



World Arabian Horse Organization

MINUTES OF THE 2019 WAHO WORLD REGISTRARS MEETING

Crowne Plaza Hotel, Terrigal, NSW, Australia, 5th February 2019

Independent Chairman: Mr. Xavier Guibert

Present at the meeting: (* Some delegates arrived after the meeting started)

Country	Name	Position
Argentina (AR)	Carlos Ezcurra	Board Member of Stud Book Argentino, SBA
Australia (AU)	Helen Dohan	Registrar & Secretary, AHSA
Australia (AU)	Teresa Edwards	Assistant Registrar, AHSA
Austria (AT)	Petra Dries	Officially representing the Austrian Registry, AAS
Bahrain (BH)	Jehangir Rustomjee	Registrar, Royal Arabian Studs of Bahrain
Belgium (BE)	Dr. Marc Somerhausen	Registrar, BAPS
China (Observer)	Dr. Zhenshan Wang	Secretary General, China Studbook Committee
Ecuador (EC)	Nathalie Weemaels	Registrar, ACCAE
Germany (DE)	Alexander Hofmann	Vice-Chairman, VZAP
Iran (IR)	Sharzad Amir Aslani	Registrar, Arabian Horse Stud Book Office
Jordan (JO)	Christina Abu-Dayyeh	Secretary General of the Royal Jordanian Stud Book
Kuwait (KW)	Abdullah Albraihi	Registrar & Manager, Kuwait Arabian Registry
Kuwait (KW)	Nasser Bourisli	Assistant Registrar, Kuwait Arabian Registry
Libya (LY)	Dr. Yusuf Wafa	Registry Assistant, LAHBS
Morocco (MA)	Omar Benazzou	Head of Stud Book Department, SOREC
New Zealand (NZ)	Fiona McLachlan	Secretary and Registrar, New Zealand Arab Horse Society
Oman (OM)	Dr. Sarhan Al Zeidi	Director General, Royal Cavalry of Oman
Oman (OM)	Khalid Al Saifi	Head of Registration Department, Royal Cavalry
Oman (OM)	Sulaiman Al Hattali	Head of Oman Horse Registry, Royal Cavalry
Portugal (PT)	Luis Lamas	President, Associação Portuguesa do Cavalo Árabe
Qatar (QA)	Hassan Al Mannai	Officially representing Qatar Arabian Horse Registry
Saudi Arabia (SA)	Dr. Abdul Ghaniy Alfadhl	Director General, K.A.A.H.C.
Saudi Arabia (SA)	Dr. Ahmed Al Sana	Head of Registration Department, K.A.A.H.C.
Spain (ES)	Jose Ramon Irigoyen	President, ACCAE
Switzerland (CH)	Didier Thievent	Board Member, SZAP
UAE (AE)	Dr. Abdelwahab Amira	Registrar, EAHS
United Kingdom (UK)	Karin Swanson	Registrar, AHSB
United Kingdom (UK)	Natalie Meredith	Chairman, Stud Book Committee, AHSB
United Kingdom (UK)	Joanne Lowe	Chairman of the Arab Horse Society, AHSB
USA (US)	Deborah Fuentes	Director of Registry Services, AHA

ITEM 1 - To convene the meeting.

Mr. Xavier Guibert, Independent Chairman, thanked Australia for hosting the Conference and meeting. Peter Pond, WAHO President, attended briefly to welcome all the Delegates and thank them for their efforts to attend. He wished them a profitable meeting as well as a wonderful Conference. He added that some Executive Committee Members may attend later to assist with some of the issues on the Agenda and explain some Executive Committee decisions.

ITEM 2 - Apologies for absence.

None were read out at the meeting.

ITEM 3 - Each Delegate was asked to introduce themselves to the meeting.

See list on page 1.

ITEM 4 - Matters arising from the minutes of the 2017 WAHO World Registrars meeting held in Manama, Kingdom of Bahrain.

UK asked to add a note to Item 4 that the UK now has a Government-managed Central Equine Database for all horse breeds. The Minutes were then formally approved.

ITEM 5 - To discuss the proposed recommendation from WAHO for a new rule on the minimum standards and requirements for the information to be included and formats to be used in Online Studbooks and Pedigree Databases.

The Chairman referred to the draft rule document circulated with the Agenda, adding this was on the Agenda because although a lot of countries may not yet have online Stud books, with the new generation of Registrars the number would likely increase, therefore it was necessary to be sure that all Registries understood the minimum requirements for online stud books.

He asked the delegates to look at the section of the proposed rule regarding PDF stud books. He said that many stud books are already distributed in PDF format which reduced printing costs and stud books could be in the same format as they are when published as printed volumes, and could also be put on the Registry's website as PDF documents. He said that it is relatively easy for the Registry to produce their stud books regularly in this way. He reminded the meeting that it is a mandatory requirement that every stud book must also be sent to WAHO and to any WAHO Registering Authority Members on request. The PDF may also be distributed on CD-ROM if preferred. Delegates were then asked to state the current format of their stud books and whether or not they had plans to produce an online stud book in future.

AR: The Argentinian Stud Book has been online for more than 10 years but only in Spanish, they will be launching a new web page in about a month and the information is updated in real time.

AU: Have an online Stud Book which is updated hourly

AT: Are still printing stud books. Hope to be online by the end of the year.

BH: Are still printing stud books but they also produce a PDF which is distributed as a CD-Rom to any Registry on request. Looking at options for moving the Stud Book online.

BE: Have an online stud book. Asked about the content of a PDF stud book. The Chairman replied that a PDF is a word document in a closed format and is just a different way of publishing, it is the Registry's decision regarding the information included, it can be the same content as the former printed stud books but instead of printing it can issued as a .pdf. BE said this would still be the same amount of work as a producing a printed stud book. The Chairman agreed but said it saved on printing costs.

CN: Working on their first Arabian Stud Book and plan to publish it as a PDF.

DE: Have an online stud book

EC: Have printed the first volume of their stud book, have a web page with most of the horse information on but at present it does not have all the information required for the stud book. Also publish their stud book as a PDF and are looking into having an online stud book.

IR: Publish the stud book as a PDF and currently working on an online stud book which should be ready in a few months.

JO: Currently producing the stud book in both print and PDF formats and are looking to go online.

KW: Currently using both PDF and printed format. Hope to go online in 2019, which will include the PDF stud books and the new foal registrations.

LY: Working on their latest stud book and it will be released in a few months.

MA: Have a stud book that is online and it can be used to search progeny and stallions.

NZ: Have published up to volume 10 which covers up to the year 2011, volume 11 is due to be printed soon and provided to Registries as a PDF.

OM: Still using printed stud books and PDF but hope by 2020 it will be online.

ES: Still using printed books and also have an online stud book.

CH: Have a printed stud book and PDF format and are preparing an online stud book.

QA: Have PDFs on their website and also printed stud books.

SA: Stud books are online on their website a PDFs, and also printed.

AE: Only use PDF, but are working on an online stud book which fulfils the WAHO requirements.

UK: Still has printed stud books which are also available as a PDF on CD, currently looking into going online.

US: Only have an online stud book which is updated weekly at present but within the next few months will be updated daily.

The Chairman said it seemed that the majority of the stud books present were planning to move online, so it was time to look into this subject before developing online studbooks, to be sure that all WAHO countries included the necessary requirements. He acknowledged that it may not be possible to have very detailed and complicated online stud books like the ones in France or in the USA, however, it was important to be sure to have all the necessary and valuable information useful for the Registrars of the other countries. The meeting then went through each section of the proposed rule.

1. Mandatory requirements for online Stud Books

A) An online stud book must clearly differentiate between pure bred Arabians and derivatives.

The Chairman mentioned that the French Database has 52 different stud books for more than 52 breeds, it was therefore necessary for them that the name of the breed appeared with each horse.

B) Online stud books should state clearly somewhere on the website they are maintained according to the rules and regulations of the World Arabian Horse Organisation.

The Chairman said it is essential that this notice is placed clearly on the Registry's website.

BE suggested it should be written another way because it should be the Registry or the website of the Association not just the online stud book as it applies for all stud books. The Chairman explained that if you have several breeds on the same database, it is not as easy to put the logo on each page. It is up to the Registry to have one page, as you access the stud book, to clearly state that for Arabians it follows WAHO rules. If a Registry only manages Arabians it should be easy to have the WAHO logo on every screen.

C) The name, address and contact details of the Registry must be clearly stated.

The Chairman said that the Registry's name and address and the possibility to send an email must be clearly shown on the website, should the user have a problem and need to make contact.

IR asked if there is a difference between the online requirements to the normal stud book, she felt they should be the same. The Chairman explained that most of the requirements are the same, WAHO established the rules for the stud books a long time ago and is now establishing the rules for online stud books.

D) A search facility that allows the user to find a horse's details by entering the name and or the registration number and or the UELN must be included.

The Chairman mentioned that a good search facility was essential.

E) The basic entry for each horse, the unit entry must include the minimum following information: name and the ISO code of the country of birth, colour, date of birth, name of sire, ISO code and UELN and registration number and the same for the dam. Full name of the breeder.

The Chairman stressed it is very important to include the ISO Code because several horses with the same name can be registered in different parts of the world, at the same time. Registries are asked to use the 2-letter ISO codes that can be found either on the WAHO website or in the ISO code website, adding that WAHO chose to use 2 letter ISO codes a long time ago, although some countries do use the 3-letter ISO Codes as used by the Thoroughbred Studbooks.

AR said that they use the ISO code for imported horses but not for domestically bred horses. The Chairman confirmed that this is correct and it is normal for a stud book not to include them for horses born in that country.

Regarding the UELN if issued, the Chairman said it was a good idea to include this. He reminded the meeting that the UELN is given at birth by the first Registry to register the horse and it never changes during the life of the horse. The UELN is the only universal number for the horse, and not to be confused with domestic registration numbers. Some databases do have a facility to add the relevant registration numbers of any country that the horse has been registered in. When an imported horse is registered in a new database there must be 2 separate fields, one for the domestic registration number if issued, and one for the UELN which is given only by the stud book of birth, never by anybody else.

US confirmed that they record the travel details, so that it is known where the horse has been.

BE asked for confirmation that it is the rule in Europe that every horse has to have a UELN. The Chairman replied that at present it is. He added that the UELN is a completely free system which opened in 1999 and there are clear explanations of how it works on the UELN website, these have also been sent to all WAHO Registry Members. He also emphasised that importing countries should not issue a UELN for an imported horse, instead they must ask the Registry of the country of birth to issue a UELN for that horse. There was a discussion about older horses that were not given a UELN at birth. The Chairman explained that if an imported horse does not have a UELN, the Registrar must ask the stud book of birth for the UELN of that horse and not create a UELN themselves. He added that creating a UELN for an imported horse could create a lot of mistakes, and it is completely forbidden to issue a new UELN with the prefix of the importing country. He added that it is a free and simple system but it works only if everyone follows the rules and the main rule is that the horse is given a UELN only by the stud book in the country of birth.

IR asked what the procedure was for older horses imported without a UELN when the country of birth did not issue one. The Chairman replied that those horses would then be left without a UELN.

AU said they do not issue UELNs at the time of registration but they are often asked for it by importing Registries, so they create it and send it.

CH said it is important to know that certain digits of the UELN correspond to the country of birth, which is why the Swiss Registry does not create a UELN for an imported horse. They ask the country of birth to make the UELN, if it doesn't then the horse will stay without a UELN.

DE said it is dangerous to create a UELN for another country's horse.

IR said they did not understand why Registries could not create the UELN of another country if they have the code numbers of their country and they have the registration number and they could follow the model the country is using. The Chairman said that whilst that is correct, it is more correct to ask the Registry of the country of birth to issue one, because mistakes can be made. More commonly the mistakes are with older horses but theoretically two horses could end up with the same number.

BE mentioned that some countries issue export certificates without the UELN of the horse and its sire and dam. The Chairman said it was essential to put the UELNs for horses born in their country on export certificates.

Regarding adding the breeder name, several delegates mentioned that they hesitated to put the name of the breeder online. The Chairman said that when France started their online system, the question was whether the Registry was authorised to publish the breeder's name, and they had decided that as it was published in the books then it should be the same online, but care must be taken when publishing these details on the internet. There is no requirement to include the breeder's contact details.

F) Details on import and export data where relevant including year of import or export and country to which exported or from which imported must be included.

The Chairman mentioned that this was not currently included on the French database but France also produce their stud books separately in .pdf format, in which this information is provided. He suggested that it would be useful to include in a database the necessary fields to register the import dates and from which country and the export dates and to which country.

G) Links to lists of registered progeny of each mare and each stallion must be included.

The Chairman said that traditionally in the printed stud book there is a section for stallions with their progeny and a section for broodmares with their produce, so this requirement was the same.

H) Links to a five-generation pedigree for each horse should be included

The Chairman said this can be either on one screen or by links so that you click on the sire and you have the pedigree of the sire and the same with the dam and so on. It is tradition in WAHO to have 5 generation pedigrees. The Chairman then asked if the Delegates thought there was any more information that should be included, as this was a first draft and this meeting should give their remarks and suggestions.

AT enquired about including the date of death. The Chairman said the date of death could be added. UK suggested this could be put in under point number four which is updates to the horse information. US said they didn't think it should be a requirement as very few people tell the Registries when horses die, but on their system they mark them 'presumed dead' at 35 years old.

BH agreed.

The Chairman said it could be added if the Registry has the information, and that in Europe, at the Central Database for the identification of horses, it is compulsory to register the date of death for each horse.

2. Optional Additional Data - At the discretion of the Registry, online stud books may also include additional data such as markings, strains, blood type, DNA and parent verification information.

The Chairman explained this did not mean including the actual blood type or DNA and parent verification results or card, it was just stating that this horse has been blood typed or DNA typed and parent verified.

BH asked for confirmation that it was mandatory for a horse to be parent verified by DNA or blood type before it is entered in a stud book. The Chairman confirmed that it has been mandatory since 2004 that all horses must be DNA typed and parent verified prior to registration.

KW asked whether including strains was mandatory. The Chairman said that it was optional, not mandatory but if a Registry is able to put an accurate strain then why not, it was at their discretion. He added that they were discussing optional additional data in this section.

KW replied they would like inclusion of strains to be mandatory. The Chairman explained it was not possible to make it mandatory. Some countries, including France, did include this data in their very earliest stud books, when they first registered imported purebred Arabians because this information came direct from the tribes that bred them, but later this system was dropped. Other countries had continued to record strains.

BH suggested it was culturally important in the Middle East, the owners like to continue and follow the strains and in Bahrain it is very easy because all of the domestically bred horses are named with the strain. He added that most people who import horses will usually ask him which strain the horse is from and sometimes it can be difficult to find.

UK said they publish the strains in their stud book, also for the imported horses, and if they have difficulty finding a strain then Katrina at the WAHO Office is extremely helpful.

KW said that in Arabia before WAHO, a horse without a strain could be considered not an Arabian. The strain is the mark of an Arabian horse. The Chairman said that he completely respects this system but was unable to produce it in the French Stud Book, as it was the responsibility of the stud book to ensure accuracy. He added that Katrina at the WAHO Office has documented records of the strains worldwide and provides them on request to any Registrar.

Regarding microchipping, the Chairman then asked if there were some countries that don't yet use microchips. He explained that it is compulsory in Europe and is recommended by WAHO, but it is only a tool, it is a bit like freeze marking as it is a mark that you put on or in the horse that is not a natural mark, but both the microchip and freeze mark can be destroyed. The best method of identification is DNA but the microchip is a fantastic tool for quick identification, at shows and so on.

EC said they do not use microchips.

US said they use microchips at the owner's discretion, it is recorded but not required. They don't think it is necessary to record the microchip number but from 2020 racing in America is going solely to microchipping, there will be no more lip tattoos, so it is competition driven and not necessarily Registry driven.

The Chairman explained that it is not necessary to publish the microchip number but it is very easy if you have links between stud books or, as in France, links between the horse database and the database where they manage the races and the other database where they manage the performance of the horse in various sports, they have a network that updates every day automatically. On the ground the competition organisers need to check that the microchip number in the horse is the same as in the passport. He added that when microchipping equines started in the 1980's the original principle was that the manufacturers around the world guaranteed the uniqueness of each microchip, so at that time it was not possible to have 2 microchips with the same number anywhere in the world. But when they started using the microchip system in cattle, the European manufacturers asked to be able to reissue a new microchip when one of the microchips in the ear tag was lost. Now the guarantee of the uniqueness of the numbers has been destroyed by cattle breeders who wanted to reuse numbers.

BH asked if the Chairman thought that these reputable companies would reissue microchip numbers. The Chairman said that it had been done in cows but he hoped they would not do it in horses, but it is only a tool, it cannot be used as the only method of identification.

DE asked how often it has happened that a second or copy of the microchip was produced following a mistake. The Chairman said that it is common in cows, because they lose the ear tag and they must re-issue it but he hoped it never happens in horses but technically they are able to do it.

UK said that they have a microchip dedicated to the Arab Horse Society, so the country number and the number for the Arab Horse Society as given by DEFRA (Ministry of Agriculture) which is the competent authority, is part of the microchip number. The Chairman explained that this is also the system of Weatherbys for Thoroughbreds, to use part of the chip to complete the six digit of the database, for the Thoroughbreds it is a bit different because they had to put some letters for the stud books, so the six digits are a bit different but each country has these nine initial digits.

AE said that some information should be kept only between Registries and WAHO because if it were published somebody could play with the microchip, it could be copied and they could build a new horse.

The Chairman said that he did not completely agree because with a microchip reader you know the number. It would be very, very serious for a company to make a duplicate, they know that for cows they are allowed to produce a copy and they know that for dogs and horses they are not allowed.

Stud book details whether printed or PDF volume are available.

The Chairman said Registries can, for example, state “We have published volume number xxx - yyy for these years xxx - yyy.”

Easy to navigate links to take the user to the unit entry for progeny and for each of the horses in the pedigree are useful.

The Chairman said this provides the ability, when you are on a pedigree, to click on one horse in the pedigree and access its data. He said it is not an easy system to create but the new generation of computer experts are very used to making these tools.

Verified competition results may be included in a separate section.

The Chairman said that it is very interesting to see the competition results, but only if they can be sure of the value of these results. In France they have this system of publication of these results, as all the computers in the horse industry are linked to the central database so you can find the results from different disciplines.

The Chairman then referred to the point asking the Delegates for their views on adding optional information about genetic disorders test results and how best to do this. Some countries already require this and the information is on their website. For printed stud books the current rule which states that the method of breeding used and the results of genetic disorder tests must not be mentioned in the printed stud book or register, is not going to be changed.

AU said that Australian breeders and owners have the choice whether they want their horse's test results published online or not. Their breeders have already told AHSA they don't want it on a separate link, they want it clearly displayed for anyone to see, but the results are only published with the consent of the person who took the sample, the breeder or the owner. The Chairman asked if they publish that a horse has been tested and is free of the disease or do they just publish that this horse has been tested?

AU replied that what they publish depends on what the owner would like. They will publish 'this horse has been tested and is free', 'this horse has been tested and is a carrier', or 'this horse has been tested and no results are to be disclosed' or 'this horse has not been tested'. The Chairman said that he thought this was a very good solution, the decision was up to the breeder or owner. He then asked if the testing of stallions was compulsory.

AU confirmed that testing is compulsory for all mares and stallions born after 2000, for those born before it is only compulsory for stallions if they are covering outside mares.

DE said they do exactly the same as Australia but they have more detailed information, so it is clear. If the breeder gives no information, you know the result is likely to be carrier.

UK said that in the UK testing is voluntary but the Registry do not ask for it nor do they publish it.

NZ said that testing is in its second season in New Zealand and that if someone stands a stallion at public stud then the genetic test details must be disclosed.

The Chairman said that he likes the Australian system where the breeder or owner has the choice to say the horse has been tested with or without any other information. If they publish that the horse has been tested but that they have not disclosed the results you can assume he is a carrier. AU said that is not correct. They have some studs that will declare everything, carrier or not. They have another very big stud that will declare nothing, carrier or not and none of them are declared.

3. *Prohibited information - For horses born overseas shown in pedigrees, it is essential that computer generated "registration numbers" must not be used if they do not relate exactly to the original or current registration number, if issued by the stud book of origin.*

The Chairman said this was a very important point as some countries do not issue registration numbers at all, so registries should never give a random 'foreign' registration number to any horse, only correctly issued registration numbers should be used.

4. *Updates of horse information. Online stud books must be kept up to date. All changes to the information on each horse already on the database must be kept regularly updated, for example, change from colt or stallion to gelding; colour change from foal coat to colour to grey if applicable; date of death; date and country to which exported or re-exported; date and country from which imported or re-imported.*

The Chairman said it was essential for the credibility of the Stud Book to update the data regularly and probably also put the date of updating.

5. *Inclusion of horses.*

A) *Online stud books must include all eligible horses under the authority of the area covered by the member Registry.*

B) *Only one registering authority member per country or area is permitted.*

The Chairman said that in any one country there must be only one official database. Private people or companies could manage their database but this would be without the guarantee of the Registry. He clarified that WAHO's Registering Authority Members are the only organizations authorised to use the WAHO logo and their own logo to authenticate and publish the data of their stud book.

6. *Data Protection: Websites should be secure and comply with national and international data protection laws. Special care should be taken if a database includes addresses of breeders or owners or any privileged information related to the horse, such as genetic disorder results, If the owner at the time of testing has not given permission for these to be included.*

The Chairman explained that publishing ownership information online can be dangerous, as it is sensitive information and it could incur legal issues under Data Protection and GDPR. He explained that on the French database, in some cases ownership information can be accessed by certain people who are involved with the system and have the access code, but it is not possible for just anybody to access the details of ownership. In France the ownership of the horse is officially registered by the National Database by order of the Government, and they follow the ownership with a separate ownership card, and it is easy to change this card when a transfer of ownership is reported. He added that this can now be done online by people with the necessary access codes.

QA asked how the ownership is updated on the passport if it can be changed online.

The Chairman explained that the passport belongs to the horse and not to the owner, and the owner's details are not put in the French passport, it is on a separate card.

UK said that in the UK it is compulsory by law that all passports must be returned to the Registry for ownership to be updated but it has to be put in on a printed label and stamped by the Registry.

KW asked what the proof of ownership is in France.

The Chairman said it was the responsibility of the owner to inform the registry when they sell a horse, and to whom, so the change of ownership can be recorded.

KW asked what the proof of ownership is should this horse be competing in an Arabian Horse Championship.

The Chairman explained that the ownership is proved by the card with the owner's name on it. If there are ownership disputes this is normally a case for the courts, the Registries are not responsible, they can only record the information as provided in the declaration from the seller and the declaration of the new owner.

KW asked if there is a standard ownership certificate.

The Chairman confirmed that in France ownership is normally followed only by the ownership card, which is official, issued by SIRE with the passport when the horse is registered at birth. When a horse is sold this card must be signed by the seller and sent to the Registry to record the transfer of ownership, the office changes the card and sends it to the new owner. This takes a few days but meanwhile the horse can continue to compete or be seen by a vet as the passport always stays with the horse to register medication and for travel. He added that France now have an online ownership transfer system, owners can access their own information on the internet with a personal code and declare the sale of the horse to the new owner. The new owner then goes online and declares they have bought the horse. The new owner can then get the paper saying the Registry has issued the ownership certificate. Many countries have adopted this system or will adopt this system, as it is so simple and it is now proposed as an option in the European regulation to have this system to separate ownership from the passport.

BE said that it is actually written in the European passport that it is not a proof of ownership. But in practice for the moment in France they are withholding the passports for exports. The Chairman explained that this is the only time when the French Registry ask for the passport, in order to issue the export certificate of WAHO. They ask for the passport to check the identity of the horse before exporting.

7. Use of WAHO Stud Book codes and ISO codes

A) WAHO requires the use of the internationally recognized two letter Alpha ISO Country Code to eliminate confusion when documenting Arabian horses and especially imported horses. It is recommended that the ISO code is entered in a separate field to the horse's registered name.

B) All registering authorities must use the same terminology for stud book codes and ISO codes when referring to these codes on online stud books. Please refer to the WAHO Office for up to date lists of ISO codes and stud book abbreviations.

The Chairman said he had explained earlier that it is very important to have two different fields on a Registry's database, one for the name and one for the ISO code of the country of birth. It was incorrect to put the ISO code in the same field as the name as it reduces the space for the name, so it is necessary to have 2 fields.

8. Language: English has been adopted as the official language of WAHO. All online stud books that do not use English as their first language and in particular those countries that do not use a Latin alphabet, (for example, Arabic or Cyrillic) must include the facility for a clear and correct English translation of all data, in the interests of international clarity.

The Chairman said that in the past there had been a lot of mistakes in the stud books when names were translated from Arabic or Cyrillic to Latin alphabet especially after export, as the same horse could have several names with slightly different spellings. He said it is the responsibility of the Stud Book to first have a UELN to guarantee the unicity of the horse and secondly it is the responsibility of the stud book of birth which uses Arabic or Cyrillic to translate the horses' name exactly into Latin characters before export.

9. Access for WAHO Registering Authority Members

All online stud books, whether as .PDF or online databases, must be available free of charge to WAHO and to the main office and Registrar of all registering authority members. Logins and passwords if required must be provided on request.

US asked if anything had changed in the frequency members are supposed to issue printed stud books, as some countries were very behind with this.

The Chairman confirmed that nothing has changed, stud book data should be published regularly. The current requirements are to publish a stud book every 4 years, adding that he thought a more frequent interval was preferable, however if countries are online it is not necessary to publish stud books except if it is a PDF or CD-ROM.

To sum up this item on the Agenda, the Chairman asked the delegates to consider all these points when building their first online stud book, He added that he thought Katrina had done a very good job producing this document, there did not seem to be any changes required and the recommendations as written would be put to a vote of the General Assembly to be included in the WAHO rules.

Item 6 - To discuss the proposed recommendation from WAHO for a new rule, before it becomes common practice, to ban the registration of foals which have been subject to any form of genetic modification at the embryo stage or later. (*Note: During this discussion the issue of cloning also came up.)

Combined with

Item 8 - To discuss the request from Australia to review WAHO Rule 21 on In Vitro Fertilisation. The current rule reads as follows:

RULE 21: EXTERNAL FERTILISATION OF OOCYTES FOR EMBRYO TRANSFER

1. It is a mandatory WAHO rule that any Arabian of any age produced by the post-mortem collection of oocytes must not be registered under any circumstances.
2. It is a mandatory WAHO rule that any Arabian of any age produced by any method of In Vitro Fertilisation (IVF) must not be registered under any circumstances. Effective from 1st January 2013.

The Chairman introduced Dr. Marek Trela, WAHO Vice President, and Valerie Bunting, WAHO Secretary, the two Executive Committee members who were going to present some items on the Agenda. Marek Trela explained they had come to the Registrars Meeting at the request of the Executive Committee, to give further information and if necessary, answer questions.

He said the first question (**Item 8*) was whether or not rule 21 should be changed or remain as it is, because there had been a request to put this on the Agenda. He informed the meeting that the Executive Committee had discussed this the previous day, and taken the decision that this rule had to remain unchanged. He said the reasons for this decision were based mainly on animal welfare and ethics, which would be the subject of one of the presentations during the General Meeting. Animal welfare because of procedures which may be painful for the mare, and also because these kind of techniques were giving the chance to have progeny of semi-fertile or infertile mares and stallions, which was not what breeding should be about. He asked if any of the Registrars had any questions or doubts about this decision, in which case he and Val would be more than happy to discuss the issue in more detail.

BH said they didn't think this rule should be changed, it was a very good rule but he questioned how it could be enforced and how a Registry would know would know the method of production, for example sometimes they are not informed about the death of a mare.

Marek Trela agreed this was a difficult question but felt these cases could be discovered because the procedures have to be done by specialist veterinarians, facilities or laboratories.

BH asked how would they go about proving it, and expressed concern that a Registry could be subject to legal action if they refused registration.

Marek Trela replied that WAHO could not create any kind of police force to check those situations but it was one of the basic duties of WAHO to be aware of animal welfare and think about ethics and, in the Executive Committee's opinion, these particular procedures were not ethical.

BH said they agreed completely but was asking how to police this.

Marek Trela said if a Registrar had any doubts they could officially ask a specialist facility or laboratory if they had performed this process and they would not be able to refuse to answer.

AU asked why post mortem collection of oocytes was considered a welfare issue, if the mare is dead.

Marek Trela explained that the mare is not always dead. In practice the ovaries would have to be removed from a mare less than 2 hours after death which is not always possible, in many cases they are collected before euthanasia because the drugs used to euthanize the horse may affect the oocytes, so in practice if it is done like this it is really a breach of the animal welfare.

AU said that this rule was not stopping that, the rule was for post mortem, it did not mention taking oocytes before the mare is dead.

Marek Trela agreed but said it was a question of how we look at this problem. If someone is planning this kind of procedure the animal is usually still alive, as it is very difficult to get an ovary and move it to a specialist laboratory within 2 hours from the moment of death.

DE said that the Registries were all on WAHO's side. He thought the problem was that there were different rules in the different countries, in Germany it is forbidden. He felt the biggest problem was how a Registry can prove it and what happens if someone has done it and some years later when the mare or stallion has foals, what do Registrars do then.

US said they had a similar concern to Australia's, if someone did harvest an ovary and FedEx it to a Laboratory or an equine centre the Registry wouldn't have a way to write to them and ask, because they wouldn't provide the information due to all the privacy laws.

Marek Trela replied that if a Registry had any information or any doubts they could always ask, as the Registry is the body that controls registrations. There are different legal systems and there is no guarantee that every court would react the same way, but if proof was ever needed it was most likely possible to get it, depending what kind of procedures were used to investigate, for example through the courts. He felt that overall it would probably be enough if people knew they shouldn't do it for ethical and welfare reasons, and the deterrent of a rule regarding non-registration of their foal if they were caught doing it was probably all WAHO could do.

AR said he agreed with US that it would be very hard for a Registry to ask a laboratory if they had done something legal. In Argentina for example, cloning a horse is legal, so there was no way the registry could take a laboratory to court because they cloned a horse, although their Arabian Stud Book does have rules preventing registration of clones.

Marek Trela said he could imagine situations where if an Arabian horse was cloned, and that clone was secretly used for breeding in place of the original horse, and if someone really strongly investigated and through the court obtained proof that the clone was used, then all the offspring would have to be disqualified and unregistered, which could have huge financial consequences.

US mentioned that in USA there is one very famous but now infertile stallion that was cloned, but fortunately the Registry has always known about this. The clone, which is not a registered Arabian, always goes with the stallion whenever he has been sold, so it would be very easy for the Registry to realise if foals by the clone ever started to appear. For others it would be harder to monitor.

Marek Trela said he was sure that sooner or later something like this would be discovered and proven and then people would realise the consequences.

DE asked what would happen if a case was proved many years later, would these horses lose their registration.

BH also asked if it was possible to deregister a horse.

Marek Trela said it was, and also the offspring.

US said they have cancelled registrations of horses and their offspring for other reasons, adding that they would have to get legal counsel to see if they could deny registration of foals produced by the methods in Rule 21, but they could certainly cancel horse registrations for cloning.

The Chairman said if there were no other remarks it would be taken as agreed that the current WAHO Rule 21 would not be changed.

(ITEM 6) The Chairman now asked the meeting to consider the rule as drafted relating to the point regarding genetic manipulation and modification. Marek Trela explained that the Executive Committee are proposing a new rule which will be added to the WAHO rules with a new number. He read it out as follows:

It is a mandatory WAHO rule that any Arabian of any age which has been subject to any form of genetic manipulation at the embryo stage or later must not be registered under any circumstances.

It is mandatory WAHO rules that the progeny of any Arabian which was subject to any form of genetic modification at the embryo stage or later must not be registered under any circumstances.

It is a mandatory WAHO rule that any Arabian of any age which has been conceived using genetically modified gametes must not be registered under any circumstances.

It is also a mandatory rule that any progeny of any Arabian which has been conceived using genetically modified gametes must not be registered under any circumstances.

Marek Trela explained the reasons for suggesting this new rule were again on the grounds of animal welfare and ethics. He mentioned that the FEI had recently banned gene doping as method of performance enhancement so clearly the sports authorities, including racing, were facing the same problem as WAHO. He added that the laboratories were urgently looking for methods of detecting this.

AR said that unfortunately vets in Argentina were quite ahead on cloning and genetic manipulation. As yet no test existed which could demonstrate the genes of a horse were manipulated whilst they were embryos or even afterwards, adding that gene doping for performance was already happening not only in South America, but also in Europe. He was concerned that the draft rule was only referring to conception and embryo stages and not going further to any stage of the horses life. If the welfare of the horse was important we should all care, and in Argentina as the official Registry, they feel they should care about all the life of the horse not only the conception or embryo stages. He said he was talking about gene doping for performance for example, which is what is coming.

Marek Trela explained that gene doping is not interfering with the registration of foals, this came later when the horse was used for some sport, adding that the first part of the rule not only refers to how the animal was created but also has the words "*or later*" which did cover Argentina's point.

AR said he thought many of the Registriess not only registered horses but also kept the official information on their performance records. If the Registry keeps this information, it was responsible for that official information and responsible for the horse competing on genetic doping too. Marek Trela said that now the FEI had banned gene doping in any sport which came under their umbrella, those horses if discovered would not be able to compete.

The Chairman agreed that the FEI will prevent any horses from competing if they were discovered to have been subject to gene doping, but he felt the wording of the proposed WAHO rule was clear enough. "*Any Arabian of any age which has been subject to any form of genetic modification at the embryo stage **or later**, must not be registered under any circumstance.*" Following this rule, if a Registry discovers any genetic modification, they can cancel the registration of this horse and have it taken out of the stud book and any progeny would be disqualified too.

Marek Trela explained that for genetic modification, in the only known case at a laboratory in Argentina, they had used biological scissors to amend the myostatin gene sequence in a cloned embryo, this is the gene in horses that relates to muscle development for endurance and speed. Theoretically horses produced by this kind of genetic editing should run faster, jump higher and have more endurance than those that have acquired similar traits naturally.

US asked if gene doping happened before birth. Marek replied and said gene doping was performed later, mostly on mature horses in training, whereas gene editing was done at the embryo stage,.

AR said gene doping was actually happening right now. Certain chromosomes that don't belong to the horse are injected into any kind of organ so that they treat the horse and that organ takes the treatment better, afterwards that horse usually expels those chromosomes naturally, so it is very hard to find. However they are now realizing that sometimes the new inserted chromosomes do stay and affect the horse permanently, and therefore could also be inherited by the progeny.

Marek Trela said this is the problem which all the racing and sports organizations will be facing, the doping techniques are getting more and more efficient but he suggested it is better to do something than do nothing.

AR thought that substance abuse will disappear soon because laboratories are able to find out so the cheaters will likely go to gene doping. Marek Trela clarified again that gene doping is different to genetic manipulation because genetic manipulation or editing is done at the early embryo stage.

US asked for an example of genetic modification. Marek Trela again explained that genetic modification is when they use "biological scissors" to change a specific gene sequence in the embryo, adding that WAHO had to be ahead of the problem.

UK asked if it was thought it should be made clearer that it is not just the animal that has been manipulated that could be deregistered but also any foals.

Marek Trela said that was already written in the rule. What WAHO is proposing on genetic manipulation is for it to be a mandatory WAHO rule that the progeny of any Arabian which has been subjected to any form of genetic manipulation at an embryo stage or later must not be registered. So it specifically includes the offspring of such animals.

BH asked if there is the provision to deregister a horse if this was found out many years later.

Marek Trela said they could, and he thought people will have to realise the risk that it might also affect all their progeny.

AR said that to be ahead of the problem also required countries to ask their laboratories to start working on a wider range of DNA markers. Placing the new WAHO rule was fine but he said countries need to take some action on the labs that do the DNA, to ask them to help. Marek agreed it will be necessary but first WAHO had to make a rule as a legal base for the future decisions.

The Chairman said they had discussed genetic modification of embryos or adults and now they were to discuss the same rule regarding gametes. Marek clarified that it is not exactly the same rule as for embryos, because a gamete is the ova (female) or the sperm (male), so a scientist could change the genetic characteristics of one of those even before fertilization occurs. For example, it could be possible to use transvaginal aspiration to retrieve an oocyte, work on it to change a gene or genes, and then implant it into the fallopian tube of a recipient mare and breed her naturally, this would be almost a natural process but the resulting foal would have been genetically modified. He said that science will always be ahead but it was important to be proactive, people need to know what is legal and what is not and be aware of the consequences. The Chairman said that perhaps only the first and third paragraphs of the draft rule were necessary because the second and the fourth paragraphs automatically resulted from the first and the third. Marek disagreed and said that it was a double lock approach to ensure clarity.

It was generally agreed that the meeting accepted the rule as written but would recommend to the Executive Committee to add the word 'horse' after Arabian.

It is a mandatory WAHO rule that any Arabian horse of any age which has been subject to any form of genetic manipulation at the embryo stage or later must not be registered under any circumstances.

It is mandatory WAHO rules that the progeny of any Arabian horse which was subject to any form of genetic modification at the embryo stage or later must not be registered under any circumstances.

It is a mandatory WAHO rule that any Arabian horse of any age which has been conceived using genetically modified gametes must not be registered under any circumstances.

It is also a mandatory rule that any progeny of any Arabian horse which has been conceived using genetically modified gametes must not be registered under any circumstances.

DE asked what would happen if two generations of offspring later, one of the offspring became a champion but then it was discovered for example that his grandsire was cloned.

The Chairman replied that if any horse has been registered with a false declaration it is quite clear that if the Registry later discovers this, the horse and all its offspring can be removed from the studbook. It is up to the owners of the offspring to have disputes with the owners who lied about the horses, it is not up to the Registries, because the horse was registered on the basis of a false declaration. He added that the first clone of a purebred Arabian, which is the clone of a successful endurance gelding called Pieraz, was registered in the Stud Book Zangersheide with the sire and dam stated as purebred Arabs but he is not a registered purebred Arab. This horse has already started to produce some part bred offspring so breeders and importers must ensure their horse was registered at birth in a purebred Arab stud book and not in Zangersheide or another stud book.

Marek Trela said he thought it interesting that although cloning is nothing new, it is many years since the first clones were produced and they have matured since then, he was sure there were a lot of clones of top sport horse but so far he hadn't heard about any successes by the clones apart from polo ponies.

AR said that in 2018 a breeder in Argentina won the final of one of the main polo tournaments in the world playing on his team with 6 clones he had bred from his most famous mare, one in each chukka, they were all running machines. Marek Trela said he had also heard about some top sport horses which were cloned but the clones are not the same quality as the horse. AR said that some are and some aren't.

US mentioned that in the USA there was a famous Quarter Horse stallion that they had nine clones from, and they ended up with six live foals and none of them were anything special. They were less than spectacular, less than average and they had major issues.

Marek Trela said he thought we would hear more about this because no one will clone an average horse due to the cost, so they use only the top horses. Finn Guinness in UK had cloned his famous gelding Tamarillo, the Olympic three-day eventer, so far he had been used for breeding but he is still too young to compete, so it would be interesting to follow the sports career of this horse.

AR informed the meeting what has been done in Argentina to try to identify falsely declared clones, because they were very worried about this. Cloning a horse in Argentina was now very cheap, around \$50,000 which was nothing compared to the money people invest to buy a horse. The Society were concerned that someone who has the sire and the dam of a horse, could clone the champion and place it inside of the dam and then declare it as a brother but it is not a brother, it is a clone of the champion. They have asked the laboratory which does the DNA for the Society in Argentina to start working on more markers in order to see if they can find these markers, because at this stage they wouldn't be able to find out if the horse is a clone or the full brother. They usually work on between 10 and 17 markers for DNA, and the Registry have asked them to go to 150/200. It would be a more expensive test, but it could be the only way to find out who the horse is, is he a brother or a clone. He suggested other Registries might ask their laboratories to do the same.

(Note: The WAHO Rule on cloning remains unchanged)

Item 7 - Further to a request from Australia to again discuss updating WAHO rules 24 and 25 on Names and Name Changes, to receive notification and explanation from the WAHO Executive Committee that these WAHO rules will remain unaltered. This is the decision of the WAHO Executive Committee following analysis of the replies to the relevant memorandum and survey sent to all WAHO Registering Authority Members in March 2018.

The Chairman introduced Valerie Bunting who explained that after looking at the survey results, she had discussed the matter and decided that the existing WAHO name and name change rules should remain.

She explained that only 37 countries had replied to the survey and that the results were confusing with many countries changing their vote from the Registrars Meeting in Bahrain. As there was no clear agreement to change the rules, and to close the subject for the time being, the Executive Committee had decided that the rule would stay as it is, but always with the proviso that there would be the possibility of revisiting this in the future.

US said that they felt that the survey was unclear and they did not recall Registrars ever discussing the option to change an imported horse's name, which the US are against.

Marek Trela clarified that the current rule had always clearly stated that the only circumstance in which the name of an imported horse can be changed is when in the new country the name translates as unacceptable for social, cultural or religious reasons, and that the Registry of the horse's country of birth and the breeder are both required to agree to this. The Chairman said that as the Registrars work mostly for the breeders it was important for the breeder to give consent, as they needed to follow the horse with the name given by them at birth.

Valerie Bunting said the discussions within the Executive Committee had highlighted that it is a complex subject and writing a new rule was extremely difficult, which is why they had taken the decision to leave the rules unchanged for the time being. She went on to say she did not understand why countries were even thinking about name changes when the WAHO rule states clearly no name changes were allowed.

US said that many buyers in certain countries won't buy horses unless they can change their names. She went on to say that in America they have changed names of domestically-bred horses, mainly for exported horses, but under strict criteria - the horses must not have been raced, shown, imported or produced foals. Valerie Bunting commented that US had just openly admitted in a WAHO meeting that they were breaking a mandatory WAHO rule. She referred to the agreement made between USA and WAHO in 2008 whereby USA had agreed to abide by WAHO rules as a condition of being readmitted to WAHO membership.

AU expressed the opinion that if a country did not use passports or have a printed stud book and if the horse had not been bred from or competed or imported, it should not be a problem. Their view is that the breeder would have to give their consent. She added that they have not as yet changed any names, as they impose a very high fee for the service which had acted as a deterrent.

DE said that breeders should be careful in naming their horses to avoid offensive words in other countries. He thought that breaking these rules opened a lot of problems and there could be a lot of duplicate names. He added that in Germany there was a small time frame in which changes to the name could be made, but only if it was found the Registry had made a mistake from what the breeder had put on the foal naming application form.

Marek Trela explained that the main reason that the Executive Committee remains against changing these rules is that the wording of the proposed amended rules that were previously under discussion did not show a great difference to the present situation.

The Chairman confirmed that at present the WAHO name rules will not be changed.

RECONVENE AFTER LUNCH

The Chairman asked the meeting to hold a minute's silence in respect of the memory of the late Dr. Manuel Domingues-Helena, who was the long-time President and Registrar of the Arab Society in Portugal, Registrar and also President of the Anglo Arabian Stud Book in Portugal, a top rider of Arabian sport horses which he competed at the highest level including in dressage, a breeder, a writer and a friend. *Minute's silence.* The Chairman then asked the Portuguese delegate, Mr. Luis Lamas, to send WAHO's condolences to his family and friends. Mr. Luis Lamas thanked the Chairman and said that Dr. Helena was greatly missed, he had been truly passionate about Arabian horses, he had invested a lot of his life in studying and raising these horses, especially as sport horses, and had been tireless in promoting them in Portugal and abroad.

Item 9 - To receive details of, and advice on dealing with the most recent European Union directives which will have a specific impact on all WAHO Registering Authority Member countries.

The Chairman explained that some of the new EU regulations would have an effect not just on WAHO's EU Member countries, but on all our Members worldwide. He added that WAHO kept up to date with all these rules and did their best to ensure they did not impact too much on our existing rules. He said the process of EU rule making was very slow but had to be applied, there were more regulations and fewer directives.

Regarding the new EU Directives as a whole, the Chairman explained that this will affect WAHO's Member Registries in non-EU countries, the so-called "third countries". He said that the European rules are always evolving and the stud books are forced to change some of their forms and regulations, and the latest rules are particularly complicated because they are for all species including cattle, sheep, goats and so on, although there were some specific decisions just for horses. Formerly there had been different regulations for each species. The red lines behind these new directives are issues of public health, food security, free trade and now a new point, animal welfare, has been added. There are new zootechnical and genetic rules, sanitary rules and horse welfare rules. He explained that the first issue is the Identification of Equidae, this 80-page directive gives methods of identification and confirms what was implemented progressively in the previous EU rules on microchipping, written description and graphic diagram and some alternative methods of identification.

Before leaving the meeting, Marek Trela asked to bring up two points raised by Krystyna Karaszewska, the Registrar from Poland, who was unable to be present. He said this concerned the new requirement for Zootechnical certificates for imported horses and semen into the EU from 1st November 2018. The second point was that for AI, the new EU rules imply that the breeding certificate may be issued only by the person making the insemination. This was from the European regulations stating that the semen has to be accompanied by a collection report, which is an identification document for the stallion. This meant the person selling semen cannot provide a covering certificate issued by their Registry, but implies that the covering and insemination certificates must be issued and signed by the person inseminating the horse. Poland felt this was very wrong.

AU agreed and said that if the covering certificate is signed by the vet or technician who is inseminating the horse, no protection is given to the stallion owner regarding the payment of fees.

UK agreed and added that the semen certificate is different to the covering certificate. The covering certificate comes from the stallion owner. The semen certificate is a separate authorisation from whoever inseminated the mare.

The Chairman explained that this is mainly a problem in the European Union and that this point would be discussed at the forthcoming ECAHO meeting for those Countries that are part of EAHRIC. He said it was a very technical problem but WAHO has to be sure that the owner of the stallion can control his stallions' semen distribution. The only control Registries have at the moment is to have a covering certificate signed by the stallion owner. Marek agreed that the most important thing to achieve is that the foal would have a proper certified pedigree and the owner of the stallion would be paid. The Chairman said that it is quite a technically difficult situation, but fortunately in both European law and in the WAHO rules it was still compulsory to have a covering certificate before registering the foal.

For equine passports, the formal name for these is now Single Lifetime Identification Document. Each EU Member state must have a national equine database for identification of all horses, this is compulsory. Regarding identification he explained that there were discussions within the EU between the vets and the zootechnicians, the vets tried to insist on 2 separate forms of identification, one for health and food security and one for the stud book certificate because for them it would have been simpler to manage everything, but fortunately at present the studbooks had managed to confirm there should still only be the one identification document as before. He added that it had taken a long time to obtain that concession and the stud book authorities intend to keep it. He said there were also ongoing discussions regarding the UELN, which will become the Unique Code. However, he said despite these discussions, it would probably be the same outcome, to keep the UELN plus the microchip if necessary.

The Chairman then explained that the second EU text related to breeding, zootechnical and genetic conditions for breeding, trading and entry into the Union, and he emphasized that its implications to all WAHO members worldwide are very important to understand. This regulation details the zootechnical and genetic rules for trading breeding animals and their semen, oocytes and embryos and their import into the Union. The first rules are zootechnical rules, the second rules are for membership and dispute settling in breed societies and breeding operations. They have created a legal definition of breed societies, because in Europe most stud books are maintained by the Societies under the authority of their respective Governments, which in turn come under the authority of the EU. The EU consider that Stud books not maintained under a competent authority or government did not give all the same guarantees and in order to improve the population of animals the Registries must offer this guarantee in order to be able and authorised to exchange or trade in animals without any problems.

The rules dictate how the breed societies must manage their stud books and how they will manage the breeding of animals including germinal products which means semen, oocyte and embryos. There are various zootechnical and genetic rules regarding the use of performance results to predict genetic ability and improve the population, but most of these do not affect WAHO Members. There is one important issue and that is that a breeding society may be authorised to register at birth, foals born in other Member States. This is new because in the past they accepted the common rule issued by ISBC for Thoroughbreds and WAHO for Arabians, that it is compulsory that a foal will be registered in the stud book of the country of birth. The breeding societies in EU Member States are now theoretically authorised to work in the other countries of the EU, in other words they can register horses everywhere in Europe, but with some very strict conditions. It is very strict, it requires the Society to ask their Government who will ask the other country where they are intending to work. In Thoroughbreds it remains very clear that the horse must be registered in the country of birth even if the mare is only there for a short time and for our purebred Arabians it is exactly the same under WAHO rules. To clarify, for Arabians you cannot work in another country except if you have asked WAHO to cover another country. For example, Germany covers Luxembourg. So for WAHO members, there can only be one stud book for the territory of a country or area of jurisdiction, each stud book cannot go and try to take customers from other countries.

What is new in this regulation for other breeds is that now for the sport horses they may restrict the use of certain reproducers through stallion licensing, they are allowed to say, a certain stallion will be recognised by your studbook to be a reproducer and another one will not be recognised as a reproducer. But, to clarify, and this is very important, under WAHO rules for Arabians the Registries cannot forbid the use of reproducers regardless of the results of any licensing or genetic tests.

The regulation concerning zootechnics and genetics contains the forms to be used in order to present the documentation to be included in the EU list of approved breed societies and the models of the zootechnical certificates for breeding animals and their germinal products. These two regulations were applied from the 1st November 2018. For the EU Member states, the first part is not a big problem, for example the Belgian Government will put the list of Belgian breed societies and recognised stud books on the European section of their website. The Chairman urged all Delegates from EU countries to ensure they were on the list. To do this they must inform their Government's relevant department or ministry. The Registries cannot go themselves and ask to be recognised by the European Union, it must go through the Government Authority. He added that the important point was that this is now a problem for non-EU Registries, which includes all WAHO Member countries outside the EU.

The Chairman mentioned that he has had personal exchanges with Dr. Füssel, the EU commissioner in charge of these affairs in Brussels and asked him to explain how the non-European breeding societies can be added to this list on the website of the European Union. Dr. Füssel had replied that first, if non-EU countries intend to export breeding animals or their germinal products into the EU and have them registered in the main section of the relevant stud book, they must appear on the EU list. A breeding body may only be included in the list upon the request of an official service of the third country, then if the documentation received demonstrates that the breeding body meets the same requirements as the European Breeding Societies, they will be added onto the list. It was made clear that for all WAHO Member Registries outside the EU, if they want to export breeding horses or semen, for registration and entry into the European stud books, they must all be on the list for foreign recognised Societies. The Chairman explained that he had also asked Dr. Füssel if they could simply use and publish the list of all WAHO recognised stud books but it had been confirmed this was not possible.

So, the situation right now is that European Registrars are not authorised to enter a horse in their stud book if the stud book of birth is not included on the European list. The ISBC with the Thoroughbred Committee is in the same situation. Everyday there are horses coming from all over the world and they can enter physically because for the sanitary rules the former rules still apply, but for registration into the importing EU country's stud book the old list no longer exists and a new one is being created. So far only Tunisia and Morocco already have their Arabian studbooks included. In countries such as the USA where the Arabian Registry did not have a Government authority in control, the situation was more complex.

US asked the Chairman for assistance, both with the zootechnical certificates and who should issue them, and with the requirement for a Government authority to apply for listing, which US does not have. It was not clear to her who issued the zootechnical certificates, especially for semen exports, it seemed to her it was the stallion owner.

The Chairman explained that the ISBC is also working on a solution with the EU Commissioner regarding countries without a competent authority and WAHO would also request clarification and let US know. WAHO will send them the list of our recognized stud books and Dr. Füssel has confirmed that as they know that WAHO is the sole governing body for Arabian Studbooks worldwide, this will make acceptance easier.

Regarding the message from Dr. Füssel, DG Santé in Brussels, it was explained that there are two issues to be considered, the entry into the Union of registered horses in accordance with Directive 2009/156 (animal health), to which there has been no change, therefore a horse can enter the territory of Europe but not into the stud book. There is no problem at the border from the health aspect but the entry into the stud book of a purebred horse from a stud book maintained by a body not yet listed. Speaking about the latter, which is the entering in the stud book, in the case of a third country which is already listed under the old legislation, for example US and Canada, the adding of a breeding body for horses is a rather simple exercise. It will be a bit more time consuming in the case of breeding bodies in countries not previously listed.

When an application is made to the Commission for a stud book recognised by WAHO for Arab horses, or by the ISBC for Thoroughbreds, it will be easier to list, provided the information in Article 34 (2) is provided by an official service in the application to the commission, who have accepted to consider the list of WAHO but it will not register any stud book if there has not been an official request from your competent authority. A further message read:

“by requesting the listing, the third countries also undersign that they will respect the legal right of entry in their stud books of horses of the same breed entered or eligible for entry in such a stud book in Member states”. That is why they ask the same condition for other foreign societies. In Europe due to common law trade is very easy. The EU want to be sure that when horses are exported from the European Union will be registered in the foreign stud books in exactly the same way, in other words full reciprocity.

AR asked why the European Commission, which is a Governmental body, if it wants something from a non-EU Government body, it doesn't ask them directly. The Chairman replied that the EU Commission doesn't want to work with each individual breeding society because it covers several animal species and if did so they would have thousands and thousands of documents to look at, so they wanted to have only one representative by country. He clarified that this rule had been passed by the European Parliament and could not be changed, adding that Dr. Füssel knows WAHO has very strict rules for the keeping of stud books, and had confirmed in writing that provided they receive the necessary assurances from the official authorities, it should not be too difficult to quickly populate the EU list of approved breeding bodies in third countries.

The Chairman urged the Delegates to go back to their country and ask their competent authority to immediately contact the European Union. He said that WAHO will write to all stud books explaining the issue in detail and providing information on what they must do. WAHO will give the Commission the list of all WAHO approved stud books with contact details, so when they receive the request of your authority they will know and can check it.

UK said they have sent all the information to DEFRA but haven't heard anything yet. The competent authority required the Memorandum and articles of association, rules etc. The Chairman said that the problems are for the foreign societies. He said that at the time of this meeting, two WAHO Member countries are on the list: Morocco and Tunisia.

IR said that the ISBC has already contacted all the Thoroughbred Registries about this.

MA said they had no problem getting their name on the list as they only have one Society to manage all horse breeding authorities and all the studbooks. They had written to their Government Department of Agriculture who sent the letter and requirements to the European Union Committee. They were then added to this list which took only two weeks.

DE said they were having difficulty with their Ministry of Agriculture who were insistent that this EU rule should be applied now. He asked how WAHO could help ensure third countries were on this EU list. The Chairman explained again that WAHO will circulate an explanatory letter to all its Members as many of them are not present at this meeting and will also liaise with the relevant office in Brussels.

Moving on, the Chairman said that there is a new EU rule about animal diseases, it is based on animal health law at present, they have created a list of diseases, it is a new regulation of 2018 and it will be applied from the 21st April 2021. Then for veterinary medicinal products there is a proposal of the Commission, prepared by a group of experts in a Governmental bodies working group and step by step they are creating proposals for regulation. This proposal will be transmitted to the EU parliament and to council. Regarding horse welfare they have an expert working group and a Government working group and instead of a rule or regulation they have so far produced a draft guide to good animal welfare practises and for the keeping, caring, training and use of horses.

Item 10 - To discuss whether or not those countries which allow an unlimited number of ET foals per mare per year would be able legally to impose a limit and if so, whether or not they would want to do so.

The Chairman said that the French Stud Book had a recent meeting of their stud book committee and have asked if it would be possible to have a WAHO rule concerning the number of Embryo Transfer foals per mare. The proposal from them is one foal from the donor mare and one foal by embryo transfer per year. The Chairman explained that they are worried about the number of embryo transfer foals that can be produced. He then explained a data chart that was on the screen for delegates. He summarised that in France approximately 2,800 purebred Arabian broodmares are covered each year, and of those only 82 mares, which is 3%, were used for embryo transfer as donors and together produced 99 ET foals plus 12 natural foals which is 5% of the registered foals. He suggested a round table discussion regarding the number of foals produced by ET in different countries.

AR said that Georgina Pelham, a Member of the Executive Committee, had asked him to bring this same request on her behalf, for Argentina, she would like a maximum of 3 registered foals per mare per year, whereas the current rule in Argentina is 5.

AE said they have no limit, but they have found it difficult in practice to obtain more than 3 embryos.

EC said they have no limit but in practice it is very rare.

US said they have no limit which was due to legal action taken against the AQHA when they tried to impose a limit as it was considered a restriction of trade. In 2018, 14.6% or 409 foals were produced by embryo transfer.

AU said they have no limit for the same reasons as the US. They said that changing the rule would be restriction of trade and wouldn't achieve anything in Australia.

AT said in theory there is no limit but there were only 4 embryo transfer foals last year from four mares.

BH said they only began allowing ET two years ago, it is restricted to three foals a year but there had been no ET foals yet.

BE said they register around 300 foals per year and 25% of them are ET foals.

CN said they currently have no rule but would like a limit set.

DE said that in theory it is limited to 5 embryos plus one natural foal in the year but this has not been done.

JO said they had no limit although in practice it is rare. They would like a limit of one embryo transfer and one natural per year.

KW said they have no limit but more than two registrations per mare are rare.

LY do not allow embryo transfer

MA said they allow 3 foals per donor mare, including the natural foal.

NZ said they allow ET but have never registered an ET foal

OM said they have no limit and have yet to register any.

ES said they allow 2 embryo transfers plus one natural.

CH said their current rules makes it possible to have 1 foal by embryo transfer and 1 natural in the same year, but they have not registered any ET foals.

QA said they have no limit but have started discussions to limit it to one embryo, with special circumstances for if the mare is old or used for showing. It has yet to be decided.

SA said they they have a limit of 3 embryo transfer per mare plus 1 natural.

PT said they have no limit but would be in favour of limiting it to 3 foals per year.

UK said they allow multiple registrations but in the rules of registration the recommend one embryo transfer foal and one natural foal per mare per year and would support a limitation.

The Chairman said that the problem would be regulating this as for Arabs there is no central database and therefore it would be difficult to discover embryos sent abroad to avoid the registration rules. The only solution at present was the rule that France had regarding racing and embryo transfers. The solution in racing was a rule stating that in one race there could be two horses issued from the same stallion and mare in the same year.

MA said that they have the same rule as France regarding racing.

US said they had previously imposed the rule of one foal per mare per year, whether it was embryo transfer or natural, the foal had to be registered within 14 days of the date of birth. The reason being that they didn't want breeders to have several and pick the best one to register. They were concerned that by not allowing multiple foals it could lead to unregistered horses. The Chairman agreed and said that this is one of the problems.

BE said that the mares are moving around the world much too fast for them to control, as they only spend a couple on months in a country before moving and many are not registered in the countries.

The Chairman said WAHO had received a question from both Sweden and Italy regarding the registration procedure for a donor mare entering a country only to give embryos to a recipient mare and then leave again. The problem arose in Italy where they found it unreasonable to issue a certificate of exportation for these donor mares which are travelling just to give embryos to the recipient. The WAHO Office had tried to help with these cases. BE said that they register all these mares that go to Belgium then go back to Italy or vice versa, they are always exchanging papers with Italy and it is one of the burdens of these people, one of the constraints Registries have on them, is to have them properly register these mares. They felt the embryos transferred in Belgium are their responsibility and 'belong' to Belgium, they were made in Belgium so the Registry delivers the papers for them.

ES said there was a problem regarding the multiple registrations and sports such as endurance, where some embryo transfer foals were competing in Spain as sport horses and not purebred horses.

AU said that they were concerned it could become a welfare issue, regarding multiple embryo transfers and the welfare of those that were not registered due to a limit.

CH agreed with AU regarding the welfare of the horses and that those not registered would be sold for a very nominal sum, they were concerned there could be abuse of the system when in practice there was only Belgium where ET was a major practice.

AU suggested that other than Belgium who are very good on the breeding, if most mares are producing three foals a year by embryo transfer they are doing really well and they can't keep it going for very long. So to mandate it for one country and risk the welfare of foals all around the world could not be justified.

UK agreed and said that most mares would not produce more than two or three embryos each year and that a mare that produces well one year, may not get in foal the following year. They suggested it is not just the welfare issue of foals that have been produced and discarded, it's also the welfare issue of the mare of going through the whole procedure every time.

BE said they were also concerned for the welfare of the mare as they believe they suffer as a result of the procedure which can be repeated for several years.

The Chairman mentioned that there would be a presentation at the General Meeting from a UK vet and reproductive specialist about the ethics and welfare of the broodmares used like that.

PT thought it was important to place a rule, as if there is no rule then one cannot be implemented and without a rule, Registries cannot even recommend, advise or try to limit this.

US said in their view all foals born by embryo transfer should be registered as it was not ethical to choose the best and discard the rest. It is not just a problem in Belgium, many others have this on a smaller scale, Belgium just has a wealth of great horses, trainers and breeding facilities.

The Chairman concluded by saying that most countries would support a limit but the issue was in enforcing any such rule.

Item 11 - Any other business

BH asked if Registrars would help each other more with regard to export documents that were not being received from host countries. He said that this was causing mares in particular to sell for low values and be sold repeatedly. Usually this is just because a Registry says this horse has left the country without their knowledge and therefore they cannot send the export papers. He understands that registration procedures must be completed but asked if Registries could work together to solve these issues.

AR replied that what was happening was that foreign buyers would buy horses and in order to avoid paying the stud book they take the horse away without papers. At a later date the horse becomes valuable and then they want the papers. If a horse has been exported it is difficult for a Registry to send papers when they cannot inspect the horse as it has already been exported.

BH replied that there are several ways of having the horse inspected in the country the horse goes to. They can have the microchip checked or a repeat DNA test. He said that all countries have good enough vets, inspectors and Registrars to check the markings and most of these owners who suddenly find the broodmare valuable again would be quite willing to pay the pending fees which are sometimes very nominal, or even a fine.

The Chairman said he hoped it would be possible to find a solution, meaning export certificates and retrospective export certificates in particular could be issued faster with less cost.

DE asked about the delays importing horses from Egypt. The Chairman explained it was for health reasons and nothing to do with registration.

US asked whether it would be possible to have a World Registrars meeting yearly rather than just at the Conferences. This was supported by several other countries including BH, EC, AU, CH.

US felt it should be at a mutually convenient place and time to minimise travel costs for everyone. There was further discussion regarding the place and time of year. Suggestions were made for the time of the Paris World Championships Show, of the Nations Cup in Aachen or during the Paris Arc De Triomphe race meeting which is when IFAHR meets, or the meeting could move locations annually.

BH suggested the meeting should have the backing of WAHO as the delegates could be discussing new WAHO rules. He thought decisions could be made faster with annual meetings.

The Chairman explained that it would be an open meeting, but it would not have the host hotels as provided during a Conference, Delegates would have to arrange their own accommodation. He said that WAHO would take this request into consideration.

BE asked about online stud books and the potential issue of having the same horse apparently registered in two different countries at the same time. There was a discussion on this point highlighting the importance of using ISO codes for imported horses and ensuring export certificates were used. It was highlighted that horses could be registered on a central equine database without being entered into the stud book, as could be the case with competing horses.

The Chairman then thanked everyone for their attendance and input, and declared the meeting closed.

END