

RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION DES REGLEMENTS DE LA FIE
FIE RULES COMMISSION REPORT
INFORME DE LA COMISIÓN DE LOS REGLAMENTOS DE LA FIE

Date, lieu et heure de la réunion : Date, place and time of the meeting: Fecha, lugar y horario de la reunión:	7 et 8 juillet 2023 13:00 CET Virtual meeting
Participants: Participants: Participantes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FERIANI Ziad (TUN) President 2. BARLADEANU, Roxana – Mariana (ROU) 3. CAFIERO Giuseppe (ITA) 4. FARYABI Abbas Ali (IRI) 5. KHDER Ahmed (EGY) 6. KOEHLER Kelly (USA) 7. LAMMER Dieter (GER) 8. LAMON Janine (SUI)
Absences (indiquer si l'absence avait été annoncée) : Absent (indicate if the absence had been announced): Ausencias (indicar si la ausencia fue anunciada):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GARES Bruno (FRA) Representative of the Executive Committee in the Rules Commission (Present 8 Jul) 2. BELMONTE Manuel (CAN), absence had been announced 3. CRUZ Alberto (CRC) absence had been announced

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCCIÓN

The President of the Commission welcomed all the members and moved to the agenda.

RAPPORT DE LA RÉUNION
MEETING REPORT
INFORME DE LA REUNIÓN

Point 1 / Item 1 / Punto 1: Proposals for the Congress regarding the Statues

Proposal 7, Article: 4.4.2 from: Legal Commission

P. 7

Opinion of the Rules Commission: **Not in favour**. The limitations are not necessary. The competence and the attitude should prevail on previous experience.

Point 2 / Item 2 / Punto 2: Proposals for the Congress regarding the Organization Rules

Proposal 1, Article: **o.10** from: Women and Fencing Council

P. 1

Opinion of the Rules Commission: **Not in favour**. The matter is already covered by the Administrative Rules.

There's nothing in our statutes or administrative rules to indicate that a council can make direct proposals for modifications in the rules (Statute 6A.5.3).

The function of councils is to suggest solutions to the Executive Committee to promote the objectives indicated in the statutes.

P. 2

Proposal 2, Article: o.15 and o.85 from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#)

P. 3

Proposal 3, Article: o.16 from: Women and Fencing Council

o.16

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [Not in favour](#). The matter is already covered by the Administrative Rules.

P. 4

Proposal 4, Article: o.18 from: Women and Fencing Council

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

P. 5

Proposal 5, Article: o.25.3 from: Women and Fencing Council

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [Not in favour](#). This information is already available in the results software.

P. 6

Proposal 6, Article: o.26 from: Women and Fencing Council

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [Not in favour](#). The matter is already covered by the Administrative Rules.

P. 7

Proposal 7, Article: o.16, o.18, o.26, o.29, o.39, o.50, o.63, o.75, o.103, o.104

from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

P. 8

Proposal 8, Article: o.29 and o.30 from: Rules Commission

Motivation: Rewrite the rule for a better understanding of its application. **Opinion of the Rules Commission:** [In favour](#).

P. 9

Proposal 9, Article: o.42 and o.102 from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

P. 10

Proposal 10, Article: o.50 from: Veterans Council

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [Not in favour with the point 2 b](#)). There is always representative of the Veterans Council, named by the Veterans Council, in the Directoire Technique at Veteran World Championships.

[In favour with the other points](#).

P. 11

Proposal 11, Article: o.99 from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

P.12

Proposal 12, Article: o.100 from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour.](#)

P.13

Proposal 13, Article: o.105 from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour as modified:](#)

Motivation : the zone championships benefit from a coefficient of 1.5. **8** pistes must be equipped with video refereeing.

Senior zonal championships	T 64	T 16	4 8	T 1-8
----------------------------	------	------	-----	-------

P. 14

Proposal 14, Article: o.108 from: Rules Commission

Motivation: Add "Juniors" to the scale

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour.](#)

P.15

Proposal 15, Article: o.109 from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour.](#)

P.16

Proposal 16, Article: o.109 from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour.](#)

P. 17

Proposal 17, Article: Table of contents from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#) after correction of the numbering
[\(PART C E - VETERANS\)](#).

P. 18

Proposal 18, Article: Index to Articles- from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#)

Point 3 /Item 3 / Punto 3: Proposals for the Congress regarding the Technical Rules

Proposal 19, Article: t.18 from: Rules Commission

P. 19

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [Proposal deleted](#).

Proposal 20, Article: t.18.2 from: SEMI Commission

P.20

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

Proposal 21, Article: t.23, t.25, t.26, t.27, t.29, t.35, t.43, t.45, t.55, t.71, t.73, t.76, t.90,
t.96, t.110, t.116, t.120, t.123, t.125, t.128, t.133, t.172 from: Rules Commission

P.21

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

P.22

Proposal 22, Article: t.35 from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

Proposal 23, Article: t.41 from: Rules Commission

P.23

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#),

with a new correction:

1 The first two opponents fence until one **or both of them** have scored five hits, within the time limit of 3 minutes.

The next two opponents fence until one **or both*** of their scores has reached ten hits, within the time limit of 3 minutes, and so on with successive bouts, cumulatively, of five hits.

(*Correction valid only in English).

Proposal 24, Article: t.45 from: Rules Commission

P.24

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

Proposal 25, Article: t.56.3 from: Refereeing Commission

P.25

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

Proposal 26, Article: t.56 and t. 170 from: Refereeing Commission

P.26

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

Proposal 27, Article: t.61 from: Rules Commission

- pools, ~~one possible appeal during each bout~~; only in the zonal qualifying event for the Olympic Games is video refereeing compulsory in the pools. The fencer has only one possibility of appeal in each period.
- in **direct elimination bouts**, two possible appeals. Should **the referee agree with the fencer** who appealed for the video-refereeing, the latter is entitled to retain the right of appeal.

Opinion of the Rules Commission: **In favour with the proposed modification.**

- in pools, **one possible appeal during each bout**; (Cf. O.105, zonal qualification for Olympic Games).

~~only in the zonal qualifying event for the Olympic Games is video refereeing compulsory in the pools. The fencer has only one possibility of appeal in each period.~~

Proposal 28, Article: t.64 and t.170.4.1 from: Fencing Federation of Jamaica

Opinion of the Rules Commission: **Not in favour.**

Proposal 29, Article: t.70 from: Rules Commission

Non-standard equipment

t.70

In whatever circumstances a fencer on the piste is found to be in possession of equipment which is **non-regulation or defective** (cf.m.8, m.9, m.11, m.12, m.13, m.16, m.17, m.23), the referee confiscates the equipment and submits it to the experts on duty for examination. The equipment in question will only be returned to the owner after the measures necessitated by this examination have been completed and, if appropriate, after the payment of any expenses for repairs. The equipment must be rechecked before it is used again.

Opinion of the Rules Commission: **In favour, with the proposed modification.**

In whatever circumstances a fencer on the piste is found to be in possession of equipment which is **non-regulation or defective** (cf.m.8, m.9, m.11, m.12, m.13, m.16, m.17, m.23) **according to Material Rules**), the referee confiscates the equipment and submits it to the experts on duty for

examination. The equipment in question will only be returned to the owner after the measures necessitated by this examination have been completed and, if appropriate, after the payment of any expenses for repairs. The equipment must be rechecked before it is used again.

Proposal 30, Article: t.77, t.91 and t.98 from: Rules Commission

P.30

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

Proposal 31, Article: t.84 from: Refereeing Commission

P.31

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [Not in favour](#).

We can't modify a convention with a simple proposal, this is not the correct procedure, we propose to create a working group with members of the Coaches' Council, Athletes' Commission, Refereeing Commission and Rules Commission. As the FIE has done in the past for sabre, the working group conducted tests during competitions.

Proposal 32, Article: t.97 from: Refereeing Commission

P.32

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

Proposal 33, Article: t.109 from: Women and Fencing Council

P.33

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [Not in favour](#). **Because this matter is already covered by the FIE Ethical Code and the Safeguarding Policy.**

Proposal 34, Article: t.111 from: Women and Fencing Council

P.34

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [Not in favour](#). The matter concerns the Statutes.

Proposal 35, Article: t.124 and o.68 from: Rules Commission

P.35

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

Proposal 36, Article: t.124 from: Refereeing Commission

P.36

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

Proposal 37, Article: t.147 from: Rules Commission

P.37

t.147

Although a competitor may in fact have hit his opponent on the target, **this hit may be disallowed**, either because it did not arrive during the period of time during which fencing is allowed, or because the competitor had crossed the boundaries of the piste, or because of defects in the electrical equipment, or because violence was involved in the making of the hit, or because of other reasons as laid down in the Rules (cf. [t.25.2](#), [t.27.2](#), [t.28.2](#), [t.29](#), [t.33.2/4](#), [t.35.3](#), [t.44.2](#), [t.56.1](#), [t.73](#), [t.79](#), [t.80](#), [t.89.2](#), [t.93.1](#), [t.94](#), [t.95](#), [t.96.3](#), [t.97.2](#), [t.99.1-2](#), [t.101.5](#), [t.106](#), [t.121.2](#), [t.137.2](#), [t.161](#), [t.170](#)).

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#), with the proposed modifications.

Although a competitor may in fact have hit his opponent on the target, **this hit may be disallowed**, either because it did not arrive during the period of time during which fencing is allowed, or because the competitor had crossed the boundaries of the piste, or because of defects in the electrical equipment, or because violence was involved in the making of the hit, or because of other reasons as laid down in the Rules ([cf. t.25.2, t.27.2, t.28.2, t.29, t.33.2/4, t.35.3, t.44.2, t.56.1, t.73, t.79, t.80, t.89.2, t.93.1, t.94, t.95, t.96.3, t.97.2, t.99.1-2, t.101.5, t.106, t.121.2, t.137.2, t.161, t.170](#)) **in accordance with the Technical Rules**.

Proposal 38, Article: t.148 from: Rules Commission

P. 38

t.148

A competitor may have a hit awarded against him which he has not in fact received, either because he has crossed the rear limit of the piste (cf. t.34), or because he has committed an offence which has prevented his opponent fencing (a flèche attack which jostles the opponent, the use of the unarmed hand while fencing, etc.) (cf. [t.22.9](#), [t.137.2](#), [t.162.1/2](#), [t.165](#), [t.166](#), [t.167.1](#), [t.170](#), [t.79.1.b](#), [t.97.2.b](#), [t.124.](#))

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#), with the proposed modification

A competitor may have a hit awarded against him which he has not in fact received, either because he has crossed the rear limit of the piste (cf. t.34), or because he has committed an offence which has prevented his opponent fencing (a flèche attack which jostles the opponent, the use of the unarmed hand while fencing, etc.) ([cf. t.22.9, t.137.2, t.162.1/2, t.165, t.166, t.167.1, t.170, t.79.1.b, t.97.2.b, t.124.](#) [in accordance with the Technical Rules.](#))

P.39

Proposal 39, Article: t.170.1.16 from: Rules Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

P.40

Proposal 40, Articles: t.170. 1.1, 1.4, 1.12, 2.1, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.4, 4.1, 4.5, 4.6, 4.8.

from: Rules Commission

Motivation: add missing references to t.170

1st group		1st fault	2nd fault	3rd fault and following
1.1	Leaving piste without permission	t.23.6 ; t.120		
1.4	Covering/substitution of valid target (*)	t.29.2 ; t.30.1 ; t.79 ; t.97		
1.12	At sabre, hit made with the guard (*); any forward movement crossing the legs or feet (*)	t.96.3 ; t.101.5 ; t.121.2		

2nd group		1st fault	2nd fault	3rd fault and following
2.1	Use of non-sword arm/hand (*)	t.29.1; t.30		
2.5	Deliberate hit not on opponent (*)	t.55.3-2		
2.6	Dangerous, violent, or vindictive action, blow with guard or pommel (*)	t.121.2; t.26.1; t.147; t.149.1		

3rd group		1st time	2nd time
3.1	Fencer disturbing order when on the piste. In the most serious cases, the Referee may award a black card (t.168) immediately.	t.108.2; t.109; t.110; t.137.2; t.139.3	
3.4	Any person not on the pist disturbing good order. In the most serious cases, the Referee may award a black card immediately (t.168).	t.109; t.110; t.111; t.130; t.132.2; t.133; t.137.3/4; t.152; t.162.4; t.168	

4th group		PENALTIES (Cards)
4.1	Fencer equipped with electronic communication equipment permitting him to receive communications during bout.	t. 64.6; t.68; t.73.1.g
4.5	Offence against sportsmanship.	t.121.2; t.122; t.123; t.129; t.144.2; t.149.1
4.6	Refusal of a fencer to salute his opponent, the referee and the spectators before the beginning of the bout or after the last hit.	t.122; t.145.2
4.8	Deliberate-Intentional * brutality	t.26.1; t.149.1

*This modification concerns English version only.

Opinion of the Rules Commission: In favour, with the proposed modifications

1st group		1st fault	2nd fault	3rd fault and following
1.1	Leaving piste without permission	t.23.6; t.120		
1.4	Covering/substitution of valid target (*)	t.29.2; t.30.1; t.79; t.97		
1.12	At sabre, hit made with the guard (*); any forward movement crossing the legs or feet (*)	t.96.3; t.101.5; t.121.2		

2nd group		1st fault	2nd fault	3rd fault and following
2.1	Use of non-sword arm/hand (*)	t.29.4; t.30		
2.5	Deliberate hit not on opponent (*)	t.55.3-2		
2.6	Dangerous, violent, or vindictive action, blow with guard or pommel (*)	t.121.2; t.26.1; t.147; t.149.1		

3rd group		1st time	2nd time
3.1	Fencer disturbing order when on the piste. In the most serious cases, the Referee may award a black card (t.168) immediately.	t.108.2; t.109; t.110; t.137.2; t.139.3	
3.4	Any person not on the pist disturbing good order. In the most serious cases, the Referee may award a black card immediately (t.168).	t.109; t.110; t.111; t.130; t.132.2; t.133; t.137.3/4; t.152; t.162.4; t.168	

4th group		PENALTIES (Cards)
4.1	Fencer equipped with electronic communication equipment permitting him to receive communications during bout.	t. 64.6; t.68; t.73.1.g
4.5	Offence against sportsmanship.	t.121.2; t.122; t.123; t.129; t.144.2; t.149.1
4.6	Refusal of a fencer to salute his opponent, the referee and the spectators before the beginning of the bout or after the last hit.	t.122; t.145.2
4.8	Deliberate -Intentional brutality *	t.26.1; t.149.1

*This modification concerns English version only.

Proposal 41, Article: t.170.0.5, 1.16 and 2.6 from: Refereeing Commission.

P.41

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

Proposal 42, Article: t.170.3.4 from: Rules Commission

P. 42

3rd group		1st time	2nd time
3.4	Any person not on piste disturbing the good order. Smoking in the competition halls . In the most serious cases, the Referee may award a black card immediately (t.168).	t.109; t.110; t.111; t.130; t.132.2; t.133; t.137.3/4; t.152; t.162.4; t.168	

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#), with the proposed modification

3rd group		1st time	2nd time
3.4	Any person not on piste disturbing the good order, including smoking in the competition halls including electronic cigarettes . In the most serious cases, the Referee may award a black card immediately (t.168).	t.109; t.110; t.111; t.130; t.132.2 ; t.133; t.137.3/4; t.152; t.162.4 ; t.168	

Proposal 43, Article: t.170.3.6 from: Rules Commission

P.43

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour](#).

Proposal 44, Article: Technical Index to articles from: Rules Commission

P.44

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour.](#)

Point 4 /Item 4 / Punto 4: Proposals for the Congress regarding the Material Rules

Proposal 45, Article: m.25.3.h from: SEMI Commission

P.45

m.25.3.h

A World Champion has the right to have his/her name and the abbreviation of his/her national federation printed in red [for the following season.](#)

An Olympic Champion has the right to have his/her name and the abbreviation of his/her national federation printed in gold.

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour, with the proposed modification](#)

An Olympic Champion has the right to have his/her name and the abbreviation of his/her national federation printed in gold [until the end of the next Olympic Games.](#)

P.46

Proposal 46, Article: m.30.1 from: Refereeing Commission

Opinion of the Rules Commission: [In favour.](#)

P. 47

Proposal 47, Article: Annex A 4 Label of quality, Material Rules (see Urgent letter 2/2022)

from: SEMI Commission - deferred proposal from the 2022 Congress

~~2. Chip and label installation requirements.~~

~~Page 80~~

~~From 01.03.2021, the obligatory chipping of new fencing equipment (jacket, trousers, plastron mask) has been introduced. It will be mandatory from 01.01.2023.~~

~~Both variants of the FIE seal of quality are acceptable up to and including the 2026/2027 2025/2026 season.~~

~~For the 2027/2028 2026/2027 season, masks, jackets, breeches and plastrons must have the new quality seal with a chip securely located underneath.~~

Cancellation of the text while waiting for a new system.

Opinion of the Rules Commission: **Cancelled while waiting for a new system.**

Proposal 48, Article: Annex A, 4.4 from: SEMI Commission

P.48

Opinion of the Rules Commission: In favour.
