



Dear Mr De Vos

Thank you for your letter of 8 November 2011.

I think there is some confusion on what changes were made to the IDRC Statutes and when they are applicable. If I may answer your paragraphs in order:

1. Whether the FEI accepts or not the decision of the IDRC General Assembly the fact remains that the two Members were excluded from membership. This is unequivocal. There is nothing that the FEI or the IDRC Executive Board can do about this now.
2. We disagree with your interpretation of Article 6.1.2. of the IDRC 2008 and 2010 Statutes. Article 6.1.2 allows for the removal of any Member by the General Assembly but only allows for the "possibility" of a hearing with the Executive Board. It does not make it mandatory nor a right. If Luis or Maria wish to take legal action on the interpretation of article 6.1.2. then they can do that of course. Even if the IDRC General Assembly acted against the Statutes, and we contend that we did not, then the decision still stands until a competent court decides otherwise.
3. As you will see from the attached versions of the Statutes, no change was made to Article 6.2.1. save for the ability of the Executive Board to be able to take such an action between General Assemblies. The Executive Board has not taken any such action.
  1. The IDRC Statutes are a matter for the IDRC. It is clear that the FEI may choose not to accept the revised Statutes when considering the IDRC's Associate Membership and if that is the case then we will consider your requests. But the FEI has never requested nor made it known that it required prior approval or even prior sight of any changes. If this is an FEI requirement then please can you confirm where this is written?
  2. Contrary to your statement, the Statutes were not amended and then applied in the same General Assembly. The Article that was applied is the 2008 version that the FEI accepted as part of the FEI Associate Membership application.
  3. The revision to the Statutes was proposed by the Executive Board and 100% of the members in attendance supported the new draft.
  4. The effective date of the new Statutes was the 30 October 2011. The fact that we have an effective date is so that it can be recorded which year they apply to. In any event, the

amendments were not used in the General Assembly so this point is specious.

4. This is a specious argument on two counts:

1. The Tribunal judge makes it clear that Article 6.5.2.(iii) of the FEI Internal Regulations is far from clear whether the intention was an exclusive right for the IDRC or not. He makes the point that the FEI should draft 6.5.2.(iii) and Article 29.10 of the FEI Statutes to be clear on what the intent actually was.
2. The amended IDRC Statutes gives the Executive Board power to remove Members (with the right of appeal) but the Executive Board has never used this power.

The IDRC takes very seriously the threat that the FEI will consider revoking its FEI Associate Membership status. Given that the IDRC has not invoked any change to its Statutes to enforce the removal of the two Members on what basis are you considering this?

Furthermore, we are concerned by comments that have been made to us regarding the intentions of the FEI in relation to the appointment of members for the Dressage Committee at the forthcoming General Assembly. We therefore respectfully remind the FEI that under Rule 6.5.2(iii) of the General Regulations, as long as there is a "qualified Candidate", a member of the IDRC must be appointed as riders' representative. This is a mandatory requirement. The requirement is for the candidate to be qualified, as opposed to being approved by the Nominations Committee or, indeed, acceptable to the FEI. We trust that this rule will be complied with in the appointments process.

In all of this, the issue that the IDRC is concerned about is that it is being deprived of having influence over which of its members is chosen to represent the rest of its members and it is the threat to that influence that it is seeking to protect by exercising its other rules. This is the only action that we, as an organisation, can take to protect what we consider to be a democratic right for IDRC members to indirectly elect their representative, instead of a representative being forced upon them by some National Federation or other. Without that influence we have no means of ensuring the person appointed will uphold the aims of the IDRC and genuinely represent our membership.

Rather than having a "battle of rules" with each other, the IDRC and the FEI ought to be trying to work together to understand each other's position to see if the matter can be resolved and I suggest both bodies have a meaningful discussion to that end.

Athlete representation is important to the IOC, the FEI as much as us and we sincerely hope that we can resolve this matter to the satisfaction of all.

With best regards

*Wayne*

Wayne Channon  
Secretary General  
International Dressage Riders' Club  
[www.internationaldressageridersclub.com](http://www.internationaldressageridersclub.com)