



22 March 2011, Paris (FRA)

Suggestions on the proposed FEI Statutory Changes

Remark: The suggestions refer to the Statutes in general and not exclusively to the proposed alterations.
All decisions were taken unanimously.

Introduction: We propose to reword the 2nd sentence. It is politically not correct to put NFs, Athletes, OCs and IOC side by side.

The Status of the Regional / Continental Groups

The status of the Groups as representatives of the assigned NFs is the main item of the proposed statutory changes. It has direct effects on the composition of steering bodies like Board/Bureau and the functioning of the Technical Committees. Thus this question has an effect on a number of articles.

The development in recent years has made clear that the sport has developed differently in the various parts of the world, with the additional problem of a very strong concentration on Europe and also on North America.

This unequal development has entailed that the regional representation of the sport, i. e. by the National Federations through their Groups – regardless whether continental or regional - becomes more important than before. If in all parts of the world the same requirements apply (MCP, Stewarding,...) as in the core areas, a development cannot take place. An inflexible alignment impedes the development both in the developing and in the core areas. That way the regional representations have continuously gained importance and at the same got more responsibility for the sport in their area.

This fact is reflected neither in the Statutes nor in the Internal Regulations. The status of the regional representation is not defined. As a result they are pure discussion clubs, without direct influence on the development of the sport.

The EEF member organisations intensely discussed this and unanimously stated that under these circumstances they have great problems to agree to a change of the Statutes the way it is proposed. They discussed at length about the necessity to steer the sport in Europe. An aspect of the discussion was also whether the considered solution could also apply to other groupings. But we decided to concentrate on Europe. However, we would welcome to give an example for other Groups as well, likewise we considered and will continue to consider the experiences from other sports. We aim at a close cooperation with

the other regions. In order to allow continental organisations like AEF, EEF, PAEC to take initiatives, articles 1.1, 1.7, 2.2 and 2.4 may need to be revised.

Transitory regulations, as explained in the presentation of Andrew Finding, certainly do make sense.

Article 2. 8 Some NFs have problems with the general exception for athletes who do not need the support of their respective NFs. It is accepted for the Board but taken into question for the Technical Committees. This is in no way meant to criticise the Athletes, but for reasons of equal treatment of all concerned groups it is questioned.

Article 31 Technical Committees

The position of the Technical Committees is strongly related to the duties of the Board. The Board has the same duties as the current Bureau, which means also the decision on sport rules (Article 20, vii). It is questioned whether this is possible without direct consultation of the Technical Chair.

Article 17.4 should be modified as follows:

"Amendments to sport rules should be proposed by the management with the approval of the relevant Technical Committee."

Also the functions of the Technical Committees laid down in Article 31.1, "shall advise FEI Management..." seem to be too weak. The only function to be an advisor to the management is not suitable to attract the right personalities.