



Federazione Italiana Sport Equestri

Il Presidente

To the kind attention of

Hanfried Haring  
EEF President EEF

cc. Carina Mayer  
EEF Secretary General

John Roche  
FEI Jumping Director

Rome, 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017  
Prot.n. AW/  
Presidenza 01373/17

**RE: Jumping Nations Cup Series + CSI/CSIO Harmonisation**

Dear Hanfried,

Please find herewith our comments regarding the FEI Nations Cup Series and worldwide harmonization of CSI/CSIOs.

**NATIONS CUP**

The circuit must continue to exist and must remain one of the FEIs greatest assets and there is therefore the need for it to more significantly enhanced by the FEI (obviously finding a main sponsor would help!).

With reference to the proposals and comments received by the various Working Groups in the last few weeks we would like to comment/propose as follows:

**Enhancing the Nations Cup Series**

1. Consider the abolition of the individual Gran Prix in CSIOs and focus the attention of the public, media, teams on the Nations Cup, which would be held on the best day of the competition (greatest public/media attention and participation) Sunday or on Saturday if Sunday is out of the question.

**Alternatively:**

The Nations Cup and the Gran Prix could be unified as one competition. The € 400.000,00 prize money would be divided € 300.000,00 for team rankings and €100.000,00 for the individual classification. We must not forget that in a CSIO there are also individual and the fifth team riders, who are excluded from participating in the NC and in alternative they would try to qualify for the Gran Prix. The individuals could start before the team members. There would be a team and individual classification. This could also stimulate the 5th non



participating team member, and give the team members who have missed out on a team result, due to a bad performance from a fellow team mate, the possibility of prizemoney from a good individual result.

As is happening in the NC Final we could also see the 5th team member being used as a substitute during the competition with the possibility of one of the team members being substituted for the second round.

2. Add the prizemoney of the Gran Prix to that of the Nations Cup (minimum 400.000,00 Euro).
3. Set up a qualification system which links the Nations Cup Series to team qualification for the Olympic Games; currently the qualification of the teams takes place at the WEG or Continental Championships or at special CSIO in certain geographical areas; a points ranking system on the final standings of the Nations Cup series of the 3 years preceding the Olympic Games could be established, leaving one place (or two places) to the winning team (as if it were a championship which takes place over three seasons, this would ensure team participation in the 3 years leading up to the Games).

### Ranking points

We are not convinced regarding the idea of giving more points for the Rankings in the Nations Cup with respect to other competitions with equal technical value. The FEI ranking system needs to be reviewed and a system of points and coefficients should be awarded according to the technical quality of the course, the number of starters in the competition and especially the penalties obtained in the round.

Today the points are given according to the prizemoney and classification of the category (points are awarded to the first sixteen classified).

This system was introduced many years ago in a different panorama, with less competitions and fewer riders. Today there are many more starters and many more top level competitions.

There are some very rich competitions with maximum Ranking points in some areas of the world where the number of riders starting are 20 and points are awarded to the top 16 and it maybe that the 16<sup>th</sup> placed rider has 12 or more penalties. Instead in Gran Prix and in the big categories of many circuits (Nations Cup, World Cup, etc.) there are 40-50 starters, the best in the world, and if they get four penalties they will probably not be in the first 16 and will therefore not receive Ranking points.

### Divisions and Finals

We agree with the proposal of a qualification for the Final in 2 Divisions as already existing but with an amended formula:

**Division 1:** 10 teams, 8 shows, 4 results to count, 6 guaranteed starts.

**Division 2:** 4 regional groups to pre-qualify through a Division 2 Final

### HARMONISATION CSI/CSIO

The FEI proposal, in looking for the right balance between the current rules in Europe and the US, favours an increase in costs for Europe and diminishing those of the USA; in essence Europe





Federazione Italiana Sport Equestri

would follow the USA, not vice versa; the proposal put forward by the organisers (AJO) is similar and even more beneficial for the European organisers within a reduced time frame;

The proposal of the European Federations (EEF) is completely different and calls for USA to adapt to the European system, reducing costs, even going as far as to eliminate them.

In principle, it is agreed by all that the majority of the competitions are in Europe and that it is necessary to bring the Americans to the European model and not vice versa; but a serious and transparent assessment of the economic aspects of the organisation of equestrian competitions needs to be made, especially in the jumping world, without hypocrisy, and sitting around a table with organisers from Europe and non-European organisers to find the best solutions, which cannot be found in the offices of FEI or National Federations.

A solution will probably, and should, take time and it is vital that the question be addressed at 360 degrees taking into account OCs in EU and USA, the costs for European Riders competing at home and in the States etc. etc.

### **Proposal Ranking points as a percentage of wild card granted to the organizer of the CSI**

As stated before the ranking should be based on a technical value concept. Using the Ranking for "political reasons" to try to limit the number of wild cards of an organiser, trying to orientate the participation of riders in one competition over another is probably not the right way forward. The rider must be free to manage his own participation in competitions of the highest technical level without be conditioned with regards to the Rankings and the organiser should be free to organise his competitions as he sees fit (freedom of the market).

### **Entry numbers**

In line with the general tendency to standardise, control and moderate the entries, also taking in to account the prizemoney it seems appropriate to also protect the Organising Committees, and in particular with reference to doubling of the amount of prize money in the event of a higher than the allowed 100 declared entries per category.

With regards to this point, the FISE has, in the past proposed a solution to this norm.

#### Actual norm

As the norm stands today the maximum number of starters per competition is 100. If more than 100 starters are declared, the OC must split the class and provide the equivalent amount of prizemoney for the additional competitions.

For the avoidance of doubt, it is the number of declared starter in the competition, not the final number of starters, that determines whether the competition must be split.

#### *Proposal*

We would look at the idea of, once the maximum number of 100 has been reached, increasing the prize money in percentage terms up until what could be an accepted number of extra starters/entries, for example 30. After which the category would be divided as per actual norm.

#### *Example*

100 = total prizemoney €50.000

101 = total prizemoney €50.000 + 1% = 50.500 total prizemoney to be distributed



Federazione Italiana Sport Equestri

---

110= total prizemoney €50.000 + 10% = 55.000 *total prizemoney to be distributed*

130= total prizemoney €50.000 + 30% = 71.500 *total prizemoney to be distributed*

From 131 riders category divided and prizemoney doubled.

The number of 30 extra and the % are obviously a hypothesis that can be worked on.

### Optional Fees

#### *Stables*

With reference to optional fees and with regards to larger stables, these may be supplied **upon specific request**. These stables cost extra and if a rider requests normal sized stables but the OC has no availability and has only the larger stables left, the rider should not have to pay the difference. This means that the OC must have enough standard stables to meet the requests of the riders.

### INVITATION SYSTEM

The new FEI system appears very difficult to put into practice, it seems to have been worked out by IT experts who have no practical experience in the work of the secretariat of the Organising Committees and the Federations.

It is probably feasible to implement it at 5\* and 4\* level, but from 3\* down is difficult to enforce this theoretical scheme. It is completely inapplicable at a 2 \* level.

We would suggest that the FEI to implement and test the new system only at 5\* level, it would be easier to iron out any teething problems that are to be expected with a new system.

2\* and 1\* levels must leave the organiser free from constraints of invitations based on rankings or, however, limit their number to a minimum.

### Youth/Under 25 3\*

It is often very difficult for some NFs to help their up and coming youth to gain experience at higher level competitions, and we would like to see some kind of invitation system which can help these youngsters to be invited to at least 3\* level; possibly through a ranking for youngsters (which would obviously exclude those outstanding youths who already hold high positions in the top World Ranking).

We have tried to summarise our opinions regarding these vital topics. We are not against the line taken by the EEF board and Working Group but think that it is important to try and discuss all aspects to make sure that the final proposal is the right one with the best intentions for our sport as a whole.

Kind regards

Avv. Marco Di Paola