

PRESENTATION/REMARKS OUTLINE:

Introduction:

Greetings and Intro of USA & CDN Delegation:

- Vonita Bowers, USEF Director of Endurance
- Tony Benedetti, USEF IHP & Active Riders Committee
- Daphne Richard, Endurance Canada Committee and Active Rider
- Myna Criderman, Endurance Canada Committee, Active Rider & OC
- Grace Ramsey, USEF Technical Committee and Trainer
- Steph Teeter, USEF Active rider Committee and Electronic Media
- A. Priesz, Jr., Esq.

I. History of Agendas Set from Prior Forums.

1. Jerez in 2002
2. Paris in 2003

II. Brief Outline of Points of Contention Today.

1. Speed
2. Distance for Championships
3. Grand Prix Finish
4. Qualifying of Nations
5. Medication Control
6. Fair Play
7. Future of Discipline

I. History of Past Forums:

A. 2002 in Jerez: The Free-For-All

1. Punchestown European Championship Distance
2. Future Championship Distances
3. Accountability of the FEI to its Endurance Members
4. Course Problems & Design in Jerez
5. Consistency of Officials & Judging
6. Conflicts of Interest

B. 2003 in Paris: The Toulouse Group

1. Championship Distances
2. Course Design & TD Responsibilities
3. Judging: Electronic Vetting vs. Objective Vetting
4. Consistency of Officials & Judging
5. Timing of Publishing FEI Event Schedules
6. Hold Times & Stages/Loop Length
7. Comment Period & Interim Amendment of Rule Changes
8. Certificates of Capability

II. Points of Contention TODAY:

1. ***Speed:*** The ISSUE is: WHETHER Endurance has become a long distance flat-track race? Jockeys are certainly athletes, but the focus in that sport is the Horse. IF Endurance is longing to be considered among the Olympic disciplines, IF it wants to be true to its roots as a Calvary discipline as those classics are: then the focus needs to be on the Human athlete. How can that be accomplished? The answer is to look back to the start of this discipline in the FEI, and to its cavalry roots. Technical trail and other efforts to force Riders to RIDE, not jockey.
2. ***Championship Distances:*** Round 3. This was the focus issue of the first Forum 5 years ago in Jerez. Traditionalists still believe a 160km test is necessary at the World Championship level. Some, including some within the FEI, have argued there is no historical tradition to rely upon. We disagree.

Going back nearly 150 years in North America alone, the US Cavalry Manual set out 100 miles as ONE of its competition “tests” of a trooper’s ability as a Horseman and to manage themselves over challenging terrain and climate. The biggest difference now is, of course, the crewing “rally” which dominates these events on the world stage. Additional considerations in both Jerez and Paris (’03) included: rules enforcement in alternate formats, fair play in multi-day alternatives, and horse welfare issues simply being traded in for a short sprint. The US and Canada believe nearly unanimously in 160km as the true test. However, approximately 50% of that number in the US understood the need to consider alternatives in certain circumstances (perhaps like Malaysia), but did not like it and felt it created a different discipline. Please remember that in 2003 at Paris, those attending opined the Championship should not be awarded to places like Malaysia if horse welfare due to climate made 160km impossible or unsafe.

Lastly, this is not simply a matter of tradition. It is also a matter of horse welfare, and needs to be studied before it is changed “ad hoc”. There is a real question about that, and about whether anything less is a sufficient or legitimate true test.

3. ***Grand Prix Finish:*** Generally, we oppose it. We believe instituting REAL course design to create a sufficiently challenging technical course will push the winning time later, closer to the CoC maximum of 12kph/13:20hours. That would accomplish the goal of compacting the field at the finish.

The problem is this. Completing 50 or 60 or 70 or even 80 miles is the easy part of Endurance. (Even “I” could do it back in the day.) That is “why” 100 miles/160km is important. We need to quit looking at trying to find a single solution to the problems we face, and look for how combined but smaller solutions will gradually bring us the appropriate result.

The continuous focus to find one large sweeping change to improve Endurance or fix its very real problems will simply create a different sport. This idea ignores the failure-rate issue which plagues the discipline, by trying to define it away. This does NOT serve Horse Welfare. It only pretends to do so. It essentially codifies racing to a quick finish or a quick pull, not horsemanship.

However, IF considered, some changes and limits would need to be implemented. Scoring would need to change as a start. IF a Team could “qualify” for classification with NASCAR/Formula One-style results, cumulative ride time will not be comparable from Team to Team. We question whether or IF it can be done fairly. Also, there would have to be some limit, such as: a nation would still be required to “complete” 2 riders under this plan to be classified as a Team.

If a cut-off is advanced from 13:20 hours, it should still be at least 2 hours following the winning time or include the Top 20 finishers, whichever is longer.

4. *Qualifying of Nations:*

This also has come up before. Our position remains that it is a good idea.

However, attaching it to the individual results from the World Wide Ranking list is not appropriate. That is an individual list, and those riders are not necessarily the choices an NF would pick to send to a World Championship. Those results are not relevant, and even might be considered as contrary indicators of the type of success we seek, since they rely on number of results, not effectiveness of attempts.

We continue to maintain a better choice would be to look at Regional and World Championship results from the past decade (for the 2008 WEC, the period from 1998-2007), and IF a Nation finished a Team 5th or higher in a World Championship or 3rd or higher in a Regional Championship, that Nation would qualify. IF that seems too narrow, then add those Nations from the World Championships within the past decade that finished a minimum of 2 of its riders within the Top Twenty.

5. *Medication Control:*

- Calibration between Labs so we know what we are managing.
- Continue to believe in “zero-tolerance”, but we need to decide what that means and straighten out inconsistencies.
- We also question enforcement despite the high number of FEI Endurance positives (tip of iceberg).
- Need for better education/information, including requiring CdE’s/TeamVets with rated Judges/Vets/Officials at Forums like this. Familiarity will lead to cooperation and trust, as well as assistance in managing legitimate medication uses. It will also flush out those who are not cooperative.
- We believe this is more than just a Rider Responsibility, and suggest being creative in applying sanctions beyond Riders.
- Additionally, limiting crew access and crewing, generally, would help control and allow better policing of potential abuse.
- We believe in Due Process rights of individuals over results, which means the FEI needs to ensure true autonomy of the collection program and integrity and privacy of process. In 2008 and 2010, MCP Teams should be sent independently by the FEI, not the OCs.

6. ***Fair Play:***

- Perception remains that there is a double standard.
- Original reason to set rules in stone remains: Changes generally accommodate influence.
- Officiating needs better international rotation, continent to continent. However, question over how to fund remains.
- At present, this feels like a struggle for the soul of the discipline. Which truly favors horse welfare in the long run?

7. ***Future:***

- Horse Welfare remains our poison pill, and the agenda floated in preparation for this forum does not present solutions to that problem.
- Numbers of Rides & Schedule: There is a disparity between the Middle East/Europe and North America-Australia-New Zealand. Perhaps the way to use the available resources we have is to consider a true League on each continent, or within each Group, to “qualify” for individual and/or team World Championships.
- As well, the impact of geographic differences for scheduling continental or regional championships like the Pan Ams, makes it unlikely that the Pan Ams will return to North America again without regard for the differences between places like North and South America in national geography and boundaries. (The “Zone” plan did work, and alternating the Pan Am from North to South or Central should allow its continuation until it becomes clear the Central and South American nations will show up in sufficient numbers.)

- Olympic Dreams: They are the ultimate stage, but we are not ready, and need to decide and make changes to focus on the Human athlete. Until we figure that out, we are more likely an “X”-Game event, at best. Problems related to drug use and rumor, horse fatalities and completion rates need to be solved before we look further to that goal. We believe it can happen, but not following the current path. Tough decisions must be made, and many will likely be unhappy as a result. But tough decisions, supported by the FEI, will provide the best chance to accomplish what should be our ultimate goal, healthy and old horses. The rest will follow naturally.

IN CONCLUSION:

Noble Act or Splendid Gesture is the most common English interpretation of the term Beau Geste. But we need more than gestures and lip-service to the soul of this discipline, to the fundamental responsibilities of our sport. So, we seize the definition: “Noble Act”.

A Noble Act requires us, as the actors, to sacrifice our own personal goals for the larger responsibilities of this thing of ours. That means considering alternatives, but thinking them through and applying them within the fundamentals and traditions of Endurance.

IF we can do that, then Endurance may have a true place with the classic Olympic disciplines. As one of the original cavalry tests of the human partnership with a horse, it deserves to be. The bigger question is whether “we” are deserving. Continuing down the current path will lead to 2 separate disciplines, one traditional and one convenient.

Four years ago, the points we raised in our presentation (“Go, Tell the Spartans”) remain valid. The problems remain as well, all too familiar. It makes us think of the poem about the path not taken. We ask all of you to think back to that presentation, compare it to the discussions today, and choose that path today.

We stand with the soul of our sport and ask you to stand with us. Doing what is right is hardly ever easy, but it is what we must do. Some may say that we, as a world endurance community, need to redefine our discipline to make it easier or more watchable. To the extent we can do so and remain “true”, we should. However, substantive changes based upon misperception or expediency generally lead to poor results.

On behalf of Group IV, Canada and the USA, we continue to believe: The Horse Comes First.

Thank-You.

A. Priesz, Jr., Esq.

From the Desk of: ARTHUR W. PRIESZ, JR., ESQ. – ENDURANCE IHP BoD-MEMBER TO USEF & CHAIR OF THE USEF ENDURANCE INT'L. HIGH PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE
1824-320TH Street in Ivanhoe, MN 56142-4060 U.S.A.
Voice-507.694.1487/FAX-507.694.1489/Mobile-952.270.6764

In preparation for our discussions on Friday with our Canadian Delegate partners and for our USEF Meeting on Monday, we provide the following background information.

Below please find:

1. Transcript of World Endurance Prep Memo sent to the US Endurance Community almost a year ago.
2. 2003 Toulouse Group Recommendations to FEI.
3. 2006 Article/Questionnaire in for Forum Prep.

1. FIRST, this memo was forwarded to the AERC BoD and the AERC-International Committee this past spring/2006. It was also distributed to the USEF Technical Committee, the USEF Endurance Eligible Athletes Committee and the USEF Endurance IHP Committee. The point is, the USEF did and does reach out to try to include input from its "grass roots".

"Hello Everyone:

Included below please find the resolution arising from the informal meeting of NF delegates attending the 2nd FEI World Endurance Forum in Paris in Feb. 2003. This resolution was presented to the FEI and the FEI Endurance Technical Committee for its consideration as the formal meetings commenced the next day. The Belgians and Swiss drafted it. Many compromises were made to reach a unanimous consensus. Not every issue was addressed within it, though more were discussed in the informal meeting. And, contrary to FEI belief/excuse since, it was intended as a "starting point" on some key issues.

It was contemplated, and even suggested by the FEI, that alternating year forums would be held, or even annually. The next one was expected at the 2004 WEC in Dubai (then scheduled to occur in Feb. 2004). It did not occur then or in 2005 at the actual WEC. The USA may seek to hold the next one in 2007 or 08, if funding can be secured to put a real dedicated Forum together (probably at the first 2010 WEG pre-Ride).

The July 26th Forum in Malaysia is coordinated with the 2008 WEC pre-Ride scheduled for 29 July 2006. It is likely to concentrate on issues important to the AGCC countries and Malaysia as it relates to that event. It also can be anticipated to be a bit of an advertisement and travelogue for the Malaysia WEC.

Regardless, we need to prepare and to attend. Too often we hear and take criticism from surprisingly uninformed persons within International and certainly from outside it implying we do not do enough or try hard enough to protect the integrity of this discipline and our horses. This is one of our opportunities to continue to lead and bring reason to the table. The other night in the AERC Int'l. conference call, I briefly gave notice this issue and opportunity were coming up. Comment was made the committee needed to prepare positions and supportive arguments to address issues which might arise. That is all well and good. But, perhaps the first step should be to look back, especially over the past 6 years to see what positions we have maintained and have argued. This is just a start. Many of you are aware of previous arguments and objections and proposals we have made to the FEI over time. Kindly try to recall them now as we consider what to raise again or anew in the coming year. For others, please ask about the history of our

From the Desk of: ARTHUR W. PRIESZ, JR., ESQ. – ENDURANCE IHP BoD-MEMBER TO USEF &

CHAIR OF THE USEF ENDURANCE INT'L. HIGH PERFORMANCE

COMMITTEE

arguments if you cannot recall them or think you are unaware of them. My numbers can be found below.

The "FEI World Endurance Forum - Agenda Suggestions and Discussion Points/Positions" will be (WAS) a specific agenda item at the AERC Int'l. Committee meeting, as well as for all 3 USEF committees in TX (2006 AERC Convention). As Chair of the USEF Endurance IHP Committee I am requesting input from all of the committees, as well as from the AERC BoD, for consideration by the Endurance IHP Committee. We are: (a) Planning to send 3 "official" Delegates. However, I would also like: (b) To encourage the AERC-International Committee and AERC BoD to consider each sending single representatives "with" us (perhaps a Rider/Ride Mgr. from AERC-Int'l. and a Vet from the AERC BoD). Ideally, I would like: (c) The IHP Committee to send 1 Active Athlete committee member, 1 IHP member and 1 Technical member. (Tony is an Active Athlete, Art is from IHP and Vonita is Director and a former Technical Committee member.)

Topics expected to arise at the Forum include/d:

1. 4 Star &/or Championship distances(160km/100mi vs 125km/80mi);
2. Cert. of Capability;
3. Flat vs. Technical Courses;
4. Creation of a position for Course Designer;
5. Step Program to "graduate" to 4 Star or Championship competition;
6. Sanction Program for repeat failures (graduating backwards);
7. Conflicts of Interest with Ride Officials/Vets;
8. Leased Horses in Championships;
9. Harmony of Test Results and Due Process in medication cases;
10. FEI point and ranking programs; and,
11. Continuing Olympic dreams.

Thanks for your time and attention."

2. SECOND, this is the original text of the Toulouse Group, later referred to as Endurance Intercontinental which issues periodic e-zine newsletters on international endurance, that included the US contingent's input and was presented as a unified voice to the FEI at the Paris Forum. Some of the issues remain unresolved, and others have only been partially addressed. It is informative in educating ourselves and our community on how we can work with the rest of the world endurance community to try to positively affect Endurance internationally.

Open Forum Resolution of the Toulouse Group

We agree that these following recommendations arise from the invitation of the original Toulouse Group to all N.F.'s to send their representatives to this meeting. However, some are not represented here and their opinions should also be considered and respected. But these recommendations are endorsed unanimously by the N.F.'s represented here today.

1. The Senior championships must take place during a CEI** with a distance of 160 kms in only one day.***

From the Desk of: ARTHUR W. PRIESZ, JR., ESQ. – ENDURANCE IHP BoD-MEMBER TO USEF & CHAIR OF THE USEF ENDURANCE INT'L. HIGH PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

2. We request the FEI Endurance Committee appoints/endorses a sub-committee to develop recommendations for standards on endurance

- a. Course design(er)*
- b. Study for Vet Gates/stages*
- c. Study for Hold Times*

(5-6 members, geographically diverse, recommended by Endurance Intercontinental Group)

*3. For championships *****, electronic monitoring of recovery and heart rate and display of the same is permissible at all vet gates and at the final control.*

4. Before the FEI Endurance Committee reports proposed rules changes and/or amendments to the rules to the FEI Bureau, they must seek 6 months of comment from N.F.'s. Rules changes can only be effective on 1 January of the year after the General Assembly approved them.

5. Final Schedules of Championships including the layout of the course, must be forwarded to the N.F.'s 4 months before the championships at the latest.

6. The policy contained in Mr M. Stone 's letter to the N.F.'s of Spain, France Great Britain, Portugal and Swiss of 8 weeks or more notice of an FEI ride before the ride date be enacted as an endurance regulation.

*7. To be nominated for a championship for any other CEI **** ride, the following qualification is required:*

- a. Horse and rider as a combination have to have completed a CEI ride over the same distance as the championship/ CEI **** ride within the current or preceding year of the event.*

Or

- b. The horse has to have completed a CEI ride over the same distance as the Championship /CEI**** ride within the current or preceding year of the event and the rider has to have completed 3 endurance rides (at least one of them a CEI ride) over the same distance as the Championship/CEI **** ride within the current or preceding 3 years before the event. There are no exceptions.*

From the Desk of: ARTHUR W. PRIESZ, JR., ESQ. – ENDURANCE IHP BoD-MEMBER TO USEF & CHAIR OF THE USEF ENDURANCE INT’L. HIGH PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

3. THIRD, here is the "article" published in AERC’s EN Magazine last July/2006:

FEI - OPEN ENDURANCE FORUM
(USEF/USA Preparation)

Scheduled Originally: Malaysia - 26 July 2006
Potential RE-Scheduling: Malaysia – November 2006

Issue Identification & Input re Debate/Position Statements:

At the joint USEF Endurance (IHP & Technical) Committee meetings held at the February AERC Convention in San Antonio, TX, discussion regarding a proposed upcoming Open Endurance Forum in Malaysia took place. The suggestion was made to send a questionnaire to all USEF IHP Committee members to express their opinions so that a compilation of ideas could be circulated in anticipation of further discussions and preparation of DRAFT Position Statement(s) on particular issues of importance. It was also decided that broader input was important in representing the opinions of the USA, so the USEF Technical Committee, the AERC-International Committee, the AERC Vet Committee and the AERC Board of directors were also asked for input.

An initial memorandum identifying anticipated issues the world community might wish to discuss, as well as the informal resolution adopted by the nations present (Toulouse Group) at the last forum, in Paris in 2/2003, was also circulated. BOTH of those documents were enclosed with the following questionnaire, as a resource to refer to for refreshing understanding of previous or anticipated debates.

In Paris, and at the first Forum in Jerez in spring of 2002, the USA played an important role. It is important we continue to do so, in order to protect the integrity and promote the spirit of the sport so many of us care about.

The following questions are aimed at several of the major issues which will be anticipated to be on the agenda at the Forum. The various recipients were encouraged to submit their own views. Those responses are being accumulated and organized for broader IHP Committee consideration. ALL opinions and views and concerns are welcome. Taking the time to carefully consider, organize and write down thoughts is important to all of us. This is not a “vote” per se, but a helpful tool in directing and narrowing our future preparation and determination of position(s)/opinion(s). Thoroughness in answers, and ALWAYS offer justifications to comments, objections and solutions to any issues discussed or identified is important.

From the Desk of: ARTHUR W. PRIESZ, JR., ESQ. – ENDURANCE IHP BoD-MEMBER TO USEF & CHAIR OF THE USEF ENDURANCE INT’L. HIGH PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

In responding, both RATING answers, as well as narrative comments or arguments were encouraged. Future articles will outline the positions which result from this input.

The Committees, et. al. were asked to RATE the issue(s) identified in a particular question, or additional issues which they might identify, TWICE/2x, once from a Horse Welfare (HW) point of view and once more from a Fair Play (FP) point of view, as follows:

- “5” – **ABSOLUTELY IMPORTANT to ADDRESS & DETERMINE NOW**
- “4” – **IMPORTANT to ADDRESS NOW, IF there is TIME, or in the FUTURE**
- “3” – **INTERESTING & should be ADDRESSED NEXT RULES GO-ROUND (in 2008?)**
- “2” – **NOT VERY IMPORTANT**
- “1” – **SHOULD BE DELETED from our AGENDA**
- “0” – **NO OPINION**

These responses, ratings, comments, arguments and additional issues identified are very important. Taking this seriously and taking time to respond fully, imaginatively, and thoughtfully will be important to US preparation.

1. Should the distance of a World Endurance Championship vary, within limits of one-day 100mi./160km. to multi-day 50+mi./80+km. x 2-3 day events, depending on locale and regional tradition, and why/why not?
2. Should the qualifying criteria to earn a Certificate of Capability take into account regional differences, climate and terrain issues, weather-related issues and such? Why/Why not? And, what should the criteria be, keeping in mind it needs to be easily applied and tracked world-wide?
3. How should Conflict of Interest problems be identified and handled (noting that we are a small world community and certain officials and veterinarians at FEI rides often have professional and/or personal relationships with participants, sponsors or otherwise) specifically relating to 4***** events or championships?
4. How should officials, judges, stewards and veterinarians graduate through the Star System, specifically considering the fact that some nations (USA as an example) may not hold 1 or 2 Star events regularly?
5. At present, there is no graduated system of “qualifying” in the USA or in the FEI to compete internationally, or in 100 mile one-day events. Should there be a qualifying system, complimentary to the CoC requirement? Should there be repercussions for a metabolic pull? Why/Why not? And, what should those repercussions be and when should they apply?
6. Endurance is generally viewed as a “no drug” discipline, with some exceptions within the AERC and USEF, as well as within the FEI. The US community has generally argued, and the consistent position of the USEF (and predecessors) has been, to follow the “spirit” of that sentiment. Elsewhere in the world, and even within the USA, there is practice and discussion that the boundary line on medication

From the Desk of: ARTHUR W. PRIESZ, JR., ESQ. – ENDURANCE IHP BoD-MEMBER TO USEF &

CHAIR OF THE USEF ENDURANCE INT'L. HIGH PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

control should be based upon a “what tests” standard. What do you think? Is there a difference between “performance enhancement” and “performance enabling”? How should any distinction be made? What are the repercussions? Do the practices elsewhere in the world have impact on your view?

7. Periodically, there are discussions over whether “Endurance” is an appropriate Olympic discipline. Olympic sports are intended to be contests of human athlete endurance/skill. However, in Endurance internationally, there is a significant reliance upon “crewing” to contribute to successful performances. Should Endurance be aimed toward the Olympics? Why/Why not? Should consideration of Endurance internationally include things like: doing away with weight divisions and making the event solo/cavalry (without any crew-help)? What purpose would those, or other changes, serve? What recommendations or ideas do you think might change the perception of FEI endurance from a flat & fast “race” to a disciplined technical “ride”? How could those changes be accomplished? Should they be?
8. Presently, the FEI views the Technical Delegate at 4**** and Regional or World Championships as responsible for the design of a safe and competitive course. The FEI has declined to require specific Course Designers be involved, and relies upon the OC and TD to manage that issue. In other the other disciplines of Eventing, Show Jumping and Driving, specific Course Designers are required. Should there be a Course Designer or Trail Master required, and qualified, by the FEI for these events? Why/Why not? How would such a person be qualified as such? Would there be impact on the event?
9. Previously, the FEI has considered whether nations should have to qualify for World Championships. The USA has offered suggestions in the past, but no action has been undertaken. Do you believe nation-qualifying is appropriate? Why/Why not? How could it fairly be done?
10. Presently, in Championships, the “host” nation is allowed to compete additional “individuals”. The FEI had asked nations for comment, and according to the FEI, only the USA and Argentina objected to changing the rule to limit host nations to the same numbers as guest nations. Additionally, there has been periodic discussion that the number of horses per nation competing might be reduced at World Championships, from 6 to 4. Presently, when 6 compete, 4 compete as a Team (requiring 3 complete in order to qualify for Team placing) and 2 compete as individuals, eligible only for individual medals. Do you have an opinion on whether any change is necessary or would be objectionable in that current format? Why/Why not? Do you think placing a Team which completes all 4 of its members ahead of a Team completing only 3 would be appropriate (Teams completing 4 still ranked by Top 3 times and Teams completing 3 also continuing to be ranked by time, with no ranking or qualifying as a Team if less than 3 members complete)? Why/Why not?

- Arthur W. Priesz, Jr. (AERC #6098)

Anyway, there you have it.

***From the Desk of: ARTHUR W. PRIESZ, JR., ESQ. – ENDURANCE IHP BoD-
MEMBER TO USEF &
CHAIR OF THE USEF ENDURANCE INT’L. HIGH PERFORMANCE
COMMITTEE***

Regards,

aprieszjr.

GO, TELL THE SPARTANS
Prepared for: The USA Endurance Representatives
February, 2003

All of us are here representing not only our homes, like the U.S.A., but various countries from around the world. More importantly, we stand here on behalf of the horses which rely upon us to make this a better sport. A great opportunity is before us, and an even greater responsibility.

Diversity

The U.S.A. is big, as geographically diverse as Australia, and as culturally diverse as the world at large. A quarter century ago, U.S. schools described that diversity as a melting pot. Now it is more accurately defined as a mixed salad where each ingredient is allowed to retain its uniqueness and is appreciated for its traditions.

Our U.S. endurance community is similarly diverse. Divided into five national zones for continental/hemispheric/Pan-Am Championships, diversity within each zone exists geographically and in the style of riding itself. However, one thing unites us as American endurance riders and that is this: We win by completing an endurance track on a healthy horse. In truth, that is the standard for everyone, or should be.

History and Tradition

In 1996, at the WEC in Kansas, the President of our national federation walked through the Boy Scout camp and trailer park, which served as the village for the championship, and christened us "horsemen without homes". She was right, and we were honored by her observation.

Our endurance tradition of living with our horses began with the U.S. Calvary. Now ride sites in the U.S.A. are villages of 30 to 100 horse trailers, springing up for a weekend with barbecues and potluck/pitch-in family style feasts book-ending timber wolf fierce competition over 50 and 100 miles, or multi -day rides of 250 miles over 5 days.

The original U. S. Cavalry trials of the late 1800's sent horsemen out on 100 mile clover leafs with two to four remote checks (of sorts) and one central check point. The rider and horse were given 24 hours to complete and were required to carry a minimum of 100 kilos, rider and tack. They were required to present for inspection the following day at noon in full gear. They had to present "fit to continue" for another 20 or so miles, or they were failed. More recently, by 1954, the first Western States Trail Ride (Tevis) was following the traditions of the U.S. Cavalry. This was the beginning of endurance as we know it today. Veterinarians were included in this event to monitor the welfare of the horses. The organizers realized that it was not only morally right, but that society demanded that the welfare of the horse be paramount. It is from these early principles that the modern endurance rules were founded. We must never lose sight of that.

Even today, the ability of a rider to safely compete a horse, event after event and year after year, is how both great riders and great horses are judged in the U.S.A. Unfortunately, in international competition, those priorities seem to have been lost.

Success is too often focused on the result of a single effort, an effort which may have been unfair to the horse, no matter the result.

While we know that no one wanted horses to die in Spain, we all stand indicted by their deaths. Unfortunately, these two deaths do not stand alone. They now draw increased attention to failures within our sport for which we are all responsible. These failures arise from acts of omission as well as commission. They also provide us an opportunity to recognize where we have strayed and to step up to do the “right” thing to repair the damage, even if it is not the easiest thing. All of our international endurance “salad” ingredients can and must contribute.

While each of us may believe we know the one true answer, it is unlikely we do, alone. However, let us begin to discuss what needs to be done, together.

I. F.E.I. QUALIFICATIONS & STANDARDS TO COMPETE

The proposed FEI qualifications to compete in a 4-Star championship represent good intentions, but are a knee-jerk reflex to what happened in Spain. The Road to Hades is paved with good intentions, and that is where we are headed (if anyone truly believes these new rules will result in better completion rates or improve the welfare of our horses). They are simply not enough, and by design will still allow the same failures and risks to occur.

A. Experience

While experience predicts success, it must be enough experience, the right kind of experience, and the right combination of experience. The proposed criteria requiring completion of two championship distance events, only one of which as a rider-horse team, is not enough.

In order to nominate in the U.S.A. for an endurance championship, the rider must have completed five one-day 100-mile rides and 1,000 miles total. The horse must have completed two one-day 100-mile rides and 500 miles total. As a combination, they must have completed 1 one-day 100-mile ride together and 200 miles in combination. Remember, this is just to nominate. We established this criteria after deciding what we felt was the minimum experience necessary for a rider, horse, and horse/rider combination to safely compete at a championship level event. Other nations, with a long and current endurance tradition, have similar experience requirements.

We simply believe a rider’s prior opportunities to experience what can go both right and wrong is a better predictor of future success than the most recent FEI proposed qualification criteria. We believe the FEI qualification criteria is based on too few miles and reliant upon the achievement of a speed standard once or twice. This formula allows for qualifications under conditions that potentially include optimal terrain and favorable environment, and will not necessarily predict success at a high profile event. Also, it allows no flexibility for the vast experience horses or riders may have gained in their national events run under the same standards as at FEI competitions.

Additionally, while HH Sheikh Ahmed bin Mohammed Al Maktoum as 2002 World Champion and Meg Wade as the leader of the Bronze Medal 2002 Team and 4th place individual can be applauded for their results in Spain, their results represent the exception not the general standard to be followed. Such results are unintentionally detrimental if they encourage others with less support or experience to do the same. The failure of a horse carrying a rider who does not know them well enough to recognize the signs of deterioration in time is grotesque and even criminal. (And, no one has to look back very far to see an example.)

One recommendation would be the following: Over the next 4 years (effective January 1, 2006) the FEI implement an experience standard for Championships, Series events and 4-Star events which will require horses and riders to demonstrate experience by earning 9 Stars in 2-3-4-Star events over the prior 4 years, of which 6 Stars must be earned in Championship distance events in the 24 months preceding the last date for nominated entries for the event for which eligibility is sought. During that same 24 month period, the horse and rider, as a combination, must earn six stars of which three stars must be at the championship distance. Stars would be earned according to the level of the events completed. Until that time, we need to discuss a graduated plan for qualifications..

This is one proposal. Even within the U.S.A., other views and proposals exist. This is far too important of an issue to only have a single view point considered. We must together discuss these issues. The Australians have created a graduation system that requires their riders to gain experience. The United States requires that many miles be completed in national rides before they can even nominate to compete at a championship event. Many other countries feel that meeting a certain speed standard once or twice is adequate. We need to discuss this and find common ground.

We also maintain that some consideration needs to be given national rides. FEI has not grown to a point in all countries such that a significant level of experience can be gained only at FEI events. It is better to grow FEI through inclusion of outside experience rather than setting policies that will hinder the growth of FEI competitions. We believe that more experience should be required in order for horses and riders to compete in FEI championships. We would like find a way to temper this with recognition of national experience in conjunction with FEI experience.

B. Automatic Sanctions Affecting Qualifications

Some consideration should also be given to mandating an automatic sanction in the event of any metabolic failure at a 4-Star event. (Consideration should be given to imposing penalties such as a 180 day suspension or, alternatively, a requirement of increased experience at 2 and 3-Star events without further failures before competing at another championship or 4-Star opportunity for the rider and the owner.) Sanctions must be flexibly increased as a hearing may warrant.

C. Leased Horses

In regard to leased horses, stricter sanctions and experience requirements would be useful in eliminating riders from high profile events who do not have the skills commensurate with the duty they are assuming. If that means fewer starters, so be it. (The alternative is to define the horse as a disposable good to be used for purposes of

economic or personal greed, and that is not acceptable.) The FEI Endurance Code of Conduct mandates in all 10 of its rules that the well-being of the horse is the prime directive and focus of the discipline. It is time we implemented that code into the leasing of horses.

D. Access to FEI Events

Finally, the FEI should continue to urge its national federation members to make hosting national FEI rides easier, rather than so much more difficult or expensive than national discipline club sanctioned events. For the USA, and possibly Australia and others, this does create hardship in obtaining FEI experience despite the strength and traditions of our national discipline clubs whose rules are mirrored by the FEI. As well, with a tradition that goes back over a century and rules going back 50+ years, it is difficult to explain at home why all of our rides do not count.

Presently, FEI events in the USA are conducted over varying and technical terrain and in varying climatic conditions. Temperatures can change by 60 or more degrees (F) during a single event, and back again. Events are often conducted in humidity and temperatures of over 95 percent and 95+ degrees. Terrain changes can require climbs of over 7,500 feet and back down again. As well, our FEI events nationally are usually run in conjunction with regular AERC events. Only riders taking the next step to international competition register into the FEI event.

As a result of the above, a 12kph pace can be unfair in the USA, as often a winning ride may not meet qualifications. Further, while we are grateful for the 50% of finishers' exception, it excludes consideration of the fact that the lower 50% Of FEI finishers may still be in the top 50% of overall event finishers. (Example: 40 finishers, of which only 8 are in the FEI event, but all of whom finished in the top 50% overall. Should only 4 qualify, assuming no one completed at 12 kph?) We suggest an additional qualification of 140% of the winning FEI time. This is being tested for the 2003 Pan American Championships (Considering the WEG speed requirement was waived due to weather, no such flexibility would have been granted outside the WEG. This only serves to make this proposal more compelling.)

Any proposals for greater experience or altered qualification standards also must be graduated into the rules, possibly over a 4 year period.

II. PACE, STAGES and HOLDS

Many believe short rests and longer stages, with fewer inspections, will result in better-paced and more sanely managed rides. We understand the concept. We even believe it can be true, under certain circumstances. Unfortunately, horses will be hurt, and some may die, as this evolutionary project proceeds to thin out the irresponsible riders and owners.

However, we also understand how frustrating it can be to face or observe uneven officiating and the misapplication of rules and standards, or the appearance of it. It is bad enough to have it happen at home. It is embarrassing, or worse, at the international

championship level. This is **not** an accusation of intentional wrongdoing or favoritism. It is a simple matter of courage, competence and eventual trust.

Vets cannot be hamstrung by rules requiring or attempting to require the objectification of every standard for judging a horse. Ultimately, that leads even the best vet to let horses go on when they should not, because they do not fit within a narrow objective criteria. That means we need more endurance educated and endurance experienced vets. They must be given time and opportunity to become familiar with each other, other officials, team staffs and riders and horses. More time on the grounds for all.

Further, like all of the officials, the technical delegate and the OC must not be rigid or threatened by input from others. (You are all invited to the 2003 PAC to see a demonstration.)

A. Longer Holds

Longer holds give vets the opportunity to thoroughly discuss the welfare of the horse. It also gives the horse a longer time to rest and to replenish itself. Too often, vet checks are simply a mad dash to get through the gate because of limited hold time (ie. time for the vet exam, time to walk to team box and to the exit gate, time for eating and drinking, time to saddle, time to electrolyte, time used for an exit check, etc.). . All of us know the math for a 30 or 40 minute hold. It provides little opportunity for rest for the horse. There should be one or two full hour holds in every 160 km race regardless of the media or the desire for some officials to go home. This is a welfare of the horse issue.

B. Shorter Stages

Criticism is leveled at shorter stages, resulting in more checks, for several reasons.

First, the more often you see the vet the greater your chance of retirement. That is a trust issue. However, it is also wrong. When a horse is being seen more often, the vet knows it has more rest opportunities to recover from early mistakes or bad luck (ie.: not eating early due to excitement or adverse weather impact are just two examples). The vet knows there are more opportunities to observe the horse and rider and give them the benefit of the doubt that the rules require be given. When the checks are fewer and spread farther, the vet has little choice but to become more arbitrary and rigid in the application of his or her evaluation.

Second, riders will simply sprint check to check. As it stands now, they do so anyway on these generally flat and non-technical courses. The way to vary pace and require more "riding" is to: implement a standard for more technical course design with changes in terrain and elevation, footing, and trail conditions, forcing a more varied pace. This would reduce some of the repetitive concussion and use injuries. It also would establish a ride rhythm which would allow the horses to recover at slower paces.

Thirdly, shorter stages and longer holds are seen as giving an advantage to teams or riders with larger crews. In theory, this is true. In practice, the number of hands in the kettle can often be more of a hindrance. However, it also can be managed by limiting access to the gate and immediate recovery areas to the rider, one crew per horse, one vet

per horse and the chef and assistant chef. Shorter stages would also decrease reliance on “road crews” which can be difficult to police or control. Let us make this sport more in the fashion of horse and rider against the trail versus the pit stop derby the sport has become.

As persons responsible (riders, owners, chefs, team vets, and federations) we are obligated to act first to ensure the health and welfare of our equine partner. The goal is the horse’s future ability to perform athletically. We should seek more, not less, vet and ride official involvement. We should require more of ourselves as riders and staffs. We should design a sport that helps us manage those responsibilities.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the beginning, we suggested how it was important to clearly define what we considered “success” in international endurance competition. The FEI rules continue the goals of the original US Cavalry trials: successful completion of a healthy and fit rider and horse.

Additionally, there is a desire and dream for our sport to be considered as an Olympic discipline. Unfortunately, despite our many advantages, today we are not ready. However, certainly we can be, but not for the Olympic dream alone. Instead, we should be dreaming it for the good of our horses and horses everywhere. We should be dreaming it for the lessons endurance can pass on to others, whether they ride or not.

No other international sport offers the democratic opportunity of endurance. The number of countries participating is truly overwhelming. No other sport pits women against men where the women may hold a numerical advantage.

Endurance combines exactly what audiences seek when well-presented, the ability of seemingly normal athletes to combine their determination and technical and thoughtful skill with the grace and athletic beauty of 1,000 pound athletes with competitive hearts as large as the great outdoors. Their reliance upon us to do right by them is unmatched in other disciplines. It is natural and it is timeless. All of our histories abound with stories of the link to horses, which demonstrate our humanity, and their spirit.

We have an opportunity to build that endurance sport, treating our horses as partners and not as disposable commodities. We must never forget that the welfare of horses is first. Now we have that opportunity.

Thank You from ALL of US,

Tony Benedetti: Co-Chair of the USA-Eq Endurance, Chair of the USA-Eq High Performance Committees, FEI Ride Official, and Rider;

Nancy Elliot, DVM: Chair of the Joint USA-Eq/USET Credential Committee and FEI Vet, and Rider;

Valerie Kanavy: Co-Chair of the USA-Eq Endurance Committee and Vice Chair of the USET Active Competitors’ Committee, and 2-time World Endurance Champion;

Mary Lutz: Director of Endurance for the USET;

Sue Phillips: Event Manager, FEI Ride Official, and Rider; and,

Edited by: A. Priesz, Jr., Esq.: VP of Endurance for the USET, Chair of the USET Endurance Committee and 2001-2 USA Endurance Chef d' Equipe.

SYLLABUS

DIVERSITY WITHIN THE USA

- *GEOGRAPHY*
- *CULTURE*
- *MELTING POTS VS. MIXED SALADS*
- *ENDURANCE*

HISTORY & TRADITION WITHIN THE USA

- *HORSEMEN WITHOUT HOMES*
- *THE 1800'S & US CAVALRY (MANDATED VET CKS., FITNESS TO CONTINUE & HORSE WELFARE, AND THE RIDER AS A RIDER)*
- *"MODERN" ENDURANCE FROM THE 1950'S ON (MANDATED VET CKS., FITNESS TO CONTINUE & HORSE HEALTH, AND THE RIDER AS A RIDER)*
- *RECOGNITION OF THE RIDER AND HORSE TEAM COMPETING AGAIN AND AGAIN*

FEI QUALIFICATIONS

1. *KNEE JERK RESPONSES AND THE ROAD TO HADES*
2. *EXPERIENCE, NOT SPEED*
 - a. *USA MINIMUMS TO NOMINATE*
 - i) *RIDER: 1,000 CAREER MILES IN 50 MI. EVENTS OR MORE, 5 ONE-DAY 100'S*
 - ii) *HORSE: 500 CAREER MILES AND 2 ONE-DAY 100'S*
 - iii) *COMBINATION: 200 MILES TOGETHER AND 1 ONE-DAY 100*
 - b. *ALL TYPES OF EXPERIENCE, NOT JUST SPEED*
 - c. *POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATION RE: "STAR" SYSTEM EXPERIENCE*
 - i) *RIDERS: 9 STARS OVER PAST 4 YEARS, 6 STARS AT CHAMPIONSHIP OR SERIES DISTANCE IN PAST 24 MOS.*
 - ii) *HORSES: SAME REQUIREMENTS*
 - iii) *COMBINATION: 6 STARS TOGETHER OVER THE PAST 4 YEARS, OF WHICH 3 STARS MUST BE AT CHAMPIONSHIP DISTANCE*
 - iv) *OVER THE NEXT 4 YEARS A MONIFIED PLAN*
 - v) *NATIONAL RIDE SCHEDULE*
 - vi) *RECOGNIZING NATIONAL BIG-RIDE EXPERIENCE*
 - vii) *FEI ASSISTANCE IN EASING OC BURDENS*
 - viii) *FEI assistance with NFs*
 - d. *Rider/Owner Sanctions for Metabolic Pulls*
 - e. *LEASED HORSES AND EXPERIENCE/SANCTIONS/FEI CODE OF CONDUCT*
 - f. *FEI ACCESS*
 - i) *SPEED & CONDITIONS*
 - ii) *140% RULE*

2. *PACE/STAGES/HOLDS*
 - a. learning curve
 - b. competence and trust of officials
 - c. increased holds for horse welfare
 - d. *SHORTER STAGES FOR HORSE WELFARE & TECHNICAL COURSE DESIGN*
3. *CONCLUDING REMARKS*

FEI Announcements:

15/02/2007

Study on Endurance horses in competition

The FEI is pleased to announce, with the cooperation of the Dubai Equestrian Club, the scientific study on Endurance horses in competition.

A number of horses, who will compete at an FEI event to be held in Dubai on 24 February, will be studied by a group of Scientists, headed by Dr David Marlin (GBR) and assisted by a panel of Vets headed by Dr Bobby Surendra Babu BL (IND).

Information will be obtained both before, during and after the event to enable the FEI to investigate the effects of top level endurance sport on competition horses.

Dr David Marlin comments: "We are very grateful for this wonderful opportunity provided to us by the Dubai Equestrian Club which will allow us to study elite endurance horses under truly competitive desert ride conditions. We have recently studied elite horses competing in the UK and this work will allow us to build up a clearer picture of the elite horse, especially in relation to warmer conditions. A small International team of respected scientists and veterinary surgeons (Dr Pat Harris, UK; Dr Hal Schott, USA; Dr Rod Fisher, UK; Dr Ray Geor, USA) will join me in Dubai next week to carry out the work. We will be examining weight loss, water consumption, heart function and looking at changes in the blood during and following the ride. This information will form part of the overall review of endurance being undertaken by the FEI and help ensure we protect the health and welfare of the horses in this fast developing and highly competitive sport".

The FEI is grateful to the Dubai Equestrian Club for the valued assistance in the project.

06/02/2007

International FEI Medication Control Forum

Important Notice:

Please note that the venue for the Medication Control Forum has been moved to Dubai and will no longer be held in Abu Dhabi as previously published (see related article below for further details).

The FEI is pleased to announce details of an International Forum on Medication Control, hosted by the UAE Equestrian Federation.

The Forum will take place in Dubai (UAE) on Wednesday 14 February 2007. The venue for the Forum will be the Fairmont Hotel.

It will commence at 12.00 and finish at 18.30. FEI National Federations are invited to send representatives to the Forum which is open to Riders, Trainers, Owners, Veterinarians and FEI Officials.

Presentations will be given by senior personnel from the FEI Headquarters in Switzerland and the FEI Medication Advisory Group together with a representative from the FEI Central Laboratory in Paris, France.

All expenses/costs in respect of travel, accommodation etc is to the charge of the delegate and is not covered by the organizer. There is no charge for the Forum itself.

Applications must be made by the National Federation of the Delegate direct to:

The UAE Equestrian and Racing Federation
P.O.Box 3234
Khalidya Street
Abu Dhabi, UAE

Email: uaefed@emirates.net.ae

02/12/2006

2008 FEI World Endurance Championship

The 2008 FEI World Endurance Championship Trial run was held last weekend at Terengganu, on the East coast of Malaysia. The Championship had been provisionally granted to the Malaysian Equestrian Federation subject to there being a number of successful trial runs held in 2006 and 2007.

Three senior FEI Endurance Officials attended the event: Dr Hallvard Sommereth (NOR), Chairman of the FEI Endurance Technical Committee; Dr Jim Bryant (CAN) and Mr John Robertson (GBR).

The Malaysian Equestrian Federation, together with the Organising Committee (OC) – the State Government of Terengganu & Yayasan Kebajikan Perkasa Alam Terengganu, invited a number of leading Malaysian riders as well as riders from America, Europe and Australia.

A detailed report is being produced; it will be submitted to the FEI Endurance Technical Committee for further consideration but Dr Hallvard Sommereth expressed his appreciation for the commitment made by the organizers in producing a very successful trial run.

The FEI Endurance Committee had required the trial run to be held at the proposed venue on a date to match the date of the 2008 Championship and for there to be a minimum completion rate of 40% and a maximum riding time of 16 hours for the 160 kms distance.

A total of 23 horses were presented at the start of the event and 60% completed the full distance well within the maximum ride time allowed. All of the horses performed well with no heat and humidity related problems.

Dr Jim Bryant confirmed that the horses had competed well under the conditions which had been relatively cool because of the timing of the event within the monsoon period. He commented that all of the riders had taken great care to compete using all of their horsemanship skills. Dr Bryant linked the performances of the riders and horses to a time within Endurance when events were less about speed and more about the combination of rider and horse working in close harmony together to overcome the challenges presented.

Mr John Robertson felt that there were certain areas which needed to be reviewed in relation to the overall management of the event. He confirmed that the OC was aware of these issues but he was confident that the OC would be able to solve them ahead of the Championship.

Dr Sommereth confirmed that the next trial event, scheduled to take place in the first half of 2007, would involve the use of overseas based horses who would travel to Malaysia to test out the facilities and also to fully evaluate the timing required to allow overseas horse to acclimatise properly ahead of competition.

A team from FEI Television attended the event and will produce a short documentary to be shown at the planned FEI World Endurance Forum planned for March 2007.

World Anti - Doping Agency: as of 24 March 2007.
(Gathered for USEF Delegates at FEI 3rd World Endurance Forum-Paris, FR)

The World Anti-Doping Code

THE 2007 PROHIBITED LIST INTERNATIONAL STANDARD

The official text of the *Prohibited List* shall be maintained by WADA and shall be published in English and French. In the event of any conflict between the English and French versions, the English version shall prevail.
This List shall come into effect on 1 January 2007

THE 2007 PROHIBITED LIST WORLD ANTI-DOPING CODE

Valid 1 January 2007

The use of any drug should be limited to medically justified indications

SUBSTANCES AND METHODS PROHIBITED AT ALL TIMES

(IN- AND OUT-OF-COMPETITION)

PROHIBITED SUBSTANCES

S1. ANABOLIC AGENTS

Anabolic agents are prohibited.

1. Anabolic Androgenic Steroids (AAS)

a. Exogenous* AAS, including:

1-androstendiol (5 α -androst-1-ene-3 β ,17 β -diol); **1-androstendione** (5 α -androst-1-ene-3,17-dione); **bolandi**ol (19-norandrostenediol);

bolasterone;

boldenone; **boldione** (androst-1,4-diene-3,17-dione); **calusterone**;

clostebol; **danazol** (17 α -ethynyl-17 β -hydroxyandrost-4-eno[2,3-d]isoxazole);

dehydrochlormethyltestosterone (4-chloro-17 β -hydroxy-17 α -methylandrosta-

1,4-dien-3-one); **desoxymethyltestosterone** (17 α -methyl-5 α -androst-2-en-

17 β -ol); **drostanolone**; **ethylestrenol** (19-nor-17 α -pregn-4-en-17-ol);

fluoxymesterone; **formebolone**; **furazabol** (17 β -hydroxy-17 α -methyl-5 α -androstano[2,3-c]-furazan); **gestrinone**; **4-hydroxytestosterone** (4,17 β -

dihydroxyandrost-4-en-3-one); **mestanolone**; **mesterolone**; **metenolone**;

methandienone (17 β -hydroxy-17 α -methylandrosta-1,4-dien-3-one);

methandriol; **methasterone** (2 α , 17 α -dimethyl-5 α -androstane-3-one-17 β -ol);

methyldienolone (17 β -hydroxy-17 α -methylestra-4,9-dien-3-one); **methyl-1-**

testosterone (17 β -hydroxy-17 α -methyl-5 α -androst-1-en-3-one);

methylnortestosterone (17 β -hydroxy-17 α -methylestr-4-en-3-one);

methyltrienolone (17 β -hydroxy-17 α -methylestra-4,9,11-trien-3-one);

methyltestosterone; **mibolerone**; **nandrolone**; **19-norandrostenedione** (estr-4-ene-3,17-dione); **norboletone**; **norclostebol**; **norethandrolone**;

oxabolone; **oxandrolone**; **oxymesterone**; **oxymetholone**; **prostanazol** ([3,2-c]pyrazole-5 α -etioallocholane-17 β -tetrahydropyranol); **quinbolone**;

stanozolol; stenbolone; 1-testosterone (17 β -hydroxy-5 α -androst-1-en-3-

The Prohibited List 2007

September 16, 2006

3

one); **tetrahydrogestrinone** (18 α -homo-pregna-4,9,11-trien-17 β -ol-3-one);

trenbolone and other substances with a similar chemical structure or similar biological effect(s).

b. Endogenous** AAS:

androstenediol (androst-5-ene-3 β ,17 β -diol); **androstenedione** (androst-4-ene-

3,17-dione); **dihydrotestosterone** (17 β -hydroxy-5 α -androstan-3-one) ;

prasterone (dehydroepiandrosterone, DHEA); **testosterone**

and the following metabolites and isomers:

5 α -androstan-3 α ,17 α -diol; 5 α -androstan-3 α ,17 β -diol; 5 α -androstan-

3 β ,17 α -diol; 5 α -androstan-3 β ,17 β -diol; androst-4-ene-3 α ,17 α -diol;

androst-4-ene-3 α ,17 β -diol; androst-4-ene-3 β ,17 α -diol; androst-5-

ene-

3 α ,17 α -diol; androst-5-ene-3 α ,17 β -diol; androst-5-ene-3 β ,17 α -diol;

4-androstenediol (androst-4-ene-3 β ,17 β -diol); **5-androstenedione**

(androst-5-

ene-3,17-dione); **epi-dihydrotestosterone; 3 α -hydroxy-5 α -androstan-**

17-

one; 3 β -hydroxy-5 α -androstan-17-one; 19-norandrosterone; 19-

noretiocholanolone.

Where an anabolic androgenic steroid is capable of being produced endogenously,

a *Sample* will be deemed to contain such *Prohibited Substance* where the concentration of such *Prohibited Substance* or its metabolites or markers and/or

any other relevant ratio(s) in the *Athlete's Sample* so deviates from the range of

values normally found in humans that it is unlikely to be consistent with normal

endogenous production. A *Sample* shall not be deemed to contain a

Prohibited

Substance in any such case where an *Athlete* proves that the concentration of the

Prohibited Substance or its metabolites or markers and/or the relevant ratio(s) in

the *Athlete's Sample* is attributable to a physiological or pathological condition.

In all cases, and at any concentration, the *Athlete's* sample will be deemed to contain a *Prohibited Substance* and the laboratory will report an *Adverse Analytical Finding* if, based on any reliable analytical method (e.g. IRMS), the laboratory can show that the *Prohibited Substance* is of exogenous origin. In such

case, no further investigation is necessary.

If a value in the range of levels normally found in humans is reported and the reliable analytical method (e.g. IRMS) has not determined the exogenous origin of

the substance, but if there are indications, such as a comparison to endogenous

reference steroid profiles, of a possible *Use of a Prohibited Substance*, further investigation shall be conducted by the relevant *Anti-Doping Organization* by reviewing the results of any previous test(s) or by conducting subsequent test(s),

in order to determine whether the result is due to a physiological or pathological

condition, or has occurred as a consequence of the exogenous origin of a *Prohibited Substance*.

The Prohibited List 2007

September 16, 2006

4

When a laboratory has reported a T/E ratio greater than four (4) to one (1) and

any reliable analytical method (e.g. IRMS) applied has not determined the exogenous origin of the substance, further investigation may be conducted by a

review of previous tests or by conducting subsequent test(s), in order to determine whether the result is due to a physiological or pathological condition, or

has occurred as a consequence of the exogenous origin of a *Prohibited Substance*.

If a laboratory reports, using an additional reliable analytical method (e.g. IRMS),

that the *Prohibited Substance* is of exogenous origin, no further investigation is

necessary and the *Sample* will be deemed to contain such *Prohibited Substance*.

When an additional reliable analytical method (e.g. IRMS) has not been applied

and a minimum of three previous test results are not available, a longitudinal profile of the *Athlete* shall be established by performing a minimum of three no

advance notice tests in a period of three months by the relevant *Anti-Doping Organization*. If the longitudinal profile of the *Athlete* established by the subsequent tests is not physiologically normal, the result shall be reported as an

Adverse Analytical Finding.

In extremely rare individual cases, boldenone of endogenous origin can be consistently found at very low nanograms per milliliter (ng/mL) levels in urine.

When such a very low concentration of boldenone is reported by a laboratory and

the application of any reliable analytical method (e.g. IRMS) has not determined the exogenous origin of the substance, further investigation may be conducted by subsequent tests. When an additional reliable analytical method (e.g. IRMS) has not been applied, a longitudinal profile of the athlete shall be established by performing a minimum of three no advance notice tests in a period of three months by the relevant *Anti-Doping Organization*. If the longitudinal profile of the *Athlete* established by the subsequent tests is not physiologically normal, the result shall be reported as an *Adverse Analytical Finding*. For 19-norandrosterone, an *Adverse Analytical Finding* reported by a laboratory is considered to be scientific and valid proof of exogenous origin of the *Prohibited Substance*. In such case, no further investigation is necessary. Should an *Athlete* fail to cooperate in the investigations, the *Athlete's Sample* shall be deemed to contain a *Prohibited Substance*.

2. Other Anabolic Agents, including but not limited to: Clenbuterol, tibolone, zeranol, zilpaterol.

For purposes of this section:

* "exogenous" refers to a substance which is not ordinarily capable of being produced by the body naturally.

** "endogenous" refers to a substance which is capable of being produced by the body naturally.

The Prohibited List 2007

September 16, 2006

5

S2. HORMONES AND RELATED SUBSTANCES

The following substances, including other substances with a similar chemical structure or similar biological effect(s), and their releasing factors, are prohibited:

- 1. Erythropoietin (EPO);**
- 2. Growth Hormone (hGH), Insulin-like Growth Factors (e.g. IGF-1), Mechano Growth Factors (MGFs);**
- 3. Gonadotrophins (LH, hCG), prohibited in males only;**
- 4. Insulin;**
- 5. Corticotrophins.**

Unless the *Athlete* can demonstrate that the concentration was due to a physiological or pathological condition, a *Sample* will be deemed to contain a *Prohibited Substance* (as listed above) where the concentration of the *Prohibited*

Substance or its metabolites and/or relevant ratios or markers in the *Athlete's*

Sample so exceeds the range of values normally found in humans that it is unlikely to be consistent with normal endogenous production.

If a laboratory reports, using a reliable analytical method, that the *Prohibited Substance* is of exogenous origin, the *Sample* will be deemed to contain a *Prohibited Substance* and shall be reported as an *Adverse Analytical Finding*. The presence of other substances with a similar chemical structure or similar biological effect(s), diagnostic marker(s) or releasing factors of a hormone listed above or of any other finding which indicate(s) that the substance detected is of exogenous origin, will be deemed to reflect the use of a *Prohibited Substance* and shall be reported as an *Adverse Analytical Finding*.

S3. BETA-2 AGONISTS

All beta-2 agonists including their D- and L-isomers are prohibited. As an exception, formoterol, salbutamol, salmeterol and terbutaline when administered by inhalation, require an abbreviated Therapeutic Use Exemption.

Despite the granting of any form of Therapeutic Use Exemption, a concentration of salbutamol (free plus glucuronide) greater than 1000 ng/mL will be considered an *Adverse Analytical Finding* unless the *Athlete* proves that the abnormal result

was the consequence of the therapeutic use of inhaled salbutamol.

The Prohibited List 2007

September 16, 2006

6

S4. AGENTS WITH ANTI-ESTROGENIC ACTIVITY

The following classes of anti-estrogenic substances are prohibited:

- 1. Aromatase inhibitors including, but not limited to, anastrozole, letrozole, aminoglutethimide, exemestane, formestane, testolactone.**
- 2. Selective Estrogen Receptor Modulators (SERMs) including, but not limited to, raloxifene, tamoxifen, toremifene.**
- 3. Other anti-estrogenic substances including, but not limited to, clomiphene, cyclofenil, fulvestrant.**

S5. DIURETICS AND OTHER MASKING AGENTS

Masking agents are prohibited. They include:

Diuretics*, epitestosterone, probenecid, alpha-reductase inhibitors

(e.g.

finasteride, dutasteride), plasma expanders (e.g. albumin, dextran, hydroxyethyl starch) and other substances with similar biological effect(s).

Diuretics include:

acetazolamide, amiloride, bumetanide, canrenone, chlorthalidone, etacrynic acid, furosemide, indapamide, metolazone, spironolactone, thiazides (e.g. bendroflumethiazide, chlorothiazide, hydrochlorothiazide),

triamterene, and other substances with a similar chemical structure or similar

biological effect(s) (except for drospirinone, which is not prohibited).

* A Therapeutic Use Exemption is not valid if an *Athlete's* urine contains a diuretic in association with threshold or sub-threshold levels of a *Prohibited Substance(s)*.

The Prohibited List 2007
September 16, 2006

7

PROHIBITED METHODS

M1. ENHANCEMENT OF OXYGEN TRANSFER

The following are prohibited:

1. Blood doping, including the use of autologous, homologous or heterologous blood or red blood cell products of any origin.
2. Artificially enhancing the uptake, transport or delivery of oxygen, including but not limited to perfluorochemicals, efaproxiral (RSR13) and modified haemoglobin products (e.g. haemoglobin-based blood substitutes, microencapsulated haemoglobin products).

M2. CHEMICAL AND PHYSICAL MANIPULATION

1. *Tampering*, or attempting to tamper, in order to alter the integrity and validity of *Samples* collected during *Doping Controls* is prohibited. These include but are not limited to catheterisation, urine substitution and/or alteration.
2. Intravenous infusions are prohibited, except as a legitimate medical treatment.

M3. GENE DOPING

The non-therapeutic use of cells, genes, genetic elements, or of the modulation of gene expression, having the capacity to enhance athletic performance, is prohibited.

The Prohibited List 2007
September 16, 2006

8

SUBSTANCES AND METHODS

PROHIBITED IN-COMPETITION

In addition to the categories S1 to S5 and M1 to M3 defined above, the following categories are prohibited in competition:

PROHIBITED SUBSTANCES

S6. STIMULANTS

All stimulants (including both their (D- & L-) optical isomers where relevant) are

prohibited, except imidazole derivatives for topical use and those stimulants included in the 2007 Monitoring Program*.

Stimulants include:

Adrafinil, adrenaline, amfepramone, amiphenazole, amphetamine, amphetaminil, benzphetamine, benzylpiperazine, bromantan, cathine***,**

clobenzorex, cocaine, cropropamide, crotetamide, cyclazodone, dimethylamphetamine, ephedrine****, etamivan, etilamphetamine, etilefrine, famprofazone, fenbutrazate, fencamfamin, fencamine, fenetylline, fenfluramine, fenproporex, furfenorex, heptaminol, isometheptene, levmethamphetamine, meclofenoxate, mefenorex, mephentermine, mesocarb, methamphetamine (D-), methylenedioxyamphetamine, methylenedioxymethamphetamine, pmethylamphetamine, methylephedrine****, methylphenidate, modafinil, nikethamide, norfenefrine, norfenfluramine, octopamine, ortetamine, oxilofrine, parahydroxyamphetamine, pemoline, pentetrazol, phendimetrazine, phenmetrazine, phenpromethamine, phentermine, 4-

phenylpiracetam (carphedon), prolintane, propylhexedrine, selegiline,

sibutramine, strychnine, tuaminoheptane and other substances with a similar

chemical structure or similar biological effect(s).

* The following substances included in the 2007 Monitoring Program (bupropion,

caffeine, phenylephrine, phenylpropanolamine, pipradol, pseudoephedrine, synephrine) are not considered as *Prohibited Substances*.

** Adrenaline associated with local anaesthetic agents or by local administration

(e.g. nasal, ophthalmologic) is not prohibited.

*** **Cathine** is prohibited when its concentration in urine is greater than 5 micrograms per milliliter.

**** Each of **ephedrine** and **methylephedrine** is prohibited when its concentration in urine is greater than 10 micrograms per milliliter.

The Prohibited List 2007

September 16, 2006

9

A stimulant not expressly mentioned as an example under this section should be

considered as a Specified Substance only if the *Athlete* can establish that the substance is particularly susceptible to unintentional anti-doping rule violations

because of its general availability in medicinal products or is less likely to be successfully abused as a doping agent.

S7. NARCOTICS

The following narcotics are prohibited:

buprenorphine, dextromoramide, diamorphine (heroin), fentanyl and its

derivatives, hydromorphone, methadone, morphine, oxycodone, oxymorphone, pentazocine, pethidine.

S8. CANNABINOIDS

Cannabinoids (e.g. hashish, marijuana) are prohibited.

S9. GLUCOCORTICOSTEROIDS

All glucocorticosteroids are prohibited when administered orally, rectally, intravenously or intramuscularly. Their use requires a Therapeutic Use Exemption approval.

Other routes of administration (intraarticular /periarticular/ peritendinous/ epidural/ intradermal injections and inhalation) require an Abbreviated Therapeutic Use Exemption except as noted below.

Topical preparations when used for dermatological (including iontophoresis/phonophoresis), auricular, nasal, ophthalmic, buccal, gingival and

perianal disorders are not prohibited and do not require any form of Therapeutic

Use Exemption.

The Prohibited List 2007

September 16, 2006

10

SUBSTANCES PROHIBITED IN PARTICULAR SPORTS

P1. ALCOHOL

Alcohol (ethanol) is prohibited *in-competition* only, in the following sports.

Detection will be conducted by analysis of breath and/or blood. The doping violation threshold (haematological values) for each Federation is reported in parenthesis.

- Aeronautic (FAI) (0.20 g/L)
 - Archery (FITA, IPC) (0.10 g/L)
 - Automobile (FIA) (0.10 g/L)
 - Boules (CMSB, (0.10 g/L)
 - IPC bowls)
 - Karate (WKF) (0.10 g/L)
 - Modern Pentathlon (UIPM) (0.10 g/L)
- for disciplines involving shooting
- Motorcycling (FIM) (0.10 g/L)
 - Powerboating (UIM) (0.30 g/L)

P2. BETA-BLOCKERS

Unless otherwise specified, beta-blockers are prohibited *in-competition* only, in

the following sports.

- Aeronautic (FAI)
- Archery (FITA, IPC) (also prohibited *out-of-competition*)
- Automobile (FIA)
- Billiards (WCBS)
- Bobsleigh (FIBT)
- Boules (CMSB, IPC bowls)
- Bridge (FMB)
- Curling (WCF)
- Gymnastics (FIG)

- Motorcycling (FIM)
- Modern Pentathlon (UIPM) for disciplines involving shooting
- Nine-pin bowling (FIQ)
- Sailing (ISAF) for match race helms only
- Shooting (ISSF, IPC) (also prohibited *out-of-competition*)
- Skiing/Snowboarding (FIS) in ski jumping, freestyle aericals/halfpipe and snowboard halfpipe/big air
- Wrestling (FILA)

Beta-blockers include, but are not limited to, the following:

acebutolol, alprenolol, atenolol, betaxolol, bisoprolol, bunolol, carteolol, carvedilol, celiprolol, esmolol, labetalol, levobunolol, metipranolol, metoprolol, nadolol, oxprenolol, pindolol, propranolol, sotalol, timolol.

The Prohibited List 2007 11

September 16, 2006

SPECIFIED SUBSTANCES*

"Specified Substances"* are listed below:

- All inhaled Beta-2 Agonists, except salbutamol (free plus glucuronide) greater than 1000 ng/mL and clenbuterol;
- Probenecid;
- Cathine, cropropamide, crotetamide, ephedrine, etamivan, famprofazone, heptaminol, isometheptene, levmethamphetamine, meclofenoxate, p-methylamphetamine, methylephedrine, nikethamide, norfenefrine, octopamine, ortetamine, oxilofrine, phenpromethamine, propylhexedrine, selegiline, sibutramine, tuaminoheptane, and any other stimulant not expressly listed under section S6 for which the Athlete establishes that it fulfils the conditions described in section S6;
- Cannabinoids;
- All Glucocorticosteroids;
- Alcohol;
- All Beta Blockers.

* *"The Prohibited List may identify specified substances which are particularly susceptible to unintentional anti-doping rule violations because of their general*

availability in medicinal products or which are less likely to be successfully abused

as doping agents." A doping violation involving such substances may result in a

reduced sanction provided that the *"...Athlete can establish that the Use of such a*

specified substance was not intended to enhance sport performance..."

Therapeutic Use Exemptions

The purpose of the International Standard for TUE is to ensure that the process of granting TUEs is harmonized across sports and countries.

What is a Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE)?

Athletes, like all others, may have illnesses or conditions that require them to take particular medications. If the medication an athlete is required to take to treat an illness or condition happens to fall under the Prohibited List, a Therapeutic Use Exemption may give that athlete the authorization to take the needed medicine.

What are the criteria for granting a TUE?

The criteria are:

- “ The athlete would experience significant health problems without taking the prohibited substance or method,
- “ The therapeutic use of the substance would not produce significant enhancement of performance, and
- “ There is no reasonable therapeutic alternative to the use of the otherwise prohibited substance or method.

Who grants TUEs?

Under the World Anti-Doping Code, WADA has issued an International Standard for the granting of TUEs. The standard states that all International Federations (IFs) and National Anti-Doping Organizations (NADOs) must have a process in place whereby athletes with documented medical conditions can request a TUE, and have such request appropriately dealt with by a panel of independent physicians called a Therapeutic Use Exemption Committee (TUEC). IFs and NADOs, through their TUECs, are then responsible for granting or declining such applications.

Where should I submit my TUE Application?

If you are an international level athlete or if you are entered in an international event, you must submit your TUE Application to your IF, which is responsible for accepting applications and granting TUEs. For other athletes who are members of a country's national registered testing pool, TUE Applications must be submitted to the athletes' NADOs. *Note: Athletes must not submit TUE Applications to more than one organization. Athletes must submit their TUE Applications to the authority which applies to their status as an athlete, using the criteria mentioned above. WADA does not accept TUE Applications from athletes.*

*Special Protocols for TUE Applications may be in Effect during **Major Events***

If you are entered in a **Major Event**, you are advised to inquire of your IF or NADO whether there is any variation in the TUE submission protocol for the Event. **Major Events** include those organized by international multi-sport organizations that function as the ruling body for any continental, regional, or other international event (e.g. IOC, IPC, FISU).

What is WADA's role regarding TUEs?

WADA's role in the TUE process is two-pronged. First, the Agency, through its TUEC, has the right to monitor and review any TUE granted by a federation or anti-doping organization and, pursuant to such review, to reverse any decision. Second, an athlete who submits a TUE Application to a federation or anti-doping organization and is denied a TUE, can appeal the decision to the WADA TUEC. If WADA determines that the denial of the TUE did not comply with the International Standard, the Agency can reverse the decision.

What is the difference between an Abbreviated TUE and a Standard TUE?

Abbreviated TUE	Standard TUE
“ Only for glucocorticosteroids by non-systemic routes (local routes of administration other than dermatological applications which are not prohibited and do not require any TUE) and for beta-2 agonists (formoterol, salbutamol, salmeterol and terbutaline) by inhalation.	“ For any treatment involving a substance or method on the Prohibited List that is not admissible for an abbreviated TUE.
“ Using the Abbreviated TUE Form.	“ Using the Standard TUE Form.
“ A notification is sent to the athlete by the relevant organization upon receipt of a duly completed request. <u>Note:</u> A review by the TUEC may be initiated at any time during the duration of the TUE.	“ Will be reviewed by a TUEC.
“ Athlete can begin treatment as soon as the form has been received by the relevant organization.	“ If approved, athlete can begin treatment only after receiving the authorization notice from the relevant organization (except in rare cases of an acute life threatening condition for which a retroactive approval may be considered).

How can I apply for a TUE?

The process for an athlete to apply for a TUE is fairly simple. Each athlete must:

- “ Contact his or her IF or NADO (whichever applies) and ask for an a TUE Application form.
- “ Have his or her physician fill out the TUE Application form and produce the required supporting documentation and forward it to the IF or NADO (whichever applies). Athletes should remember that according to the International Standards, the TUE Application should be submitted at least 21 days before participating in an event.

Tips on applying for a TUE

- Choose the correct form (standard or abbreviated – whichever applies).
- Fill in the form by typing if possible, or in block capital letters. If the form is not legible, the form is deemed incomplete and will be returned to the athlete.
- When faxing the form, ensure that you include all the required documentation and keep a copy of the request as well as a record of the transmission or acknowledgement of receipt.

What happens if I am granted a TUE?

TUEs are granted for a specific medication with a defined dosage. They are also granted for a specific period of time and do expire. The athlete needs to comply with all the treatment conditions outlined in the TUE Application. Once a TUE has been granted by an IF or a NADO, it will inform WADA, who will then have the opportunity to review this decision. If the decision does not conform to the International Standard for TUEs, WADA may reverse it and deny the TUE.

What can I do if WADA reverses the original decision granting me a TUE?

You or your granting authority can appeal to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) for a final decision.

What should I do if I am notified for doping control while using a prohibited substance under a granted TUE?

When filling out the doping control form, make sure that you declare the substance or medication being used and that you specify that a TUE has been granted. If you have easy access to a copy of the TUE Approval form, it is preferable but not mandatory that you show it to the doping control official.

What will happen if the prohibited substance is detected during the analysis?

When the doping control authority receives the report from the laboratory, an initial review will take place to verify that the TUE is still in effect and that the results of the analysis are consistent with the TUE granted (nature of substance, route of administration, dose, time frame of administration, etc.). If the review proves satisfactory, the result of your test will be recorded as negative.

What can I do if my TUE is denied by my granting authority?

If your granting authority denies your TUE Application, you may ask WADA to review the decision at your own expense, by providing all information given during the first submission (complete file) as well as the initial decision returned (using the following fax number: +1 514 904 4456). In doing so, you may be requested to submit additional medical information to WADA's TUEC. The review procedure does not suspend the first decision, therefore you are not allowed to use the substance while waiting for the decision from WADA. If WADA overturns your granting authority's original position and grants the TUE, your granting authority still has the possibility of appealing to CAS for a final decision.

What can I do if WADA upholds my granting authority's decision not to grant the TUE?

For athletes applying to an International Federation:

You can then appeal the IF decision to CAS for a final decision.
--

For athletes applying to a National Anti-Doping Organization:

You can then appeal the NADO decision to an independent review body in your country. If this body grants you the TUE, WADA could appeal this decision to CAS for a final decision.
--

Will the information on my TUE Application remain confidential?

Athletes concerned about confidentiality should note that all the information contained in their TUE Application will be kept strictly confidential as medical data. All members of the TUECs are required to sign confidentiality agreements and if they require advice from other scientific experts on a particular case, the name of the athlete will not be used when circulating the application outside the TUEC.

Where can I find out more about therapeutic use exemptions?

The procedures for applying for and granting a TUE are outlined in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, published by WADA. You may also contact your IF or NADO for more information.

PRESENTATION/REMARKS OUTLINE:

Introduction:

Greetings and Intro of USA & CDN Delegation:

- Vonita Bowers, USEF Director of Endurance
- Tony Benedetti, USEF IHP & Active Riders Committee
- Daphne Richard, Endurance Canada Committee and Active Rider
- Myna Criderman, Endurance Canada Committee, Active Rider & OC
- Grace Ramsey, USEF Technical Committee and Trainer
- Steph Teeter, USEF Active rider Committee and Electronic Media
- A. Priesz, Jr., Esq.

I. History of Agendas Set from Prior Forums.

1. Jerez in 2002
2. Paris in 2003

II. Brief Outline of Points of Contention Today.

1. Speed
2. Distance for Championships
3. Grand Prix Finish
4. Qualifying of Nations
5. Medication Control
6. Fair Play
7. Future of Discipline

I. History of Past Forums:

A. 2002 in Jerez: The Free-For-All

1. Punchestown European Championship Distance
2. Future Championship Distances
3. Accountability of the FEI to its Endurance Members
4. Course Problems & Design in Jerez
5. Consistency of Officials & Judging
6. Conflicts of Interest

B. 2003 in Paris: The Toulouse Group

1. Championship Distances
2. Course Design & TD Responsibilities
3. Judging: Electronic Vetting vs. Objective Vetting
4. Consistency of Officials & Judging
5. Timing of Publishing FEI Event Schedules
6. Hold Times & Stages/Loop Length
7. Comment Period & Interim Amendment of Rule Changes
8. Certificates of Capability

II. Points of Contention TODAY:

1. ***Speed:*** The ISSUE is: WHETHER Endurance has become a long distance flat-track race? Jockeys are certainly athletes, but the focus in that sport is the Horse. IF Endurance is longing to be considered among the Olympic disciplines, IF it wants to be true to its roots as a Calvary discipline as those classics are: then the focus needs to be on the Human athlete. How can that be accomplished? The answer is to look back to the start of this discipline in the FEI, and to its cavalry roots. Technical trail and other efforts to force Riders to RIDE, not jockey.
2. ***Championship Distances:*** Round 3. This was the focus issue of the first Forum 5 years ago in Jerez. Traditionalists still believe a 160km test is necessary at the World Championship level. Some, including some within the FEI, have argued there is no historical tradition to rely upon. We disagree.

Going back nearly 150 years in North America alone, the US Cavalry Manual set out 100 miles as ONE of its competition “tests” of a trooper’s ability as a Horseman and to manage themselves over challenging terrain and climate. The biggest difference now is, of course, the crewing “rally” which dominates these events on the world stage. Additional considerations in both Jerez and Paris (’03) included: rules enforcement in alternate formats, fair play in multi-day alternatives, and horse welfare issues simply being traded in for a short sprint. The US and Canada believe nearly unanimously in 160km as the true test. However, approximately 50% of that number in the US understood the need to consider alternatives in certain circumstances (perhaps like Malaysia), but did not like it and felt it created a different discipline. Please remember that in 2003 at Paris, those attending opined the Championship should not be awarded to places like Malaysia if horse welfare due to climate made 160km impossible or unsafe.

Lastly, this is not simply a matter of tradition. It is also a matter of horse welfare, and needs to be studied before it is changed “ad hoc”. There is a real question about that, and about whether anything less is a sufficient or legitimate true test.

3. ***Grand Prix Finish:*** Generally, we oppose it. We believe instituting REAL course design to create a sufficiently challenging technical course will push the winning time later, closer to the CoC maximum of 12kph/13:20hours. That would accomplish the goal of compacting the field at the finish.

The problem is this. Completing 50 or 60 or 70 or even 80 miles is the easy part of Endurance. (Even “I” could do it back in the day.) That is “why” 100 miles/160km is important. We need to quit looking at trying to find a single solution to the problems we face, and look for how combined but smaller solutions will gradually bring us the appropriate result.

The continuous focus to find one large sweeping change to improve Endurance or fix its very real problems will simply create a different sport. This idea ignores the failure-rate issue which plagues the discipline, by trying to define it away. This does NOT serve Horse Welfare. It only pretends to do so. It essentially codifies racing to a quick finish or a quick pull, not horsemanship.

However, IF considered, some changes and limits would need to be implemented. Scoring would need to change as a start. IF a Team could “qualify” for classification with NASCAR/Formula One-style results, cumulative ride time will not be comparable from Team to Team. We question whether or IF it can be done fairly. Also, there would have to be some limit, such as: a nation would still be required to “complete” 2 riders under this plan to be classified as a Team.

If a cut-off is advanced from 13:20 hours, it should still be at least 2 hours following the winning time or include the Top 20 finishers, whichever is longer.

4. *Qualifying of Nations:*

This also has come up before. Our position remains that it is a good idea.

However, attaching it to the individual results from the World Wide Ranking list is not appropriate. That is an individual list, and those riders are not necessarily the choices an NF would pick to send to a World Championship. Those results are not relevant, and even might be considered as contrary indicators of the type of success we seek, since they rely on number of results, not effectiveness of attempts.

We continue to maintain a better choice would be to look at Regional and World Championship results from the past decade (for the 2008 WEC, the period from 1998-2007), and IF a Nation finished a Team 5th or higher in a World Championship or 3rd or higher in a Regional Championship, that Nation would qualify. IF that seems too narrow, then add those Nations from the World Championships within the past decade that finished a minimum of 2 of its riders within the Top Twenty.

5. *Medication Control:*

- Calibration between Labs so we know what we are managing.
- Continue to believe in “zero-tolerance”, but we need to decide what that means and straighten out inconsistencies.
- We also question enforcement despite the high number of FEI Endurance positives (tip of iceberg).
- Need for better education/information, including requiring CdE’s/TeamVets with rated Judges/Vets/Officials at Forums like this. Familiarity will lead to cooperation and trust, as well as assistance in managing legitimate medication uses. It will also flush out those who are not cooperative.
- We believe this is more than just a Rider Responsibility, and suggest being creative in applying sanctions beyond Riders.
- Additionally, limiting crew access and crewing, generally, would help control and allow better policing of potential abuse.
- We believe in Due Process rights of individuals over results, which means the FEI needs to ensure true autonomy of the collection program and integrity and privacy of process. In 2008 and 2010, MCP Teams should be sent independently by the FEI, not the OCs.

6. ***Fair Play:***

- Perception remains that there is a double standard.
- Original reason to set rules in stone remains: Changes generally accommodate influence.
- Officiating needs better international rotation, continent to continent. However, question over how to fund remains.
- At present, this feels like a struggle for the soul of the discipline. Which truly favors horse welfare in the long run?

7. ***Future:***

- Horse Welfare remains our poison pill, and the agenda floated in preparation for this forum does not present solutions to that problem.
- Numbers of Rides & Schedule: There is a disparity between the Middle East/Europe and North America-Australia-New Zealand. Perhaps the way to use the available resources we have is to consider a true League on each continent, or within each Group, to “qualify” for individual and/or team World Championships.
- As well, the impact of geographic differences for scheduling continental or regional championships like the Pan Ams, makes it unlikely that the Pan Ams will return to North America again without regard for the differences between places like North and South America in national geography and boundaries. (The “Zone” plan did work, and alternating the Pan Am from North to South or Central should allow its continuation until it becomes clear the Central and South American nations will show up in sufficient numbers.)

- Olympic Dreams: They are the ultimate stage, but we are not ready, and need to decide and make changes to focus on the Human athlete. Until we figure that out, we are more likely an “X”-Game event, at best. Problems related to drug use and rumor, horse fatalities and completion rates need to be solved before we look further to that goal. We believe it can happen, but not following the current path. Tough decisions must be made, and many will likely be unhappy as a result. But tough decisions, supported by the FEI, will provide the best chance to accomplish what should be our ultimate goal, healthy and old horses. The rest will follow naturally.

IN CONCLUSION:

Noble Act or Splendid Gesture is the most common English interpretation of the term Beau Geste. But we need more than gestures and lip-service to the soul of this discipline, to the fundamental responsibilities of our sport. So, we seize the definition: “Noble Act”.

A Noble Act requires us, as the actors, to sacrifice our own personal goals for the larger responsibilities of this thing of ours. That means considering alternatives, but thinking them through and applying them within the fundamentals and traditions of Endurance.

IF we can do that, then Endurance may have a true place with the classic Olympic disciplines. As one of the original cavalry tests of the human partnership with a horse, it deserves to be. The bigger question is whether “we” are deserving. Continuing down the current path will lead to 2 separate disciplines, one traditional and one convenient.

Four years ago, the points we raised in our presentation (“Go, Tell the Spartans”) remain valid. The problems remain as well, all too familiar. It makes us think of the poem about the path not taken. We ask all of you to think back to that presentation, compare it to the discussions today, and choose that path today.

We stand with the soul of our sport and ask you to stand with us. Doing what is right is hardly ever easy, but it is what we must do. Some may say that we, as a world endurance community, need to redefine our discipline to make it easier or more watchable. To the extent we can do so and remain “true”, we should. However, substantive changes based upon misperception or expediency generally lead to poor results.

On behalf of Group IV, Canada and the USA, we continue to believe: The Horse Comes First.

Thank-You.

A. Priesz, Jr., Esq.