

72nd UIPM Congress

Day 1, Session 1

Housekeeping information for voting delegates

A video was played to inform delegates about the procedures of the Congress.

Welcome message

UIPM President Dr Klaus Schormann (KS) welcomed delegates and said he looked forward to a Congress consisting of important discussions and fair debate to secure the future of the UIPM Sports movement.

Tribute to friends of UIPM

A video was played commemorating friends of the Modern Pentathlon movement who died in the past 12 months.

Congress conduction procedures

KS gave the floor to UIPM Secretary General Shiny Fang (SF), who asked UIPM Legal Counsel Fulvia Lucantonio (FL) to explain the Congress Conduction procedures. FL said that voting would be conducted by Lumi Global, a renowned provider of electronic voting and partner of the IOC and several international federations, and that the notary public would be Edward Gardiner (EG) of Cheeswrights, who had assisted several international sports Congresses.

FL said that for motions to pass, they would need a 2/3 majority or 50%+1 majority of the members present and eligible to vote, and this will be made clear in the motion before each ballot. FL further explained that for the sake of having certainty about the number of “members present” at the relevant vote, the percentage would be counted based on the number of votes (yes, no, abstain) expressed. Any abstention would be relevant for calculating whether the required majority for approval had been reached or not. FL said that each nation would have one turn to speak per agenda item or motion, with a clock on screen counting 3mins for their first intervention, followed by a UIPM reply, then an additional 1min for follow-up questions that would finally be addressed by UIPM again.

Roll-call of the Members

Kyle Sleep from Lumi and EG held the roll call.

A total of 83 NFs were counted as registered to the virtual meeting room at the time of the Roll-call. *See appendix (i) for the full list of NFs that participated in Congress¹.*

SF stated that with 83 NFs present at the Roll-call, the Congress reached the required quorum of at least 50% of 129 NFs members of UIPM at the start of Congress, and invited questions.

FIN: Noted that SWE was having a technical issue joining. Asked for a comment regarding voting, with rules stating that the calculation of a majority should be based on UIPM Statutes.

FL (response): Stated that all votes cast will be counted, whether Yes, No or Abstain.

CZE: Mentioned doubts about the eligibility to vote of every single nation. Asked if every NF deemed eligible to vote was recognised by its respective NOC. Asked to know which nations were taking part and which nations were included in the Roll-call.

FL (response): Confirmed that all nations invited were connected and vetted and good standing and with a right to vote.

SWE: In reference to the Roll-call, stated that UIPM Statutes contained three criteria and said it was important everyone knew who was being given the right to vote. Asked for highest standards of governance. Asked to what extent the participating NFs fulfilled the criteria: 1) active member, 2) fee-paying member; 3) recognised by its NOC. Stated that there was a lack of information online and the UIPM website listed the two nations whose membership is subject to approval in Congress as members. Asked if they had paid their membership fees and said UIPM Treasurer John Helmick (JH) had called earlier that day and admitted UIPM had paid some NF membership fees.

FL (response): Stated all members in good standing and meeting requirements to vote. Made no comment on JH phone call and said she could not recall the UIPM Budget showing any contribution to membership fees from UIPM.

SF (response): Stated there was no record of any NFs being suspended, which meant that all members would be able to vote. Asked members to vote on the Congress conduction procedure.

AUS: In context of SWE question, asked for evidence of due diligence had been to ensure members were eligible, including checking recognition by their NOC, and asked if Malta and Guinea (whose membership was subject to a Congress motion) were participating as members with voting rights.

FL (response): Confirmed that Malta and Guinea, as they had not been approved as members, did not have voting rights as of yet.

SF (response): Said she understood the members' concern but restated that when members become members they pass certain checks. In the absence of any suspension there was no reason to

¹ For the avoidance of doubt, the list in appendix (i) will show a total of 96 NFs which logged in during the course of the Congress while 83 of them were connected at the time of the roll-call. There were 97 voters in total, made up of 96 NFs and the UIPM Athletes Committee.

question their entitlement to equal voting rights. SF called for Congress to vote on the conduction procedure, stressing the importance of Congress and the need to move on.

Before calling the first vote, Lumi asked a test question with a reminder of the procedure for delegates that had not joined an earlier training session.

TEST QUESTION – 87 possible votes, 12 blank, 75 valid votes;

- YES 55 (73.33%)
- NO 14 (18.67%)
- ABSTAIN 6 (8%).

CONGRESS VOTE – UIPM Congress conduction

Does the General Assembly approve the UIPM 2022 Congress conduct procedures? (50%+1 majority needed)

87 possible votes, 5 blank, 82 valid, majority needed 42;

- YES 71 (86.59%)
- NO 10 (12.20%)
- ABSTAIN 1 (1.22%).

CONDUCT PROCEDURES APPROVED

Adoption of the agenda

CONGRESS VOTE – Adoption of the agenda

Does the General Assembly approve the UIPM 2022 Congress agenda? (50%+1 majority needed)

87 possible votes, 2 blank, 85 valid, majority needed 43;

- YES 78 (91.76%)
- NO 7 (8.24%)
- ABSTAIN 0.

UIPM 2022 CONGRESS AGENDA APPROVED

Approval of the minutes of UIPM 2021 Congress

SF invited questions from the floor.

MRI: Stated that they had missed the roll call and had been raising their hand for 15 minutes. Asked UIPM to confirm which African nations had registered to vote.

SF (response): Stated that UIPM had no access to that information at this stage².

AUS: Wished it formally recorded they raised their hand on both Congress conduction procedures and adoption of the agenda, as had a number of NFs, with no interventions permitted. Rejected the 2021 minutes as the voting system had been the same as the current Congress. Complained that UIPM was not acting democratically and not displaying good governance.

FL (response): Stated that the matter of UIPM 2021 Congress was brought to the Court of Arbitration for sport (CAS), which did not object to the way the Congress was conducted. She stated that the elections in UIPM 2021 Congress were run pursuant to Article 10 of the UIPM Election Rules with no tampering and no errors, as certified by a notary public.

GBR: Expressed support for AUS comments and expressed frustration with process in terms of amount of time and opportunity for nations to speak. Placed on record a request that a copy of the list of participating nations be provided by Lumi before Congress progressed any further.

FL (response): Stated that all NFs that had logged in could be seen by all other NFs that were logged in, and added that the list of all participating NFs would be in the minutes.

SWE: Seconded comments of AUS and requested the minutes to reflect that they were denied the floor on both previous agenda items, stressing the need for debate before voting on agenda items. Stated that it was not correct to add items to the Agenda, as per UIPM Statutes, and asked for this comment to be reflected in the minutes.

CZE: Asked FL about the method used to determine votes cast in UIPM 2021 Congress, following a conversation with SF and a request forwarded on email during the testing session. Highlighted apparent inconsistencies between 2021 and 2022 Congress.

FL (response): Stated that in 2021 the voting process was run as per the requirements of an election Congress, that the entire process was unified and Article 10 of the UIPM Election Rules was applied. Added that in 2022 there were no elections, so the relevant articles would apply according to the conduction procedures approved by more than 90% (*sic*³).

CZE (response): Stated that according to the opinion of 3 different legal firms, the UIPM 2021 Congress was not conducted according to Statutes, with Article 10.3 of the UIPM Election Rules referring to electing positions but not, for example, to voting on motions submitted by NFs.

FL (response): Noted the point, reminded Congress once more that CAS did not object to the conduction.

² As the Roll-call was being done by the Lumi system under the supervision of the Notary Public, SF could not provide the requested information at that moment.

³ FL referred to 90%. It is, however, to be noted that the conduction procedure for the 2022 Congress was approved with 87% of votes.

DEN: Referred to MRI question on African voting nations and complained that the lack of a full overview was undermining the process. Pointed out that UIPM was the “meeting leader, not the boss”, and asked for the question to be answered.

UIPM Legal Advisor Paul Fischer (PF) (response): Stated that UIPM had in advance of Congress provided credentials to every delegate registered by an NF, and only those persons competent and eligible to vote had been given the possibility to log in and cast a vote. Confirmed that the list of nations would be clearly indicated in the minutes and easy to check and review.

FIN: Complained that the quality of proceedings was bad, and asked if it were intentional to disable discussion. Complained that they had raised their hand and not been given the right to speak.

FL (response): Stated that UIPM had no control on the line and connection, that there was no intention to provide a bad service and that professionals were working on it and doing their absolute best.

FIN (response): In relation to the minutes of 2021 Congress, mentioned that an issue relating to JH answering a question about the costs of KS’s Presidential office had not been recorded correctly in the minutes.

PF (response): Noted that the minutes had been provided in the Congress Book well in advance of Congress and any objection could have been expressed sooner.

SF (response): Underlined that the minutes were sent 30 days after UIPM 2021 Congress, and again within the UIPM 2022 Congress book sent 30 days before, with no remarks. Asked Lumi to move to the voting procedure.

CONGRESS VOTE – 2021 minutes

Does the General Assembly approve the minutes of the UIPM 2021 Congress? (50%+1 majority needed)

87 possible votes, 6 blank, 81 valid, majority needed 41;

- YES 68 (83.95%)
- NO 8 (9.88%)
- ABSTAIN 5 (6.17%).

UIPM 2021 CONGRESS MINUTES APPROVED

Report of the President on the activities of the Executive Board

KS referred Congress to his written report and said he would like to provide more information. First, he thanked the athletes who had a great competition year in the global UIPM Sports circuit, and also those who took part in the New Pentathlon Discipline Test Events, whose enthusiasm he saw personally in their faces. He said he had attended many competitions and wanted to see athletes and listen and speak to them, not only hand out medals. He also thanked competition organisers at international and national level, and Committee and Commission members who volunteer their time for the benefit of the sport, describing his love for the Modern Pentathlon family in listening and speaking face to face and looking each other in the eye, sharing and respecting opinions. He thanked National Federations for supporting and attending competitions and asked Congress never to forget the strong solidarity shown by NFs in helping athletes from Ukraine.

KS said UIPM's relationship with IOC President Dr Thomas Bach was good, pointing out he had been appointed as a special mentor to the IOC Culture and Olympic Heritage Commission, while UIPM Vice President Joel Bouzou (JB) and other UIPM officials had also been trusted to serve on IOC Commissions. In a speech to the CISM General Assembly in Lima (PER) he said he had explained UIPM's process of mapping out a future after 2024 without Riding, and said the feedback was positive and CISM wanted to maintain their historic partnership with the sport. In university sport, he said Turkey had offered to organise the next FISU University Modern Pentathlon World Championships.

In a very stressful situation due to the pandemic and other issues, KS said the IOC was advising UIPM how to handle such situations. And he mentioned the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between UIPM and ANOCA, in Seoul (KOR) in front of 53 African NOCs and the IOC President, who introduced the accord and said it was an important matter. With the Youth Olympic Games Dakar 2026 coming up he said it was important to focus on that – together with all African nations trying to develop a sport with five disciplines and not only four. He said he was trying to raise money wherever possible and taking all possible measures to keep Modern Pentathlon in the Olympic movement for Los Angeles 2028. He finished by underlining President Bach's new emphasis on the word 'together' in the Olympic slogan, and said this was essential for the future of sport.

Report of the 1st Vice President / other Vice-Presidents

Juan Antonio Samaranch (JAS) said it was not a day for too many speeches, because life-changing decisions had to be made. He said he would save energy for his keynote address, where he would explain plainly how he saw the situation at this time. He said he was certain that all Congress delegates wanted the same thing – the best for Modern Pentathlon, with the key objective of staying in the Olympic Games.

SF mentioned that some delegates had raised their hands and would give them the floor after her report.

Report of the Secretary General

SF apologised for technical issues earlier in the day before giving a presentation entitled 'Embracing the Future!' designed to summarise UIPM activities in past year.

- **Sport growth:** IOC started from London 2012 to monitor impact and value of each sport on the Olympic programme. UIPM faced a lot of issues, especially around number of participants and NFs, and had worked since 2015 to address that. A graphic about new NFs showed a growth peak in 2019 (126) with continued slow growth since. An events portfolio graphic showed growth with a record number of participants in both the UIPM 2022 Biathlon-Triathlon and Laser Run World Championships, even without some traditionally strong countries that could not travel. The potential growth was illustrated by the fact that 90% of NFs currently took part in Laser Run and Biathlon but only 45% did so in Modern Pentathlon, and growth depended on accessibility.
- **Media growth:** reflected on a low participation base and fan base, and noted that numbers demonstrated growth from the Rio 2016 Olympics when the Fencing Bonus Round was introduced to a peak around the UIPM 2018 Pentathlon World Championships, before the trough of the pandemic, with numbers recovering in 2022 thanks to the new format of all five Modern Pentathlon disciplines within 2 hours. In social media, reflected that UIPM had missed the blooming years but with all possible efforts of very small team, caught the trend of growth and always found new ways to engage with fans, albeit competing with other IFs was not an easy task. Mentioned the good news of website users going up to 1m users in 2022 (compared to 280k in 2019) and 3.18m page views (compared to 930k in 2019), and the newsletter open rate that had also grown in 2022.
- **Support growth:** said it was not fair to compare Modern Pentathlon with team sports that had millions to spend, but still \$500k per year was given to development and 478 sets of equipment were provided in 2022. UIPM partnered with numerous universities to provide scholarships and there was a special focus on promoting opportunities for women coaches.
- **Service growth:** a short video was played based on the 4E strategy (Education, Equipment, Expansion, Empowerment). SF said the CCP, JCP and new ACP programmes were servicing 50 countries and certifying thousands of judges and coaches, and highlighted the UIPM Central app, Educational Platform, UIPM Shop and a CMS competition system servicing more than 100 events per year. More than 100 countries were supported and the goal was to reach 150 NFs by the end of 2024 via the NF Development Kit.
- **IOC data comparison:** reminding Congress of the tough reality of Olympic Games data comparison, SF said it was not only about Riding. IOC never had such an evaluation until London 2012, followed by Rio 2016 and Tokyo 2020. Modern Pentathlon was ranked last after London 2012 based on low numbers. SF showed three examples of graphics covering TV audience, appeal among youth and average audience/maximum audience. She said that total viewer hours were always the lowest for Modern Pentathlon because it only had two finals days, and the product was not TV-friendly, hence the need for the new elimination format based on conversations with IOC TV officials. The sport scored low on social, website and press articles, and a trend analysis indicated that in most KPIs it was lowest of all Olympic sports, and the gap between Pentathlon and the 'safe sports' was becoming bigger, especially for universality. SF stated that eight of the top 10 markets for Modern Pentathlon were within Europe and said the IOC was not looking for that.

- **Why new discipline?** The solution was proposed because innovation had until now not been enough to cover all the shortcomings, and there was a need to address accessibility, complexity and awareness. SF said she was still confident the new format could improve Paris 24 but the decision-making timeline around LA28 did not allow UIPM to wait and see the results. She repeated that Riding was not to blame, but it was the main limitation to growth for many countries and UIPM had to act quickly to meet IOC requirements, meaning the reality could not be ignored.
- **Why obstacle?** SF said this part would be covered by JB as Coordinator of Working Group.
- **Next steps:** End of November: finalise UIPM's proposal to IOC, including the new discipline name and competition format without detailed competition rules yet, and its added value to the Games. In 2023, she said the IOC Programme Commission would discuss and make recommendations to the IOC EB, then the EB decision was likely to be made in the middle of 2023 with a recommendation to IOC Session.

Finally, she stated a message of empathy to athletes, and appealed to them to appreciate that it was essential to protect the status of the sport.

With the approval of Congress, she stated an intention to provide a whole new package of the services related to the governing of the new discipline including workshop for each Confederation and its NFs, workshops for event organizers, guidelines and training tips – and to discuss potential combinations of the new discipline with existing disciplines as additional part of the UIPM Sports.

She finished by thanking all NFs and said the future of the sport was in their hands. She hoped that the next UIPM Congress in 2024 would bring an opportunity to physically celebrate together.

KS thanked SF for her report, and SF invited questions.

AUS: Addressed the conduct of the meeting so far, underlining the importance of Congress with the world watching, and claimed they had seen an undemocratic process, with speakers blocked as the agenda was progressed. Addressing the UIPM President's tenure of 29 years, they said the SG Report illustrated the demise of the sport, which was in a very bad place no longer in the Olympic programme and having to work for re-inclusion. They said the President had presided over the 'disaster' of Tokyo, which came about because UIPM had avoided advice on how to take the sport forward. Mentioned a draft contract they had seen between UIPM and World Obstacle (FISO) dating back to 2016. Described the New 5th Discipline Consultation as a smokescreen, accused UIPM of lying to the community and betraying the athlete base, with a 'majority of athletes' having asked UIPM to examine Riding reform. Finished by saying that the President should take responsibility for the situation because he had ignored due process.

KS (response): Reflected that he had known the speaker a long time and expressed surprise at his opinions, which he said were not correct and did not merit debate. He said he could not comment on statements made without knowing the source of information, saying UIPM was doing its best for the next generations. KS recalled the MOU drafted with FISO in 2016 and said that after an hour of consideration, he had disposed of it. He asked AUS for solidarity so that they could work together for the benefit of future generations and help Modern Pentathlon to stay in the Olympic programme in 2028.

AUS (response): Stated that KS's response was interesting but insisted that the opinions expressed were not only his, and said 700 athletes had signed a document expressing their wish to retain Riding, and 46 Olympic medallists wrote a letter of complaint to the IOC about process KS had overseen. They said it was not a minority view but rather that of the vast majority of the global community, who had asked for due process and transparency. They said KS was responsible and had shown appalling governance and the sport needed to restore its respect.

JAS (response): Added a remark about claims made that purported to represent the wishes of athletes of the world. He said it was difficult to claim to be the representative of those people, because the UIPM Athletes Committee had been elected by the athletes during the UIPM 2021 Pentathlon World Championships to perform this duty. JAS pointed out that candidates were not proposed by UIPM or by any secret force, but by the athletes. Therefore, he said that if someone had the right to speak on behalf of athletes, it would be the AC, not an obscure group – and this system was standard throughout the Olympic community. Turning to other comments, JAS said he would not answer, respecting the opinion of the speaker, admitting there could be a long conversation on what was done well and what could have been done better, but most important was discussing how to stay on the Olympic programme; otherwise all discussion would be futile.

FIN: asked SF to confirm the process that everybody who raised their hand would be allowed to speak.

SF (response): Yes

FIN: 1) made comments on UIPM strategy, disputed the interpretation of success in a situation where Modern Pentathlon was out of the Olympic Games for 2028; 2) at the same time losing 80% of sponsor revenue between 2019-22 – said sponsors were 'voting with their feet'; 3) commented on a recent letter from an athlete group to the IOC, stressing a belief that every athlete was entitled to their own voice; 4) commented on Russia, noted the lack of any thanks for UIPM Vice-President Viacheslav Aminov or any presentation made, which led them to question why UIPM allowed leaders who support Russian aggression to remain in office while athletes and coaches were suspended from competition.

SF (response - 1): Underlined that Modern Pentathlon was not out of LA28, just not in the initial programme.

JH (response - 2): Stated that the comment around 80% of sponsors was not correct. Said sponsors had been retained, and would elaborate on this in his presentation. Mentioned New Balance and Absolute Fencing and RAM as examples. Admitted Tokyo 2020 had been difficult and sponsors clearly had concerns about cancellation, but these had been addressed, resulting in the retention of 100% of sponsors.

UIPM Athletes Committee Chair Yasser Hefny (YH) (response - 3): referred to earlier explanation by JAS about the democratic system of athlete representation. Assured Congress the Athletes Committee had acted in the correct way, not just before Congress but since the beginning of its term by creating an athlete rep network, to connect with them before every important decision. Said data could be presented after Congress, and added that every athlete even those not part of an NF had been invited to give their feelings.

JAS (response - 4): Speaking also in his capacity as IOC Vice President, described the IOC reaction to the 'cruel and brutal invasion of a sovereign country' and its decision to immediately suspend Russian Government officials and remove an award given previously to President Vladimir Putin, recommending that no competitions be allowed to take place in Russia or Belarus, and initially recommending that athletes be enabled to compete on behalf of independent NFs because they had not been guilty of anything. This had created a moment of conflict, he said sport was the only way of keeping competition alive, but the IOC had to change policy, not to sanction athletes but to protect the fairness of competitions by recommending IFs should not allow athletes to compete for the time being. He stated that the IOC was always looking to reverse that decision ASAP. For officials who are not responsible for the situation in Ukraine, he said that to suspend them would be to punish them, and the IOC was not in that league because guilt is individual, not collective, and not relating to one's passport.

SF: reminded Congress that each VP had contributed a written report to the Congress book.

FIN (response): Stated a clarification that their remark about 80% sponsorship revenue was not about the number of sponsors. Repeated opinion that as Russian killing continued in Ukraine, Russia should have no role in UIPM Congress. And asked KS for an answer on the athlete question.

SF (response): Asked FIN to repeat the precise question to KS, and reiterated that all speakers would be allowed to speak before voting on every motion.

MRI: Congratulated the new CAPM President but raised doubts about the CAPM Board, with no General Assembly and the President using money to travel without budget approval. Stated that this had been reported to SF. Addressing KS comment about close relationship with African countries, asked which countries? Raised doubts about the ANOCA MOU and asked for it to be published in full, with no mention of it in either UIPM or ANOCA Statutes. Stated that they had introduced KS to ANOCA in the past, but nothing had been done, and suddenly now KS was talking about Africa a lot, because pressure had been applied about neglect of Africa. Heard KS will attend CAPM Board meeting in South Africa and asked why money would be used for this which could instead be spent on development.

KS (response): Stated that he had always tried to raise money for special projects. Former SG Bouzou had already had discussions with the NOC President who was now ANOCA President. Said he had spent much time in African countries and mentioned a special sponsor who was paying for meetings focused on Africa, therefore it was nonsense to claim that special funds from the Union were being used. Claimed that discussions were continuous over the years and he was very happy to sign the MOU with content that was studied for weeks by the ANOCA Board. Asked UIPM Vice President Sharif Elerian (SE) and African Confederation President Sylvestre Zare (SZ) to add remarks as the MoU was the action of a team with a big focus on Dakar 2026.

SZ (response): Challenged MRI as a person who was CAPM President for five years to state what they had done for Africa. Described the question asked to KS as indecent, because it was a matter for the CAMP Executive Board. Stated that CAPM did have a GA and MRI did not attend, this is why they had no information. Said they were unwilling to fight over futile issues, with a need to stay positive and do all possible to boost development in Africa, and said all CAPM EB members were informed of what was happening at every moment.

SE (response): As President of the leading NF in Africa, Egypt, provided an assurance that Africa is going in the right direction under the guidance of SZ. Claimed that nothing was done in five years with Mr Fakun (MRI) as President and this is why Africa had asked for change and they had lost the Presidency. SE said he was happy with progress in just one year, with the ANOCA MOU signed, and remarked that UIPM had been in connection with ANOCA long before they or anyone from MRI had been involved in MP. Asked them not to give misleading information. Said he was not blaming MRI for failures, but asked them to respect the direction of travel. Commented on an apparent attempt to deliberately delay Congress, with only 7/8 nations asking for the floor all the time. Called on the community to put differences aside and focus 100% on the priority. Lastly, stated that the Athletes Committee was elected democratically by athletes of the world, and they were consulting with the whole athlete group to listen before making decisions.

MRI (response): Noted the accusations raised against them by KS and SZ and SE, and complained that one minute was insufficient to reply after three replies to his comment lasting a total of eight minutes.

SWE: 1) Questioned the President's Report and its apparent definition of success; instead described the last 1.5 years as a disaster. Mentioned the exclusion of Modern Pentathlon from the provisional programme of LA28; stated that athletes 'obviously don't like' the new UIPM Sports with no registered athletes in over 25 member countries; stated that Africa can't be going in the right direction with only 30% of countries members of UIPM. Also stated that UIPM was asked by IOC to work with all athletes, not only a few, and yet many athletes would have asked for a 'Pentathlon United' presentation to be on the agenda, to be 'fair to everybody'. Challenged KS to name the sponsor involved in Africa.

YH (response): Expressed happiness at NFs representatives advocating the athlete voice and the apparent excitement about protecting athletes. Assured Congress that according to IOC advice, the AC is connecting with all athletes all over the world – supportive or not. Stated that athletes not being happy with everything is normal, but the role of the AC was to give feedback to leadership and improve. Mentioned an online meeting with 'Pentathlon United' two days before Congress, and confirmed that ultimately the AC will build an opinion based on majority of athletes around the world.

JH (response): Stated that he would speak about sponsors in report and confirmed that sponsorship revenue is never budgeted unless there is a signed contract.

UGA: 1) What is the cost of an Obstacle course and how will it be installed in all countries that are lacking in resources? 2) Asked why none of the Test Events to date could have taken place in Africa to help African nations understand it better. 3) Asked if developing nations could be given resources at the start of each year, not only from the relevant Confederation but also financial and technical support. 4) With Africa struggling to get on its feet, anything geared towards sustainability should be welcomed by Europe and Americans and all others; Riding reform proposals do not mention what would be done for Africa; UGA doesn't have a single athlete riding horses.

SF (response): Assured that more Obstacle test/events would go to Africa if Congress passed the relevant motion and said UIPM would be in touch about relevant support.

JH (response): Said that UIPM had learned from the Test Events that obstacles could be bought and rented at different levels. Stated that wooden playground obstacles were inexpensive. Spoke about possible provision in future Budgets for nations to be allocated funds to build obstacle courses.

SZ (response): Said that information had been given but thanked UGA for making an 'important point' and underlining the self-interest that exists in certain countries, by highlighting that in Africa, only Egypt and South Africa can support Riding, which limits all other nations.

UGA (response): Again challenged UIPM on Africa and asked how countries could benefit the same way as those in Europe, the Americas and Asia.

KS (response): Referred to President's Report about the big focus on Africa and highlighted inclusion and facilitating participation in all five disciplines, which applies to other continents too, and the same nations should not be dominant – which he stated was the reason for signing the MoU with ANOCA – to enlarge our sport in Africa.

DEN: 1) Challenged KS to speak about the problems of 2021 in a 'fair way' rather than giving a historical account of the last 30 years in the Congress Book. 2) Stated that AC member James Cooke (GBR) had 'spoken openly' that the majority of athletes favour keeping Riding. 3) Acknowledged the problems around starting up Modern Pentathlon in Africa, and said the logical thing was to start up Obstacles as a standalone sport and leave Modern Pentathlon as it is.

KS (response): Said that it was a matter of choice whether or not to agree with his report. Stated that UIPM is looking forward to the future and doing everything it can to be in LA28, remaining in very close contact with the IOC. Stated that DEN would be welcome to attend more competitions so that all countries around the world can be involved.

UIPM Innovation Commission Chair, Ivar Sisniega (IS) (response): Stated that Den had touched on a central topic asked if Modern Pentathlon should be left to a small number of rich countries where horses were available, or if it should be universal? Argued that the sport should be a true test of the universal complete athlete, which meant including the whole world. Stated that UIPM Congress was essentially voting on whether or not it wanted the sport to be global or only accessible to a small number of countries.

DEN (response): Argued that it was not only a small number of countries, and clarified that he was not advocating for countries not to join the movement, but where they do, they should be properly supported and not only 'on the voting list'. Argued that 70-75 countries would in principle be enough, and the 'impossible mission forcing you to change the sport beyond recognition' would result in nothing being left of Modern Pentathlon.

SRI: 1) thanked UIPM for its attempts to introduce a new discipline to the sport. 2) Like UGA, stated that SRI was a new member to the Union with a lot of challenges and problems to resolve. Recalled its introduction in 2014/15 when UIPM provided equipment support etc, and in 2017 the creation of the UIPM Sport Pyramid was a benchmark – with more than 400 athletes in SRI starting Laser Run. Said that all efforts to facilitate a full Modern Pentathlon met with the problem of Riding, and now felt very fortunate that they could focus on the new discipline with high confidence about producing athletes for the international arena – immediately double with the new format. Invited fellow

delegates to show fair play and help developing countries to join the sport as friendship and fairness are pillars of the Olympic movement.

GBR: 1) asked if it would be possible to ask questions on each Vice-President's report with multiple time slots? 2) Mentioned the future investment outlined by JH with regard to Obstacle, asked what investment would be made to support Riding as the sport continues to feature Riding?

SF (response): Stated that Q2 would be answered in JH report.

IND: Confirmed that they would be able to produce more pentathletes if the new discipline were approved; agreed with SRI and recalled origins of development in 2010 with difficulties remaining due to Riding; requested Congress to consider fellow athletes in other countries and give them a chance to compete in a fair way. Stated that the new event would raise viewership on digital and social platforms; requested UIPM to take a step forward and provide development support to maximum number of countries.

SF concluded the Q&A and thanked all delegates for their contributions and informed them there would be more opportunities to speak about reports and motions later.

Report of the Treasurer

JH remarked that it was a pleasure to report on financials of UIPM – past, present and future. He referred to his written report in the Congress Book and provided commentary around the following accompanying slides:

- 1) Revenues – projections vs actual 2017-2020.
- 2) Expenses – projections vs actual 2017-2020.
- 3) Year 2020 and Year 2021.
- 4) JH also reported on aspects of Year 2022 finances (without an accompanying slide), finishing by projecting a cash balance of \$7,838,585 at the end of 2022.
 - Commented on several motions from NFs about financial matters and said he had proactively contacted AUS and SWE to clarify and understand their concerns. Mentioned that KPMG had been providing independent audit of UIPM finances for 20 years and acknowledged that this had not met GAAP standards. Announced to Congress that he had agreed with KPMG to provide GAAP-standard auditing for 2021⁴ (by Dec 2022) and 2022 (by end of Q1 in 2023). Advised that differences in style of financial statements would be explained and asked for questions to wait until budget presented. He finished by thanking the UIPM Secretariat and book-keeper Valerie Russo (VR), UIPM Finance Director.

⁴ JH statement was partly inaccurate as 2021 audit has already been published, therefore GAAP-standard auditing will be applied initially to 2022

Report of the honorary auditors

JH clarified that Honorary Auditors are elected by Congress, and explained how the auditing process works and the roles played by himself, VR, KPMG and the Honorary Auditors within that. He stated that the Honorary Auditors were not in attendance at Congress and had asked JH to read their report, which he did. It was split into the following three sections, around which JH provided commentary.

- 1) National Federation Membership Fee
 - With the Honorary Auditors recommending a new policy to support members paying their fees on time, JH stated a belief that Confederations were in the best position to collect membership fees, using the example of the recent 2022 NORCECA Championships where fees were collected. He therefore stated that each Confederation's budget had been increased according to its number of members.
- 2) Optimizing Financial Results with two recommendations as follows:
 - a. Low interest rate
 - JH said there would be a more detailed study to follow, with the Hon Auditors looking for UIPM to increase its current return of 1.5% on funds invested.
 - b. Minimize financial loss due to dollar and euro fluctuations
 - JH noted that UIPM's budget was presented in USD but with a majority of expenses (60-65%) in EUR, USD-EUR was a key conversion, and any loss on currency being held had to be marked on financial statements.
- 3) Governance
 - After analysing some invoices, Honorary Auditors recommended that UIPM should finalise all ongoing payments through contracts or signed agreement letters applicable to lower amounts; they also proposed 5k yearly to justify use of this suggested procedure. JH said he had met with auditors and agreed, so they established a safe Dropbox account to hold all contracts and invoices above a value of \$5k where they can be quickly reviewed by UIPM HQ, Treasurer and President.

JH concluded by commending the Honorary Auditors for their work across three days and said he was sorry they were not present to answer questions.

Adoption of the budget plan and approval of the budget for 2023/24

JH provided commentary around the budget for 2023 and 2024, displayed on the screen.

Total projected income was \$660k for 2023 and \$750k for 2024.

Total projected expenses was \$4,345,000 for 2023 and \$4,826,000 for 2024.i

With a beginning cash balance of \$7,838,585, the budget forecast a cash balance of \$4,153,585 at the end of 2023 and \$77,585 at the end of 2024.

FIN: Noted an excellent improvement in standards compared to previous years. Asked six questions:

- 1) Any reason to display comparisons with realised figures and budgeted figures and not year-on-year change or actual EUR vs USD figures?
- 2) Why did it take 10 years since 2012 for SWE proposal for GAAP standards to be passed?
- 3) Why is there no rotation of Auditors, even with the move to GAAP standards? Remarked that this was a risk and not best practice.
- 4) Referred to Statutes where each NF is asked to follow international accounting standards; why not UIPM?
- 5) Referred to the audit by KPMG: is this an independent *audit* as required by Statutes or a *review*, as you stated in your presentation (Page 65 in Congress Book)?
- 6) Referred to JH statement re 150k for development of Obstacle equipment; asked for clarification in context of statement around \$15k cost of the course.

JH (response) – answering in reverse order:

- 6) Spoke about a possible plan to provide nations with support for obstacle equipment in the 2025-28 Olympic cycle.
- 5) Said that KPMG had confirmed they were independent, reviewed, compiled financial statements, that did not meet GAAP or international financial reporting standards, but it would not take long to bring them up to standards. JH said those standards would be met for 2021⁵/22. He agreed this was not a standard that should be considered acceptable, hence the increase.
- 4) JH said he had never reviewed a NF audit other than USA, so it was hard to comment. Acknowledged that Confederations should provide more clear financial statements.
- 3) To upgrade the KPMG audit to GAAP standards would take time so JH said they would be retained for 2021⁶/22, and confirmed the EB will look at other auditors, but Monaco has limited choices. Stated that switching every 3-5 years is recommended practice.

FIN (response): Thanked JH for the honest commentary and the improvements, which showed that previous standards were unacceptable during the President's tenure. Called for continued improvement with better annual reporting standards of audit.

AUS: Asked if the procedure of Congress was according to international meeting standards, noted that the sequence of reports and motions was jumbled, confusing and limited discussion. Criticised UIPM's "governance ethics and democratic process". Stated that the Treasurer's tenure would be untenable in any other organisation.

⁵ Only 2022, not 2021, as per footnote No.3

⁶ Only 2022, not 2021, as per footnote No.3

JH (response): Clarified that the audit financials were subject to a change in UIPM Statutes in 2019, and were not yet at the preferred standard but the difference was marginal and would not take long to get to IRFS standards.

AUS (response): Asked JH to explain how it was acceptable that the accounts hadn't been "up to standard" for over a decade, and asked for disclosure of sponsorship supporting President's travel to Africa.

JH (response): No projection in 2023/24 Budget or any other Budget for any sponsorship fees that are not signed under contract. All monies received recorded in financial reports. Clarified that he had not expressed a view that the standards were 'poor', but said instead that standards needed to be raised, which was under way.

SWE: Welcomed JH admission that improvements were coming as a result of pressure from NFs. Asked four questions: 1) why was expenditure recorded such an opaque way? 2) related to that, asked for total spending for the President's Office including compensation of expenses, travel and discretionary spending he controls, noting a media report about a State of Hesse inquiry; 3) asked for details of the cost of developing OCR and noted the lack of information on spend on improvement of Riding in 2021; 4) reiterated the call for information about the President's African travel sponsor.

JH (response): 1) invited SWE to email or call to talk about improving financial reporting and disclosures; 2) Stated that the President was a volunteer with a budget of \$200k that covers his assistant, office and travels except IOC/ANOC travels under International Relations budget; total expenditure was \$240k, budget was adhered to; stated a belief that UIPM had the least expensive IF President in the world; 3) agreed to provide the relevant figures offline; 4) Said that the value of the sponsorship was €18k, did not agree to disclose identify of the sponsor other than to name it as a Swiss entity, and repeated that until such a contract is signed it doesn't exist.

CZE: Two points. 1) Queried the cost of providing professional conditions for Obstacle training and competition, suggesting that the \$15k stated by UIPM did not match their research for a whole, safe, professionally built and homologated course. 2) Asked for clarity on the suggestion made earlier in Congress that UIPM had paid membership fees for a high number of NFs.

JH (response): 1) clarified that the source for the \$15k estimate was obstacle experts. 2) Clarified that UIPM has not paid any NF membership fee; added that UIPM Confederations have paid some member fees as is their right to where some nations can't afford it; added that UIPM provides such nations with non-financial support, e.g. equipment.

MRI: Thanked JH for report and noted that the African sponsor remained unnamed. Four questions: 1) Noted that Africa was allocated \$49k in UIPM budget and asked about the criteria for continental funding; 2) asked if UIPM Statutes should be changed to reflect such criteria? 3) asked if CAPM was registered and if so, where? 4) asked how many countries the UIPM President had visited in Africa in 2021/22.

JH (response): Clarified that the membership fee per nation was \$300 and said UIPM believed that Confederations were better placed than UIPM to receive fees; also said he didn't count the number of countries visited by the UIPM President.

GBR: Three questions: 1) asked why an earlier question about future investment in Riding had not been addressed; 2) asked why other competitions were not subject to the rights fee contribution paid by the UIPM Pentathlon World Championships host; 3) highlighted the budgeted reserves of 77k and suggested that it seemed a low number.

JH (response): 1) Explained that the UIPM budget had an allocation for development and this could cover Riding if the EB wished, also that the European Confederation (for example) could use its grant to host a Riding clinic; 2) remarked that the \$50k rights fee for WCH is normal and in fact a very low fee, covering some but far from all of the costs incurred by UIPM; 3) explained that there is always more demand for resources and the budget would have to be dramatically changed to accommodate a reserve of say, \$1m, which he would prefer to have, and if Congress wanted it he would reduce allocation for other areas.

GBR (response): Noted the suggestion of \$1m and asked what JH would feel appropriate? Also replied on the rights fee and noted there was no host for 2024 WCH and perhaps removing the fee would encourage more bids.

JH (response): Said if he could wave a magic wand, would like to have an aggregating reserve that equates to one year of expenses, but said it would be challenging because some competitions cost money and do not generate a profit.

SF (response): Remarked that China is the provisional organiser of 2024 WCH, having already paid a hosting fee of 100k for the postponed 2020 competition, with a new bid in the pipeline.

DEN: Agreed with GBR statement and remarked that some NFs would struggle to find \$50k and this could be preventing the sport from flourishing. Two questions: 1) Asked if it was routine for NF membership fees to be paid by Confederations. 2) Asked JH to expand on interim statement at points 62.10 and 63.10 and asked how these figures were composed.

JH (response): Noted that most International Federations receive a lot of revenue from sponsorship and rights fees and organisers have entry fees.

UGA: Appreciated JH answers and thanked other NFs for their dialogue. Suggested that JH give a special percentage of income to African and Latin American countries from Confederations.

UZB: Thanked colleagues for their patience during the first session of Congress. Expressed her respect for the opinion of everyone including the "8-10 Federations out of 83" that seemed to disagree with all UIPM policy and everything being proposed by UIPM, and noted that the time allocated to Congress was being wasted by "useless questions and foolish insinuations that have been discussed for plenty of time already", and said it was upsetting to hear the lack of respect paid to the President and EB Members elected by the General Assembly 12 months previously. Asked why all of Congress had to listen to the same people asking the same questions, "like chewing the bubble gum".

CONGRESS VOTE – Approval of budget plan

Does the General Assembly approve the budget plan for 2023 and 2024? (50%+1 majority needed)

92 possible votes, 15 blank, 77 valid, majority needed 39;

- YES 63 (81.82%)
- NO 9 (11.69%)
- ABSTAIN 5 (6.49%).

BUDGET PLAN FOR 2023 AND 2024 APPROVED

Approval of the new members

Malta and Guinea were proposed as new member federations of UIPM.

CONGRESS VOTE – New members

Does the General Assembly approve the new UIPM members presented? (50%+1 majority needed)

92 possible votes, 12 blank, 80 valid, majority needed 41;

- YES 70 (87.50%)
- NO 6 (7.50%)
- ABSTAIN 4 (5.00%)⁷.

NEW UIPM MEMBERS APPROVED

⁷ With the approval of UIPM Congress, Malta and Guinea officially became Members with voting rights.

Reports of representatives of other UIPM bodies

Reports of continental confederations

SF referred to the written reports in the Congress Book and said that questions could be accommodated after the break but Congress was already subject to significant delays.

SF adjourned the session for a 20-minute break.

Day 1, Session 2

Keynote speeches

Speeches were made in the following order. *See appendix (ii) for full text.*

1. UIPM President Dr Klaus Schormann
2. Michael Payne, former IOC Marketing Director
3. Yasser Hefny OLY, Chair, UIPM Athletes Committee
4. Joel Bouzou OLY, UIPM Vice President and Coordinator of the New 5th Discipline Working Group
5. Juan Antonio Samaranch, UIPM 1st Vice President and IOC Vice President

A short film was then played about the history and the future of Modern Pentathlon.

Decisions on motions from the Executive Board

Motion 1

- Obstacle Discipline: Statutes

SF referred Congress to Page 124 of the Congress Book and invited questions from the floor.

AUS: Thanked all speakers and noted their passion and asked that where there were differences in opinion, all should be aligned on the importance of governance and opportunity for proper debate. Noted that there were five keynote speakers, with only one opportunity to reply; no notice given of who would speak, and suggested that keynotes had not previously been a feature of Congress. Noted that DEN had put forward a motion calling for Pentathlon United to be invited to address Congress and put forward an alternative view. Asked three questions: 1) How long does UIPM think Fencing will stay in the sport; 2) how does MP think it will market itself effectively with six disciplines; 3) how many NFs want to retain Riding beyond the inclusion of Obstacle Discipline? Finally, noted that World Obstacle is not signed up to the WADA Code and there had been no real clarity from UIPM as to what Modern Pentathlon would look like with Obstacle, with no provision of rules and only guidelines.

JAS (response): Noted that UIPM had a clear structure of athlete representation which he hadn't seen challenged. Said that many EB Members had had conversations and direct interaction with Pentathlon United but observed that the organisation is not certified or recognised anywhere, unlike the NFs which comprise Congress with elected representatives and which are certified members of UIPM; said it was important that issues are discussed in a context that is recognised and certified. Remarked that the views of Pentathlon United had already been represented by various participants in this Congress, but it was important to stick to dialogue between elected representatives.

MP (response): Added to remarks made in his speech and said that discussion about the exact format of Modern Pentathlon with Obstacle was still to come – internally and with IOC and with athletes. Suggested that broadcasters would prefer a continuous format. Said the UIPM team had

done a 'miraculous job' with the first four Test Events and publicity outreach. Remarked that the key questions was whether or not the sport could remain in the Olympic Games, and embracing Obstacle would not be a guarantee but it would interest the IOC in terms of the "demographic and the direction".

AUS (response): Accepted that it was a defining moment and that everyone was trying to be constructive, but remarked that constructive decision-making comes through open and truthful debate about the issues. Acknowledged the expertise of Michael Payne but complained that the question had been framed as one with no alternative to Obstacle as a means of keeping the sport in the Olympics, describing this as "scare tactics", because there had been no discussion of how the sport could work in future with equestrian. Asked if UIPM was claiming that athletes had been brought along in the process, why during an Athlete Meeting in Ankara had a number of athletes led by Joseph Choong (GBR) walked out of a meeting because they felt they were not represented?

YH (response): Recalled that before the Athlete Meeting in Ankara there had been one in Albena, while the Athletes Committee (AC) had also 'set a new world record in holding meetings and conferences online'. Noted that in Albena, it was stated that athletes needed a meeting with UIPM leadership to ask them questions and listen; the request was made and KS and SF agreed to take part along with the AC. Noted that those who left the meeting did so without listening; that the AC had met several times with Joseph Choong (GBR) and other Pentathlon United representatives and listened to everyone. Remarked that it was not the fault of the AC or UIPM that some athletes left the meeting.

SWE: Noted that after 1hr 25min of presentations, those with an opposing view should have equal time and repeated that PU should be allowed to present and make arguments that should be heard, regardless of not being certified. Suggested an immediate vote on the relevant motion from DEN. Remarked that Modern Pentathlon's absence from the provisional programme of LA28 was due to mismanagement, not Riding. Asked those who spoke in favour of Obstacle if they were suggesting to all equestrianists worldwide that their sport was not inclusive or had the other merits mentioned in favour of Obstacle? Stated a concern about gender equality with OD and suggested it would not be clean, and if the gamble fails, what would happen next – would Fencing be dropped? Repeated a view that Congress needed to hear a counter view of those who are against Obstacle.

SF (response): Noted that in a world governing body of 131 countries, if every country had equal time when presenting motions and proposals it would not be operationally possible. Asked SWE to confirm their question.

SWE (response): Three questions/comments as follows: 1) as there is a motion from DEN re Pentathlon United, argued that this must be taken before any debate on Obstacle otherwise it would be moot; 2) if speakers were saying that equestrian is a niche sport, would they be willing to state this view to all riders worldwide; 3) if Obstacle fails, then what next, would Fencing be dropped?

SF (response): 1) Stated that the Congress Book would be followed according to the order of motions.

JB (response): 2) Clarified that UIPM was not criticising the sport of Equestrian within the Olympic programme but talking instead about the replacement of Riding within Modern Pentathlon because

it was blocking the development of the sport, and said this problem had been confirmed by many including the IOC President.

EGY (response): Mentioned the difficulty of organising competitions with Riding and asked all nations in attendance to consider how many of them were able to organise a complete Modern Pentathlon competition with Riding.

GUA: Stated that Modern Pentathlon in their country had already brought great stories to our athletes and great competitions, and the country had been recognised for great achievements for many years competing in NORCECA and Pan American Championships and global. Commented that Obstacle was making the sport more accessible, increasing the competitiveness of their region and allowing them to be part of a Central American Caribbean (CAC) Games, which had so far been impossible due to a shortage of eligible countries. Thanked UIPM for enabling GUA athletes to compete in three of the four test events and asked opponents of the motion to open their eyes to the many countries all over the world, including Central American and Caribbean nations, and see how it would open the door to all Latin American countries.

FIN: Reflected that it was sad to see Modern Pentathlon being subject to a political agenda driven by the Russian invasion of UKR. Stated that RUS and BLR officials should be removed. Finished by underlining support for Riding.

SF: Asked FIN to stay on the topic of the motion.

DEN: Said it was not appropriate for SF to comment on the number of times NFs spoke and made a remark about the lack of a balanced debate.

CZE: Said that they understood all the arguments but felt that athletes should be in centre of the process. Noted that Michael Payne had dismissed the relevance of Pentathlon United surveys and asked YH where the AC got their numbers about 80% of athletes supporting Obstacle, and asked if they had done any "relevant research"?

YH (response): Admitted that it was an important point to raise. Stated that every view had been taken into consideration, but remarked that the open survey in question had not required a sign-in nor a deadline, and he had filled it five or six times himself, and in the end it had about 200 responses. Explained that the AC survey process had involved contacting athlete representatives all over the world, consulting and taking their opinion, and asked if they wanted to propose any motion to Congress.

CZE (response): Again disputed the survey results put forward by UIPM and the AC.

YH (response): Noted that CZE athletes had been consulted, and stated that Jan Kuf (CZE) would confirm this.

MRI: Referred to comment by UZB in Session 1 about 'silly questions' and remarked that it was only silly answers that had been given. Stated that they were talking for Africa with a duty to talk for their continent. Commented that none of KS, JAS and JB had been raising the issue of Riding within the sport since 1992. Noted that none of them had said sorry for not taking notice of IOC views.

KS (response): Challenged MRI delegate, as a previous UIPM EB Member in their capacity as CAPM President, to ask themselves how often they had attended EB meetings? Stated that messages from IOC had been discussed many times at EB meetings over the years.

MRI (response): Noted that they had been in the EB since 2017, but that KS had been there for almost 30 years, argued that MRI should not be responsible for the issue. Stated that they had only been speaking about problems faced in Africa. Challenged KS to state how many countries in Africa he had visited.

GER: Referenced numerous speakers advising about the need to keep athletes in the centre of discussion and stated that GER NF took care of the future of their athletes and with Riding, there was no future for the sport; no federal support at all. Stated a belief that “the investor we have in our bankrupt sport at the moment is Obstacle”. Asked Congress to consider what was their future and said they had a responsibility to the community.

PAN: Stated respect for all opinions and said that from a PAN perspective, this motion represented the future. Said it was necessary to save the sport so that it would stay in the Olympics, not save Riding within the sport. Expressed a love for Riding but said Modern Pentathlon had to be improved or it would “die and disappear”. Asked Congress to think about the best option for the sport to develop and grow for real, and remain in the Olympics and do so in a fair way.

PUR: Speaking from Los Angeles as an Olympian and former IOC Athletes Commission Member and elected federation official, with deep knowledge of the Olympic family and a long-standing Member of UIPM, assured fellow delegates that if they didn’t make changes, none of them would be together in the future. Noted that 20 nations in Central America / Caribbean had been unable to join the movement because of Equestrian limitations.

SGP: Commented that although their country might seem rich, the cost of living was very high and one athlete had spent several thousands per month training for Riding in order to qualify for the Asian Games. Concluded that if families were not rich enough, athletes could not stay in the sport but with the change to Obstacle, it would become more possible to develop athletes.

GBR: Said it was interesting listening to colleagues around world, but asked Congress to return to the actual motion, and asked two questions: 1) if a sixth discipline would be added to the sport, would the motion led by GEO to preserve Riding still be voted on? 2) if indeed a new discipline would be put forward as part of the sport for the LA28 Olympic proposal, how would this be voted on and what would be the next steps to move forward to IOC?

VM (response): Informed Congress that after consultation with the group of nations behind the relevant motion, they had decided to withdraw it because it made no sense to vote on the future of Riding at a time when it would still remain part of the Olympic sport for the next two years, and the motion concerned keeping Riding as part of a non-Olympic format.

GBR (response): Noted that CZE motion about maintaining Riding also related to that, and repeated their second question about the process of including Obstacle Discipline within an application to the IOC.

SF (response): Stated that UIPM would love to have a contribution from NFs if approval of the motion would be forthcoming, and said that input would be sought once the proposal to IOC was under way.

AFG: Commented that, as an under-developed country, they had never had a chance for athletes to become full pentathletes because of the barriers of Riding and the unavailability of horses and facilities; but today they had possibilities, already with LR where AFG athletes had won a medal in the Mixed Relay, and now they could have an achievable dream of becoming Olympians. Asked opponents of the motion if they would like to keep Riding in the interests of a thousand athletes while neglecting many other thousands who would not be able to do it?

CONGRESS VOTE – Obstacle Discipline: Statutes

Does the General Assembly approve the modifications to article 2.1 of the UIPM Statutes? (2/3 majority needed)

97 possible votes, 14 blank, 83 valid, majority needed 56;

- YES 69 (83.13%)
- NO 11 (13.25%)
- ABSTAIN 3 (3.61%).

MOTION PASSED

Motion 2

- Obstacle Discipline: Competition Rules

SF: thanked all NFs for their understanding and support and cooperation, and said the next motion also related to Obstacle Discipline and invited Congress to turn to Page 125. Invited questions from the floor.

AUS: 1) Asked to put on record that article 33.1 requires that the Statutes may only be amended by the affirmative vote of a majority of 2/3 of the members present and entitled to vote at the General Assembly; commented that this was not the same thing as 2/3 of the members who actually cast a vote; alleged that the last vote was inaccurately calculated. 2) In relation to Motion 2, stated that article 22.1.11 provides that the General Assembly may only amend the Competition Rules in the year of the Olympic Games, and also that it states that in all other years, changes to the Competition Rules can only be approved in the case of force majeure. Continued by pointing out that 2022 was not an Olympic year and there was no case of force majeure, that UIPM motions did not mention force majeure or any event that could possibly constitute force majeure, which must be unforeseeable, outside the reasonable control of the party claiming relief, and it must completely prevent performance of the obligation. Commented that urgency does not equate to force majeure,

and stated that if the UIPM wished to argue against that, they had other NFs that stood ready to respond.

PF (response): Counting was made in accordance with UIPM Statutes and in accordance with the Congress procedures approved by the General Assembly.

HUN: Made reference to earlier comment from SE about which nations were able to organise a full Modern Pentathlon competition with Riding and said that HUN was one of them. On behalf of HUN NF and speaking about Motion 2, stated that there were five traditional Modern Pentathlon disciplines and in UIPM 2021 Congress they supported Riding because of our heritage, but said they also understood the IOC view and the need to improve the standing of the sport in the Olympic programme. Commented that the picture shown in Paris 2024 would lead to the future, and Riding was very important in that and should be subject to the best possible preparation. Based on opinion of HUN coaches they commented that to ensure safe Riding in 2024, Riding should be maintained at Junior level, to mitigate risk. Said he was pleased to hear from JH that there might be provision in the Budget for more Riding events. Asked UIPM Coaches Committee Chair Christian Roudaut (CR) about the speed of the transition as coaches needed to work with kids and parents.

CR (response): Admitted that more time would have been preferable, but the rationale for Motion 2 was based on the IOC decision coming in 2023, to allow two years for a period of adaptation. Regarding Juniors, stated a belief that this was the best way to manage the transition, that all Juniors could compete in senior competitions at all levels and in Olympic qualification competitions. Said that the Motion would also give them the opportunity to practise Modern Pentathlon with Obstacle to be ready to start the next Olympic cycle.

HUN (response): Agreed with CR but encouraged thought to be given to teams with multiple athletes competing at a high level, only four of whom could be selected for each senior competition.

FIN: 1) Stated for the record that there had been a violation [inaudible] 2) Reinforced AUS question around the force majeure justification for changing the Competition Rules at this time.

SF (response): Stated that she did not believe there was a requirement for force majeure in this instance.

FIN (response): Argued that therefore there should be no entitlement in Statutes to change Competition Rules this year.

PF (response): Pointed out that the next Olympic Games is in 2024 and where an essential change to the Statutes has been made, a change to the Competition Rules must inevitably follow; stated that this was a very important situation for the Federation and that such adaption was not in conflict with the purpose of the rule FIN was referring to, and the change to the Competition Rules was therefore compliant in this context.

PER: Spoke as an emerging NF in the South America A region. In 2018 they started working as an NF with a completely unknown sport, with major barriers to face to join the Olympic movement in their country. With this change they were now facing another challenge, but mentioned that they could not justify the sport at national level because of Riding. They needed specific horses, masters,

teachers etc, and could not find them in their country – but by including the new discipline it would be feasible for us to enjoy our sports all over the country.

GBR: 1) Following HUN comment and responses by CR and PF, around Juniors, proposed an amendment to Motion 2. Stated that many juniors would compete at Paris 2024 and Riding would need to look at its best and athletes perform at their best in this No.1 showcase opportunity for the sport; remove opportunity to ride from Juniors would deny them valuable preparation for the Olympics. Remarked that the proposed amendment would follow a communication made by SF at the Coaches Meeting in Ankara, where Riding would continue for Juniors; proposed amendment would make the motion apply only at Youth level. 2) Responded to OF explanation that Competition Guidelines would have to change following change to Statutes, questioned the correctness of this statement because Riding remained in the Statutes, and Competition Guidelines could still relate to Riding. Noted that the successful Motion 1 simply stated that there were now six disciplines. Summarised by stating a belief that it was appropriate from a performance and safety perspective that Juniors be permitted to continue Riding for two more years.

JP (response): Stated a belief that CR had already answered the question, and gave an example of POL where all juniors would continue to compete and train with senior athletes until 2024, and even after the Olympic Games, with Riding.

SF (response): Reinforced that for Junior athletes who wished to compete in Paris 2024, would have to compete in senior events with Riding, because even the Junior WCH included no Olympic ranking points. Also noted that the Competition Guidelines was only referring to Junior WCH, and all other junior competitions could be flexible.

GBR (response): Remarked that Junior WCH 2023 with Riding would provide athletes up to 3 opportunities to compete under pressure at highest level for their age group in Riding, which would be very strong preparation for the Olympics. Acknowledged that they would still have to compete at senior level to qualify for the Olympics but the Motion would remove them of three opportunities to compete under pressure in Riding. Said it would be appropriate for their athlete development to prepare Junior athletes for Paris 2024.

CAN: Spoke in support of HUN and GBR request to keep Riding in the Junior WCH in 2023/24, as athletes had done a lot of work to prepare for that and some wouldn't be able to compete in senior events, and their own World Championships was really important – supported GBR proposed amendment to Motion 2.

SWE: 1) Stated that the basic rule of good governance was to follow the Statutes, therefore reminded Congress and asked for inclusion in Minutes that article 22.1.11 provided that the General Assembly could only amend Competition Rules in a year of Olympic Games, and only in other years as force majeure. Noted that SF had confirmed that no claims of force majeure had been made. 2) Argued that there should have been a vote on Motion 1, which did not happen. Commented that if Congress was following the Statutes, Motion 1 and the vote on that motion would be moot – and procedure was not compliant with UIPM Statutes.

SF (response): Asked to correct herself, and stated that not only was the whole purpose of Motion 2 to act before the qualification for Paris 2024 began, but most importantly to enable UIPM to present a proposal to the IOC for LA28 – whether that would be considered force majeure or not.

SWE (response): 1) Restated that no claim for force majeure had been made, as force majeure had to be something unforeseeable. 2) Reiterated AUS point that a 2/3 majority consisted of 2/3 of all delegates present and allowed to vote, not only those that were voting. Argued that the vote on Motion 1 would therefore fail on more than reason.

SE (response): Noted that the General Assembly Roll-call at the beginning was 85 (sic⁸), but it would not be practical to make a Roll-call before every motion, and said it was correct that the 83 people who voted did so as a 2/3 majority, and further stated that even when talking about the 129 members who were allowed to attend the GA, and allowing for a 2/3 majority from that group, it would be 88, which was less than the people in the GA. Stated that it was very clear that there was a 50%+1 majority for a Quorum and then decisions were done by a 2/3 majority – and even with a GA with 92 people on board, a 2/3 majority would be 61, and with a GA with 103 on people on board, it 2/3 majority would be 68 – and Motion 1 received 69 yes votes, so in all circumstances it was a 2/3 majority.

PF (response): Added that as clarified in the Congress Conduct Procedures for online meetings of members present, an initially logged-in user could be anywhere, in the bathroom or driving and might therefore not be present in the virtual meeting room, and therefore it would be unfair to all active delegates if those people not sitting at their computer and/or not voting would be considered present.

CONGRESS VOTE – Obstacle Discipline: Competition Rules

Does the General Assembly approve the amendment to and insertion of several articles in the UIPM Competition Rules and Regulations? (2/3 majority required)

97 possible votes, 18 blank, 79 valid, majority required 53;

- YES 59 (74.68%)
- NO 20 (25.32%)
- ABSTAIN 0.

MOTION PASSED

Motion 3

- Term Limits: Statutes

⁸ The actual number of nations registered at the Roll-call was 83

- Term Limits: Election Rules
- Women's Commission: Rules on Internal Organization

SF: referred Congress to Pages 129-131 and invited questions, and announced this would be the last motion of the day.

FIN: Put on record that the voting on Motion 2 did not meet criteria because according to the presentation there were 97 eligible voting members present at the time of the vote, thus more than 59 yes votes would have been needed for the Motion to pass on a 2/3 majority, which suggested very clearly a breach of Statutes in voting procedure.

SF (response): stated that the point had already been explained many times, and Congress needed to move on with the agenda.

AUS: noted that other motions were due to be put on Day 2 on the same topic of term limits, asked to clarify if those motions would be put if Motion 3 was passed?

SF (response): Clarified that if Motion 3 were passed, the other related motions would be covered and would not need to be voted on.

GBR: Commented that it would be inappropriate for Congress not to consider the related motions because there were some subtle differences, with respect to Election Rules and term limits; for example GBR motion had a substantial and material difference in the content, namely a 12-year term limit for any role, rather than 12 years for EB and then a further 12 years for President. Asked that all related motions be considered together, because all nations deserved the opportunity to consider and vote on the variations.

SF (response): Noted it was a valid point and said NF motions would be voted on during Day 2 where variations existed. Also reassured MRI delegate the same after a question [inaudible]. Invited DEN to make the last remark of Day 1.

DEN: Said they were not in a rush and expressed support for GBR delegate, asked that the related motions be considered together on Day 2.

SF (response): Clarified that all continents' and countries' time zones needed to be respected – for example in some parts of Asia it was already after midnight. Thanked DEN for understanding.

CONGRESS VOTE – Term limits: Statutes / Term Limits: Election Rules / Women's Commission: Rules on Internal Organization

Does the General Assembly approve the amendments to article 14.2 of the UIPM Statutes, the insertion of article 1.4 in the UIPM Election Rules and the changes to article 4.21 of the UIPM Rules on Internal Organisation? (2/3)

97 possible votes, 16 blank, 81 valid, majority required 54;

- YES 64 (79.01%)
- NO 14 (17.28%)

- ABSTAIN 3 (3.70%).

MOTION PASSED

SF: thanked Lumi and all participants.

KS: thanked all who participated in an exchange of information and a fair discussion, and as stated by a few delegates, it was important to be fair to everybody and give voices to those from all continents and respecting the interests of all NFs in different corners of the world, and indeed this global sport had to be much more global.

Day 2, Session 3

Congress conduction procedures

SF: opened the third session and advised delegates to switch off video if their signal was not good, and announced that based on the experience of Day 1 there would be new conduction procedures on Day 2.

FL: explained the adjustment, with first opportunity to speak reduced from 3mins to 1min, so that every nation could have opportunities to speak and no amendments to the timetable would be needed.

CONGRESS VOTE – UIPM Congress conduction

Does the General Assembly approve the Congress Conduction Procedures for today's 3rd Congress Session? (50%+1 majority needed)

82 possible votes, 5 blank, 77 valid, majority needed 39;

- YES 64 (83.12%)
- NO 12 (15.58%)
- ABSTAIN 1 (1.30%).

CONDUCTION PROCEDURES APPROVED

Decisions on motions from the Executive Board (cont'd)

Motion 4

- Congress Organization: Statutes

JH: Observed that "the age of Covid has changed our lives" and while it remained important to have live Congresses to exchange ideas and friendship, there might always be a time and a place for virtual Congresses to ensure equal participation of all members. Stated that Motion 4 provided a clear option for the Executive Board to decide whether Congress should be live or virtual.

AUS: Complained about the reduction in time allocation to 1min and said the last motion on Day 1 had been put to Congress without full discussion, which underlined the need to be careful about any motion that would give the EB the right to decide on the format of Congress. Remarked that online gave more people the opportunity to participate and expressed support for a hybrid model where NFs could travel if they wanted to. Noted that poor sound quality online can be frustrating and the chat function is disabled. Suggested that in future there might be a question delegates feel passionate about and wouldn't want to have their voice "silenced because UIPM has control". Expressed doubt that the motion had adequate safeguards for democracy.

SF (response): Said the advice had been well noted and assured AUS that UIPM would try its best to restore Congress in future.

GBR: Following AUS comment, expressed support for the hybrid approach as a preference. Stated importance of safeguarding the opportunity to network and build a community that online did not allow. Noted that it was very rare for nations to be together in a room discussing the future of the sport and recognised the need for all nations to be together.

JH (response): Agreed it was a valid point and stated that his preference would be for hybrid too. Noted that he would be happy if there were a friendly amendment to the motion that allowed both.

SWE: Seconded AUS point; noted that 2021 and 2022 Congress showed very clearly that to follow basic governance functions and principles, Congress shouldn't take place online. Said that a hybrid Congress would be fine if people were given opportunity to attend in person, but giving EB the right to call a fully online Congress would only further increase governance problems. Objected to the motion.

GBR (response): Thanked JH for the proposed amendment and expressed an expectation that Congress was therefore voting on a hybrid approach as preference with the option of moving to online if needed.

SF (response): Confirmed.

UGA: Noted that the online UIPM 2021 Congress was "OK due to Covid" but said it should only be fully online where it is impossible to have a physical meeting. Suggested that any reduction in spend on Congress could be used for other things. Finally expressed a preference for physical Congress because of the networking opportunity.

SF (response): Noted and said the point was totally understood.

CZE: Suggested that Lumi had promised on Day 1 to provide a list of NFs present in Congress, which was not yet forthcoming 17 hours later. Kindly asked for this information so that they could know who was taking part and voting, with transparency the goal. Noted that on Day 1 it appeared that numerous NFs involved in Congress were not listed on official website of their NOC, which is a requirement of UIPM Statutes.

SF (response): Countered by saying that Lumi made no such promise and reiterated that the participating countries would be listed in the Congress Minutes, and reminded that delegates could see all participants on their screen.

CZE (response): Suggested that it would be fairer for all delegates to know who was currently present because it was not easy to follow on the screen without an official list.

SF (response): Reiterated that the list would be provided in the Minutes and UIPM could think about how to handle this in future.

FIN (response): Thanked JH for his proposed amendment, describing hybrid as "the best of both worlds".

DEN: Supported the statement to have a hybrid Congress as minimum, and noted that UGA statement addressed the key issue around Congress. Reminded UIPM that some NFs had offered to stage a hybrid Congress in 2022 and said it was clear this would be needed in future.

SF (response): Noted that a hybrid Congress would be offered as minimum in future where possible, and stated that the “whole EB would prefer a physical Congress”.

CONGRESS VOTE – Congress Organisation: Statutes

Does the General Assembly approve the insertion of a new article 21.3 in the UIPM Statutes?

87 possible votes, 8 blank, 79 valid, majority required 53;

- YES 60 (75.95%)
- NO 16 (20.25%)
- ABSTAIN 3 (3.80%).

MOTION PASSED

Motion 5

- Masters: Election Rules; Rules on Internal Organization and Competition Rules

FIN: Commented that the motion should be dismissed as anti-democratic, as Masters should not be treated differently. Asked why UIPM would move from an existing electoral process to a nomination system that is “non-democratic”?

SF (response): Explained that there were three Masters Committee Members including a Chairman in place but the Chairman and members later resigned, which led to the creation of a Working Group and based on all Working Group and Committee experiences, there was a lot of commitment and time and it was felt best to have experienced candidates appointed by the EB (which could be nominated by NFs).

GER: Agreed with the opinion of Fin and said good governance and democracy was not always an easy process, but the Masters Committee should be elected.

SF (response): Acknowledged that there could be further discussion on the matter within the EB.

JH (response): Agreed that there should be elections, but the issue was that there was currently nobody on the Masters Committee; the nomination was proposed as a two-year workaround before UIPM 2024 Congress would include an election procedure for Masters like other Committees. The temporary solution would ensure someone was running the MC for the next two years.

SF (response): Again clarified that NFs could nominate, but said that all points were reasonable and valid and said Congress come back later to vote.

UGA: Commented that technically the election could not be removed and a nomination would not confer full power to appoint. Advocated a system where all countries nominate and then all countries vote. Accepted the temporary nomination system if it were because of a resignation, but later it should be a very well-developed structure that everyone can follow and be comfortable with.

SF (response): Well noted.

Motion 6

- Anti-doping procedures

GBR: Thanked UIPM team for updating procedures to ensure requirements under WADA Code were met; very encouraged to see progress based on experiences in this area.

SF (response): Paid tribute to very good comments given by GBR during competitions and thanked them on behalf of UIPM Anti-Doping Manager.

CONGRESS VOTE – Anti-Doping procedures

Does the General Assembly approve the amendment to article 1, article 3.1, article 3.3, article 5.2, article 5.3 and article 11.4; the deletion of part 3 (article 13 and 14) and part 4 (article 15, 16 and 17).

88 possible votes, 7 blank, 81 valid, majority required 41;

- YES 77 (95.06%)
- NO 3 (3.7%)
- ABSTAIN 1 (1.23%).

MOTION PASSED

Motion 7

- Biathle-Triathle Competition Rules

SF: Referred Congress to Page 141 and explained an amendment from the EB to remove the ‘-39’ stipulation as an upper limit of the Senior age group in Triathle and replace it with ‘22 and over’.

SE: Described the motion as a good change; coming from a country with many participants (EGY), the amendments were needed especially the number of athletes in each heat.

DEN: Stated that the motion was good and supported SE statement; made a more principled standpoint that the way the text was formulated in motions was not appropriate.

SF (response): Asked for clarification: were they talking about Laser Run Guidelines?

DEN (response): Said no, they were referring back to the previous two votes which lacked a full overview of the motion in the voting window, making it hard to refer back to the content.

GBR: Asked a minor question and proposed an amendment to article 1.6.3 and 1.6.4 and 3.3.2, proposed a change to allow unlimited teams in relays. Expressed an understanding that the previous maximum of three per NF could maximise number of NFs participating. Said they were in favour of growing the sport rather than large teams, eg GBR, taking over. Recommend retaining three athletes per team as a maximum.

SF (response): Clarified that podium results would not be affected, because only one relay team per country could be in the top 3.

RSA: Expressed an issue with the motion in that the open event and elite event were held in parallel, which created problems for NFs where an athlete winning medals in the open event could still be seen as national athletes from one country.

SF (response): Remarked that before Congress they had discussed the matter on a call.

RSA (response): Said that if Congress would be willing to separate the two and find a solution, that would be their preference.

SF (response): Agreed to discuss possible solutions, however it would be the merged competition as for 2022 WCH already.

AUT: Made a suggestion around the age of athletes, specifically U9 class – said it didn't make sense for U10s around the world to participate in Biathle-Triathle WCH when there were lots of regional competitions available; travel overseas at high cost was not useful.

SF (response): Said it was understood, which is why this was absent from the original rules, but there had been many proposals to have the U9 category because some young athletes were left competing with much older kids, hence why the EB added this age group.

AUT (response): Said they did not agree, because in the regional environment there were lots of opportunities at all ages to compete.

SF (response): Said it would be up to individual parents to decide, and some might want their children to have a world title. Thanked AUT for the comment.

MRI: Asked for a clarification on the change in age groups.

SF (response): Explained that originally there was no U9, then U11 is for 9-10-year-olds because kids grow at different rates and it was difficult to put them together.

SE (response): Stated that the system of age groups every two years in Biathle-Triathle had been in place for years and was normal in all sports, and to have one category for every year would double the number of categories.

MRI (response): Claimed that they had not been misunderstood, and asked if their athlete was 14+ in which group should they compete?

CONGRESS VOTE – Biathle-Triathle Competition Rules

Does the General Assembly approve the amendment to articles 1.5.1, 1.5.9, 1.6.2 & 1.6.3 of the Biathle Competition Rules and the amendment to articles 1.5.1, 1.5.8 & 1.6.4 of the Triathle Competition Rules?

88 possible votes, 8 blank, 80 valid, majority required 54;

- YES 64 (80.00%)
- NO 7 (8.75%)
- ABSTAIN 9 (11.25%).

MOTION PASSED

SF: added in answer to MRI's final question, that if athlete were 14, they should be in U15 category.

Motion 8

- Riding + fencing: Competition Rules

JP: explained the motion was based on athlete falls resulting in elimination.

CONGRESS VOTE – Riding + fencing: Competition Rules

Does the General Assembly approve the amendment to articles 2.2.4, 2.4.18, 2.4.20, 2.4.22, 2.4.26, 2.6.7, 2.7.1, 2.8.7, 3.5.2.1, 3.8.2, 3.8.3 of the Competition Rules and Regulations?

88 possible votes, 7 blank, 81 valid, majority required 54;

- YES 73 (90.12%)
- NO 5 (6.17%)
- ABSTAIN 3 (3.70%).

MOTION PASSED

Motion 9

- General Aspects: Competition Rules

SF: highlighted two amendments from EB meeting due to changes in Competition Rules for Junior, 19 and 17 athletes, whose age categories were proposed to be deleted from the title of Section 1.11.1.

SE: Stated that the new format had been tried in 2021 and the amendment was good because it provided equality to athletes where conditions could be affected by rain and other factors. As for other amendment (maximum 12 athletes per host country), said he understood EB discussion but still felt that because of the numbers in competitions, the limit of 12 per host nation should be retained but with only six per nation in the Final.

CR: explained that the motion was based on feedback from all athletes and coaches in competitions. Also clarified that the Final will consist of 36 athletes for under-age groups.

SE (response): asked that where only six per host nation would be allowed in a Final, would the host nation have a right to choose the six athletes or would it be automatic based on results?

SF (response): Stated that it would be the top 6 according to results, to be fair.

HUN: Expressed positive surprise about the new amendment from SE, and thanked him because they hadn't agreed with the change. Wanted to warn everybody they still had to work on this because during the 2022 European Championships they had tried similar and it hadn't been the best choice; in the Qualification Group A, 3 HUN athletes were competing fiercely and all finished in the top 3, while other athletes took an easier route but the third HUN athlete was not able to move forward to the Semi-final.

GBR: Highlighted Section 1.11.1 and SE's mention of direct qualification of 18 or 12 or 9 athletes, which may have been tried but commented that the current model allowed the best-performing athletes to qualify. Asked what was proposed for those athletes to advance? Stated a preference for the amendment not to go through. Noted that the other change gave an unfair advantage to host countries, especially where it affects Olympic qualification.

JP (response): Mentioned the Junior WCH in Poland where in men's qualification all six POL athletes qualified from one group and none from the other one, because conditions were much worse. Expressed understanding that it was not perfect but would be fairer with two groups and 18 athletes qualifying.

YH (response): Supported JP to have best athletes from each group because conditions often change, and timings are different, said that the change worked well according to athlete feedback to the AC.

SE (response): Responding to GBR about Olympic qualifiers, noted that host nations could only play with four athletes like any other country, except where space allows, with a maximum of six.

CONGRESS VOTE – General Aspects: Competition Rules

Does the General Assembly approve the amendment to articles 1.7.1, 1.16.1, 1.11.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.6, 1.12.4, 1.12.8, 1.19.4 of the Competition Rules and Regulations?

88 possible votes, 11 blank, 77 valid, majority required 52;

- YES 62 (80.52%)
- NO 14 (18.18%)

- ABSTAIN 1 (1.30%).

MOTION PASSED

SE: thanked EB for their work on the motions and NFs for their trust.

Decisions on motions from National Federations

AUS Motion 1

- Reform of the Riding discipline

Motion not supported by EB

AUS: Commented that while Riding remains in the sport for two more years, standards must be improved drastically ahead of Paris 2024 to avoid a repeat of the situation seen in Tokyo, described as a “catastrophe”. Stated there was great scope for improving standards and work must begin soon, based on strong guidelines. Referred to recommendations made by the UIPM Coaches Committee under a riding reform project, with detailed costing, in 2018, to ensure Riding standards and competition management would be based on athlete expertise; asked if it could be ensured that those standards would be vastly improved from Tokyo?

JP (response): Referred to the Riding Working Group that had worked very strongly on new rules to improve welfare in Riding after Tokyo 2020, covered in a very professional way with athletes and coaches; remarked that there was no need to vote on this motion because it was already done with recommendations implemented. Noted that many riders had already been suspended based on very strict new rules.

JH (response): Made a technical statement about financial impact; having had two phone conversations with AUS NF President about the costing of these changes; AUS estimated it at \$150k while others considered it could cost up to \$500k – the implementation of which would mean changing the budget and moving \$500k from other places to support the Riding reform. Made it clear he was only fulfilling his duty of making Congress aware of the cost of the motion.

AUS (response): Said all comments were understood but the aim was to protect the image of the sport and the welfare and safety of athletes to bring competitions up to standard; suggested that the EB might comment on 2018 recommendations made to adopt Riding reforms up to Tokyo, which were not taken up – and how could Congress know the standard would be raised for Paris?

SF (response): Clarified that amendments were made based on WG recommendations and agreed that continuous improvement was possible. Identified the UIPM 2023 Pentathlon World Championships in Bath (GBR) as an example of a competition where UIPM could be confident in the NF providing high-quality horses. Concluded that all were on the same page.

SWE: Remarked that this was a motion, not a Q&A session with UIPM, and the proposer should have the same opportunity as the EB when presenting its own motions – argued that a 1min limitation did not allow for that. Said it was essential to improve animal welfare based on riding rules, and SWE

had been calling for that for decades. Remarked that this failure was the reason for the “debacle” in Tokyo that put the sport in a “dire situation”. Concluded by saying it was not a cost issue but a fundamental governance matter.

SF (response): Provided assurance that the motion would be voted on.

DEN: Said the motion was trying to do what had not been until now for Riding. Namely, to help those who cannot get Riding to function for various reasons. Asked Congress to consider what had been spent on developing Laser Run in the past 5-7 years and at the same time, nothing was spent on developing Riding, which had been in trouble for a much longer time, almost 20 years. Stated that this job had to be left to real experts, recommending that money was found to help everyone bring Riding up to standard.

KS: Explained that he had a very close relationship with the International Equestrian Federation (FEI) President and they had prepared everything needed for the WG with the FEI represented at all times by its equestrian experts – including attendance at competitions. Stated that letters and reports were sent to FEI and questions came back and all was agreed. Recalled his last meeting with FEI President who said “great work, you listened, and we can work together very closely for Paris 2024 when we are together in Versailles”. Also mentioned that he had been visiting Riding competitions in a spirit of close relationship. Noted that the work based on FEI recommendations was not finished, but a lot of investment and time was being given to take care of having high-quality Riding in 2024; it was being taken very seriously and this was seen in all competitions in 2022.

SF (response): Agreed that more could be done and, at operational level, after Congress the WG would create an action plan for 2023-24 with JP as Chair of the Riding Working Group.

DEN (response): Thanked KS for his explanation and asserted that right thing had to be done now, because if athletes are not helped in qualification there is a risk of the “same disaster as Tokyo”, where it wasn’t only one ride that caused a problem, it was many. Said rules needed to be changed to make it stricter but this wouldn’t help athletes to improve Riding; also the licence level needed to be upgraded in a way that makes sense.

CONGRESS VOTE – Reform of the Riding discipline

Does the General Assembly approve motion number 1 from AUS? (2/3 majority required)

89 possible votes, 14 blank, 75 valid, majority required 50;

- YES 24 (32.00%)
- NO 43 (57.33%)
- ABSTAIN 8 (10.67%).

MOTION NOT PASSED

AUS Motion 2

- Russia's unacceptable aggression

Motion not admissible. No voting required

FL: Explained that a formal requirement was not met; it would formally breach UIPM Statutes if the GA would suspend two members as this could only be done pursuant to Statutes by the EB. Gave additional reasoning: that the motion requested two persons who were not elected by the GA to be removed and the GA wouldn't have the power to do so – the President of the European Confederation was elected by European NFs and the Chair of the Medical Committee was elected by her peers. Finally provided a reminder as to what the IOC President clearly stated at multiple occasions and not to suspend or remove anybody just because of their nationality – and it was clear that any individual did not have the power to stop Russia's aggression.

KS: Stated that President Bach had held various meetings with all Summer IFs and Winter IFs to explain the IOC position, and it was important for UIPM to stay in strong solidarity with policy of IOC. Also mentioned the recent ANOC meeting in Seoul (KOR) which Dr Bach attended, and asked Congress not to debate this motion.

AUS: Asked to make a comment not for inclusion as their 1min to speak about the motion, because it referred to the previous motion (AUS 1) – why was the majority shown to be a required 2/3, when this was not an amendment to Statutes?

SF (response): Explained that Motion 1 would have required a change to Competition Rules in terms Riding, hence why a 2/3 majority was required.

AUS (response): Commented that there is no requirement for a 2/3 majority on changes to the Comp Rules; but that there is a requirement that it can only be done in an Olympic year, which the UIPM EB overruled on Day 1 by putting forward EB Motion 2. Suggested that there appeared to be a double standard.

SF (response): Referred to Page 163, No.3 (adjustment of the Riding Rules to align with FEI) which would have been a change to the Competition Rules requiring a 2/3 majority.

AUS (response): Stated that they understood, and then asked for clarification on whether the 2/3 majority was applied on Day 1 to UIPM EB Motion 2.

SF (response): Replied that this was correct, all EB Motions except Anti-Doping Procedures had been subject to a 2/3 majority. Invited AUS to talk about their second motion.

AUS: Agreed to do so, and argued that given the war being waged by Russia and Belarus on Ukraine, it was unconscionable that their representatives be allowed to participate in and report to Congress while athletes were suspended. Claimed that this was an unacceptable double standard and that UIPM was hiding behind an IOC position they described as "weak, unprincipled and illogical". Questioned why the UIPM President needed the IOC to tell him right from wrong. Said that while the UIPM EB "hides behind Statutes", they had not deemed it necessary to appoint a Scrutineer and Teller on Day 1, "in violation of Rule 5.1". While UIPM Legal Counsel has quoted this Motion as inadmissible, argued that there was no reason why UIPM EB "could not take the action so clearly

warranted and suspend RUS and BLR [officials] while their athletes are also suspended while this unacceptable war and terrorist attack continues”.

FL (response): Explained that RUS and BLR athletes were currently suspended for their own safety, while NF officials were not suspended because these people had been elected by their peers to represent UIPM or represent their country or continent.

JB (response): Reinforced that athletes are suspended because of safety reasons, as per IOC guidelines; also stated that WOA [of which JB is President] had made a unanimous decision to not suspend anyone, even for safety reasons, taking the view that sport was above all division and should not be affected by politics whatever happens – as a pillar of society that had to be preserved. Argued that this was consistent with what was expressed by the IOC and UIPM Presidents.

AUS (response): Stated that they would leave it to the Members to decide whether they thought the moral courage of the EB stood up to scrutiny, and to judge for themselves on this motion.

SF (response): Clarified that as AUS Motion 2 was inadmissible, it was time to move to the next one.

CAN Motion 1

- World Cup and World CH program, format/schedule

Motion covered by decision on EB Motion 9. Voting not required but floor open for NFs to speak.

CAN: Expressed a feeling that many competitions are too long in terms of days and proposed a 5-day format to reduce participation costs for athletes and increase accessibility.

JP (response): Thanked CAN for the question but stated that the length of competitions was already reduced for younger age groups, while the senior format had to remain as it was because of rules around Olympic qualification.

CAN (response): Thanked JP for the information and asked for a reminder how long Junior competitions would now last in terms of days?

SF (response): Stated that it was not yet confirmed but without Semi-finals, the number of days would be reduced.

CZE Motion 1

- The format of the UIPM’s proposal to the Olympic Programme Commission for the Los Angeles Games

Point (i) of the motion is not updated with the current tasks of the Olympic Program Commission and point (ii) of the motion was overruled by the approval of UIPM EB motion #1. No voting required.

CZE: Agreed that in the current situation it made no sense to vote. Felt it necessary to say our sport already lost its place on LA28 programme and UIPM was now trying with a completely different sport. Secondly, asked for a response to their query that the proposal UIPM will submit to IOC will not include Competition Rules, and will be mainly about the new format. Expressed big concerns

about it, and asked why IOC EB Members should approve a discipline with no Competition Rules and with no official competition having taken place, commented that it was not realistic.

SF (response): Noted opinion.

CZE (response): Reminded Congress it was not their personal opinion but a statement of the NF.

JB (response): Expressed respect for the position, but clarified it was not true to say Modern Pentathlon had lost its place – even in presentations made by IOC President he had drawn a clear distinction between MP and Boxing / Wrestling (*sic*⁹). Stated that MP would be accepted subject to acceptance of what would replace Riding. Said that those who express otherwise only weaken the MP position.

RS (response): Added perspective from US and LA28, there were another 32 sports being examined on the US side, to determine two that they will put forward to the IOC Programme Commission. Other than that, echoed JB comment.

DEN Motion 1

- Athlete representation

Motion not admissible. No voting required

PF: Explained that the motion was not admissible because it breached UIPM Statutes and UIPM Rules, since third parties were not allowed to be part of the GA unless invited by the EB, as per article 19.2 (f).

SF: Stated that as the motion was not admissible, the floor would only be given to the presenting NF.

DEN: Asked for PF to further explain, as they had not accepted the explanation. Said it was clear that compared to the “one-sided” presentation of keynote speakers on Day 1, a place should have been found for representation from a different viewpoint representing a “very large majority of athletes”. Asked for this to be put to the protocol.

SF: Underlined that some delegates were raising hands but repeated that the motion was inadmissible, therefore only the presenting NF could have the floor; thanked those delegates for their understanding.

DEN Motion 2 and MRI Motion 2

- No confidence in the UIPM President

Motion not recommended by UIPM EB.

⁹ Weightlifting, not Wrestling, was excluded from the initial programme of LA28

DEN: Said they were very sorry to be delivering this message but felt they were speaking for the community. Addressing KS, said the Tokyo Olympics was the final straw, and the incident seen by the world was a symptom of a failing system. Quoted JH as saying nothing had been spent on developing Riding, and accused KS “of throwing athletes under the bus”. Complained about the “circus” of Congress, with limited opportunity to debate, being undemocratic with “one-sided sales talks”. Noted an offer from GBR to host the 2022 Congress free of charge and alleged that KS “didn’t want us to meet”. Acknowledged that they and KS were friends for many years and this was not to be taken as personal, having advised him many times in a loyal way, but stated that the style of rule was not acceptable – it becomes undemocratic. They finished by saying that many felt it was time for KS to step down, if not now then in 2024.

VM (response): Acknowledged that Tokyo 2020 was a difficult event for the entire Union, but elections were held right after Tokyo and KS was strongly supported by Congress. Remarked that blaming one person was wrong. Reminded Congress about the explanations given on Day 1 that questions had surrounded MP in the Olympic Games for many years and thanks to KS’ work on political side, networking, it survived. Argued that now, with a really historical change needed, was not the time to blame KS for these changes. Said the sport really deserved a good political atmosphere before the IOC made its decision on LA28 programme. Expressed full support in KS.

AUS: Made four points. 1) Observed that VM spoke for 1min 40sec, more than the time limits imposed on NFs. 2) Argued that leaderships take accountability when things go wrong, so if KS was not taking responsibility here, which member of the EB would? 3) Asked that the text of the question on which Congress was being asked to vote be shown to members beforehand, to give them time to consider it before voting for full clarity. 4) Requested a secret ballot; even if other votes had not been, imperative that this one was.

SF (response): 4) Said that she understood that every vote in the Congress had been done via secret ballot. 1) Pointed out that NFs have 2min (1min + 1min) to speak, which is more than 1min 40sec. Invited EB members to reply.

JH: Said that he often debated with KS over budget decisions and expenses, and while they disagreed and argued, it was always with respect and politeness. Said it was not necessary to agree with everyone, but to listen to each other’s point of view and compromise. Expressed support for KS, noted that with elections taking place every four years, it seemed extraordinary to have this motion, but thanked the presenter.

FIN: Claimed that 30 years in the modern world is way too long for one person to govern, especially amid a crisis which may have been partly caused by things that did and didn’t happen in those 30 years. Returned to focus on the EB’s stance on RUS, which invaded UKR, and where the EB includes a “Russian oligarch clearly connected to the Russian Government”. Identified the Kremlin Cup as a competition that UIPM should stand against, noting that the historic ban on South Africa taking part in international sport was effective, and UIPM should do the same.

SF (response): Noted that the Kremlin Cup was not a UIPM competition.

UIPM Vice President Juan Manzo (JM): Clarified that he was not cutting or interrupting anyone’s right to express themselves. Remarked that this debate was an example of what democracy should

be, and it was thanks to the leadership that the debate be allowed. For those who didn't understand or agree with the changes, stated that he too had not been convinced that Riding should be eliminated, that he loved it, but with the best intentions of where to go it was necessary to make the change happen right now, with a positive mindset, and after reviewing all the statistics held by the IOC, it was a simple question of life and death. Said it was needed to transform the sport and not only MEX but the rest of the Americas was supporting KS, and repeated that all those part of UIPM should have a say and be able to express themselves. Thanked KS and offered support.

FIN (response): Admitted he was very thankful for the great achievements of KS over a long tenure, but was very worried about his eventual legacy due to the experience of recent years and the future uncertainty.

SWE: Noted that JH talked about dialogue with KS, and agreed it was essential to good governance especially for an IF based on international sporting values, but suggested that this Congress had shown the opposite and this was very clear to delegates. Remarked that 30 years was too long and it was time for a change in leadership, with more democracy and transparency and aligned with values of international sport. Described 2021 as a "disaster" that should result in consequences and higher governance standards.

RS (response): Addressing SWE comment, said the establishment of term limits made a statement of where UIPM was going. Said the EB was united in having great confidence in KS. Observed that over many years since he was a young athlete, there had been challenges and KS had risen above them, with Modern Pentathlon still on the Olympic programme as a test of the complete athlete as envisaged by Coubertin. Finished by saying the EB had great confidence in their President.

SE: Provided an opinion as one of the new EB members elected in 2021, and previously "one of the angry ones" who didn't agree with KS on many things. Now with an inside perspective on how UIPM works, said it was a democratic way, where every voice counts, and whatever the majority agrees on goes. Stated that it was vital to be united in one mission, with the survival of the sport at stake, to show the IOC a picture of one big family. Noted that members would always have differences but according to voting, 83% of GA was behind EB decisions. Asked Congress to go 100% in one direction until 2024 and having backed the new term limits, to stand behind KS clearly for the coming years.

UIPM Executive Board Member for Marketing, Martin Dawe (MD): Said he had known KS for many years and his passion for our sport had never waned, and he continued to work tirelessly for the benefit of Modern Pentathlon.

SWE (response): Noted that the support of the EB was not surprising, but it was surprising that nobody on the EB seemed to agree that 2021 was a disaster and that someone needed to be responsible for that. If not KS, they asked, who was responsible for negligence and bad governance? Repeated calls for Riding reform and better governance, saying that better accounting principles came 10 years late, and the community could not wait 10 more years for reform.

JB: Argued that supporting the President did not take the form of "polishing his shoes". Remarked that the leadership of UIPM had actually been very efficient in 2021, and since then the right decisions had been taken. Said the situation had changed and competition for the Olympic programme was huge, and it was time to be united to go together under one banner to win the fight

to stay on the programme. Remarked that criticising was very easy and those who criticised should think about how they could organise and send athletes to competitions and contribute to the future of UIPM.

INA: Spoke from the perspective of a newcomer NF in terms of Modern Pentathlon organisation. Having already followed 2-3 Gas, expressed some opinions. Asked delegates who did not approve of the President why they did not express their view in the election at UIPM 2021 Congress, and why did nobody put themselves forward as a candidate? Commented that it was not the right time to continue discussion about the leadership of KS.

JP: Expressed sympathy for KS as a victim of the Riding situation, without which he would not be under attack. Reflected that it was sad that people judged him this way. Stated that he had known KS since 1968 and knew what he had done for sport, including making mistakes like everyone, and it was not his fault that he had been President for 30 years, as he didn't make the rules. Said he did not understand SWE attack. Remembered in 1992 when IOC President Samaranch was talking about biking as an alternative discipline, and also in 1996 when athlete numbers were very small, and then at Sydney when KS fought so strong for increased numbers and gender balance. Said it was very sad that he was in this situation and life did not seem fair, the more he worked and gave his heart, the more he made friends but also enemies. Thanked KS for everything he had done.

IND: Said they had listened to all the criticism for the past two days, but as a house Congress now had to approve the decisions. Mentioned mistakes and issues that had been spoken about, but now there was a new opportunity and instead of blaming, they should put all efforts together because only the NFs could take this reform to the IOC to keep the sport in the Olympic Games. Remarked on the need to come together and support the leadership.

SZ: Highlighted the same people going against the current and complaining, said he was tired of the Riding story, and people must understand and stop thinking about themselves but about everyone, as sport is universal. Urged them to let everyone practise sport, talk about equality of competition and not eliminate others. Told them that Africa was a big continent and in a few years the decisions taken by Congress could bring a lot of countries forward, and they would understand that soon.

JH: Spoke about 2021 and said the year was not a disaster, but the Riding event in Tokyo was a disaster for UIPM, also for [GER athlete] Annika Schleu who should have been an Olympic medallist but instead received death threats, and for [GER coach] Kim Raisner, who was known as an athlete and coach and "did exactly what I would have done" in the situation. Stated that he had an opinion about who was responsible and it was not a UIPM person, and he would happily talk about it offline because he was upset and didn't want to defame anyone.

CONGRESS VOTE – No confidence in the UIPM President

Does the General Assembly approve motion number 2 from DEN on no confidence in the UIPM President and his immediate removal from office? (majority 50%+1)

89 possible votes, 17 blank, 72 valid, majority required 37;

- YES 13 (18.06%)
- NO 55 (76.39%)
- ABSTAIN 4 (5.56%).

MOTION NOT PASSED

KS: Thanked Congress for the support, and pledged to continue the work he had been doing for 30 years, having been elected until 2024 and doing his best with all his passion. Promised to give all energy, knowledge, experience and connections to drive UIPM to LA28.

DEN motion 3

- The current UIPM Athletes' Committee be disbanded

No voting required

PF: Stated that the motion broke UIPM Rules as the AC had been voted by peers and could not be voted out by the GA.

DEN: Said he understood the decision and noted the legal advice, but 1) made a point that there were big discrepancies between groups of athletes in terms of how they felt supported in the past year; 2) with several AC reps employed as coaches who might therefore have a bias, asked if YH could explain his status if appropriate.

YH (response): 1) repeated his statement that a big majority of athletes had been consulted and announced there was a big majority of support of numbers collected according to the right process, all of which would be presented after Congress. 2) disagreed with the view because being employed in the sport gives access to more information about the sport, offers a chance to connect with athletes in competition; noted that in the past the AC had not attended all competitions and followed up with athletes. Extended hand to DEN to help and support them to develop more athletes and look at how this could be improved.

DEN (response): Again felt there was a discrepancy and said it was important for athletes to get together, not only have fronts formed like they had been in the past year.

YH (response): Extended hand to cooperate with all athletes together, retired or active, even those who criticised the AC, to put ideas together for the best proposal for LA28.

SF (response): agreed with DEN that it was time to gather all athletes together and there would be elections in 2024, including AC elections, but it was important to get back to LA28 first.

EGY & others Motion 1

- Continental Championships with the points

SE: Commented that this was about equality for all continents and genders; that ranking points should be equally weighted regardless of who is in top 100. For sport to grow, he said there needed to be equal chance for all to qualify for the Olympics.

CONGRESS VOTE – Continental Championships with the points

Does the General Assembly approve the amendments to article 1.19.2 of the UIPM Competition Rules and Regulations?

90 possible votes, 19 blank, 71 valid, majority required 48;

- YES 51 (71.83%)
- NO 17 (23.94%)
- ABSTAIN 3 (4.23%).

MOTION PASSED

GEO and others motions 1-6

1. Keep Pentathlon with riding as non-Olympic format
2. World Cup Challengers
3. U15 UIPM World Championships
4. U19, U17 Junior new competition circuits
5. Competition format
6. Competitions accreditation fee

Withdrawn by the NFs.

VM: Confirmed that all motions were withdrawn and the withdrawal of motions 2-4 had been agreed with EB, while there was no need to vote on motion 5 because of the approval of EB motion 9.

SF: Announced EB decision based on various related motions to introduce one new WCH for U15 athletes, which, according to normal procedures, a bid process would soon be open to all NFs.

SF called a 15-minute break.

GBR motion 1

- UIPM Board Member term limits

Amendment article 14.2 of UIPM Statutes is already covered by the approval of UIPM EB motion 3.

The remaining part of the motion is not recommended by UIPM EB.

SF: explained that the remaining part of the motion would require a 2/3 majority as it would require a change in Statutes.

GBR: Stated that Congress provided an opportunity to come together and improve sport and plan for the future; they welcomed this opportunity to collaborate with peers to further progress development of sport – but governance must be improved to achieve this, with a diverse board with skilled, independent voices. Stated that to have good decision-making and trust, strict term limits were required, and anyone serving 3+ terms risks losing independence. Expressed a belief in strict term limits, succession planning and fair and transparent election processes, transparent and rigorous reporting and auditing, engagement with and involvement of our athlete community. While the EB motion went some way to achieving this, they believed it should go further with maximum 12-year term limits for all roles, including Presidency, and with a phased removal post-2024 of three long-serving members every two years for succession planning. Commented that EB motion 3 might mean a higher number of EB members having to step down in 2024 – asked UIPM to confirm when that motion would come into effect in 2024, would everyone begin at zero years' service?

AUS: Stated that although they had spoken a lot, not all arguments had been about Riding and governance was also very important to them. Clarified that if they appeared rushed and forceful at any time, it was because the 1min time limit made it hard to articulate statements. Remarked that the imposition of term limits had been shown to have a higher correlation in higher governance standards overall in IFs, according to ASOIF governance reports, therefore they supported the motion because it was consistent with the effort to improve governance and it did require renewal.

SWE: Concurred with AUS and GBR that term limits were an improved sign of good governance, supported their arguments; added it was vital to show now to IOC and other bodies that UIPM was taking steps to improve governance like other IFs, to prove UIPM was open to circulation of board members, that they valued independence and diversity, where people should be able to speak their minds and be totally independent from UIPM in representing their countries and areas of the sport.

SF (response): Expressed understanding and explained the reason the EB proposed a motion for term limits was to go in the same direction – wanted good governance with improvements still to be made. Clarified that the difference in the NF article was that the clock would stop in 2024, with the result that most EB members would have to stop in 2024 – therefore in the interests of continuity, EB proposal was more in the direction of stability. Repeated that good governance was important.

CONGRESS VOTE – UIPM Board Member term limits

Does the General Assembly approve the new Article 14.2.1 and 14.2.2 to the UIPM Statutes? (2/3 majority required)

90 possible votes, 21 blank, 69 valid, majority required 46;

- YES 31 (44.93%)
- NO 32 (46.38%)

- ABSTAIN 6 (8.70%).

MOTION NOT PASSED

EGY motion 1 (cont'd)

- Continental Championships with the points

SF: Explained that the agenda was returning to this motion, even though it was already approved, on request of several NFs for more information. Stated that an amendment would be drafted immediately after Congress. Clarified that one result of the motion was that Level 3 competitions would be amended for a minimum participation of four countries for both women and men and all other connected rules would be amended accordingly.

GBR motion 2

- The need for UIPM's strategic alliance with FEI

This motion is not recommended by UIPM EB.

KS: Again mentioned recent working sessions with FEI President and respective technical experts. On political side, acknowledged that UIPM and FEI together in Versailles would have to deliver a great show at Paris 2024, but stated that everything will be discussed deeply and cooperation would be much closer between the two IFs, especially as equestrian sport in France was likely to be subject to significant protesting during the Olympic Games. Said that UIPM and FEI would have many opportunities to educate athletes together to support their participation, once qualification is confirmed, offered possibilities to train for Riding together ahead of the Games. Acknowledged that presentation, as always, had to be at the highest level possible in Paris – and there was a clear mission to make the relationship with equestrian a constant priority.

GBR: Asked to use 2min allocation up front and noted that this motion was about governance, and said it was encouraging that KS had supported this motion effectively by recommending that there is a relationship with FEI; and the motion was about strengthening that relationship with FEI to be in the best place possible ahead of Paris 2024. Remarked that it was strange the EB was not supporting this motion, when KS was talking very eloquently about the relationship. Also went back to the previous motion where there was no timeline in the UIPM motion around term limits, just that it would be introduced and take effect from 2025, and that was not known to Congress when voting. Said it was imperative to have real clarity on what documentation Congress was voting on, without changes being brought in without recourse to an amendment. Also thanked the support of UIPM in agreeing on the paramount importance of Riding.

KS (response): Underlined that the relationship had existed already more than 30 years, and it was clear after Tokyo that it was time to work more closely together again; this was communicated in Tokyo and then during various working sessions between experts.

JH (response): Asked GBR if they would consider a friendly amendment to *continue* UIPM's strategic alliance with FEI?

JP (response): Underlined that there were already two FEI Riding Stewards from Bulgaria and Italy working together with UIPM, hence he didn't see the need for the motion.

CONGRESS VOTE – The need for UIPM's strategic alliance with FEI

Does the General Assembly approve motion number 2 from GBR? (50%+1 majority required)

90 possible votes, 19 blank, 71 valid, majority required 36;

- YES 24 (33.80%)
- NO 42 (59.15%)
- ABSTAIN 5 (7.04%).

MOTION NOT PASSED

GBR motions 7 & 8

- Introduce suspension and rehabilitation of poor riders / improving riding quality and experience

These motions are not recommended by UIPM EB.

SF: Informed Congress that these two motions had been fast-tracked because they related to Riding.

GBR: Asked to confirm if they could have twice as much time, for two motions, as opposed to a single motion.

SF (response): Confirmed.

GBR: Said the motions were all about improving quality of Riding as we approach Paris 2024, where it would be imperative to have the best showcase of all disciplines. As motion 2 had not passed, argued that motion 7 would be a more cost-efficient way forward, formalising safeguarding and making sure only high-quality Riding would be on display. Stated that it followed discussions with the Technical Committee (TC) and should ensure athletes were able to ride and, where eliminated many times, rehabilitation could take place. Turning to motion 8, stated that it was designed to ensure a stronger TC led by an FEI technical expert to protect and safeguard Riding in the run-up to Paris 2024.

JP (response): Stated that UIPM already had two people from England, and also previous high-performance manager from England, on the Riding Panel and rules for suspension and rehabilitation are already in place. Said it was happening right now and already some athletes had been suspended.

GBR (response): Said that part of the challenge was confusion around regulations; what exists and what is opinion? Claimed to have been given answers that contradicted the response given by JP. Stated that it was imperative this be written down and regulation established against which to take action. Reiterated that it was about improving governance and regulation standards, with a framework for fair play and high-quality performances.

SF (response): Agreed that the matter would go back to the Riding Working Group where GBR input would be very much welcome, and JP would be very open to conversation there.

AUS: Endorsed GBR comments, and appealed to everyone to look at situation; said it was one thing to claim Riding was under control and standards were in place, but evidence on the ground was not showing that, going back to Tokyo. Going forward, stressed it was vital for athlete safety and animal welfare and presentation of the sport; important to go on evidence from the ground and not what we hear about the governance; stated that in the past two years, it was anything but a good level of Riding management.

SF (response): Agreed that the matter would go back to the Riding Working Group where AUS input would be very much welcome.

JB (response): Reiterated JP statement that it was already covered, but stressed that there was also potential for interference with Olympic qualification rules already approved by IOC, and the motion could have an impact on that.

SF (response): Agreed, in that part of the motion related to a 12-month suspension, providing no chance to qualify. Clarified that motions 7 and 8 would now be subject to voting.

CONGRESS VOTE – Introduce suspension and rehabilitation of poor riders

Does the General Assembly approve motion number 7 from GBR? (2/3 majority required)

90 possible votes, 20 blank, 70 valid, majority required 47;

- YES 22 (31.43%)
- NO 45 (64.29%)
- ABSTAIN 3 (4.29%).

MOTION NOT PASSED

CONGRESS VOTE – Improving riding quality and experience

Does the General Assembly approve motion number 8 from GBR? (2/3 majority required)

90 possible votes, 17 blank, 73 valid, majority 49;

- YES 26 (35.62%)
- NO 44 (60.27%)
- ABSTAIN 3 (4.11%).

MOTION NOT PASSED

GBR motions 3-5

- Event Briefings / Technical communication to Teams during the events / Clothing & equipment regulations

The motion is linked to operational procedures without impact on UIPM Rules. No voting required.

GBR: Made a general request that where EB members make reference to Olympic matters, further detail needed to be provided later. Explained that motion 3 was designed to ensure the right information was provided to athletes and organisers to put on the best possible event. Key part of the motion was ensuring there would be a clear briefing for all participants.

SF (response): Explained that there was no need to vote on motion 3 because it was already being discussed on the operational side, similarly motion 4 because the UIPM Central App would be upgraded with more services. Thanked GBR for the “very good suggestion” to have everything combined in one document, which would be done. Also stated that there were very good suggestions in motion 5 relating to uniform. Agreed the efficiency of Technical Meetings would be improved.

GBR (response): Commented that while the motions might be seen as recommendations, in motion 5 there was a requirement to change the wording of a regulation, which may require a vote. Mentioned the challenge presented by the existence of other documents that contradicted the UIPM Competition Rules and Regulations. Said it was “really pleasing” to hear UIPM’s confidence and support in recommendations put forward to improve event experience. Would come back for clarification of Point 2 in motion 5.

SF (response): Agreed that motions 3-4 would not need to be voted on, and Legal Counsel would check motion 5.

GBR motion 6

- Change responsibility for competition disciplinary actions to Technical Delegates

The motion is not recommended by UIPM EB.

GBR: Motion followed frustrations of colleagues from different nations in past year. Responsibility to be professional on and off the Field of Play (FOP) and abide by regulations; said there was a need for action to take place where individuals failed to follow regulations; used an example of Fencing Ranking Round where coaches are reminded that there could be only one coach per athlete in the fencing zone, but nations had abused the rule and nobody had taken responsibility. Stated that a TD or another person needed to ensure this was managed well with a more professional delivery of the sport.

SF (response): Agreed that it was a struggle, and the sport need a cleaner FOP, also for media/TV. Suggested there was no need to vote, but could be done so if insisted.

GBR (response): Said they were pleased to hear support for improving the FOP, therefore proposed an amendment as to who should be responsible for this, to improve operational delivery; asked EB and SF what they believed the solution to be, as an amendment might be a positive outcome for the sport. GBR: Satisfied there was no need to vote, asked for it to be recorded in minutes that UIPM confirmed some cooperative work would be done to improve in this area, where regulations were essential – believed a number of countries would be happy to step forward and help implement the regulations.

FL (response): Reason for EB recommending not to vote on motion 5 was because they saw it as a suggestion to ensure all clothing and equipment regulations would be recorded in a single document, which was very sensible and something UIPM would definitely do. Proposed not to have a vote because UIPM would present a proposal to see if it's acceptable.

GBR (response): Agreed no need for a vote, accepting that it were minuted that the documents would be grouped together; asked for a timeline so that all nations could go into 2023 with those documents resolved.

SF (response): Proposed deliver by end of January, asked if it was acceptable.

GBR (response): Confirmed.

MRI motion 1

- Amendment of Statutes

The motion does not meet the requirement of art 32.1 of Statutes which requires 5 NFs to propose amendments to Statues. No voting required.

MRI: Agreed that the motion could be removed.

MRI motion 2

- No confidence in Dr Klaus Schormann as president of UIPM

The motion is already voted together with DEN motion 2. No voting required.

MRI: Agreed that the motion could be removed.

MRI motion 3

- No confidence in UIPM Treasurer

This motion is not recommended by UIPM EB.

MRI: Stated that they would withdraw this motion and would deal with it in another platform.

MRI motion 4

- Visa

This motion is not recommended by UIPM EB.

MRI: Nothing to add.

SF: Stated that the motion was not inadmissible, but it might be an “impossible mission”, because most competitions require visa process except Olympic Games where the IOC has power to do what the motion requested. Expressed understanding for the good intention, but admitted it would be really difficult.

MRI (response): Acknowledged that it was difficult, but not impossible as the system is already in place for African Games and other continental and regional competitions – and underlined that it was a big problem for African nations that lack Embassies in every country in Africa, meaning NFs have to send passports by email or FedEx and this can be expensive and time-consuming.

SF (response): Corrected herself, there were also continental Games where the system was in place, but stressed that for UIPM competitions it could be very difficult for the current UIPM LOCs; agreed to open the voting.

CONGRESS VOTE – Visa

Does the General Assembly approve the imposition of an obligation on the countries wishing to bid to host a UIPM competition to the effect that visa are issued upon arrival to athletes, officials and representatives of the various NFs?

90 possible votes, 21 blank, 69 valid, majority required 35;

- YES 17 (24.64%)
- NO 43 (62.32%)
- ABSTAIN 9 (13.04%).

MOTION NOT PASSED

SWE motion 1

- UIPM’s disrespect of past General Assembly motions; UIPM accounts must be prepared in accordance with the international accounting standards

This motion is already covered by UIPM Treasurer report. No voting required.

JH: Agreed with the part of the motion about international accounting standards and reiterated that they would be improved.

SWE: Stated that motion 1 was filed because an organisation like UIPM needs good governance standards and financial reporting, expressed that they were happy to see finally introduced; if JH statement was the case, the motion could be withdrawn. However, as there was more than one point in it, asked if JH could comment further.

JH (response): Under Statutes, UIPM engages auditors, said he had presented the EB with letter of engagement to KPMG, with timelines including deliverables.

JB (response): Stated that UIPM worked within laws and was in good standing with Monaco; minutes every year were passed to the Government and no remarks had been received, which proved that everything was done according to Monaco law.

SWE Motions 2-3

- A forensic review of the UIPM's financial records for the last 20 years / OCR Test Event funding

This motion is not recommended by UIPM EB

SWE: Regarding motion 2, argued that UIPM should not only accept good financial reporting standards in the future, but also to go back so that everybody could see that finances were in order and rules and regulations were followed. Said that currently the accounting standards were not comprehensible for anyone who doesn't have accounting background. Called for a forensic report to show good governance standards.

JH (response): Noted various action items in motion 3, as follows: 1) asked for a full explanation of what they were you asking for in the first part of the motion; 2) stated that the information requested in the second part of the motion was in the budget he presented, but if needed he could certify those results and break them into components by end of 2022; 3) stated that any relationship with Tokyo Broadcasting System (TBS) or other third party would be filed with all material sponsorship agreements, and there was no such contract or relationship or MoU with TBS.

SWE (response): 1) put on record that motion 3 should have been voted on before the discussion of OCR vs Riding, as it would have been relevant. As the decision had been taken, and JH having explained the cost of OCR and the fact there was no formal agreement with TBS, noted that motion 3 was now moot, but added that it wouldn't have been had there been a logical argument during Congress. Confirmed that motions 1 and 3 could be withdrawn, but-expressed a hope that in future years, Congress could know the terms of all agreements.

SF (response): Agreed on motion 3 and related items, suggested that UIPM would always communicate directly with NFs, removing the need for a motion. Regarding the agreements, said there were issues of confidentiality but UIPM could summarise in a briefing to NFs in future. Asked SWE if Motion 2 still required a vote.

SWE (response): Confirmed that motions 1 and 3 were withdrawn but motion 2 was not withdrawn, and JH having appointed KPMG, which was UIPM's regular auditor, argued that it should have been an another independent firm.

JH (response): Regarding motion 2, understood that it would have to be done by a firm other than KPMG, but met them and asked for a quote; said they told him it would be impossible to do it by Jun 1, secondly estimated a cost of €250-500k; JH confirmed that quotes would be sought from multiple accounting firms but stated his opposition to the idea because he did not feel it would a good use of UIPM funds.

CONGRESS VOTE – A forensic review of the UIPM's financial records for the last 20 years

Does the General Assembly approve to subject UIPM financial records of the last 10 years to a forensic review? (50%+1 majority required)

90 possible votes, 19 blank, 71 valid, majority required 36;

- YES 25 (35.21%)
- NO 40 (56.34%)
- ABSTAIN 6 (8.45%).

MOTION NOT PASSED

UKR motions 1-3

- Russia's aggression on Ukraine / Russia's unacceptable aggression / Material support of UKR pentathletes

No voting required.

SF: Explained that motion 1 was not appropriate because it was purely political and not within the power of the IF; motion 2 was already covered by AUS motion 2; motion 3 did not require a vote because material support was already in place, with UIPM and several NFs continuously taking action to support the UKR pentathlon family.

UKR: State that they were a democratic and law-abiding NF and would comply with all decisions taken by Congress and by the EB. Described the horrific situation in Ukraine where more than 400 athletes have been killed, no pentathletes as yet, and more than 200 sites destroyed. Thanked the support given to athletes and their families, which was valued, from UIPM together with KOR NF and KOR athletes, and the Asian Confederation, which created a foundation to help, also ESP, ITA and TUR who offered free competition in their countries. Also to GER and LTU, particularly thankful to POL and FRA who did everything to create conditions for athletes and coaches, provided housing and food and training opportunities.

KS (response): Addressed the NF and dear friends in Ukraine, stating that from beginning of the war they had big solidarity within the Olympic movement, from UIPM; expressed thanks for having mentioned all the support given by nations and individuals; affirmed that the UIPM family was

supporting as much as it could based on available resources, to help UKR athletes. Asked for no vote to be taken, as he assured UKR in front of the Modern Pentathlon family they were helping and trying our best; also reminded Congress not to forget about beloved athletes in RUS and BLR, who are the victims of a very special political situation, where IFs had to be very neutral. Confirmed with strong solidarity that wherever there is a war in the world UIPM should help and act where sport could help through peaceful messages.

JP (response): On behalf of POL, wished good luck to UKR, promised continued support and offered to do anything possible from sponsors and sport community.

YH (response): Added voice to KS and JP, supporting UKR athletes and all athletes in the world facing this kind of problems. Stated that the AC was always working with UKR athletes to support them and stay in contact with them.

UKR (response): Thanked KS and delegates for kind words and support, which made them very emotional. Added thanks to EGY NF and President Sharif. Asked Congress to understand that UKR athletes in Kiev have no possibility to train, and yesterday they were not able to take part in Congress because of air raids – they had to hide. Thanked everyone and promised to comply with all instructions and regulations adopted by UIPM management and by EB and Congress.

BLR: Asked to make a short declaration. Expressed gratitude to UIPM for interpretation and the chance to greet UIPM delegates. Referenced the decision taken to stop participation of BLR and RUS athletes and said it was discrimination that violated the principles of the Olympic Charter; described the consequences as “catastrophic for our sport in Belarus and in the Russian Federation”. Stated that they had more than 800 athletes in BLR, the majority children, and it was an impasse. Said their NFs were civil organisations, not political, and challenged UIPM to comply with international law and charter. Stated that it was mandatory to improve the situation and allow RUS and BLR from 1 January 2023 to all competitions without limitations. Made a final remark in agreement with cooperation between BLR and UKR NF; as President they offered help and assistance to UKR athletes and coaches so they could train in Belarus. Thanked Congress for their attention.

SF (response): thanked BLR for statement, said everybody had heard it and they would do whatever they could for athletes.

AFG: Expressed happiness with all solidarity towards UKR, but suggested that support and subsidies should go to all countries struggling with war, not only UKR, and said it was very unfortunate they had not received the same solidarity shown to UKR during times of conflict. Remarked that all NF communities should be supported this way and described a “really bad situation in my country 1.5 years ago where athletes were struggling to survive for six months”.

KS (response): Thanked AFG for the statement and said he had joined the Asian Confederation (AMPC) session a few days previously and started to explain what was needed. Said he had discussed with AMPC President Kim the need to look forward and said AFG was completely right and UIPM would try to help. Remembered that President Kim had stated there would be now close communication to find ways to help AFG athletes and agreed to stay close so they could know where to send money. Noted that other areas in the world with wars and NFs were affected, and that UIPM should always try to help and listen, as a sports society they needed to help colleagues and athletes

equally, and nobody should be privileged according to the continent where they live. Said UIPM was united and serving everybody.

UIPM awarded events 2023-24

SF: congratulated all nations concerned after the following event awards were confirmed by the UIPM EB:

UIPM 2023 Pentathlon World Cup

- UIPM 2023 Pentathlon World Cup: Ankara (TUR)
- UIPM 2023 Pentathlon World Cup Final: Ankara (TUR)

UIPM 2023 World Championships

- UIPM 2023 Pentathlon Youth World Championships (U17) – Alexandria (EGY)
- UIPM 2023 Pentathlon Youth World Championships (U19) – Istanbul (TUR)
- UIPM 2023 Pentathlon Junior World Championships – Druskininkai (LTU)

UIPM 2024 Pentathlon World Cup

- UIPM 2024 Pentathlon World Cup Rome (ITA)
- UIPM 2024 Pentathlon World Cup Final: Ankara (TUR)

Decisions on motions from UIPM Executive Board (cont'd)

Motion 5

- Masters: Election Rules; Rules on Internal Organisation and Competition Rules

SF: apologised for the oversight and reminded Congress that EB motion 5 was incomplete.

FL: explained the amendment of motion 5 with the words “elected by the General Assembly” and said some additional adjustments needed to be done, because Masters Committee members were subject to the same requirements as other Committee members.

FIN: Argued that the motion was not democratic; as an active Masters athlete he said he wanted the Masters community to be the ones selecting representatives.

SF (response): noted that this was a different issue, the Masters Committee was composed of people from different NFs but athlete representatives had to be elected by peers.

FIN (response): argued that the existing system worked where Masters athletes selected representatives; said they had participated in this and thought the change would be an anti-democratic move in light of discussions in this Congress.

CONGRESS VOTE – Masters: Election Rules; Rules on Internal Organisation and Competition Rules

Does the General Assembly approve the deletion of article 2.1 of the Election Rules and articles 1.9.1 and 1.9.2 of the Masters Rules; the amendments to articles 4.2, 4.10 and 7.16 of the Rules on Internal Organisation, and the amendments to articles 1.8.1 and 1.8.2 of the Masters Rules? (2/3 majority required).

90 possible votes, 17 blank, 73 valid, majority required 49;

- YES 46 (63.01%)
- NO 13 (17.81%)
- ABSTAIN 14 (19.18%).

MOTION NOT PASSED

UIPM Annual Awards

A video was played announcing the winners of the UIPM 2022 Annual Awards.

- UIPM 2022 Best Promoted Event: UIPM 2022 Pentathlon World Championships, Alexandria (EGY)
- UIPM 2022 Best Overall Event: UIPM 2022 Tetrathlon Youth World Championships (U19/U17), Lignano Sabbiadoro (ITA)
- UIPM 2022 Best New Organizer: Turkey (UIPM 2022 Pentathlon World Cup Ankara & World Cup Final, New Pentathlon Discipline Test Event I)
- UIPM 2022 Best Contribution to the Sport: Korean Modern Pentathlon Federation, Lithuania Modern Pentathlon Federation, Polish Modern Pentathlon Association – for special support to Ukraine
- UIPM 2022 Best Modern Pentathlon Relay Team: Italy
- UIPM 2022 Fair Play Award: Patrick Dogue OLY (GER)
- UIPM 2022 Best Overall Modern Pentathlon Team: Egypt
- UIPM 2022 Best Coach: Janos Martinek OLY (HUN)
- UIPM 2022 Best Youth Male Pentathlete: Moutaz Mohamed (EGY)
- UIPM 2022 Best Youth Female Pentathlete: Lucie Hlavackova (CZE)
- UIPM 2022 Best Junior Male Pentathlete: Mohamed Elgendy (EGY)
- UIPM 2022 Best Junior Female Pentathlete: Emma Whitaker (GBR)
- UIPM 2022 Best Senior Male Pentathlete: Joseph Choong OLY (GBR)
- UIPM 2022 Best Senior Female Pentathlete: Michelle Gulyas OLY (HUN)

KS: closed the Congress with some brief remarks about the importance of discussion in Congress, within the spirit of Coubertin to make the sport more universal, more accessible. Thanked all involved for the decisions made in the interests of the future, especially after Paris 2024. Wished all members of the community to have a successful movement and promised that the EB and all Committees and Commissions and Working Groups would continue to work hard, to serve together with the staff under leadership of SF, staying together and always keeping in mind that this is a noble sport in the Olympic movement, a community of noble and respectful people, and it was always needed to be fair. Looked ahead to the elective UIPM 2024 Congress which was awarded to Antigua (GUA) originally in 2021.

Appendix (i): Participating National Federations

1	AFG
2	ARG
3	AUS
4	AUT
5	BAN
6	BEL
7	BER
8	BLR
9	BOL
10	BRA
11	BUL
12	BUR
13	CAN
14	CHA
15	CHI
16	CHN
17	COL
18	CIV
19	CRO
20	CUB
21	CYP
22	CZE
23	DEN
24	DOM
25	ECU

UIPM 2022 Congress Minutes

Online, 12-13 November 2022



26	EGY
27	ESP
28	EST
29	FIN
30	FRA
31	GAM
32	GBR
33	GEO
34	GER
35	GHA
36	GRE
37	GUA
38	HKG
39	HUN
40	INA
41	IND
42	IRI
43	IRL
44	IRQ
45	ISR
46	ITA
47	JAM
48	JPN
49	KAZ
50	KGZ
51	KOR
52	KSA

UIPM 2022 Congress Minutes

Online, 12-13 November 2022



53	KUW
54	LAT
55	LIB
56	LTU
57	MAD
58	MAW
59	MDA
60	MEX
61	MGL
62	MKD
63	MLI
64	MLT
65	MON
66	MRI
67	NEP
68	NZL
69	PAK
70	PAN
71	PER
72	PHI
73	POL
74	POR
75	PUR
76	ROU
77	RSA
78	RUS
79	SEN

UIPM 2022 Congress Minutes

Online, 12-13 November 2022



80	SGP
81	SRI
82	SUD
83	SUI
84	SVK
85	SWE
86	THA
87	TLS
88	TOG
89	TPE
90	TUR
91	UGA
92	UKR
93	URU
94	USA
95	UZB
96	VEN

Appendix (ii): Keynote Speeches

1) UIPM President Dr Klaus Schormann

Dear friends, dear colleagues, dear lovers of our sport.

Before I begin my remarks, let me clarify the order of speakers for this afternoon. Following me, you will hear from Michael Payne, the IOC's first marketing director. Michael has worked in the global sports marketing industry for forty years.

After Michael, our Athletes Committee Chair, Yasser Hefny will speak about his perceptions and his role in the new Pentathlon Discipline process.

After Yasser, our Vice President Joël Bouzou will take us through the developments of the 5th Discipline Working Group this year. He will report on the actions we have taken, and the great feedback from the participating athletes at the four Test Events.

And finally, our First Vice President and IOC Vice President Juan Antonio Samaranch will recap our current position, and the profound challenges we face to keep Modern Pentathlon in the Olympic Games.

I have had the honor of addressing you over many years about the health of Modern Pentathlon and its future on the Olympic programme.

And today our sport faces yet another crossroads – but so does the world itself.

For the past three years, our entire planet has been shaken by the Coronavirus pandemic. Its impact on sport has been profound – just look at the Tokyo 2020 and Beijing 2022 Games.

It is a wonder that they took place at all, and a testament to the entire Olympic Movement working together toward common goals.

And this year we are dealing with a tragic, senseless war in Ukraine. Our fellow colleagues' and athletes' lives are under real danger.

We can do more for them and we must.

The debate about the future of Olympic Modern Pentathlon, and the discipline of Riding within it, is an emotional issue.

I understand this.

I understand it perhaps more than anyone in this Congress today because I, and my fellow board members have spent thirty years trying to save Modern Pentathlon...with the inclusion of riding...as an Olympic sport.

Today, I want to repeat what the IOC asked us to do – not just recently, but many times over thirty years.

And...like it or not...I have a duty to tell you that we only have one course of action if we wish to remain an Olympic sport.

Three successive IOC presidents...from Juan Antonio Samaranch Senior to Dr. Jacques Rogge, to Dr. Thomas Bach, have advised us that our sport is not growing... our sport is not accessible...and our sport is not universal. IOC president Avery Brundage even wrote about it in one of our Union publications in 1972.

Each of these IOC presidents clearly informed us that Riding was the primary reason for our lack of success as compared to other sports on the Olympic programme.

Some continue to doubt the seriousness of the IOC's position on riding in Modern Pentathlon.

Recently, President Bach gave an interview in Italy with *Corriere della Sera*, he said,

"...Horse riding (In Modern Pentathlon) raises problems of balance of competition... not only that, animal abuse has been highlighted...The international federation is trying to change format... in Paris the discipline will remain and in traditional form...its future will also depend on how the federation will replace the equestrian test."

Dear friends, these are not my words, they are the words of the IOC president.

This is what is called a "hard truth." And the only way to deal with a hard truth is with "tough love."

Tough love means tough choices, and tough choices means not everyone agrees.

So, my question to everyone today is very simple: What is our goal as an organization devoted to the success of our sport?

Is "success" defined as being part of the Olympic Games, or is success keeping Riding in the sport of Modern Pentathlon?

There is only one answer, my friends.

If we are no longer in the Olympic Games, we will be in the Olympic Museum.

And if that happens, we lose future generations of young athletes.

I am willing to fight, just as I have for the last thirty years, to make sure that does not happen.

We have seen many changes in sports over the years, but perhaps none so dramatic as the impact of modern marketing and communications.

For years...the IOC's decision-making process for sports on the Olympic Programme was not clear; it was often political, and many times it was emotionally based on personal relationships.

I, and people like Juan and Joël know this because to be honest, it is how we have managed to keep our sport in the Games for the past thirty years.

That was in the past.

We need a new approach.

Today the IOC makes decisions across its entire business based on data from the consumer marketplace.

This is especially clear in the new process of how sports are selected for the Olympic Programme.

I am not here to judge or criticize anyone about their desire for our sport to remain the same. I know that you honestly believe your point of view to be correct.

But that is not what the IOC asked us to do. They asked us to change.

We must move forward...and to move forward...we all must compromise.

There are two ways forward.

We can debate and discuss our differences with honour and respect - or we can engage in the theater of personal attacks.

Our sport's future deserves more than negative social media posts and misinformation.

Everyone in the Modern Pentathlon family wishing to express an opinion has been invited to participate in person, online, and via all means.

We have worked hard to ensure all voices are heard. The 5th Discipline Working Group has been open and transparent.

Our founder, Pierre de Coubertin, was not a man focused on the past.

He knew the Games must always evolve.

He wrote, "Success comprises in itself...the seeds of its own decline...and sport is not spared by this law."

This is a clear call for constant innovation and evolution.

Our sport has made many changes over its history... we have never been afraid of change.

But history's greatest lesson teaches us we cannot let our affection for the past become a chain around our future.

So, today we are here to define our future...together. But make no mistake, if we hope for an Olympic future, we must change and we must change now.

Let me pose a simple question: "How can we remain on the Olympic Programme if we cannot quickly find a way to grow our sport's participation base?"

Does anyone really believe we can chart a new course for our Olympic future by doing the exact same thing for years and years?

That is not logical.

So, the real question is, "what is restricting our growth and popularity as an Olympic sport?"

We must ask this question through the eyes of millions of young Pentathletes all around the world...often in places with limited access to proper equestrian training or resources.

The answer is clear for anyone who is truly objective.

If young athletes around the world do not have the resources, they need...then we must give them a more accessible version of our sport.

The values and the ideals of the Olympic Movement are eternal – they do not and will not change.

However, using "tradition and heritage" to ignore what creates the "right" to be on the modern Olympic programme is irrational.

The IOC criteria for new sports is clear.

They told us what to do – and what not to do. Now we must do it because we are in the greatest competition of our sport's history.

To be specific, the IOC provided six clear guidelines to update our sport.

We have addressed each of these. Joël will go into the detail in his remarks.

Unlike in the past, we have no second or third opportunities to remain an Olympic sport.

We must do all we can to remove emotional attachment and focus on objective facts and opportunities.

As I said earlier, I know this is difficult.

There are some here today that wish to make this Congress a referendum on me and my leadership. To be fair, that is your right to do so.

But I would also say that this moment in our shared history together is not about me – it is about all of us.

The reality is our sport can have a great future...it can be an incredible new Olympic journey built for the next generation of athletes and fans.

And this is why we are here – for the next generations.

Since you voted for change in 2021, we have done our very best to ensure a transparent and inclusive process to make sure that everyone – especially our athletes – voices were heard.

And we have heard from a lot of athletes, especially the ones who participated in the Test Events. Their message of support is loud and clear.

In conclusion...I know that some will never embrace this proposal for change...no matter what I say...or what the facts say.

But I hope we all can agree that our true goal is to remain on the LA28 Programme.

So, again I ask the simple question: What is our goal as an organization devoted to the success of our sport?

Is “success” defined as being part of the Olympic Games, or is success keeping Riding in the sport of Modern Pentathlon?

There is only one answer.

Dear friends and colleagues, thank you for your friendship, your dedication and your passion for our sport.

It is an honour to work on your behalf every day...and it is my greatest hope that we...as one Modern Pentathlon family...move our sport into the future to create Olympic dreams for generations to come.

Thank you.

.....

2) Michael Payne

Thank you, president, and greetings to everyone on this very important and crucial day in the future of Modern Pentathlon.

Not many of you here today will know me or have perhaps even have heard of me.

My name is Michael Payne.

I have spent the last 4 decades working closely for the Olympic Movement.

For twenty years I worked as the IOC's first broadcast and marketing director; and the last twenty years as an advisor brokering over \$4 billion of the Olympic Movement's biggest sponsorship and broadcast deals from Alibaba to Coca-Cola / Mengniu.

Paris will be my 22nd Olympic Games..... that's both winter and summer.

Aside from the Olympic World, I also served for more than two decades as advisor to some of the other most important groups in the sports and entertainment world.

These assignments include over a decade with Bernie Ecclestone and F1, Sir Martin Sorrell and WPP – the largest marketing agency group in the world, and more recently with CVC - Europe's largest private equity group, supporting a series of major investments in sports.

I have been privileged to see a lot of the global sports world; to understand the different challenges and opportunities facing that world, gaining an intimate understanding of the business of sport.

Last year I was asked to serve on the UIPM 5th Discipline Working group to try help save Modern Pentathlon in the Olympic Games. I accepted because I respect and admire your great sport and its history, but I was also wary of just how much difference I could make.

Let me state up front, I am not a Modern Pentathlon insider.

I am here today, as an outsider. I have no agenda within your federation other than to try to help in this process. My goal here today is to simply tell you how it is as I see it. I plan to speak some home truths – and will speak directly.

As it stands today you are the weakest sport on the Olympic programme, and you are great peril of losing your place as an Olympic sport.

Modern Pentathlon ranks at the bottom of all Olympic sports federations – across every single criterion.

Bottom of broadcast audience; bottom of social media audience; bottom in terms of sponsorship; bottom in terms of spectators; bottom in terms of active participants. Bottom in every single criterion that the IOC tracks.

Numbers don't lie. This is not about personalities, not about your president, nor your executive board, your athletes, or even your personal passion for your sport. It is purely and simply about the performance of Modern Pentathlon at the Games.

I make my living in the Olympic world and speak to literally dozens of Olympic stakeholders every month.

Many people ask, "why is Modern Pentathlon still on the Olympic programme?"

And to be perfectly honest, I am amazed that you are still on the programme.

I have watched how over the last 3 decades; your sport has been repeatedly threatened with being dropped from the Olympic programme.

You have dodged death multiple times. I fear that some in your ranks believe that you can dodge death again. I fear friends, that this time you cannot. No amount of lobbying or tinkering with the format will save you.

I can say with absolute certainty that unless you change Modern Pentathlon, your sport has no chance, zero chance of competing at the LA28 Games.

Let me be very clear, once you have been dropped from the Olympic programme, it is game over: There will be no way back - and your sport will struggle to even survive without the Olympics.

As I noted, when approached earlier this year by your leadership, asking if there was anything I thought could be done to save your sport, my initial reaction was "I doubt it."

I knew of the schism in your ranks about riding, and it was my impression that a house divided cannot stand.

Those who know me well also know I have great respect for heritage and tradition, and a deep love for the Olympic Games.

At the IOC, I pioneered the whole development of Olympic brand management and saw firsthand the importance of tradition to the Olympic brand.

So, rather than stand by and watch a great Olympic sport die, I accepted the challenge to try and help.

I proposed that if we are going to undertake this review properly, there could be no half measures. I also suggested we should bring along some of the greatest broadcast, social media and brand minds in the world.

Due to my long-standing work in the industry, I was able to persuade a few friends to join the group:

David Hill, the founder and former Chairman / CEO of US Network Fox Sports and viewed by many as the greatest living TV sports producer. He is currently transforming the broadcast of F1 and Volleyball.

Peter Hutton, the former CEO of Eurosport and now head of sports and entertainment at Facebook / Meta.

Terrence Burns, one of the world's leading sports brand and campaign experts, and my former head of brand marketing at the IOC.

We all got together with one single mission – to help you save your place on the Olympic programme. We set out to do this by ignoring personalities and politics and focusing only on the best possible outcome to remain in the Olympics.

I would humbly point out that no other federation has assembled such an august assembly of sports, marketing, and television professionals to assist its efforts.

This is the type of dedicated effort that the IOC notices, and they did notice. But we still must deliver.

Our group genuinely believes that Obstacle has the potential to not only save your sport's Olympic place, but to go from being the weakest sport on the programme, to be one of the strongest, with some of the highest TV and social media ratings, and unlimited growth potential.

That's a big statement and I would not say if I believed otherwise.

As an outsider let me try and give some context, dispel some of the falsehoods that have been doing the rounds. There are six key points:

- the leadership of UIPM is the cause and out of touch.
- the IOC's true position on the equestrian discipline;
- and the broader sports programme
- why now, why so rushed?
- the athletes have not been consulted
- the whole process has not been democratic.

Frist, the notion that your leadership has failed the sport by not developing strong marketing programmes and growing audiences.

Let me be very clear, the only reason you are still on the Olympic programme is because of Klaus Schormann's very active and successful lobbying over the last 30 years to stay on the programme.

Without Klaus and the deep personal relationships he's built in the Olympic world, your sport would have been out of the Games long ago. Other sports leaders did not build those relationships, and that in part was why they lost their place on the Olympic programme.

That is a “hard truth,” to use the president’s own words. You may not like, understand, or agree with it, but it is a fact.

Second, the assertion that “the IOC has never said equestrian must be out; we can fix this by changing the rules on equestrian sports to make it fairer.”

That is simply incorrect.

The IOC rarely says things directly – it is always couched in diplomatic language, and you have to read between the lines.

The IOC does its best to respect the independence of each IF, and publicly only gives guidance, subtle hints.

But privately the leadership of the IOC has been very clear – and more recently in public, they spelled it out very directly and very clearly; equestrian must go.

President Bach’s words about riding in this most recent interview in Italy was unequivocal – read them for yourself.

Third, “If Equestrian is such an issue, why does the IOC not take issue with show jumping and the 3-day event?”

No sport is safe on the programme. Look at what has happened to Boxing and Weightlifting. And it is far from certain that these sports will make it back on the programme for LA28.

Baseball and Softball are also struggling to get back on. Wrestling was dropped and only through a major overhaul did they succeed in getting back on.

I would not be surprised if behind closed doors clear messages are not also being given to the FEI.

Fourth – “Why now – this all seems so rushed...?”

Let me repeat. 30 years. Three IOC presidents. And a single clear repeated message to your sport.

I don’t consider a year’s reflection and hard work as being rushed. A lot of other sports are actively lobbying to seek their place on the Olympic programme for LA.

In fact, several of them are making presentations to the LA28 team as we speak.

The IOC and LA28 need to understand where Modern Pentathlon and UIPM family stands on sincere, genuine change.

At the moment, they don’t think you will be able to get your act together and they will just move on without Modern Pentathlon.

Fifth, “The athletes are opposed and have not been consulted.” I think this is insincere at best and deceitful at worst.

I have seen the polling numbers released by those against Obstacle – claiming over 90% opposed to the change.

I know a lot about polling, and how you need to examine such headline grabbing statistics with extreme caution.

But whether the polling was for real, was broad, was focused on youth athletes of tomorrow, or long-retired athletes is not the issue.

It’s background noise.

The first, and frankly the only relevant question is: “does the sport of Modern Pentathlon want to stay on the Olympic Programme?”

So, I challenge you all today: do you? Do you want to stay on the Olympic Programme?

And let’s have an honest review about the question of supposed “lack of consultation.”

Over the course of my career, I have worked closely with many of the leading international federations. I can honestly say, I have never, repeat never, seen a federation engage so actively with their athletes as has the UIPM.

I have met your athlete commission representatives. Would they like to keep equestrian in the sport? All things being equal, of course they would.

Do they understand that if they want their sport to stay on the programme, they don’t have a choice? Yes, they understand it.

Do they think that Obstacle is a great fit and has the potential to not only save their sport, but really allow it to grow? Absolutely, yes, they do.

This isn’t about reading the tea leaves; it’s about reading the data from the IOC.

Six and finally– “The process has not been democratic.”

Again – I have spent 40 years at the forefront of sports governance. The process your leadership has put in place, is one of the most democratic I have seen.

Your Vice President, Joël will take you through, step by step, every milestone and timeline the UIPM and the 5th Working Group has taken to engage with the UIPM family in every form available.

Talking about democracy is somewhat ironic, if you only believe it exists, if it only validates your point of view.

So here we are. Your votes today are about your future; whether you even have a future, whether most of you even have jobs in your sport after 2024.

It truly is in your own hands.

This is life or death for your sport in the Games.

The IOC has been explicitly clear about what they are looking for and for what you must do. As you will hear in Joël's remarks, the UIPM has addressed all six of these major points and issues.

However, there are some who are missing half of the issue, here. Modern Pentathlon's objective in this effort isn't only to save your sport, but it must also make the Games stronger.

You must be a catalyst for a Games that attracts more youth, fosters greater fan engagement, is more broadcast friendly, and more popular in a growing sea of competing events vying for consumer attention.

Imagine the incredible turnaround story of the sport created by Pierre de Coubertin, its Olympic debut in 1912. A sport that has fought for years to maintain its tenuous role as an Olympic sport suddenly becoming one of the most exciting and popular events on the Olympic programme.

This isn't fiction. This can happen. You just need the courage and objectivity to see it through.

You have seen the data on global participation rates of Obstacle racing – 20 million people, television viewership – over a billion consumers watching, and the commercial appeal of this new sport.

Obstacle is also a sport that demands many athletic skill sets of its athletes, such as strength, balance, strategy, and speed. These fits perfectly with the existing DNA of pentathlete excellence.

This is a golden opportunity, no pun intended, to seize upon that. No other federation in my professional life has had such an opportunity.

So, when you vote today, the real question is "do I want Modern Pentathlon to remain in the Olympic Games, or do I want riding to remain in Modern Pentathlon." The answer is you cannot have both.

Thank you very much for your time and attention today, and I sincerely hope to be in LA28 watching the new and "modern," Modern Pentathlon.

.....

3) Yasser Hefny OLY

Dear fellow athletes, dear friends, and colleagues...

When I began my career in Modern Pentathlon at age eleven, I never thought I would be an Olympian or a world champion...let alone speaking to you as Chair of the UIPM Athletes Committee.

My role, however, is both an honour and a responsibility for which I am grateful, especially at this momentous time for our sport.

We all know why we're here.

We're trying to save our sport on the Olympic programme, which could also mean we are here to save our sport, quite literally.

I realize there are many points of view about what we must do.

And I realize that this is an emotional issue.

Emotions are not easily swayed by facts.

But we must face the facts, however painful they may be.

I have attended all four of the Obstacle Test Events.

I even participated on the course, and I can tell you there is nothing easy about it. It is a demanding sport for every skill of an athlete.

But more importantly, I listened to the athletes who participated.

That is an important point here today – we have testimony from athletes who've actually participated in Obstacle.

Allow me to share a bit of what the young athletes had to say; there are many more examples, I've just chosen a few.

Milan Czak from HUN said, "I liked it, because I always watch TV series about obstacle courses at home, so I always wanted to try them"

Sam Cobb from GBR said, "I've just done obstacle course racing and it's really good fun, a different challenge – just different and really good."

And **Adam Pierzchala from POL said,** "I think it's good for the future of Modern Pentathlon...I think obstacle is a really good choice to change the five disciplines in Modern Pentathlon."

Now, some may say "these are just young athletes." Well, that's the point. This entire exercise is about their future as Pentathletes.

My friends, If I could snap my fingers and keep Riding in our sport for the Olympic programme, believe me, I would happily do so.

But this isn't about how much I love Riding. This is about Riding's impact on our future as an Olympic sport.

I believe that some in our family misunderstand the challenge.

My friends, we are fighting to keep Modern Pentathlon in the Olympic Games, not fighting to keep riding in Olympic Modern Pentathlon.

We cannot have both.

As I said, I recognize that emotions are high. I also recognize how hard it is to change.

But what I cannot accept are the statements that the 5th Discipline Working Group and the UIPM ignored athletes' voices during this process. That is simply not true.

We have engaged every NF throughout this process and every registered member of the UIPM has had a voice and an opportunity to express themselves.

I am also disappointed by the ongoing personal attacks on our team, and the IF's leadership. This is not a referendum on leadership, it is a referendum on our Olympic future.

Many of you know me, and some know me very well. We've competed together and against each other. We supported each other. We are family.

So, why would I lie about this...?

We are faced with a clear challenge to our future as an Olympic sport. But the IOC has also given us a clear opportunity to address this challenge.

But it's not only about how well we do at the Games. It is about what every single national federation can do, day in and day out, to make our sport more accessible and universal for young athletes everywhere.

Going forward, Olympic sports' performance will be measured with Games-time data. Data that we currently score dead last amongst all sports on the programme.

As Olympic Agenda 2020+5 pushes further to make the Games more accessible...more affordable...and more universal...so too must all sports on the programme.... (pause)

Including us.

I see that as an opportunity...not for me, but for the generations of Modern Pentathlon athletes to come.

We must create a path forward for future athletes that is more accessible... more affordable...and more universal than the Modern Pentathlon of today, or there will be no Olympic path forward.

We can change that here today. We must change that.

Obstacle Discipline has twenty million participants at varying levels around the world. Twenty million! And one billion people watching it on TV.

It is highly accessible...It is universal...It is growing...It is popular among the young target audience. And at the elite level, it is a highly demanding sport for women and men.

Use your imagination...

How many of those twenty million people would it take to transform our sport? Ten percent? Five percent? Those numbers still dwarf our sports participation base today.

We all know that what we are proposing is a drastic change to the sport we all love, and perhaps the part of our sport that we all enjoy the most. I know that as well as any of you here today.

But I also know that keeping Riding is not an option for the Games. As Michael Payne noted, three IOC presidents over 30 years have asked us to change.

We've made changes before. Many in our sport were against those changes too. But in the end, those were the right decisions.

I am asking each of you to search your hearts...as I have had to do...ask yourself a simple question: "are we here to save our sport in the Olympic Games or to save Riding in our sport?"

My answer to that question is clear.

It is why I whole-heartedly support adding Obstacle to our format.

And I firmly believe it is the only chance we have for young Pentathletes in the future to dream of being an Olympian.

Dear athletes, friends and colleagues. I am here today putting my name and my reputation on the line to try to save our sport.

I am asking you to join me.

I know that by working together we can save our sport, but if we work against each other, our future on the Olympic programme is lost.

Thank you, and now allow me to introduce our Vice President Joël Bouzou.

4) UIPM Vice-President Joël Bouzou OLY

Thank you, Yasser, and greetings, dear friends and colleagues.

A year ago, at our 71st Congress we outlined the challenging situation of Modern Pentathlon's future in the Olympic Games.

The point of concern was and remains Riding Discipline's role in the future of our sport's Olympic format.

The issue is not a new one. There were debates, many heated, about riding in Modern Pentathlon even when I was competing in the 1980s and 90s.

Even then-IOC president Juan Antonio Samaranch suggested that we replace horses with bicycles – and that was in 1992.

The UIPM fought to not only remain in the Games, but to keep Riding part of our program.

And even if those efforts to save our sport worked at the time, they will work no longer.

Given the IOC's new focus on data and commercial metrics, we can no longer afford to remain the same sport and stay in the Games.

As Michael just remarked, Modern Pentathlon ranks last in virtually every measurement the IOC is using to re-define the sports programme.

Every single one...!

Last year we knew we had to act, and we had to act quickly. At that time, our First Vice President told us it could even be a matter of weeks. So, we sprang into action with a plan to save our sport.

Let me first address the suggestion that only UIPM member federations with fully developed Modern Pentathlon programmes could be allowed to vote on the selection of a new discipline. That is simply not true.

To repeat UIPM's statement of Nov 18 last year: "Each member federation of the UIPM is entitled to a vote. None shall be denied, excluded or discriminated and all shall be heard."

We should also address the accusation that the UIPM Executive Board, in initiating the 5th Discipline consultation process, acted unconstitutionally.

The EB made no attempt to amend UIPM Statutes or Competition Rules – any decision over a change of the UIPM Statutes, a potential new discipline, and so on will be made by us here today...together...and legally.

What the EB has done is accelerate the process of proposing a new format to the IOC for the Los Angeles 2028 Games.

As noted, three IOC presidents over thirty years have been very clear about the Riding discipline in our sport.

Their advice and guidance were not intended as a critique of equestrian in the Games, rather, it was an observation that equestrian in Modern Pentathlon was not sustainable.

Some in our family want to make this a debate simply about riding; it is not a debate about riding, it is a debate about our sport's accessibility and universality.

Last December, the UIPM formed the "5th Discipline Working Group" for which I served as the Coordinator.

Our goal was two-fold:

Based on the direction of the IOC, we had to:

One: reimagine our sport; and two: add value to the Olympic Games.

There has been a lot of misinformation and misunderstanding surrounding the timing and the decisions taken. I would like to take a moment to refresh everyone's memory with the facts and a timeline.

On 29 OCT 2021 – Innovation Commission meeting and the UIPM decision to replace riding

On 26 NOV 2021 - Delegates voted 81% to UIPM EB decision to open the 5th Discipline consultation process

On 17 DEC 2021 – The UIPM Athletes Committee met with IOC

On 20 DEC 2021 - The first ever online Athlete's Conference led by UIPM Athletes Committee

On 23 DEC 2021 - The 5th Discipline Working Group announced

As you can see on the slide, the group was comprised of 21 individuals, including 10 Olympians. We also included four independent external sports marketing and media specialists.

On 13 JAN 2022 the Working Group held their first meeting, online. At this meeting the following issues were addressed:

- Validating the 13 Criteria set by all UIPM stakeholders
- Athlete's voice and wishes for the new discipline
- Data Comparison of the last 3 Olympics
- General Opinions and inputs on new direction with experts

As you can see from the slide, the 13 criteria covered every crucial aspect of our sport – from competition aspects to the health of the athletes, to ensuring we did not encroach on any other Olympic IF sports, a focus on the youth demographic, fan engagement opportunities, and so on.

From 28 JAN-15 FEB 2022 – We launched an Open Consultation Process – 62 suggestions were made from 40 stakeholders in 38 nations.

On 23 Feb 2022 - First Working Group Voting – 62 proposals ranked down to five

On 1 MAR 2022 - Second Working Group Voting ranked the five proposals – you can see from the slide the sports that were suggested, and the votes received.

On 1 MAY 2022 - Working Group Physical Meeting in Budapest

On 2 MAY 2022 - UIPM EB Decision approving the Obstacle Discipline to be tested

As we all know, the IOC and LA28 also issued a list of six specific criteria for us to follow in our deliberations.

Let's address these one-by-one, and the actions we've taken and are proposing

-A reduction in the cost and complexity

The cost of a UIPM World Cup Riding event can range from one hundred to two hundred thousand US dollars. A similar World Event in Obstacle Discipline can range from ten to forty thousand US dollars.

The Modern Pentathlon competition at the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Games cost approximately one-point-five million US dollars. And the estimated cost of Obstacle Event at the Olympic Games is one hundred fifty thousand US dollars.

These costs do not account for the cost of training at the grass roots level around the world.

Next, let's look at **Athlete Health and Safety**

The author of one study, Jull Colleby, a member of the Medical Commission of FISO, found a .023% rate of hospitalizations across all races, and nearly all the injuries were minor.

UIPM has conducted four Test Events this year to ensure that Obstacle Discipline is safe for athletes of all ages.

From the 2023 season onward, pending Congress approval today, UIPM will arrange more tests including Junior and Youth major events.

-The IOC's third criterion is "**global appeal to fans across the world, and host country interest.**"

Rather than simply rely on data from World Obstacle – which is impressive – we also tracked the media coverage of our first three test events and its association with *Ninja Warrior*. This data demonstrates a huge level of global interest.

These numbers are huge, and are the metrics used by PR agencies for all media coverage. This represents all the combined totals of all people who consume the big media titles that have covered this story.

Of course, it doesn't mean that 1.2bn people have read an article, but these numbers are massive compared to our usual Modern Pentathlon reach.

-In terms of TV potential, the opportunity is also vast.

NBC's *American Ninja Warrior* attracted 35m viewers in Season 13.

American Ninja Warrior is broadcast in 148 countries and *SASUKE* in 160.

More than 1 billion viewers watch TV coverage of obstacle racing.

TBS, the rights holder of *Ninja Warrior*, attended all UIPM Obstacle Discipline tests. Their feedback is incredibly positive, and they are eager to help us from technical side as well.

All of this means that our sport is in a good position to engage this new market and attract more TV viewers, more sponsors and in the end, more athletes.

And Obstacle indexes very high against the core younger audience the IOC – and all sports on the programme – are trying to reach.

Obstacle content consistently achieves very high engagement on social media – here are a few examples – they are much higher numbers than traditional Modern Pentathlon social posts.

-The fourth IOC criterion for inclusion into the LA28 Programme is **“prioritizing gender equality and youth relevance to engage new fans and athletes.”**

Modern Pentathlon has been fully gender-equal since 2000 – in fact, we were a leader in this important issue over twenty years ago.

Every discipline or event is for both genders with the same distances/rules, awards, and prize.

Obstacle Discipline has around 20m participants globally and generates thousands of events per year.

35% of obstacle athletes who attended our tests would like to start training other MP disciplines.

And finally, in terms of growth and accessibility, World Obstacle Racing projects a total of thirty-eight million participants worldwide by the year 2024.

Twenty-four percent in the US, twenty-six in Europe, 32% in Asia, and 18% in the rest of the world.

By any measure or even fraction, the projections for current Modern Pentathlon growth are nowhere near these numbers.

-The fifth criterion is **Upholding integrity and fairness to support clean sports.**

We can be proud that Modern Pentathlon has been a clean sport and with very limited doping cases for decades.

But fairness isn't only about doping.

We also know that there is a factor in our sport that makes it unfair, often for the best Pentathletes...this is of course the "draw of the horses" for the riding competition.

The IOC has also brought this to our attention many times.

Obstacle Discipline eliminates this built-in unfairness – no athlete would be dependent anymore on the "luck of the draw" for an Olympic medal.

Eliminating the barriers of high cost and limited access will stimulate interest and participation for athletes coming from different continents, cultures, and economic conditions.

-The IOC's final criterion for LA28 is "**supporting environmental sustainability.**"

Our sport has made many innovations, including the exchange of laser shooting instead of live ammunition. This has been recognized by the IOC for its friendly approach to the environment.

Sustainability is based on universal accessibility and low cost. Obstacle training courses are much cheaper to build and maintain than riding resources.

This is true at the grass roots level and for future Organizing Committees.

In summary, Obstacle Discipline matches all IOC criteria for LA28, and provides additional value for the Olympic Games because of its:

- Much bigger participation base
- Ensuring fairness for athletes
- Huge new and non-traditional audience for the Olympic Games
- Much higher media interests and exposure
- Universality and accessibility
- Relevance and youth attraction
- Low cost of organization and participation, and
- More foreseeable commercial value

The four Test Events we've held this summer and early autumn have been exciting, successful, and highly informative.

The first Test Event took place 27 – 28 June 2022 in Ankara, Turkey. The event brought together athletes from over 19 countries, including Olympic medalists and elite obstacle athletes.

The second Test Event took place on August 06-07 in Manila, Philippines, to allow access for athletes from Asia and Oceania who represented 9 countries in the region.

The third Test Event was held on September 09-10 in Lignano Sabbiadoro, Italy during the UIPM 2022 U19/U17 World Championships.

The fourth and last Test Event took place on October 07-08 in Zielona Gora, Poland, which event was designed for Junior Athletes (U22) and was considered a huge success by the participants.

Let's look at some of the feedback from the athletes who competed in the Obstacle course – and remember, these athletes also ride horses so there is an honest comparison of the two.

As someone who has dedicated his life to our sport, including the love of show jumping, I understand the appeal and allure of riding.

But I also know that this appeal is *niche* in its nature and comes at a cost to growing Modern Pentathlon.

We know that equestrian resources and training are severely limited in many parts of the world.

There are many great champions here with us today. To you, I ask an honest question: look back at your athletic careers and try to imagine if you came from a country where little to no riding resources were available – would you be here today? I can honestly say that I would not be.

We must ensure future pentathletes will have a sport where access and opportunities are fair and equal, because Sport is not egalitarian – it belongs to everyone.

We must find a way to ensure universal accessibility for Modern Pentathlon – but no one can honestly say that this exists today for our sport. The IOC certainly does not believe it exists.

But if we are brave enough, if we are willing to work together and place our emphasis on the athletes of tomorrow...not of the past...I am certain we can give future generations a truly "modern" version of Modern Pentathlon

Thank you, and now allow me to introduce the first Vice President of the UIPM, and IOC Vice President, Juan Antonio Samaranch.

5) UIPM 1st Vice President Juan Antonio Samaranch

Thank you Joël, and greetings to all of you joining us today.

I believe our president said it correctly. We are faced with some “hard truths.” He was also correct that in situations like these, what is needed is some “tough love.”

I know we all love this sport. We may disagree on many things, but I know that everyone here loves Modern Pentathlon.

That makes the changes we must undertake so difficult. Too often in our lives, we react emotionally rather than objectively to things we care about the most.

That’s human nature. But to make the best decisions in life, we must let objectivity and reason take the place of emotion.

Preparing for today, I was struggling with “which hat” to wear for this speech. Should I speak only as the First Vice President of the UIPM? Or should I speak to you as an IOC Vice President?

It struck me that the message is the same, regardless of the hat.

The president, Michael, Yasser, and Joël laid out the stark reality we face and the options that we have and the consequences of each. For me, the way forward is very clear.

I have been an IOC member since 2001 and been involved with the Olympic Movement most of my life.

I do not have a crystal ball, but I have observed a lot and have learned a lot by doing so.

I cannot read the minds of the IOC EB other than to say this and say it for certain: if we do not approve the proposed new format going forward, we have zero chance of remaining in the Olympic Games.

So, if that is your unmovable stance, that is your certain consequence.

However, if we do approve the proposal at least we will have a fighting chance to save our sport’s Olympic future.

Why would anyone choose certain failure over a chance to succeed?

Over the years, I have seen a lot of sports work hard to be part of the Games. Too often there is little evidence of their added value to the Games.

I mention this because this debate isn’t only about saving our sport, it is about making the Games stronger. Some of us seem to forget that.

I recall the naysayers about snowboarding, surfing, rock climbing, and skateboarding in the Games. They've proven to be very popular with the one demographic we are weakest – the youth.

Obstacle offers the IOC an interesting proposition.

And from all the proposals we've reviewed, I truly believe that Obstacle's accessibility, its popularity, and its universal focus on youth is something the IOC is looking for in new sports on the programme.

And I think it fits perfectly with the Modern Pentathlon role of the best all-around athlete.

Is that a guarantee we will be successful? No, it isn't.

But I do guarantee you this: our sport will never see another Olympic Games if today we choose to remain the same.

We've about the changes within the IOC's decision-making process. And over the past 10 of my 21 years as a member, I have seen the pace of these changes accelerate dramatically.

President Bach's original Olympic Agenda 2020, The New Norm, and now Olympic Agenda 2020+5 are not mere words on paper.

They are an extraordinary call to action designed to modernize the workings and the abilities of the IOC.

The Movement knows how to host and manage Olympic Games very well.

But where the IOC has lagged – and is now catching up quite quickly – is in the understanding of modern communications, marketing, fan engagement.

Some of you are worried about losing our heritage and tradition. That's an honest perspective, but I ask you this: what good are heritage and tradition if they can only be seen in a museum?

Modern Pentathlon will never lose its foundational core, the one given to us by our founder.

But Coubertin also wanted the Movement to always innovate and to change so that the Games would always remain relevant.

My friends, right now we are not relevant. In fact, we are dead last in every metric the IOC is interested in.

We are a sport, but we are also an organization with a duty to those who will follow us. Therefore, we must make our sport relevant to remain on the Olympic programme so that we have something to pass on. It's that simple.

This entire process has been complicated by passions and emotions. But it is not about emotions. It is about what is best for our sport, and that decision will be based on data.

The question the president asked earlier is the correct one, and its answer can either guide us forward or derail us into obscurity:

“Is our “success” defined as being in or out of the Olympic Games, or is it the preservation of Riding in the sport of Modern Pentathlon?”

This is not a rhetorical or trick question. It is merely a statement of fact that we cannot have both.

This is the true crux of the matter as I see it, and I am not the only one.

30 years. 3 IOC presidents. One consistent opinion about our lack of universality.

And one IF, the UIPM, holding on to the Games by the sheer will and exhausting work of its leadership. That is not sustainable going forward.

I have seen many organizations in the Olympic Movement deal with change over the years. Even the IOC has not been immune to this.

What I have learned is this: don’t dwell on what when wrong. Instead, focus on what to do next. We must spend our energy moving forward together towards an answer. It may not be perfect, but it is better than sitting still.

Dear friends, this is our time.

And although the situation is critical, it is not helpless. But we must we have the courage to adapt – because the alternative is to fall behind, to fade away, and to finally, disappear.

We cannot let that happen to our magnificent sport.

Thank you for your time and attention here today.