

PROPOSALS OF MODIFICATIONS TO THE RULES 2017 CONGRESS

Proposals of the Executive Committee

Proposal 1

Motivation: In the current rules, it is not described in detail how the pools should be constituted. This sometimes creates unclarity as to whether ranking or nationality should prevail.

Composition of pools

o.13

1. The pools are composed taking account of the latest official FIE ranking and by drawing lots among any fencers who are not in the ranking. **The composition is made using the following method:**

Pool	A	B	C
Fencer ranked	1	2	3
	6	5	4
	7	8	9
	12	11	10
	13	14	15
	18	17	16
	19	20	21

2. The allocation of fencers in the pools must be made in such a way as to place fencers of the same nationality in different pools, as far as possible. **If a fencer is placed in a pool where there is already a fencer of the same nationality, he is moved one or more places down the ranking until he is placed in a pool without a fencer of the same nationality. If this is not possible, he must remain in the original pool.**

Rules commission: In favour

Executive committee: In favour

Proposal 2

Motivation: It is often difficult to understand the score sheets for the pool round. There are differences in the way results are annotated between different referees and the space to fill in the results on the actual pool sheet is often very limited. Problems with

understanding what is actually written are a cause of delays in competitions. Therefore, the following changes are proposed:

Notation of results in the pool sheet

o.17

1

a) One of the fencers **has scored 5 hits**. In this case the score registered on the score-sheet is the final score of the bout (~~$V5 - Dn$, where $n =$ the number of hits scored by the losing fencer~~) ($V - n$, where $n =$ the number of hits scored by the losing fencer)

b) **At épée**, if the two fencers reach a score of 4–all, they must fence for a deciding hit, up to the time limit. Any double hit will not be counted (and the fencers will therefore remain where they are on the piste).

2. Three minutes of effective fencing time have passed. (There is no warning for the last minute.)

a) If **when the time limit expires** there is a difference of at least one hit between the scores of the two fencers, the fencer who has scored the greater number of hits is declared winner. The score registered on the score-sheet is the actual score achieved in the bout ($VN - Dn$, where $N =$ the number of hits scored by the winning fencer and $n =$ the number of hits scored by the losing fencer).

b) If **at the end of regulation time the scores are equal**, the fencers fence for a deciding hit, with a maximum time limit of one minute. Before the fencing recommences, the Referee draws lots to decide who will be the winner if scores are still equal at the end of the extra minute.

c) In this case the score registered on the score-sheet is always the **actual score achieved in the bout**:

— $VN - Dn$ if a deciding hit is scored within the time limit for the bout.

— $V4 - D4$ or $V3 - D3$ or $V2 - D2$ or $V1 - D1$ or $V0 - D0$ if the winner is designated by drawing lots.

Rules commission: In favour

Executive committee: In favour

Proposal 3

Motivation: In order to have a record of all incidents during a competition, the special cases when a fencer does not start or does not finish the competition need to be documented in the result list.

Special cases in the result list

o.20

~~A fencer who **withdraws, or who is excluded**, is scratched from the pool, and his results are annulled as if he had not taken part.~~

1. A fencer who **is not present at the start of the pool** is scratched from the pool and is recorded without a classification at the end of the final classification list with the information "Did Not Start".

2. A fencer who **is excluded during the pool phase** is scratched from the pool, and his results are annulled as if he had not taken part. The fencer is recorded without a classification at the end of the final classification list with the information "Excluded"

Rules commission: In favour

Executive committee: In favour

Proposal 4

Motivation: In order to have a record of all incidents during a competition, the special cases when a fencer does not start or does not finish the competition need to be documented in the result list.

Special cases in the result list

o.25

1. ~~When~~, At any stage of the competition, if for whatever reason, a fencer **does not fence, or cannot- is unable to fence, or cannot—does not complete his bout**, his opponent is declared winner of that bout. A fencer who withdraws does not lose his place in the overall classification of the competition **and is recorded in the result list with the information "Did Not Finish"**

2. A fencer who **is excluded** is scratched from the direct elimination table and his results are annulled as if he had not taken part. The fencer is recorded without a classification at the end of the final classification list with the information "Excluded".

Rules commission: In favour

Executive committee: In favour

Proposal 5

Motivation: clarification of the classification used to rule out any ambiguity.

Classification

o.28

1. The **general classification** is obtained as follows:
First: the winner of the bout for the first place
Second: the loser of the bout for the first place
2. The two fencers who lose the semi-final matches are placed equal third, **when it is not necessary to separate them.**
3. When it is **necessary to separate them**, a bout for third and fourth places will be fought between the two losers of the semi-final matches.
4. The remainder are placed, **within each round of the direct elimination**, in accordance with their **original classification**

Rules commission: In favour with the following wording:

o.28

1. The **general classification** is obtained as follows:
First: the winner of the bout for the first place
Second: the loser of the bout for the first place
2. The two fencers who lose the semi-final matches are placed equal third, **when it is not necessary to separate them.**
3. When it is **necessary to separate them**, a bout for third and fourth places will be fought between the two losers of the semi-final matches.
- ~~4. The remainder are placed, **within each round of the direct elimination**, in accordance with their original **classification for the composition of the direct elimination table.**~~
4. The remainder are placed, in each round of the tableau:
 - a) Competitions with a round of pools: according to the ranking for the drawing of the direct elimination tableau following the pools.
 - b) Competitions with no round of pools: according to the ranking preceding the drawing of the initial tableau and before any drawing of lots if that is required.

Executive committee: In favour of the proposal as modified by the Rules Commission.

Proposal 6

Motivation: during the season not all the organisers respect this rule and in more than one case the Sport Department had to remind the below rule. This attitude results in a delay of the dissemination of the information that prevents the participating National Federations from organising the logistic well in advance. This may result in a damage for the Federations that are bound to face higher costs, which would not occur if the invitation is released within the deadline established by the FIE Rules. In order to make the organisers more respectful and attentive of the below obligation and protect the National Federations, it is proposed to apply a financial sanction to those federations that do not deliver the information on time.

Official invitation

o.50

1. For all the official competitions of the FIE except the Olympic Games, the **official invitation** is the letter in which the organising federation invites every FIE member federation to take part in the Championships.
2. For the **World Championships**, this invitation must be sent to all the member federations, without exception, at least ~~six~~ **four** months before the competitions.
3. For **World Cup and Grand Prix competitions**, it must be sent out at least two months before the competition in question.

If an organising federation fails to comply with the above mentioned deadlines, it will be sanctioned with the payment of a fine amounting to 1000 €, paid to the FIE.

Rules commission: In favour

Executive committee: In favour

Proposal 7

Motivation: if the important aspect is for the athlete to be at least 13, 14 or 15 at the time of registering for a competition, then our proposal is to delete the text underneath this. In fact, the junior competition year lasts until April so if an athlete is 13 on the 2nd of January of the year in which the match takes place, he cannot take part in the competition.

Age of athletes

o.55

1. No fencer is allowed to take part in an official event of the FIE unless he or she is **at least 13 years old** when his FIE licence is applied for ~~on 1 January in the year of the competition.~~

Rules commission: In favour

Legal commission: The Legal Commission agrees with the establishment of the birthday as the date for determining eligibility for an FIE license. Unless the medical commission presented documentation for a change of age, age 13 should be retained.

Medical commission: After a discussion whether more medical research should be investigated on the minimum age limitation, the Medical Commission approved by majority to accept Proposition n° 2 to consider the date of an athlete's 13th birthday and thereafter as determinant to participate in FIE sanctioned competitions.

Executive Committee: In agreement with the Legal and Medical Commission. The final text proposed is:

o.55

1. No fencer ~~is allowed to take part in an official event of the FIE unless he or she is at least 13 years old on 1 January in the year of the competition~~ may obtain an FIE licence, enabling him or her to enter for an official FIE competition, until he or she has reached their 13th birthday.

Proposal 8

Motivation: to update the text relating to the practice followed in recent seasons, given the growing number of participants in the World Championships compared with the restricted numbers in the Olympic Games.

Nomination of the Directoire Technique

o.57

The Directoire Technique is composed of people **who have the experience and competence to organise competitions.**

1. **World Championships and Olympic Games.**

- a) **For the Olympic Games** the Directoire Technique is composed of **six** members of different nationalities, one of whom must represent the organising country.

- b) **For the World Championships**, the Directoire Technique is composed of **8** members of different nationalities, one of whom must represent the organising country

c) The **President of the Directoire Technique** and **the other members** are appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.

Rules commission: In favour with the following wording:

Nomination of the Directoire Technique

o.57

The Directoire Technique is composed of people **who have the experience and competence to organise competitions.**

1. World Championships and Olympic Games.

a) **For the Olympic Games** the Directoire Technique is composed of **six** members of different nationalities, one of whom must represent the organising country.

b) **For the World Championships**, the Directoire Technique is composed of **8** members of different nationalities, one of whom must represent the organising country

c) The ~~President of the~~ **Directoire Technique** (the President and the remaining members, one of whom will be in charge of the protocole) ~~and the other members~~ are appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.

Executive Committee: In favour as modified by the Rules Commission.

Proposal 9

Motivation: to update the text relating to the practice followed in recent seasons in terms of both the number of members of the DT and the refereeing delegates and referees.

Invitations for international officials

o.67

1. Any proposed **candidature for organising the World Championships** must be studied at the venue concerned by an ad hoc delegation designated by the Executive Committee, at the invitation of the candidate federation.

2. The organising committee of the World Championships, who will receive all the entry fees from the participating delegations, must invite, **at their own expenses**, the following international officials (tourist-class return airfare, accommodation and daily allowances):

a) The **President of the FIE** or his representative, who presides over the World Championships and, in particular, controls the smooth running of the Directoire Technique.

~~b) A head of protocol designated by the President of the FIE.~~

- ~~e~~ b) **Eight Six** members of the **Directoire Technique** appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE, of whom one must belong to the organising country and one is a **Head of Protocol**.
- ~~d~~ c) **Three members of the SEMI Commission**, appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.
- ~~e~~ d) **Six Four** members of the **Refereeing Commission**, one of whom is designated principal delegate, appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.
- ~~f~~ e) **Two members of the Medical Commission**, appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.
- ~~g~~ f) The **referees** designated by the Executive Committee **on proposal of the Refereeing Commission (maximum 34)**.

Rules commission: In favour. The proposal is consistent with current practice and the provisions in the Handbook of regulations. The Commission proposes the following wording:

o.67

1. Any proposed **candidature for organising the World Championships** must be studied at the venue concerned by an ad hoc delegation designated by the Executive Committee, at the invitation of the candidate federation.
2. The organising committee of the World Championships, who will receive all the entry fees from the participating delegations, must invite, **at their own expenses**, the following international officials (tourist-class return airfare, accommodation and daily allowances):
 - a) The **President of the FIE** or his representative, who presides over the World Championships and, in particular, controls the smooth running of the Directoire Technique.
 - ~~b) A head of protocol designated by the President of the FIE.~~
 - ~~e~~ b) **Eight Six** members of the **Directoire Technique** appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE, of whom one must belong to the organising country and one is **Head of Protocol**.
 - ~~d~~ c) **Three members of the SEMI ~~Committee~~ Commission**, appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.
 - ~~e~~ d) **Six Four** members of the **Refereeing ~~Committee~~ Commission**, one of whom is designated principal delegate, appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.
 - ~~f~~ e) **Two members of the Medical ~~Committee~~ Commission**, appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.

- g f) The **referees** designated by the Executive Committee ~~on~~ at the proposal of the Refereeing Commission in accordance with the Handbook of Regulations (maximum 34).

Executive Committee: In favour as modified by the Rules Commission, but with 3 members of Medical Commission for the new item "e"

Proposal 10

Motivation: there are no rules for the satellite competitions and the organisers frequently find themselves in a difficult situation as a result. Most organisers actually apply this article already, as there are no precise rules. In addition, many federations come with four fencers or less and therefore do not bring referees. As a consequence, the organisers must find referees seven or six days before the competition.

o.81

1.

- a) **The number** of FIE A or B Grade **referees** that must accompany teams to junior A Grade competitions, [satellite competitions](#) and Veteran World Championships is:

1–4 fencers: no obligation to provide a referee

5–9 fencers: 1 referee

10 or more fencers: 2 referees

1 Junior Team 1 referee

For junior A Grade competitions [and satellite competitions](#), the name(s) of the referee(s) (who must have an FIE category in the weapon of the competition for which they are entered) must be notified via the FIE website 7 days before the competition (midnight, Lausanne time).

- b) Should a national federation not provide the required number of referees, a fine (cf. o.86, table of financial penalties and fines) will be inflicted on it.

Rules commission: The Commission is in favour of the proposal to clarify the referee obligation for the satellite competitions. The Commission is also in favour of the proposal of the Italian Federation where referees will be brought by federations only to satellite competitions. The following wording is therefore proposed:

o.81

1.

- a) **The number** of FIE A or B Grade **referees** that must accompany teams to ~~junior A Grade competitions,~~ [satellite competitions](#) ~~and Veteran World Championships~~ is:

1–4 fencers: no obligation to provide a referee

5–9 fencers: 1 referee
10 or more fencers: 2 referees
1 Junior Team : 1 referee

For ~~junior A Grade competitions and~~ satellite competitions, the name(s) of the referee(s) (who must have an FIE category in the weapon of the competition for which they are entered) must be notified via the FIE website 7 days before the competition (midnight, Lausanne time).

- b) Should a national federation not provide the required number of referees for satellite competitions, a fine (cf. o.86, table of financial penalties and fines) will be inflicted on it.

Executive Committee: Not in favour of the designation of referees for the junior World Cups but in favour of the designation of referees for Veteran World Championships which should be dealt as the J/C and senior World Championships for which the referees are nominated and their expenses are paid by the organising committee which receives the entry fees.

Because of the Italian proposal on the same issue, 3 votes are necessary regarding the different types of competitions concerned:

- Satellite competitions: referees brought by the federations as it is already currently practiced.
- Veteran world Championships: referees nominated by the Executive Committee and entry fee as follows: 90 euros for individuals and 185 euros for team events.
- Junior world cup competitions

If the proposal on satellite and Veteran World Championships are accepted the rules should be modified as follows:

o.81

1.

- a) **The number** of FIE A or B Grade referees that must accompany teams to junior A Grade competitions and satellite competitions ~~and Veteran World Championships~~ is:

1–4 fencers: no obligation to provide a referee
5–9 fencers: 1 referee
10 or more fencers: 2 referees
1 Junior Team 1 referee

For junior A Grade competitions and satellite competitions, the name(s) of the referee(s) (who must have an FIE category in the weapon of the competition for which they are entered) must be notified via the FIE website 7 days before the competition (midnight, Lausanne time).

- b) Should a national federation not provide the required number of referees, a fine (cf. o.86, table of financial penalties and fines) will be inflicted on it.

o.93

Referees

~~Participating countries must notify at least one month in advance whether they will either bring the required number of referees or pay the penalty, in order to allow enough time to the organisers to recruit other referees.~~

Refereeing at Veteran World Championships is carried out by referees appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE, selected by the Refereeing Commission on indication of the Organizing Committee and Veterans Council.

Referees must attend the refereeing meeting that takes place the day before the World Championships.

o.94

Invitations for international officials

1. Any proposed candidature for organising the World Championships must be studied at the venue concerned by a delegate designated by the Executive Committee, at the invitation of the candidate federation.
2. The organising committee of the World Championships, who will receive all the entry fees from the participating delegations, must, at their own expense, invite the following international officials (tourist-class return air fare, accommodation and daily allowances):
 - a) The President of the FIE or his representative, who presides over the World Championships and, in particular, controls the smooth running of the Directoire Technique.
 - b) Four members of the Directoire Technique appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE, one of whom must belong to the organising country.
 - c) One member of the SEMI Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.
 - d) One member of the Refereeing Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.
 - e) One member of the Medical Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.
 - f) The referees appointed by the Executive Committee of the FIE.

~~These~~ officials a) to e) should preferably be selected from the Zone in which the Championships are being held.

NB: The handbook for the organisation of Veteran World Championships must be modified accordingly.

Proposal 11

Motivation: to update the text following an omission made when the rule was amended for the World Cup and Grand Prix events.

Official FIE individual ranking

o.83

1

c) For both Senior and Junior rankings, the ranking is **kept permanently up to date**.

The first Grand Prix event of the current year cancels out the first Grand Prix event of the previous year and so forth for the remainder of the Grand Prix events.

The first World Cup event (individual and team) of the current year cancels out the first World Cup event (individual and team) of the previous year and so forth for the remainder of the World Cup events in the season.

[The first satellite competition of the current year cancels out the first satellite competition of the previous year and so forth for the other satellite competitions.](#)

The points allocated for a competition cancel out the points attributed to the same competition in the previous season.

If a competition does not take place in the current season, the points obtained at the same competition in the previous season are deleted on the anniversary of the competition.

Rules commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 12

The proposal has been withdrawn

Proposal 13

Motivation: to update the text as the rule is obsolete and also contradicts the previous phrase. As the satellite competitions are FIE competitions, which count in FIE classifications, FIE referees must be used.

t.35

1. All bouts at fencing in official FIE competitions are directed by a referee who must be an FIE referee licensed for the current season. ~~For reasons of expedience, National category referees who are candidates for the FIE refereeing exams and have paid to take them are authorised to referee satellite competitions~~

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing Commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 14

The proposal has been deferred

Proposal 15

Motivation: to update the text as the rule is both obsolete and useless as it causes unnecessary delays.

m.25

The national uniform includes the socks, the breeches and the jacket.

3

- e) There shall be **only one** national uniform per country with the exception that the manufacturers' marks and sponsors' logos may be different.
- f) **Logos** (national strips) worn on the national clothing must be approved by the **FIE Executive Committee** ~~at least 30 days before they are used for the first time in an official FIE competition~~; they are then published on the FIE website and may then be used in official FIE competitions.

Rules commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposals of the Members of Honour

Motivation: To consolidate, remove inconsistencies, clarify and, where needed, correct and expand the Rules concerning both black cards and the rights of fencers to appeal the decisions of the referee, the supervisor or FIE delegate and the DT.

Argument: Currently the immediate penalties for the awarding of a black card are defined in the Rules (articles t.114 and t.119) whereas the potential for additional disciplinary action is spelled out in the Statutes (article 7.2.11); this proposal consolidates the texts in the Rules, deleting Statutes Article 7.2.11.

It is also proposed that Rules Article t.124 relating to the need to hold an enquiry previous to the imposition of a penalty should be deleted, as it contradicts t.97 (t.97 notes that DT and delegate decisions are immediately enforceable, being appealable solely to the Disciplinary Commission; and that no such appeal can suspend the decision during the competition).

Proposal 1 (Sam Cheris; Peter Jacobs)

t.114

2. Penalties are cumulative and they are valid for the bout with the exception of those indicated by a BLACK CARD, which means exclusion from the competition, suspension for the remainder of the tournament and for the following two months of the active season (~~1 October~~ 1 September – World Championships for the Juniors, and (~~1 January~~ 1 October – World Championships for the Seniors), whether current or forthcoming or both (cf.t.119.2).

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 2

The Fourth Group of offences

t.119

1. The first infringement in the Fourth Group, is penalised by a BLACK CARD (exclusion from the competition, suspension from the remainder of the tournament and for the following two months of the active season (~~1 October~~ 1 September – World Championships for the Juniors, and (~~1 January~~ 1 October – World Championships for the Seniors), whether current or forthcoming or both). However, a **team** excluded from a tournament because of a BLACK CARD imposed on one

of its members is not excluded as a team from the following competitions, but it may not select the penalised fencer.

2. Furthermore any black card awarded at an international competition organized under the aegis of the FIE shall be reported within 10 days to the President of the F.I.E., for him to assess whether the severity of the offence committed warrants the sending of the report made by the FIE supervisor or by the Directoire Technique to the president of the Legal Commission, requesting him to establish a Disciplinary Tribunal to determine if penalties in addition to those imposed at the competition should be imposed.

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 3

PROTESTS AND APPEALS

Against a decision of the Referee

t.122

1. **No appeal can be made** against the decision of the Referee regarding a point of fact **except as permitted in t.42.3 for video refereeing** (cf. t.95.1/2/4, t.96.2).

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 4

t.122

2. If a fencer infringes this principle, **casting doubt** on the decision of the Referee on a point of fact during the bout, he will be penalised according to the rules (cf. t.114. t.116, t.120). However, if the Referee **is ignorant of or misunderstands a definite rule**, or applies it in a manner contrary to the Rules, an appeal on this matter may be entertained. **A point of fact includes, but is not limited to, any ruling by the referee analysing what happened on the piste, such as the validity or priority of a**

hit, whether a fencer left the side or end of the piste or if a person's behaviour is a Group 3 or Group 4 offence.

3. This **appeal** must be made:

a) in **individual** events, by the fencer,

b) in **team events**, by the fencer or the team captain,

it should be made courteously but without formality, and should be made **verbally** to the Referee **immediately** and before any decision is made regarding a subsequent hit.

4. If the Referee **maintains** his opinion, the Refereeing Commission delegate or the Supervisor (if there is no delegate) has the authority to settle an appeal (cf. t.97). If such an appeal is deemed to be **unjustified**, the fencer will be penalized in accordance with Articles t.114, t.116, t.120.

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 5

Other protests and appeals

t.123

1. Complaints and protests, which are not concerned with a referee's decision, must be made **in writing without delay**; they must be addressed to the Directoire Technique.

2. If a complaint or protest contests a decision **initially** taken by the Directoire Technique or ~~the~~ **an** official FIE delegate it should be addressed to the FIE Central Office.

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 6

Investigation — Right of defence

~~t.124~~

~~No penalty can be imposed until after an enquiry has been held in the course of which the parties concerned have been called on to give their explanation of the occurrence either verbally or in writing, within a reasonable interval of time, suited to the time and place. After this time limit has expired, the penalty may be imposed~~

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 7

Method of decision

t.125

The decisions of the ~~juridical authorities of competitions~~ Directoire Technique are **by majority vote**, the chairman (president) having the casting vote in case of a tie.

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 8 (Sam Cheris)

Motivation: To create clarity and consistency in refereeing when dealing with the issues of covering with the head or the back arm.

Argument: The attempt to eliminate covering with the back arm by passing t. 18.5 has not been successful. Referees are finding it extremely difficult to interpret and enforce the rule in a consistent manner. There has been an aversion by some referees to call covering by the mask and back arm, especially at or near the end of a close bout. Additionally the counter-attacker has figured out how to use his/her head to eliminate access to the valid target area, while keeping his/her head facing the opponent. By

including the mask and rear arm as target the attacker will have target available to touch and the defender/counter-attacker will not be able to use the mask and rear arm to eliminate the availability of valid target area. This should positively affect the game, since the attack and riposte will have valid target available to touch. The extended target should speed up the game, making foil more exciting, without losing any of the major traditions of the weapon.

Target - Limitation of the target

t.47

1. At foil, only hits which arrive **on the target** are counted as valid.

2. **The target** at foil excludes the ~~limbs and the head~~ sword-arm. It is confined to the trunk, the upper limit being the collar up to 6 cm above the prominences of the collar bones; at the **sword arm** sides to the seams of the sleeves, which should cross the head of the humerus; and the lower limit following a horizontal line across the back joining the tops of the hip bones, thence by straight lines to the junction of the lines of the groin, **the non-sword arm and the head**. ~~It also includes the part of the bib beneath a horizontal line 1.5–2 cm below the chin, which, in any case, may not be lower than the line of the shoulders~~ (see Figure 4).

Attention:

In case the proposal is approved, figure 4 needs to be re-drawn showing valid target to include the entire mask and the rear arm.

Rules commission: Unanimously not in favour

Coaches Council: Not in favour

Refereeing commission: Not in favour

Athletes Commission: Not in favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposal 9

t.18

~~5. At foil it is forbidden, during the course of fencing, to advance the shoulder of the non-sword arm in front of the shoulder of the sword arm (cf.t.19). If a competitor does so he is liable to incur the penalties enumerated in Articles t.114, t.116, t.120.~~

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Coaches council: In favour

Athletes Commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposals of the Refereeing commission

Proposal 1

Motivation: a) This article prevents close combat and allows the fencer who causes the corps à corps to benefit from this article.

b) After his parry, fencer A attempts to hit fencer B, who closes the distance and looks for the corps à corps in order to avoid the riposte; the only solution for fencer A is to reverse the line of the shoulders by pulling back the shoulder of the sword arm in order to score a hit.

c) We have seen some excellent and very spectacular hits annulled by the referee because of this article.

t.18

5. The order 'Halt!' is also given if the play of the competitors is dangerous, confused, or contrary to the Rules, if one of the competitors is disarmed or steps off the piste, or if, while retiring, he approaches too near the spectators or the Referee (cf. t.26, t.54.5 and t.73.4.j).

~~At foil, it is forbidden, during the course of fencing, to advance the shoulder of the non-sword arm in front of the shoulder of the sword-arm (cf.t.19). If a competitor does so, he is liable to incur the penalties enumerated in Articles t.114, t.116, t.120. Any hits scored by the fencer at fault while committing this offence will be annulled.~~

Rules commission: In favour

Coaches council: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Athletes Commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 2

Motivation: It must be specified that the unarmed hand may touch the piste, and in the last years even the knee of the rear leg was added, so or/and must be stated.

t.21

1. Displacing the target and ducking are allowed, even if during the action the unarmed hand **and/or** the knee of the rear leg comes into contact with the piste.

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 3

Motivation: With conventional weapons [f and s], to apply the spirit of the convention, hits occurring after faults of combat are not counted but halt the bout and annul any subsequent hits.

Example: If a fencer who is under attack and avoids this by means of covering or using his unarmed hand or leaves the piste with both feet, then scores a valid hit, his hit must be annulled. This stops the bout and an opponent's remise must not be counted. This rule is generally applied but the following specific information does not appear in the rule.

t.26

4 If one of the two fencers leaves the piste with both feet, under these conditions **and only in epee**, only a hit made by the fencer who remains on the piste with at least one foot only can be counted valid, even in the case of a double hit. **The convention must be applied for foil and sabre.**

Rules commission: Not in favour by vote of 6 and 2 abstentions.

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposal 4

t.48

A hit which is made on a part of the body other than the target (whether directly or as a result of a parry), **or which is made after a combat offence, or after crossing one of the lateral boundaries of the piste with both feet** is not counted as a valid hit, but stops the fencing phrase and so annuls any subsequent hits (Cf. t.49).

Rules commission: Not in favour by vote of 6 and 2 abstentions.

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposal 5

t.72

1. A hit, which arrives on a non-valid part of the target, is not counted as a hit, **it is not registered by the apparatus**, it does not stop the fencing phrase and does not annul any subsequent hits. **On the other hand, a hit, which arrives after a combat offence or after the fencer has crossed one of the lateral boundaries of the piste with both feet is not counted as a valid hit, but stops the fencing phrase with any subsequent hit therefore being annulled.**

Rules commission: Not in favour by vote of 6 and 2 abstentions.

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposal 6

The proposal has been deferred

Proposal 7

The proposal has been deferred

Proposals of the Legal Commission

Proposal 1

Motivation: to harmonize the technical and organizational rules with the proposed changes to the Statutes.

o.63

With the aim of ensuring that the rules are observed at the World Championships and Olympic Games, the President and the members of the Bureau of the FIE have the right to **attend all meetings of the Directoire Technique** and of the official delegates of the FIE. The Directoire Technique is obliged to give them notice of such meetings.

It is the responsibility of the Bureau of the FIE or of its designated representative to settle any ~~other~~ disputes, **other than concerning discipline**, which arise at World Championships. **With respect to disciplinary actions, please see t.99.4 and t.123.2).**

Rules commission: In favour.

Legal commission: The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposal and suggests it be treated with Proposal 6 of the Legal Commission related to the Statutes since it deals with the same topic.

Executive Committee: in favour

Proposal 2

t.99

4. In urgent cases, the **FIE Central Office** may take the **preliminary** administrative measures necessary for the suspension of the licence of the accused in accordance with the Disciplinary Code.

Rules commission: In favour.

Legal commission: The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposal as amended to show that the “Central Office” is the Bureau and suggests it be treated with Proposal 6 of the Legal Commission concerning the statutes since it deals with the same topic:

t.99

4. In urgent cases, the **FIE ~~Central-Office~~ Bureau** may take the **preliminary** administrative measures necessary for the suspension of the licence of the accused in accordance with the Disciplinary Code.

Executive Committee: in favour of the proposal as modified by the Legal Commission

Proposal 3

t.123

2. If a complaint or protest contests a decision taken by the Directoire Technique or the official FIE delegate, it should be addressed to the FIE Central Office in accordance with Articles 7.2 and t.97.6.

Rules commission: In favour.

Legal commission: The Legal Commission is in favour of this proposal as amended to show that the “Central Office” is the Bureau and suggests it be treated with Proposal 6 of the Legal Commission related to the Statutes since it deals with the same topic:

t.123

2. If a complaint or protest contests a decision taken by the Directoire Technique or the official FIE delegate, it should be addressed to the FIE ~~Central Office~~ Bureau in accordance with Articles 7.2 and t.97.6.

Executive Committee: in favour of the proposal as modified by the Legal Commission

Proposals of the Legal and Medical Commissions

Proposal 1

Withdrawn

Proposal 2

Motivation: Standardise the age at which a fencer may participate in an official FIE competition based on actual date of birth alone.

Argument: Currently, to compete in their first cadet world championships (the only official FIE competition for cadets) after achieving the minimum age (currently 13) a fencer has to wait anything from some 3 months after their actual birthday (birthday on December 31st) up to 15 months (birthday one day later, on January 1st).

Similarly, to compete in their first FIE competition of any sort the wait from after their birthday is from a few days to a full 12 months.

In effect, currently we have a fluid 'minimum age' varying from thirteen to fourteen, which is complicated and unfair.

o.55

1. No fencer ~~is allowed to take part in an official event of the FIE unless he or she is at least 13 years old on 1 January in the year of the competition~~ may obtain an FIE licence, enabling him or her to enter for an official FIE competition, until he or she has reached their 13th birthday.

Rules commission: in favor of the proposal of the Executive Committee

Legal commission: See Legal Commission response to Proposal 7 – Proposals of the Executive Committee:

The Legal Commission agrees with the establishment of the birthday as the date for determining eligibility for an FIE license. Unless the medical commission presented documentation for a change of age, age 13 should be retained.

Medical Commission: After a discussion whether more medical research should be investigated on the minimum age limitation, the Medical Commission approved by majority to accept Proposition n° 2 to consider the date of an athlete's 13th birthday and thereafter as determinant to participate in FIE sanctioned competitions.

Executive Committee: In favour. See its modified proposal which proposes the same text.

Proposal of the Medical Commission

Proposal 1

Motivation: -These changes are aimed at finding the right balance between appropriate medical care for the fencers, fair play and minimal disruption to the competition.

- In 1 below 'event medical official' means the FIE medical delegate or the local duty doctor (for World Cups etc.).

Application:

Proposal to reduce length of break from 10 minutes to 5 minutes will be trialled during the 2016 and 2017 Junior and Cadet World Championships and 2017 Open World Championships.

Proposition n° 1 of the changed t.33 was approved unanimously by the Medical Commission.

INJURIES OR CRAMP, WITHDRAWAL OF A COMPETITOR

t.33

1. For an injury or cramp **or other acute medical incident** which occurs in the course of a bout and ~~which is properly attested by the delegate of the FIE Medical Committee or by the doctor on duty~~, has been assessed by the event medical official ~~the Referee will allow a break in the fight lasting no longer than 10 minutes.~~ the fencer may be allowed a break in the fight for treatment in order to continue to compete. This break will be timed from the start of treatment and will be for a maximum of 5 minutes. The actual period of time allowed will be decided by the event medical official. ~~This break should be timed from the point when the doctor gave his opinion and be strictly reserved for the treatment of the injury or cramp, which brought it about.~~

If the doctor considers, before or at the end of the ~~10~~ 5 minute break, that the fencer is incapable of continuing the fight, he will ~~recommend~~ **decide** that the fencer should retire (individual events) and/or be replaced, if possible (team events) (cf. o.44.11.a/b).

2. During the remainder of the same day, a fencer cannot be allowed a further break unless as a result of a different injury or cramp or **acute medical incident**.

3. Should a fencer demand a break which is deemed by the ~~delegate of the Medical Committee or by the doctor on duty~~ **event medical official** to be unjustified, the Referee will penalise that fencer as specified in Articles t.114, t.117, t.120.

4. In team events a fencer judged unable to continue the bout by the doctor may, nevertheless, on the advice of the same doctor, fight in subsequent matches on the same day.

PP Commission: In favour

Refereeing Commission: Testing of 5 min for injuries was positive. It helped to keep the time schedule and proved that 5 min for treatment of injury is enough. 5 min for injuries should be changed in the rules for the future

Rules Commission: In favour of a modified proposal as follows:

INJURIES OR CRAMP, WITHDRAWAL OF A COMPETITOR

t.33

1. For an injury or cramp or other acute medical incident which occurs in the course of a bout and which is properly attested by the delegate of the FIE Medical Committee or by the doctor on duty, the Referee will allow a break in the fight lasting no longer than ~~10~~ 5 minutes. This break should be timed from the point when the doctor gave his opinion and be strictly reserved for the treatment ~~of the injury or cramp which brought it about.~~

If the doctor considers, before or at the end of the ~~10~~ 5 minute break, that the fencer is incapable of continuing the fight, he will decide that the fencer should retire (individual events) and/or be replaced, if possible (team events) (cf. o.44.11.a/b).

2. During the remainder of the same day, a fencer cannot be allowed a further break unless as a result of a different injury or cramp or acute medical incident.

3. Should a fencer demand a break which is deemed by the delegate of the Medical Committee or by the doctor on duty to be unjustified, the Referee will penalise that fencer as specified in Articles t.114, t.117, t.120.

4. In team events a fencer judged unable to continue the bout by the doctor may, nevertheless, on the advice of the same doctor, fight in subsequent matches on the same day.

Medical Commission: Modified proposal agreed by the Commission:

t.33

1. For an injury or cramp or other acute medical incident which occurs in the course of a bout and which is properly attested by the delegate of the FIE Medical ~~Committee~~ Commission or, in his absence, by the doctor on duty, the Referee will allow a break in the fight lasting no longer than ~~10~~ 5 minutes. This break should be timed from the point when ~~the doctor~~ the delegate of the FIE Medical Commission or, in his absence, the doctor gave his opinion and be strictly reserved for the medical treatment ~~of the injury or cramp which brought it about.~~

If ~~the doctor~~ the delegate of the FIE Medical Commission or, in his absence, the doctor on duty considers, before or at the end of the ~~10~~ 5 minute break, that the fencer is incapable of continuing the fight, he will decide that the fencer should retire (individual events) and/or be replaced, if possible (team events) (cf. o.44.11.a/b).

2. During the remainder of the same day, a fencer cannot be allowed a further break unless as a result of a different injury or cramp or acute medical incident.

3. Should a fencer demand a break which is deemed by the delegate of the Medical ~~Committee~~ Commission or, in his absence, by the doctor on duty to be unjustified, the Referee will penalise that fencer as specified in Articles t.114, t.117, t.120.

4. In team events a fencer judged unable to continue the bout by the delegate of the FIE Medical Commission or, in his absence, by the doctor on duty may, nevertheless, on the advice of the same delegate of the FIE Medical Commission/doctor, fight in subsequent matches on the same day.

Executive Committee: In favour of the modified proposal of the Medical commission.

Proposals of the Rules Commission

Proposal 1

Motivation: In order to bring the rules up to date, add to the list of competitions in t.1 satellite competitions

OBLIGATORY USE OF THE RULES

t.1

These Rules are obligatory **without modification** for the 'Official Competitions of the FIE', viz.:

- The World Championships, in all categories
- The fencing events at the Olympic Games
- All World Cup competitions.
- The Zonal Championships.
- [The Satellite competitions](#)

Rules commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 2

Motivation: Since, with current FIE rules, this offence can no longer happen, in **t.18.5** – delete:

t.18

5. The order 'Halt!' is also given if the play of the competitors is dangerous, confused, or contrary to the Rules, if one of the competitors is disarmed or steps off the piste ~~or if, while retiring, he approaches too near the spectators or the referee~~ (cf. t.26, t.54.5 and t.73.4.j).

Rules commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 3

Motivation: Delete this article - it is no longer possible to commit this offence.

~~t.53~~

~~3. Fencers are forbidden to place a non-insulated part of their weapon in contact with their conductive jacket with the intention of jamming the electrical apparatus and thus avoiding being hit.~~

~~The penalty for committing such an offence is specified in Articles t.114, t.116, and t.120. Any hit scored by the fencer at fault is annulled.~~

Rules commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 4

Motivation: t.43.1.b) and d) The rules regarding the correct fitting of the conductive jacket at foil and sabre have been changed in book **m** ; to bring these two articles up to date and in agreement with **m.28.1** and **m.34.1**, rewrite as follows:

t.43

1

b) at foil, the conductive jacket conforms to the provision of Article m.28 when each competitor ~~is standing upright, is in the~~ 'on guard' ~~and is in the lunge~~ position;

d) at sabre, the conductive jacket conforms to the provision of Article m.34 when each competitor is ~~standing upright in the~~ 'on guard' ~~and is in the lunge~~ position;

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 5

Motivation: t.114.2 and 3, t.119, t.120: In all these articles, which quote, the sanctions associated with a **black card**, there is reference to '2 months': this should be changed to '60 days'. Months are of different lengths – the sanction should be consistent.

t.114

2 Penalties are cumulative and they are valid for the bout with the exception of those indicated by a BLACK CARD, which means exclusion from the competition, suspension for the remainder of the tournament and for the following ~~two months~~ 60 days of the active season (1 October – World Championships for the Juniors, and 1 January – World Championships for the Seniors), whether current or forthcoming.

However, a team excluded from a tournament because of a BLACK CARD imposed on one of its members is not excluded as a team from the following competitions, but it may not select the penalised fencer.

Certain offences can result in the annulment of the hit scored by the fencer at fault. During the bout, only hits scored in circumstances connected with the offence may be annulled (cf. t.120).

3

c. Exclusion from the competition, suspension from the remainder of the tournament and for the following ~~two-months~~ 60 days of the active season, whether current or forthcoming, indicated by a BLACK CARD with which the Referee identifies the person at fault.

t. 119

The first infringement in the Fourth Group, is penalised by a BLACK CARD (exclusion from the competition, suspension from the remainder of the tournament and for the following ~~two-months~~ 60 days of the active season (1 October – World Championships for the Juniors, and 1 January – World Championships for the Seniors), whether current or forthcoming). However, a **team** excluded from a tournament because of a BLACK CARD imposed on one of its members is not excluded as a team from the following competitions, but it may not select the penalised fencer.

t.120

BLACK CARD	Exclusion from the competition, suspension from the remainder of the tournament and for the following 2-months 60 days of the active season (1st October – World Championships for the juniors and 1st January – World Championships for the seniors), whether current or forthcoming.
-------------------	--

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 6

Motivation: m.12.2 and m.20.1: In both articles, delete the word '~~insulating~~': in both weapons, but particularly in foil, the tip absolutely must not be insulated from the blade.

m.12

2. Normally, only **fixing** by metal-to-metal is allowed. However, fixing by any

insulating material of great mechanical strength may be authorised after approval by the SEMI Commission of the FIE.

m.20

1. Normally, only **fixing by metal-to-metal** is allowed. However, fixing by any **insulating** material of great mechanical strength may be authorised after approval by the SEMI Commission of the FIE

Rules commission: In favour

SEMI Commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 7

Motivation: m book, Annex A, section 2.1.2: Since the use of transparent masks is now forbidden, the section of Annexe A dealing with these masks should now be deleted.

2.1.2. TRANSPARENT MASKS

1. ~~General~~

~~The FIE in its standard practices has established the possibility for fencers to use either traditional masks made with metal mesh or transparent masks.~~

~~The transparent visor, when used, must be a minimum of 3.0 mm in thickness and must also have a separate replaceable outer covering (a "sacrificial" layer) at least 1 mm in thickness. The visor must be made of polycarbonate resin thermoplastic, and each mask and each replacement visor must be accompanied, at the time of purchase, with a statement that guarantees the authenticity and origin of the polycarbonate resin thermoplastic. The visor must correspond to the required norms of materials and manufacture as indicated in 2.1.2. of the annex to chapter 3 (Materials) of the rulebook.~~

~~These transparent masks can be of two types:~~

~~— composite masks, made using traditional masks, of which a part of the front mesh has been replaced by a visor of transparent plastic;~~

~~— masks made entirely of plastic, of which the front part must be transparent.~~

~~Currently only composite masks have been accepted by the FIE.~~

~~The wearing of the transparent mask is forbidden at all weapons and in all FIE competitions.~~

~~2. Manufacturing norms for transparent masks~~

~~The norms are, at present, valid only for composite masks.~~

~~The starting point is a metal mesh mask; into the front part of the mesh, at eye level, a window is made by cutting the mesh to a width that may reach as far as the lateral part of the mesh and to a height that may not exceed 12 cm.~~

~~The window must be rimmed by a frame of stainless steel, made of two superimposed sections, of which the first is to be soldered to the mesh and the second fixed to the first by bolts.~~

~~The transparent visor made of polycarbonate (Lexan) will be placed between the two parts of the frame.~~

~~Care must be taken that:~~

~~— The thickness of the steel gauge of each part of the frame must be between 0.8 mm and 1.0 mm.~~

~~— The edges of the frame which holds down the transparent visor must not be sharp (cutting) and must adhere to the mesh, without any perceptible projections.~~

~~— The part of the frame that is soldered must be fixed to the mesh before the window is cut, to ensure that the shape of the mask is not altered when the wires of the mesh are cut.~~

~~— The bolts fixing the two parts of the frame must not project beyond the nuts into which they screw.~~

~~— The polycarbonate transparent visor (Lexan) must have a minimum thickness of 3.0 mm, and a protective layer against damage to the outside surface is recommended.~~

~~— The visor must not have any holes in it, must be shaped when hot, and placed in its location in the frame, under no pressure, when cold and, therefore, without being in any way 'stressed'.~~

~~— There must be provision for an anti-condensation system on the inside of the visor, or Lexan treated to this end must be used.~~

~~— Because of the damage caused to transparent visors during fencing competitions, it is essential that fencers are able to change the visor of their masks simply and easily.~~

~~— The padding of the mask must be reduced as much as possible, using any system which will provide a circulation of air virtually equivalent to that of the traditional mask.~~

~~— The total weight of the mask must not exceed 2 kg.~~

~~3. Safety standards~~

~~All transparent visor masks must provide a high level of safety for fencers. They must therefore comply with very strict standards and in particular:~~

~~— The whole structure of the mask must be rigid and not be distorted as a result of violent shocks.~~

~~— The metal mesh and the bib must have the same strength characteristics as those of traditional masks.~~

~~— Because of ageing of the plastic material, the polycarbonate visor must only be used for two years after its manufacture and, therefore, the date of manufacture, using the format of month (two digits) and year (four digits), e.g. 10-2010, must be indicated on it very clearly.~~

~~— To avoid degrading the polycarbonate, all contact with chemical agents that can damage the material must be prevented; in particular, any presence of PVC is unacceptable.~~

~~— The mask should be kept in a protective bag and it is desirable to avoid putting the mask in the fencing bag (and hence in the aircraft hold) during airplane journeys, but rather to keep it in hand luggage.~~

~~4. Homologation of transparent masks and test methods~~

~~Before being put on sale and used, all transparent visor masks must be approved and homologated by the SEMI.~~

~~4.1. Homologation~~

~~To obtain FIE homologation, the manufacturer must send his masks to one of the following three institutes: In Germany "Denkendorf" ; in France CRITT or IFTH. The institute will conduct penetration resistance tests on the metal mesh and the visor in accordance with the CEN norms (e.g. Norm EN 13567).~~

~~If the test results are positive, the constructor must send two examples of the mask to be homologated, together with the Institute's certificate, to the headquarters of the SEMI in Lisbon, for the violent shock tests.~~

~~If this result is also positive, the SEMI will issue the homologation certificate to the manufacturer, and the mask may be put on sale and used at official FIE competitions.~~

~~4.2. Violent shock testing~~

~~Transparent visor masks must satisfy either the norms established by the CEN Special Commission (cf. the paragraph on masks) or the additional norms established by SEMI relating to resistance to violent shocks.~~

~~Therefore, in addition to the tests for resistance to penetration on several parts of the mask as provided for by CEN norms, there is a need for a further test of the resistance of the entire mask to violent shocks, which might occur as a result of impact with the head or the guard of the opposing fencer.~~

~~This test will be carried out in the following manner.~~

~~4.2.1. Equipment for the test~~

~~The machine to be used must provide for a striker, of variable but known weight, to fall from a height which is also variable, up to a maximum of 2 m.~~

~~Fixed to the striker there must be a rod, made of tempered steel, ending in a head in the form of a sphere, with a diameter of 20 mm \pm 0.3 mm.~~

~~The rod must be 40–50 mm long and provided with a means of attaching it (normally a thread) to the drop test machine (see Figure A.1)~~

~~–~~

~~Figure A.1. Test rod~~

~~An appropriate support for the mask must be provided on the base of the test apparatus, to hold the mask firmly during the tests.~~

~~On the base of the apparatus, in effect, sliding structures must be in place that can be fixed in an established position, so as to form a sort of rigid box within which the mask is held (see Figure A.2).~~

~~Figure A.2. Method of affixing the mask~~

~~4.2.2. Drop equipment~~

~~The equipment to be used must allow a guided mass weighing between 3 kg and 5 kg to drop from variable heights to achieve a maximum speed of between 5 and 6 m per second at the moment of impact of the striker on the sample to be tested.~~

~~A means must be arranged for stopping the drop weight, with the aim that only the rod with the spherical end touches the mask, and not the weight.~~

~~The releasing mechanism of the striker must be controlled in such a way as to ensure the same starting conditions, whatever the height of the drop.~~

~~The rod, as already specified in 4.2.1, must be fixed to the drop weight.~~

4.2.3. ~~Sample to be tested~~

~~The sample to be tested must be the complete mask, but without the bib and the trimmings.~~

~~The mask must be placed on the base of the test apparatus, with the front part turned uppermost.~~

4.2.4. ~~Successive test cycles~~

~~The tests must be conducted in the following order:~~

- ~~1. first test on the visor with the impact point of the sphere on the centre of the mask and on the line crossing the centre of the visor;~~
- ~~2. second test on the same point.~~

4.2.5. ~~Procedure~~

- ~~1. Fix the mask onto the base of the machine and the rod with the impact sphere onto the drop weight of the drop test apparatus.~~
- ~~2. Place the mask in a such a way as to align the impact point on the mask's visor with the centre of the sphere.~~
- ~~3. Prepare the drop weight for a total weight of 5 kg \pm 0.03 kg, including the rod and the impact sphere.~~
- ~~4. For the first test, raise the drop weight to a height that gives a distance between the sphere and the point of impact on the mask visor of 1600 mm \pm 10 mm, corresponding to a drop energy of 80 joules.~~
- ~~5. Allow the drop weight to fall onto the mask.~~
- ~~6. For the second test, raise the same drop weight to a height of 1800 mm \pm 10 mm, corresponding to a drop energy of 90 joules.~~
- ~~7. Allow the drop weight to fall onto the mask.~~

4.2.6. ~~Test result~~

~~The result of the test is considered positive if the mask resists the two tests without either deformation or damage to the visor itself, or to the frame fixing the visor to the metal mesh.~~

~~Only a small impression on the polycarbonate visor, at the point of impact of the test sphere, is acceptable.~~

Rules commission: In favour

SEMI Commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 8

Motivation: m.44.5, m.51.7.a, m.52.4 and m.58: All these articles require that the only source of electricity for all the apparatus at FIE competitions should come from accumulators, i.e. car batteries. These rules have – understandably – been ignored for many years: we therefore suggest that the rules be revised in order to bring them up to date, bearing in mind any safety issues.

m.44

5. The **source of electrical current** (12 volts D.C. via a step-down transformer or by accumulators) (cf. m.58)

Rules commission: In favour

SEMI Commission: In favour of the following wording:

m.44

5. The **source of electrical current** (~~accumulators~~) should be 12 V DC via AC/DC converter or through VRLA (valve-regulated lead-acid) batteries (cf. m.58).

Executive Committee: In favour of the proposal as modified by the SEMI commission.

Proposal 9

m.51

7

- a) For official competitions of the FIE the **source of power** ~~must~~ ~~always~~ may be supplied either via a step-down transformer or by accumulators. In any event, the wiring of the ~~box~~ apparatus to be powered in this way must be designed so that it is impossible for the ~~box~~ apparatus to become connected by mistake directly to the mains supply.

Rules commission: In favour

SEMI Commission: In favour of the following wording:

m.51

7

- a) For official competitions of the FIE (cf. t.1) the source of power must always be ~~accumulators~~ secured through external batteries or UPS (Uninterruptible power supply) in order not to interrupt the load during the match if any interruption happens in the normal electricity supply. The wiring of the ~~box~~ apparatus to be powered in this way must be designed so that it is impossible for the ~~box~~ apparatus to become connected by mistake directly to the mains supply.

Executive Committee: In favour of the proposal as modified by the SEMI commission

Proposal 10

m.52

4. For official FIE competitions, ~~it is compulsory that~~ the apparatus should be powered by a step-down transformer or by accumulators. ~~without any connection to the main electrical supply~~

Rules commission: In favour

SEMI Commission: In favour of the following wording:

m.52

4. For official FIE competitions (cf. t.1) it is compulsory that the apparatus must be powered ~~by accumulators~~ through external batteries or UPS (Uninterruptible power supply) with minimum 5 minutes backup time ~~without any connection to the main electrical supply.~~

Executive Committee: In favour of the proposal as modified by the SEMI commission

Proposal 11

m.58

3. If the apparatus is constructed to operate with **dry batteries**, it must be equipped with a voltmeter or some other device enabling the power in the batteries to be checked at any moment. However, the apparatus must always be **equipped with either a socket, ~~as described above~~**, to allow it to be powered by accumulators **or a socket to allow it to be powered by a step-down transformer.**

Rules commission: In favour

SEMI Commission: In favour of the following wording:

m.58

3. If the apparatus is constructed to operate with dry batteries, it must be equipped with a voltmeter or some other device enabling the power in the batteries to be checked at any moment. However, the apparatus must always be equipped with **either a socket, ~~as described above~~** to allow it to be powered by ~~accumulator~~ **12 V DC via AC/DC converter or through VRLA batteries**

Executive Committee: In favour of the proposal as modified by the SEMI commission

Proposal 12

m.58

4. Generally, **if the apparatus is to be powered by batteries**, there should be **two batteries** available per apparatus: 12-volt car batteries are used, of 60 or 90 amps/hour.

Rules commission: In favour

SEMI Commission: In favour of the following wording:

m.58

4. Generally, **if the apparatus should be powered by batteries or UPS (Uninterruptible power supply)**, the minimum backup time for the external batteries or UPS is 5 Minutes.

~~there should be two batteries available per apparatus: 12 volt car batteries are used, of 60 or 90 amps/hour.~~

Executive Committee: In favour of the proposal as modified by the SEMI commission

Proposals of the Coaches council

Proposal 1

Motivation: The Turning of the Shoulder is something that has been very much opposed by the international foil community ever since its introduction after Rio Olympics. It is very difficult to understand how much “the shoulder of the non-sword arm” should be advanced “in front of the shoulder of the sword-arm” and for all referees and fencers to maintain the same understanding of this rule.

There are enough penalties in the rules for covering the target, turning, irregular movements on the piste, use of non-sword arm, etc. Proposal was discussed. All members of the Council are in favour of this proposal. This rule should be cancelled.

Special comments: Refereeing commission should be advised to use the rules of fencing in “close quarters” more consistently.

t.18. ~~5. In foil it is forbidden, during the course of fencing, to advance the shoulder of the non-sword arm in front of the shoulder of the sword-arm (cf.t.19). If a competitor does so he is liable to incur the penalties enumerated in Articles t.114, t.116, t.120. Any hits scored by the fencer at fault while committing this offence will be annulled.~~

Rules commission: In favour

Coaches council: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Athletes Commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 2

Motivation: To investigate possibility of reducing the gap (tolerance) in blocking time in sabre from 20 milliseconds to 3-6 milliseconds. All coaches present supported the proposal.

ANNEX B TO THE MATERIAL RULES C SABRE

a.8

After a hit has been registered, a subsequent hit made by the other fencer will only be registered if it occurs within a maximum of 170 ms (~~± 10~~ 3 ms).

Rules commission: Not in favour of changing the rule without evaluation.

Coaches council: In favour

SEMI Commission: In favour, but suggests +/-5ms

Executive Committee: Not in favour. Without supporting investigation and corresponding reports, it is impossible to choose between 10, 5 or 3 milliseconds. If tests have to be done in all FIE competitions, before making a final decision, it will be necessary to change again all the apparatuses.

Proposals of the Belgian Fencing Federation

Proposal 1

Motivation: this article leads to decisions being made by referees who do not reflect the spirit of the rule, if the article is strictly applied. This article is not needed, since the referee has other methods of justifying a penalty (turning one's back, covering, substitution, etc.)

t.18

5.The order 'Halt!' is also given if the play of the competitors is **dangerous**, **confused**, or **contrary to the Rules**, if one of the competitors is **disarmed** or **steps off the piste**, or if, while retiring, he approaches too near the spectators or the Referee (cf. t.26, t.54.5 and t.73.4.j).

~~At foil it is forbidden, during the course of fencing, to advance the shoulder of the non-sword arm in front of the shoulder of the sword arm (cf.t.19). If a competitor does so he is liable to incur the penalties enumerated in Articles t.114, t.116, t.120. Any hits scored by the fencer at fault while committing this offence will be annulled.~~

t.120

t.19				
Reversing the line of the shoulders at foil *	t.18.5	YELLOW	RED	RED
Application: starting season 2016-2017				

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Athletes Commission: In favour

Coaches Council: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 2

Motivation: Even if the proposal is rejected, it would still be a good idea to correct the index.

Index To Articles

[Reversing the line of the shoulders \(foil\) t.18.5](#)

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Athletes Commission: In favour

Coaches Council: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposals of the British Fencing Federation

Proposal 1

Motivation: Although the rules and diagrams seem to be clear, some referees and even some Directoires Techniques have assumed that the safety strips either side of the pistes for semi-finals and finals are part of the piste, thereby making it 50cm. wider. In order to make the rules quite clear, we propose to add a new paragraph 3 to article t.13

t.13

3. The **conductive safety borders**, indicated in Fig 1, the diagram of the pistes for finals and semi-finals, do not form part of the piste.

Rules commission: In favour by 3 votes, 1 against and 4 abstentions

SEMI Commission: The Commission did not form an opinion

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 2

The proposal has been withdrawn

Proposal 3

Motivation: Just as warnings and sanctions must be recorded, so should time taken for injuries and cramps – particularly as no further time may be taken for the same injury in the same day. We therefore propose the addition of the following sentence to t.33.1:

t.33

1. For an injury or cramp which occurs in the course of a bout and which is properly attested by the delegate of the FIE Medical Commission or by the doctor on duty, the Referee will allow a break in the fight lasting no longer than 10 minutes. This break should be timed from the point when the doctor gave his opinion and be strictly reserved for the treatment of the injury or cramp, which brought it about. If the doctor considers, before or at the end of the 10 minute break, that the fencer is incapable of continuing the fight, he will decide that the fencer should retire (individual events) and/or be replaced, if possible (team events) (cf. o.44.11.a/b).

All breaks for injury or cramp must be noted on the score-sheet for the bout, the pool or the match.

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour with the condition that the software is able to keep record of injury throughout the competition

Executive Committee: In favour of the proposal and agrees with the remark of the Refereeing Commission.

Proposal 4

Motivation: When a fencer makes an appeal for video refereeing, there is an interruption, sometimes quite long, which can irritate the spectators. In other sports which use a video-refereeing system, spectators are able to see the replays and hear the discussion between referees – which considerably lessens the harmful effects of the interruption, since the spectators feel much more involved in what is happening. We therefore propose the addition of the following sentence.

t.42

3

b. iv The replays of an action under review must be shown on a screen so as to be visible to the spectators: any discussion between the referee and the video-referee must also be made audible to the public.

PP Commission: Not in favour from L64 for practical reasons. In favour for finals for displaying of replay and propose testing of broadcast of communication.

Refereeing commission: In favour of making video available to public. Not in favour of making audio available to public.

Rules commission: In favour of the following wording:

t.42

3

b. iv At the Olympic Games and at the Senior, Junior and Cadet World Championships, the replays of an action under review must be shown on a screen so as to be visible to the spectators

Executive Committee: In agreement with the remark of the PP Commission and of the Rules Commission. The final text proposed, therefore, is:

t.42

3

b. iv At the finals of the Olympic Games and at the finals of the Senior, Junior and Cadet World Championships, the replays of an action under review must be shown on a screen so as to be visible to the spectators

Proposal 5

The proposal is withdrawn

Proposal 6

Motivation: Following recent anxieties caused by masks falling from heads during fencing, add the following two texts:

t.45

1. If a fencer appears on the piste:
 - with only **one** regulation **weapon** (cf. t.86.1/2); or
 - with only **one** regulation **body wire**; or
 - with only **one** regulation **mask wire**; or
 - with a weapon or a body wire which does not work or which does not conform with the Rules; or
 - without his **protective under-plastron** (cf. t.43.1.e); or
 - with a **conductive jacket** which does not fully cover the valid target; or
 - with a mask whose 2nd security device is not securely fixed to the body of the mask; or
 - with **clothing** which does not conform with the Rules;

the Referee will apply the penalties stipulated in Articles t.114, t.116, t.120 (First Group).

2. When during a bout an irregularity is found in the equipment which could be caused by conditions **during the bout**:

Examples:

- conductive jacket with holes in which hits are registered as non-valid,
- weapon or body wire no longer functioning,
- pressure of the spring in the point too weak,
- the travel in the point no longer regulation,

the Referee will apply **neither warning nor penalty** and any hit scored with the equipment, which has become defective will be awarded.

However, even during the course of a bout, any fencer whose weapon, at the moment he presents himself on guard and ready to fence, has a **curve of the blade** which exceeds that permitted (cf. m.8.6, m.16.2, m.23.4) commits an offence in the first group and will be penalised in accordance with Articles t.114, t.116 and t.120.

Similarly, even during the course of a bout, any fencer whose mask, at the moment he presents himself on guard and ready to fence, is not securely held on his head by the 2nd security device, commits an offence in the first group and will be penalised in accordance with articles t.114, t.116 and t.120

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 7

Motivation : If, in the course of a bout, an item of a fencer's clothing becomes damaged and therefore dangerous, he must have the chance to replace it with new clothing – if he has to buy it on the spot, it will not have his name, nationality or, if necessary, national logo on it. He should therefore be in the same position as a fencer replacing a non-regulation conductive jacket as outlined in article t.45.5. We therefore propose that the current article becomes t.45.5.a and the following text becomes t.45.5.b. We also suggest that if the organisers of the competition have not provided the necessary printing service for new clothing, this should be recognised as being 'force majeure'.

t.45

5

a. If the conductive jacket does not conform to the rules, the fencer must put on a spare jacket that does conform to the rules. If this jacket does not have his name and nationality on the back, the fencer has until the next stage of the competition (from the pools to the table of 64, the table of 32, etc.) to get his name and nationality printed on it.

If this is not done and except in cases of 'force majeure', the referee will eliminate the fencer and he cannot continue to participate in the competition.

b. If an item of a fencer's clothing bearing the name and nationality or the national logo becomes dangerous (e.g. tear, burst seam), the fencer must put on spare clothing, which conforms to the rules. If this clothing does not bear the name and nationality or the national logo, the fencer has until the next stage of the competition, as detailed in the preceding article, to get them printed on it. If this is not done and except in cases of force majeure, the referee will eliminate the fencer.

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

SEMI Commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 8

The proposal has been deferred

Proposal 9

Motivation: Article **t.122** states that casting doubt on the referee's decision on a point of fact is an offence, but it does not figure in **t.120**: we therefore propose that it be added to **t.120, 1.17** so that the text reads:

t.120

1.17

Unjustified appeal : casting doubt on the decision of the referee on a point of fact	t.122.2/4 t.122.1/2	YELLOW	RED	RED
--	--------------------------------------	--------	-----	-----

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 10

Motivation: We suggest changing the article reference for **t.120, 4.5**, currently **t.87.2**, to **t.87.2/3** – the offences in **t.87.3** also need to be covered.

t.120

4.5

Offence against sportsmanship	t.87.2/3 t.105.1	;	BLACK
-------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	-------

Rules commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 11

Motivation: Add the reference to article 'm.5.5.d', which also defines the fault in question.

t.120

4.3

Equipment altered to allow the recording of hits or the non-functioning of the apparatus at will	t.45.3.a) v) ; m.5.5.d	BLACK
--	---	-------

Rules commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 12

Motivation: The second explanatory note concerning black cards is in fact not accurate – they are preceded in three cases by a yellow card and in two cases can be given without even a yellow card. We, therefore, suggest deleting this note.

t.120

Explanations	
BLACK	A fencer only receives a BLACK CARD in the Third Group if he previously committed an offence in this Third Group (demonstrated by a RED CARD).

Rules commission: In favour

Refereeing commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 13

Motivation: For greater precision, we suggest changing the wording of the article from 'Fencers' clothing/ to

m.25

3

c. ~~Clothing~~-Jackets, under-plastrons, breeches and trousers must be made entirely in cloth able to **resist a pressure of 800 Newtons**. Very particular attention must be paid to the way the seams under the armpits, if there are any, are made. An **under-garment** consisting of a protective under-plastron covering the vital upper areas of the body (following the design given in Annexe A to these Rules, 'Safety norms for manufacturers') resistant to 800 Newtons is also obligatory.

Rules commission: In favour

SEMI Commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 14

Motivation: In the interests of safety, we suggest adding to m.25.6 a second sentence:

Glove

m.25

6. At all weapons, the **gauntlet of the glove** must, in all circumstances, fully cover approximately half the forearm of the competitor's sword arm to prevent the opponent's blade entering the sleeve of the jacket.

~~Under no circumstances, should there be any hole in the hand of the glove, even to allow the passage of the body wire.~~

Rules commission: Not in favour

SEMI Commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In agreement with the SEMI commission, in favour of the proposal.

Proposal 15

The proposal has been withdrawn

Proposals of the Iranian Fencing Federation

Proposal 1

Motivation: For more clarification, we propose to add the mentioned references:

o.17
2

b) If **at the end of regulation time the scores are equal**, the fencers fence for a deciding hit, with a maximum time limit of one minute (see o.17.1.b). Before the fencing recommences, the Referee draws lots to decide who will be the winner if scores are still equal at the end of the extra minute.

o.24

3. If **at the end of regulation time the scores are equal**, the fencers fence for a deciding hit, with a maximum time limit of one minute (see o.17.1.b). Before the fencing recommences the Referee draws lots to decide who will be the winner if scores are still equal at the end of the extra minute.

PP Commission: Not in favour. Unnecessary addition. In any case the rule reference is o.17.2.b

Rules commission: Not in favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposal 2

Motivation: In order to distinguish and pinpoint the real winner according to a real, fair and more exhaustive factor we propose the following sub-article to o.24 as:

o.24

5. Whenever the two fencers reach the score of 14/14, the match will continue until one of them reaches a result with a difference of 2 points.

PP Commission: Not in favour. Touches at 14-14 are some of the most exciting moments in fencing.

Rules commission: Not in favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposal 3

Motivation: In order to have pools of 7 in competitions organized with exemption, we propose to modify o.31.3;

o.31

3. At the Senior World Championships or senior world cups, if all pools are of 7, the 16 fencers entered, who are ranked highest in the most recent official FIE classification are exempt from the preliminary phase. If not, in order to have balanced pools, the extra **needed number** of fencers will be **added to or subtracted from the 16 exempted** fencers according to their initial FIE ranking.

PP Commission: Not in favour

Rules commission: Not in favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposal 4

o.32

2. After the round of pools, the 16 fencers ranked highest on the general index (cf o.19) are exempt from the preliminary direct elimination table. Should there be a tie between two or more fencers for the 16th place, there will be a barrage for 5 hits to decide who is ranked 16th. Following the barrage, the ranking of the fencers is determined according to V, TD-TR, TD. (2016/17)

After the round of pools, if the number of the first 16 exempted fencers was increased or decreased in order to have all pools of 7, the number needed to make up 32 from those who are ranked highest in the general index are exempted from the preliminary direct elimination table.

PP Commission: Not in favour

Rules commission: Not in favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposal 5

Motivation: As one of the most important aims of the FIE is to promote fencing and to encourage more countries to participate in its events, it seems that one of the easiest ways is to offer more privileges in its own official events. In this regards, awarding 2 third places in team events will help the winner teams to receive more franchising from their governments and their national Olympic Committees. On the other hand, receiving a bronze medal in a WCH or a WC will have great effects on the media, which in return will encourage more people to watch fencing on TV and finally participate in our beautiful sport. Therefore, we propose to add the following sub-article to o.43;

o.43

4. Two bronze medals are awarded to the losing teams of the semi-final matches.

PP Commission: Not in favour. The bronze medal match is a spectacle for our sport.

Rules commission: Not in favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposal 6

Motivation: In order to distinguish and pinpoint the real winner according to a real, fair and more exhaustive factor we propose to modify o.44.8 as follows:

o.44

8. The winning team is that which first reaches the maximum score of 45 hits, or that which has scored the greatest number of hits after the expiry of regulation time.

Whenever the 2 teams scores are equal at 44/44, the match will continue until one of the teams reaches a result with a difference of 2 points.

PP Commission: Not in favour

Rules commission: Not in favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposal 7

Motivation: According to “Training Theory” scientifically, a fencer or a team cannot reach his or its performance peak more than 2 times a year. Besides, in order to reduce the financial pack of member federations, we propose to reduce the number of events in the FIE calendar as follows:

4 individual World Cups

4 team World Cups

2 Grands Prix

Accordingly, we propose to modify the following articles:

o.83

1. Official FIE individual ranking

a) Principles

The official Senior ranking of the FIE takes into account the best ~~five~~ four results of the World Cup, Grand Prix or Satellite competitions in which the fencer has participated, irrespective of continent, plus the World Championships or Olympic Games and the Zonal Championships.

PP Commission: Not in favour

Rules commission: Not in favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposal 8

o.84

1. Official team ranking of the FIE

a) Principles

The official Senior team ranking of the FIE takes into account a team's **best four three results** in the Senior Team World Cup competitions, irrespective of continent, plus the Senior World Championships or the Olympic Games and the Zonal Championships.

PP Commission: Not in favour

Rules commission: Not in favour

Executive Committee: Not in favour

Proposals of Iraqi Fencing Federation

Proposal 1

Motivation: 1. If we have a quick look on the FIE ranking, for example, Senior Epee Men Individual (17/03/2017), we see that from the 1092 ranked world fencers, only 385 fencers have points and the rest 707 fencers have 0 points (about double).
2. To value the efforts of all participants in all FIE competitions.
3. To show the difference between eliminated and qualified fencers in the round of pools.
We propose to modify the scale of points in o.83.2 as follows:

o.83

Scale of points

2

a) The ranking is based on the **following points system:**

1st place	3248 points
2nd place	2640 points
3rd place <i>ex aequo</i>	2032 points
5th–8th places	1424 points
9th–16th places	816 points
17th–32nd places	412 points
33rd–64th places	28 points
65 th –96 th places	14 points
97 th –128 th	2 points
129 th –256	1 point

PP Commission: Not in favour

Rules commission: In favour of the following addenda to the current system without changing the current awarding of points:

97 th –128 th	0.5 point
129 th –256 th	0.25 point

Executive Committee: Not in favour of modifying the current point system. However, in order to value the participation of the athletes in competitions, it agrees to provide points to the fencers ranked 97th to 256th according to the proposal of the Rules Commission.

Proposals of Israeli Fencing Federation

Proposal 1

Motivation: The junior season starts at the 1 September. A fencer can be titled at the cadet junior and senior continental and world championships but cannot take part on the competitions ahead at the first 4 months of that season (1 September-31 December).

The following article contradicts o.55. 1. as it is because if the fencer is allowed to take part at the world championships (cadet junior and senior) then he or she can compete also on the 4 months (1 September-31 December) preceding the year of the world championships .

o.80. only fencers who are **of an age to qualify** for the next Junior World Championships may fence in the official FIE Junior competitions, individual or team, of the current fencing season.

o.55

1. No fencer is allowed to take part in an official event of the FIE unless he or she **is will be at least 13 years old** on 1 January in the **year season** of the competition.

Rules commission: Not in favour

Legal commission: See Legal Commission response to Proposal 7 – Proposals of the Executive Committee:

The Legal Commission agrees with the establishment of the birthday as the date for determining eligibility for an FIE license. Unless the medical commission presented documentation for a change of age, age 13 should be retained.

Medical Commission: After a discussion whether more medical research should be investigated on the minimum age limitation, the Medical Commission approved by majority to accept Proposition n° 2 to consider the date of an athlete's 13th birthday and thereafter as determinant to participate in FIE sanctioned competitions.

Executive Committee: not in favour. In favour of its own proposal.

Proposals of Italian Fencing Federation

Proposal 1

Motivation: The proposal aims to make uniform the rules for referees for the different categories and world cup and avoid the diversification regarding the issue.

In order to avoid that the countries participating with less than 5 athletes will not bring their referee and do not pay any fee, this rule will be more equal and all the countries will be responsible to their quota of the corresponding referee fee.

o.81

~~1-a) The number of FIE A or B Grade referees (cf. t.35) that must accompany teams to junior A Grade competitions and Veteran World Championship is:
1-4 fencers No obligation to provide a referee
5-9 fencers One referee
10 or more fencers Two referees
1 junior team One referee~~

~~For junior A Grade competitions, the name(s) of the referee(s) (who must have an FIE category in the weapon of the competition for which they are entered) must be notified via the FIE website 7 days before the competition (midnight, Lausanne time).~~

~~b) Should a national federation not provide the required number of referees, a fine (cf o.86, table of financial penalties and fines) will be inflicted on it.~~

For **Open A-grade, Grand Prix, Veterans World championships and Senior and Junior World Cup team competitions**, between 8 and 12 referees, depending on the number of expected fencers, proposed by the Refereeing Commission, will be designated by the Executive Committee and delegations will not have to provide any referees. The additional referees required (not less than 5) will be provided by the organizing committee.

All the referees will be at the expense of the organizers who in return will keep the entry fees.

For **Veterans World Championships and Junior World Cups** an additional entry fee for referees is added to the registration fee; the amount of this fee will be proposed by the organizers and approved by the FIE.

Legal commission: The Legal Commission expresses no opinion since this is a Rules provision that does not affect any statutory provision or principle.

Refereeing Commission: in favour for the Veterans World Championships. Not in favour for the Junior Word Cups.

Veterans' Council: in favour

Rules commission: The Commission agrees on the principle of this proposal. However, the entry fees and number of referees designated for each category must be defined and decided by the Congress. Unanimously in favour with the following wording:

o.81

2. For **Senior A-grade Grand Prix and Senior and Junior World Cup individual and team competitions and Veterans World championships**, the number of referees designated by the Executive Committee as proposed by the Refereeing Commission figures on the table below. Delegations do not have to supply referees. ~~8 referees proposed by the Refereeing Commission will be designated by the Executive Committee and delegations will not have to provide any referees. The additional referees required (no less than 5) will be provided by the Organising committee.~~

The organisers of all the above competitions are required to supply additional A and B Category referees depending on the numbers of fencers entered in order to guarantee both the quality of the refereeing and that only neutral referees are used.

All the referees will be at the expense of the organizers who in return will keep the entry fees.

Category of competition	Number of A or B referees designated by the FIE (one per country)	Entry fee
Senior World Cup	8	EUR 60 individual EUR 400 team
Grand Prix	14	EUR 100
Junior World Cup	5	EUR 60 individual EUR 300 team
Veterans World Championships	30	EUR 90 individual EUR 185 team

Executive Committee: Proposal already dealt with proposal no. 10 of the Executive Committee

Proposals of Swedish Fencing Federation

Proposal 1

Motivation: In order to ensure a clear understanding of how the length of the blade of an épée is measured a reference to m.3 should be added, same as in m.8.4 for foil. Paragraph m.16.3 should be amended as follows

m.16

3. The maximum length of the blade is 90 cm (cf. m.3).

Rules commission: In favour

SEMI Commission: In favour

Executive Committee: In favour

Proposal 2

The proposal has been deferred