan, recommendation number 5, which aligns with this area.

**FEI** – Göran Åkerström– Explain how the focus area applies here, regarding what are the drivers behind performance (sales/finance, medals/results/points) that can lose the ethics. The key focus is on ethical training methods, and at the Dressage stakeholder meeting, there was a productive discussion on this, what we want to see in the horse, and how it can be achieved. This then touches on the judging, but the foundation must be in the ethical training methods

**FEI – Ronan** – In advance of the Dressage stakeholder meeting there was considerable feedback provided on what practical and operational changes could be considered. Over 100 proposals were provided, of which 33% were related to the judging and assessment, with an understanding this has implications for the training, breeding and approach of the sport. Ronan outlined there have already been changes in the judging, informally, that have had effects. Going forward they will look at number of judges, use of technology and find ways to achieve an objective way to ensure there is not tension in the horse, with a clear road map to be produced on how to do this

**IDRC – Klaus Roser** – Raises that in relation to the ethical training methods, there is an urgent topic around riding behind the vertical, and the reaction this provokes from the public. He does not agree with the strong reactions of the public to call it horse abuse, as it is not about being behind the vertical but the way that it is achieved.

**FEI – Goran** – Fully agrees with this point and the need for experts to work on this within the working group, using science to help achieve clarity. States that there is a very critical group engaged in this topic and there needs to be worked

JE asks Ronan for clarification on the process as it has been mentioned changes are required but a full rule revision is not yet planned

**FEI – Ronan –** The process was the first meeting with the MoU stakeholders in Riyad, then a follow-up meeting after the Olympics with the stakeholder group. There has been agreement on the vision; the next steps are to look at the actions that need to be implemented through a working group and in line with the EEWC action plan. There will be a partial rule revision in 2025 and a full rule revision in 2026 (for implementation 2027). It has been discussed if the full revision should be brought forward, but it has been agreed with the committee to have time to do the work and come up with complete and clear proposals for change.

**GBR – Fields** – Asks what kind of input and how can NFs feedback back into this, when we are tackling the same issues on a national level and we want to be aligned

**FEI – Ronan** – Explains the NFs are an essential pillar alongside the other stakeholders, and the at the CDIs there are meetings with riders/trainers/officials, and there is a strong understanding that this is a collective issue to act on together. The steering group for the action plan will be defined by the Committee, but there will be extensive consultation with the NFs through this process.

**ITA** – Raise two considerations; for the sanctions can there not be automatic application from the FEI sanction then on a national level, and second the performance issue should be considered in all disciplines (6 bar jumping, frangible pins in eventing as examples), and there must be a proactive communication to convince the neutral bystanders that what we are doing is ethical

**IDTC - Linda** – Agrees on the proactive approach, and the riders and trainers are proactive in this area and this is not always being seen and understood by the public

**FEI – Ronan** – Agrees it is across disciplines, but dressage is the sport in the most prominently targeted currently. There were 24 allegations of horse abuse during the Olympics, and 20,000 videos and photographs were sent to the FEI to investigate horse abuse. So there is a very real need to be active here

**FEI – Mikael** – On the FEI level this automatic sanction will apply if a national sanction is given, with the potential to open additional proceedings if it is felt the sanction should be different

**FIN** – Expresses the opinion and is happy the plan is now broader and not only focused on small items as in the past. The emphasize there must be a joined approach and not a sense of panic, that changes are made together

**FEI – Mikael** – Agrees with the comment with the reminder that plans must also adapt with time as the society develops overall. The communication is very important and the FEI will be looking at this as a priority. The action plan is very thorough, and involves a lot of core research and this also needs better communication

?? – Adds a comment that it should also be broader and involve the studbooks

**FEI – Goran** – Explains he breeders have been active in this too and there are discussion are happening, to understand the effects of the sport on breeding and vice versa, alongside the importance of the early years education and ethical handling of the horses

* **Supervised warm-up arenas:**

**NED** – Agrees with the importance of having a supervised area; however, in some competitions, it has not been clear who is responsible for delivering messages to the riders. The stewards, veterinarians and other officials were all involved even suggesting to riders they must now rest the horse or walk the horse

**FEI – Goran** – In Paris, there was an additional set of veterinarians there to support the stewards, provided as part of the OCs welfare committee. There was an issue, and the stewards also lacked clarity, but it was addressed and improved. It will be further discussed and the role of the veterinary delegate

**NED** – Also raises the pressure that is placed on the stewards and asks how they are being educated to make these decisions

**FEI – Goran** – There needs to be proper training and support for stewards to be empowered to do their role confidently. We have cases where inappropriate riding has been witnessed with no intervention and this is also problematic

**FRA** – Agrees there the need for education with stewards, but not only in the rule education but also in the “soft skills” in their communication and ways of handling

**GRB – British Dressage** – Explains they are looking at the role of the stewards on a national level and trying to improve and professionalise their role. They received feedback that there is a need for more education and clarity to ensure consistency. They support the new official’s hub the FEI has launched to aid this but the information can still be quite vague. They would like to do additional national-level training but would like it to be in line with FEI

**IJOC** – Supports the previous comments regarding the stewards, and additional rules and functions are being added to the workload of officials. Every year, within the new rules of welfare, it adds to the responsibility of the official, which may cause them to miss other aspects of their role. In addition, the education of officials should not only be a test of knowledge but problem solving, communication and these soft skills are very important to the role

**SWE** – Suggests that technology plays a key role in this area to help stewards to be empowered

**GER** – Brings focus back to the role of NFs, and the need for NFs to take control of education on a national level to ensure when they arrive at international level they already have a lot of the skills and knowledge required

* **Tack rules**

**GER –** Building on the previous discussions, and not subject only to dressage, there needs to be a holistic approach. There is a proposal for the jumping rules revision, but it applies to all, there should be an approach for having clarity on what is or isn’t permitted to help the stewards

**FEI – Mikael** – Agrees there is a problem with the definitions around tack and it is open to interpretation which does not give complete consistency. The Tack App has been a strong move forward, but the provisions need review and the number of updates and revisions should be discussed.

**IRE** – Raises there are issues in the language we use with relation to tack, some terminology (example pizza cutter spur) should be examined and considered if it is fit for purpose

**IJRC** – Expresses the need to be open, the rules should allow for horsemanship and scenarios in which action may need to be taken for the horse and others safety (if a stallion is reacting as an example) and there must be common sense in the application of the rules.

**FEI – Mikael** – Responds that the core aim is to achieve consistency, and avoid situations in which actions are handled similarly to achieve fairness.

**EEF – Theo Ploegmakers** – Summarises that while the overall vision appears similar across all the parties, there are differences in the approach and methods for change. He provided an example that 80% of the complaints received during the Paris Olympics came from people inside the sport, so it not only a generic outside public that have issues, but it is also a fundamental problem from within the sport.

JE concludes the session.

1. **Safeguarding**

**FEI – Mikael –** Provided a short update on the templates and resources for safeguarding protection available from the FEI, including incident reporting. There is a need for all NFs to have clear rules and procedures in place for this to ensure you can act if a case arises. It is not yet a rule obligation for NFs to have rules, but it is strongly suggested NFs have this in place.

1. **Coaches’ registrations at FEI – FEI concept for coaches’ data base registration**

**FEI – Mikael –** Gave details on the rationalisation behind this proposal and the need to have additional control and the ability to sanction inappropriate individuals. They request any NFs with national databases and criteria to share this to help shape the FEIs

**IDTC – Linda** – Explains that this idea has come from them to aid communication and give a greater voice to the trainers and coaches in the sport. It is less about certification or control, but a bringing together of the training community

1. **General regulations; Equine Anti-doping**

**GER** – Raises the topic of the out of competition testing progranne, which brings a substantial change. Germany supports this idea generally, and already conducts some national out of competition testing itself. However, it is raised there is very little information about the procedure, and what riders/owners/NFs must do and it cannot yet be voted on without all this knowledge.

**FEI – Mikael** – More information will be provided in the GA tomorrow. Explains the plan is to implement in 2025 but within a small field, to start. It is proposed to start with endurance, due to the risk factor, and the lower competition load. The FEI is aware of the workload this is going to bring to NFs, riders and the FEI itself. The intention is to put the sanction onto the horse, as it harder to place responsibility on owners or riders and to ascertain the fault.

**IJRC –** Expresses the importance of transparency and the support of the idea, but questions the timeline without the full process, funding and understanding.

**FEI – Mikael** – Reiterates the rules are clear, and the funding is there as they will reduce some in-competition testing to fund this out-of-competition testing. There is a need to confirm some procedures like the selection of testing veterinarians and the exact access guidance but there is the overall responsibility to do this now.

**IJRC** – Also raises the extra workload for veterinarians and riders to log medications

1. **FEI Fees**

**ITA** – Simone Perillo - Raises the proposal from the FEI in regard to the increase of registration fees and organising dues. Suggests a change in the proposed that that the dues should be fixed, and not as a percentage, to give better clarity to the OCs.

There was inaudible discussion to understand the full calculation of the dues, as it was found the % was cumulative.

**GER** – Expresses there is already an incentive to increase prize money due to the decrease of the % as the prize money increases, as the more prize money as the ratio of the fee is lower. This is similar to the national dues, and it should be kept in line

**ITA** – Then raises the issue of the registration fee increase, especially for smaller nations or disciplines where costs are prohibitive

**GER** – States when the presentation was first made in Tallinn the FEI gave a strong explanation of the services that have increased but feels it has not been an open discussion and takes a very large step forward that gives an impression of a lack of respect and integration.

**NED** – Explains the budgets are approved by the members, and with only two month time frame, it is impossible to adjust the tariffs and would create an 100,000 euro loss if it has to be implemented

**IJRC** – Thanks for the federations for their support, and would like to look for a modification and clarification on how the increases will be managed

**GBR** – Agrees with the other federations regarding the process, and there needs to be an agreement on how the fee will be set, for how long and with what level of increase in future to allow fairness

**FRA** – Agrees with the other federations and that the main investments of the FEI have already been made for the services that are in place, and the raise should be postponed

**EEF** – Theo Ploegmakers – Expresses the federations be active in the discussion during the GA, as there is a need to find a solution, and the process in the future should be managed differently

**FRA** – Agrees, and the FEI needs to be transparency between their service development and the financing required

**EEF** – Teodor Sheytanov – Suggest there should be a clear proposal from the group on an alternative suggestion

**IDRC** – Klaus – agrees there should be a united proposal, perhaps with a three year increment of fee

**FRA** – Any increase in Jan 1 will cause a problem for NFs who have agreed their new budgets so any changes need to be applied for 2026

**GER** – Proposes it is delayed until 2026, and in 2026 we align horse/ponies and riders to 25CHF, then allow for an incremental increase to 30CHF for the riders (and also horses) in 2028.

**SWE** – Supports a unified approach in which it is stated EEF NFs would be voting against the proposal and then a suggestion for a new proposal

The NFs take an unofficial vote that shows support for the proposal made by GER. GER will raise the proposal during the GA.

**AUT** – Raises also the option to increase the trainer fee, so all fees are the same at 25

**???** – Considers there should also be a counter proposal as it is highly likely the FEI will not accept this

**FRA** – Raises the main issue is with the procedure, for a rule change there is a lot of time given and time to review, which has not been provided for this fee increase.

**EEF – Theo Ploegmakers –** Also raises they he does not feel the FEI will accept no increase for 2025, and could consider their services offering if they cannot raise more funding.

**SWE** – There should be raised a criticism of the process and the core aim should be to postpone the decision

**IRE** – Expresses that in Tallinn the FEI wished to make a larger increase, and came down, so feels there is a need to put something forward as a counter

**GER** – Feels there needs to be the debate, and is concerned there is a fear amongst the group that we will lose anyway. They express there should have been a very clear and fair process, as the implication on the NFs is very large so it must be raised at the GA.

**IJOC** – Suggests working with the other groups would be beneficial and a pre-meeting is held with the FEI tonight ahead of tomorrow

**EEF** – Theo Ploegmakers – Asks the group if it would be acceptable enough to just delay by one year, to allow time for the accounting budgets to be made

**GER** – Expresses its not a problem for the NF, but it’s a problem for the athletes

**GBR** – Notes its financial negligence that the FEI have not bene implementing changes before now, and the increase is far beyond the rate of inflation

**EEF** – Theo Ploegmakers – clarifies they have an issue on the operational side, so they are looking at options to increase the fees in order to fill the loss

Additional comments were made, including AUT discussing requests made for dressage judges to have remuneration alongside the jumping judges and the irregularity of the FEI operational loss was questioned.

The group make a final vote to go forward with the proposal made by GER back to the FEI and hold a meeting before the main GA. It is agreed a representative group of GER, NED, BEL, GBR, FIN will attend the meeting,

1. **AOB**

**EEF - EYLE –** The secretary general briefly provides information on the EYLE programme, which is now open to new countries. There will be a webinar in December to provide more information to interested NFs.

**EEF – Hong Kong Racing –** The EEF have been approached by HKJC regarding their training of racehorse training programme. There are seeking some partners to help continue the journey of the racehorses into a new ridden life in Europe. Interested NFs can contact the EEF for more information.

Theo Ploegmakers closes the meeting.