

# FEI Eventing Committee Consultation process for the 2013 Rules revision

## Listing of Bookmarks

(page# 1) 2011-06-15 EVENTING COMMITTEE Consultation process for the 2013 Rules revision  
(page# 4) 2011-06-15 Hemut Mett (GER)

(page# 6) 2011-06-18 Aachen Organizing Committee (GER)

(page# 7) 2011-06-21 Joaquim Duarte Silva (POR)  
(page# 10) 2011-06-27 Eric Smiley (IRL)

(page# 11) 2011-07-06 Geoff Sinclair (AUS)  
(page# 13) 2011-07-10 Wayne Copping (AUS)  
(page# 16) 2011-07-12 Gill Makey-Harfield (GBR)  
(page# 17) 2011-07-12 FRA NF  
(page# 18) 2011-07-14 various anonymous responses from IEOC members  
(page# 27) 2011-07-17 GBR NF  
(page# 30) 2011-07-17 Christian Landolt (SUI)  
(page# 32) 2011-07-17 Vicki Burgess (AUS)  
(page# 35) 2011-07-17 Eric Lieby (FRA)  
(page# 37) 2011-07-17 Sylvia Roberts (AUS)  
(page# 39) 2011-07-17 Ronald Alexander (GBR)  
(page# 41) 2011-07-18 Barry Roycroft (AUS)

(page# 42) 2011-07-18 GER NF

(page# 45) 2011-07-18 José Lupi (POR)

(page# 49) 2011-07-18 NZL NF  
(page# 55) 2011-07-18 Hugh Thomas (GBR)  
(page# 57) 2011-07-18 Raf Desmedt-Floren (BEL)

(page# 58) 2011-07-18 Geneviève Pfister (SUI)  
(page# 61) 2011-07-19 Delano Bastos De Miranda (BRA)

(page# 62) 2011-07-19 USA NF

(page# 69) 2011-07-19 CAN NF

(page# 71) 2011-07-20 ITA NF

(page# 75) 2011-07-22 Sue Baxter (GBR)

(page# 81) 2011-07-25 Ernst Topp (GER)  
(page# 83) 2011-07-25 Tom Ryckewaert (BEL)

(page# 84) 2011-08-01 Ataide Peirera (BRA)  
(page# 85) 2011-08-01 ERA (Eventing Riders Association)  
(page# 87) 2011-08-01 SWE NF  
(page# 89) 2011-08-14 IEOC International Eventing Officials Club

## **EVENTING COMMITTEE Consultation process for the 2013 Rules revision**

The Eventing Committee chaired by Giuseppe Della Chiesa, consisting of Anne-Mette Binder Deputy Chairman, Clayton Fredericks (AUS), Robert Kellerhouse (USA), Alec Lochore (GBR) and Pierre Michelet (FRA), together with the FEI Eventing Department would like to collect views from all parties involved and open a discussion on the main topics that could be part of the statutory Rules revision for 2013.

For this reason 3 Open Forums for Eventing will be organized:

1. Luhmühlen (GER) during the European Championships **Thursday 24 August 2011** after Dressage
2. Guadalajara (MEX) during the Pan Am Games Eventing on **Friday 21 October 2011**
3. Australia November 2011 or New Zealand early 2012 date and place to be confirmed

In order to prepare the discussion topics for these forums the Committee wish to present the following document for review by the NFs, OCs, Riders and Officials and would very much like to receive feed- back **by 18 July 2011**.

The feedback from all parties is very much appreciated to allow full involvement by all for the future development of the Eventing Sport.

The intention is to start an overall consultation process to take place until **May 2012** in order to prepare the needed rules revision and changes for presentation to the FEI GA in November 2012 for implementation **1 January 2013**.

Your initial views on the following points to be discussed are much appreciated:

### **1. COMPETITION FORMATS (CIC-CCI)**

This issue has been much discussed inside and outside the Eventing Committee and it has become apparent that with the current evolution of the sport after the deletion of the Steeple-Chase and roads and tracks maintaining a clear difference between the two formats (CIC-CCI) is becoming increasingly difficult.

Hence the questions:

- Is it still relevant for the international sport of Eventing to keep two different competition formats?
- If we retain the two different competition formats should there be a clearer difference between the formats?
- Is the flexibility we currently have with the two formats a positive attribute and if so how do we ensure that the two formats remain different?
- Does having the two formats create confusion around the different rules?

- Do we need two formats to ensure we maintain robust MER principles? Or could the overall structure of “qualifications – minimum requirements” be simplified by restructuring the competition formats.

Should the sport be concerned that:

- The specificity of each format is often difficult to understand for the insiders and nearly impossible for the general public.
- Are there any small changes that could be made to simplify and strengthen the sport? (i.e. minimize alternatives at 1&2 star level, ...)
- Especially at the lower levels (1&2 star) distances and number of efforts in some cases tend to blend together and the only difference is often represented by a loop and maybe one or two more fences.
- Maintaining at international level the two formats requires a greater level of complexity in rules and regulations

Your initial views on the following points to be discussed are much appreciated:

- Could the international sport of Eventing be defined as “one sport” based on the current CCI format leaving the one day (CIC) to be used at national level only?
- Is the tradition order of tests important or not – does the Dressage, Cross-Country, Jumping order of tests represent eventing and does it have any influence on the public perception of “horse welfare” ?
- If there was a single format should the CIC format be retained at 3 star level for certain special competitions i.e. the right to retain the format for WC’s etc?

## 2. QUALIFICATIONS OF ATHLETES & HORSES (MER)

It is agreed that the international Eventing “qualification system” has had and currently has a huge impact on all involved in the sport.

It has often been criticized for being too complicated and often misleading for the wrong perception that having obtained a qualification for a higher level automatically would imply “competence to compete at that level”.

The change of definition from Qualification Result (QR) to MER (Minimum Eligibility Requirements) does not seem to have improved the situation and National Federations still find it difficult to reject an entry to an international competition by riders/horses that have obtained the MER also if they are not considered competent to participate at that certain level.

***Hence the question if the Eventing qualification system is fulfilling the right role in the sport today and if not, how it could be improved.***

The overall qualification system has often been perceived to be too complicated and the original policy of using the same criteria for horses and riders has made it very difficult to make justice of the great variability of cases.

After ten years of the current system it might be useful to reconsider the whole system and it’s foundation.

To streamline the discussion on the review of the Eventing qualification procedure your initial views on the following would be greatly appreciated:

- Is the current Eventing qualification system achieving the right result ?
- Is the meaning of “minimum eligibility requirement (MER)” clear to national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors ?
- Is the Eventing qualification system discouraging national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors to take up their responsibility ?
- If we adopted a one format sport and gave more emphasis to NF’s would we lose the control of the standards by which athletes obtain MER
- Are technical requirements for MER strong enough ?
- How important is it for the sport of Eventing to ensure that new horses and riders get the right positive experience before stepping up the levels also if this would necessarily mean a slower progression for horses and riders ?
- Could a different approach for riders and horses improve the system (riders licenses) ?
- Could a “reverse qualification” (downgrading) in the case of a clear failure of performance improve the system and increase the level of responsibility of all involved ?
- How important is the achievement of a MER as a combination ?
- Could performances at national competitions be better integrated as part of the overall qualification process ?
- Could larger nations assist smaller nations to establish better national qualification structures and processes ?

### 3. OTHER TOPICS

The Committee welcomes any other topics proposed by NFs, Riders, Officials, Organizers or others that could be included for discussion point at the Open Forums. It would be appreciated if these topics proposed could be of general interest and/or related to the 2013 Rules revision to all involved.

We look forward to reading your comments and thank you for forwarding your comments and proposals by **18 July 2011** addressed to the FEI Eventing Department, Catrin Norinder ([catrin.norinder@fei.org](mailto:catrin.norinder@fei.org))

Yours sincerely,

FEI Eventing Committee:

Giuseppe Della Chiesa (Chairman); Anne-Mette Binder, Clayton Fredericks, Robert Kellerhouse; Alec Lochore, Pierre Michelet.

15.06.2011

FEI

---

Re : **FEI Eventing Consultation Process for the 2013 Eventing Rules**

---

Dear Catrin, dear Jean,

here my comments to the consultation process for the 2013 rules revision.

**1. Formats**

There is no obvious difference in formats CCI/CIC, especially for the non-expert public. If CCIs are to be kept as format, I propose to restrict CCIs to national and international championships and to clearly define their distances as significantly larger than CICs of the same level. I wonder whether today there is a clear definition of the goals to be reached by extended distances. Turning the system into 1 format definitively will make the qualification system more transparent.

**2. Concerns**

Alternatives at 1 / 2 star level: Especially at the 1\* level we often have beginners; in order to keep them in the sport, we should take all measures to enable them to complete the competition and therefore offer alternatives at “critical” fences, e.g. water jumps etc. Qualification events for international championships on the other hand should reduce the number of alternatives to an absolute minimum in order to avoid qualifications just achieved “on the chicken way”.

**3. Discussion points**

**CIC** = one-day event: this seems to be unrealistic in view of the fact that the number of participants in international events in general will not allow to have the event being limited to 1 day.

**Traditional sequence** of event: I am very much in favour of this, since in my eyes a successful competition is only reached with a horse still passing the veterinary control one night after the completion of the cross-country part. In addition there are – to my knowledge – only rare cases of horses being eliminated due to veterinary concerns after the cross country, when that is the last part of the competition.

**4. CICs for WCs only**

I do not understand what the benefit of this regulation should be.

**5. Eventing qualification system**

In my opinion this problem will remain as long as there is not a strict quality standard being enforced by course designers. Qualifying results must be reached on courses which have an international standard, and these results must be imported into a data base at the FEI, which is accessible for each show office for control of the qualification of each horse and each rider.

**6. Initial views**

**Qualification system:** In my eyes the biggest problem is at the lowest level: qualification for 1\*. Here qualification standards have to be newly formulated.

**MER:** not clear on the national level

**Discouraging:** every rider, trainer, sponsor etc will be eager to participate and to compete at higher classes. So keep control at a level independent of directly involved people.

**Experience of riders and horses:** MER system should automatically enforce gaining of experience. A limitation can be imposed that horses and riders can step up only 1 level per year; e.g. a new horse can only compete in 1\* and 2\* during the first year.

**Riders' licence:** In Germany every rider needs a national licence which ensures his/her qualification for given classes. This should be similar in international competitions.

**Reverse qualification:** I am not in favour of dictating every detail. I believe that existing instruments like yellow card, dangerous riding etc are sufficient to control this. An option could be to limit the validity of qualifying results to a period starting with the horse show and ending at the end of the following year.

**MER as combination:** I believe that this is not needed, since riders who qualified with a different horse should have sufficient experience to self-critically analyse whether they will be able to compete with a new horse qualified under a different rider.

**Qualifications based on national results:** Much effort should be taken in order to get national standards to the level of international shows (German VL = CIC\*). Again this is predominantly a task for course designers. When this goal is achieved, I do not see reasons why not to include national results in the qualification scheme.

**Help for small by large eventing nations:** this should be kept at the discretion of the respective countries.

# 2011-06-18 Aachen Organizing Committee (GER)

we refer to the below sent document „Eventing Committee Consultation Process for the 2013 Rules Revision” and would like to give you some feedback on the point of “traditional order of tests”.

As you know, since the introduction of Eventing at the CHIO Aachen, cross-country has always been the final test of the Eventing competition. This format has considerably contributed to a high popularity of Eventing in Aachen. The fact that the winner of the competition was decided immediately after the cross-country test finishing in the main stadium was a particularly decisive factor for the decision of television to broadcast Eventing every year.

We had many discussions with TV about the format and they are not interested in the jumping competitions of eventing. For them it is a must to have a winner after the cross country.

For us as organisers it is very important to consider not only the interests of the riders but especially the interests of the important stakeholders like media and sponsors. And also from a sports point of view we do not see any disadvantages in running cross-country as last test.

We therefore strongly hope that the new rules will still give the organisers the option to run cross-country as last test.

## 1. COMPETITION FORMATS (CIC-CCI)

This issue has been much discussed inside and outside the Eventing Committee and it has become apparent that with the current evolution of the sport after the deletion of the Steeple-Chase and roads and tracks maintaining a clear difference between the two formats (CIC-CCI) is becoming increasingly difficult.

Hence the questions:

- Is it still relevant for the international sport of Eventing to keep two different competition formats?
  - *At 3 STAR, YES.*
- If we retain the two different competition formats should there be a clearer difference between the formats?
  - *YES.*
- Is the flexibility we currently have with the two formats a positive attribute and if so how do we ensure that the two formats remain different?
  - *NO.*
- Does having the two formats create confusion around the different rules?
  - *YES.*
- Do we need two formats to ensure we maintain robust MER principles? Or could the overall structure of "qualifications – minimum requirements" be simplified by restructuring the competition formats?
  - *NO.*  
*QUALIFICATIONS MUST BE SIMPLIFIED.*

Should the sport be concerned that:

- The specificity of each format is often difficult to understand for the insiders and nearly impossible for the general public.
  - *INDEED IT IS.*
- Are there any small changes that could be made to simplify and strengthen the sport? (i.e. minimize alternatives at 1&2 star level,...)
  - *IF ONLY ONE FORMAT (EXCEPT 3 STAR), NO.*  
*ALTHOUGH 1 & 2 STARS XC/STANDARD'S SHOULD BE REDEFINED.*
- Especially at the lower levels (1&2 star) distances and number of efforts in some cases tend to blend together and the only difference is often represented by a loop and maybe one or two more fences.
  - *AS ABOVE.*
- Maintaining at international level the two formats requires a greater level of complexity in rules and regulations.
  - *AND ALSO EXPENSIVE FOR OC's!*

Your initial views on the following points to be discussed are much appreciated:

- Could the international sport of Eventing be defined as "one sport" based on the current CCI format leaving the one day (CIC) to be used at national level only?
  - *YES, EXCEPT 3 STAR LEVEL.*
- Is the tradition order of tests important or not – does the Dressage, Cross-Country, Jumping order of tests represent eventing and does it have any influence on the public perception of "horse welfare"?
  - *YES.*
- If there was a single format should the CIC format be retained at 3 star level for certain special competitions i.e. the right to retain the format for WC's, etc?
  - *YES.*

## 2. QUALIFICATIONS OF ATHLETES & HORSES (MER)

It is agreed that the international Eventing "qualification system" has had and currently has a huge impact on all involved in the sport.

It has often been criticized for being too complicated and often misleading for the wrong perception that having obtained a qualification for a higher level automatically would imply "competence to compete at that level".

The change of definition from Qualification Result (QR) to MER (Minimum Eligibility Requirements) does not seem to have improved the situation and National Federations still find it difficult to reject an entry to an international competition by riders (*Athletes*)/horses that have obtained the MER also if they are not considered competent to participate at that certain level.

***Hence the question if the Eventing qualification system is fulfilling the right role in the sport today and if not, how it could be improved.***

The overall qualification system has often been perceived to be too complicated and the original policy of using the same criteria for horses and riders (*Athletes*) has made it very difficult to make justice of the great variability of cases.

After ten years of the current system it might be useful to reconsider the whole system and it's foundation.

To streamline the discussion on the review of the Eventing qualification procedure your initial views on the following would be greatly appreciated:

- Is the current Eventing qualification system achieving the right result?
  - *AS STATED, «COMPLICATED»!*
- Is the meaning of "minimum eligibility requirement (MER)" clear to national federations, riders (*Athletes*), trainers, parents, sponsors?
  - *IT SHOULD BE!*

- Is the Eventing qualification system discouraging national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors to take up their responsibility?
- *DIFFICULT TO ANSWER, BUT IF IT IS REALLY HAPPENING, SOMETHING MUST BE WRONG!*
- If we adopted a one format sport and gave more emphasis to NF's would we lose the control of the standards by which athletes obtain MER?
- *QUALIFICATION SYSTEM (HORSES & ATHLETES) MUST BE ADAPTED. NOT MORE THAN YOU LOSE NOW!*
- Are technical requirements for MER strong enough?
- How important is it for the sport of Eventing to ensure that new horses and riders (Athletes) get the right positive experience before stepping up the levels also if this would necessarily mean a slower progression for horses and riders (Athletes)?
- *AGREED WITH THE FIRST PART OF THE QUESTION, IT'S IMPORTANT. SLOWER PROGRESSION WILL DISCOURAGE A LOT OF ATHLETES.*
- Could a different approach for riders (Athletes) and horses improve the system (riders (Athletes) licenses)?
- *NF's ALREADY CERTIFY THE CAPABILITY OF HORSES & ATHLETES TO COMPETE. THEY MUST BE REGISTERED EACH YEAR AT FEI, AND THEY PAY FOR IT. ISN'T THIS A LICENSE?*
- Could a "reverse qualification" (downgrading) in the case of a **clear failure of performance** improve the system and increase the level of responsibility of all involved?
- *AGREE, AND SHOULD BE APPLIED TO ALL INVOLVED IN THE SPORT (HORSES, ATHLETES & OFFICIALS). THE PROBLEM IS; DEFINITION OF «CLEAR FAILURE OF PERFORMANCE», AND HOW TO PUT IT WORKING WITH CLEAR GUIDELINES TO ALL INVOLVED! HUGE CHALLENGE!*
- How important is the achievement of a MER as a combination?
- *JUNIORS & YOUNG RIDERS CHs, YES. SENIORS CHs, RGs, OGs, MER MUST BE LIGHTEN.*
- Could performances at national competitions be better integrated as part of the overall qualification process?
- *YES AND NATIONAL RULES MUST BE LINED UP WITH FEI RULES.*
- Could larger nations assist smaller nations to establish better national qualification structures and processes?
- *IN AN IDEAL WORLD, YES, WHEN REQUIRED BY NFs.*

### 3. OTHER TOPICS

The Committee welcomes any other topics proposed by NFs, Riders (Athletes), Officials, Organizers or others that could be included for discussion point at the Open Forums. It would be appreciated if these topics proposed could be of general interest and/or related to the 2013 Rules revision to all involved.

From: Sue Smiley [mailto:eric.suesmiley@btinternet.com]  
Sent: lundi 27 juin 2011 16:48  
To: Catrin Norinder  
Cc: Jean Mitchell  
Subject: Consultation process for the 2013 Rules revision

1. Competition formats.

To retain the "heart" of our sport i.e Horsemanship it is important that the endurance element is maintained. Without it, horses start and finish much the same and riders never learn the skills embodied in the word horsemanship.

The CIC could be a national event with an approved FEI T.D. except for exceptional cases or a special competition such as a World Cup. The CCI would then become more of a focus for riders to aim for.

For O.C. it might be important to run some of these together to make them financially viable.

2. MER's should be made harder to achieve. Too many riders and horses are competing above their experience and/or level of competence. The implementation is not uniform within countries as some Federations "allow" too easily.

3. I believe 'downgrading' has merit, as does rider licensing.

4. The traditional order of tests is the sport. Welfare issues are addressed in the Horse Inspection prior to Show Jumping.

## Eventing going forward from 2013

---

July 3<sup>rd</sup> 2011

### **TWO SPORTS**

Since the dropping of the roads and tracks and steeplechase and more recently the lowering of distances allowed for CCI competitions the CIC and CCI have slowly morphed into one. In my view we should create a clear difference between the competitions that will require different experience and skill from both athletes.

**CIC** has proved a very successful format for a huge number of athletes and is still growing. The short cross country could be seen as 'show jumping' over fixed obstacles. A broader range of horse types that require less fitness and can compete for more years along with riders who can be safely less experienced and require less time and financial commitment means the CIC is a wonderful introduction to every level of eventing.

For CIC we should keep the distance limited and the maximum number of jumping efforts well below the equivalent CCI star level. The maximum distances in CIC should be 1500m lower and jumping efforts six (6) less than the equivalent CCI competition at each level creating a clear difference. I have no problem with allowing show jumping to be before or after cross country in CIC only.

For the world to create a level playing field we need to encourage more FEI accredited competitions. If we let the CIC become national competitions then the standard will vary greatly and the risk to safety and quality officiating would be too high.

**CCI** is often far too close to the CIC competition now. We need to increase the skill and endurance required of both horse and rider to return the CCI clearly to the ultimate test. The type, experience and fitness of these athletes needs to be much better than required at CIC level. Minimum distances of 4000m and 34 jumping efforts for 1\* to 6000m and 44 jumping efforts at 4\* need to be reestablished to clearly separate the two sports.

In Cricket there is a clear difference in type of athlete and spectator expectation from Test Cricket to 20/20 and One Day matches and eventing should continue to grow by allowing TWO SPORTS to be available to athletes and spectators.

### **QUALIFICATIONS**

We have already established a system that should be strengthened not diluted to National level. Increasing and separating the qualifications for CIC and CCI more will mean a slower progression through the system but this is important for safety.

Riders who have recently competed at higher levels should be able to ride horses that have been qualified by others at lower levels and if a license is an easier way to manage this then that is

acceptable. However for riders coming up through the grades they must never ride above their own qualified level no matter how experienced the horse.

CIC combinations should be required to complete 2 x MER at each level in CIC to move up a grade (except at 1\* where NF certification applies).

CCI combinations should be required to complete 2 x MER CIC at 1\* to compete in CCI 1\* and 2 x CCI MER at all other levels to upgrade. Although simplistic, as we make CCI more professional and enduring again, we must keep the qualifications high and a privilege for the right quality athletes to compete in.

## **MARKETING**

The CIC and CCI need names commonly understood by the general public to separate them. This is a marketing exercise and a quantitative survey of the FEI members with a list of choices will have the best chance of coming up with a popular agreed and understood terminology.

CCI names like Eventing... test, pro tour, pro-am, grand prix and triathlon are all alternatives.

CIC names like Eventing ... one day, nation's cup, short format, fast jump are some alternatives.

Once these are internationally adopted and the new formats are implemented worldwide there will quickly become a public understanding of the different sports.

The new CIC should also be allowed to use dressage to music, more colorful and branded clothing and tack to liven the interest in the sport and test new ideas and rules before they are rolled into CCI competition.

## **CONCLUSION**

It is wonderful to have the opportunity to review the sport with a longer time frame than the urgent reactions that have been needed because of Olympic Games and safety issues in recent years. I am sure that we can have a strong sport at two levels that appeals to both markets and is controlled well by the FEI and its National Federations. I look forward to a good outcome.

Cheers

Geoff Sinclair

Brigadoon, 28 Maddens Lane, Gruyere, 3770, Australia

[geoff@brigadoonhorses.com.au](mailto:geoff@brigadoonhorses.com.au)

**EVENTING COMMITTEE**  
**Consultation process for the 2013 Rules revision**

*One Sport*

It would be a big mistake in my opinion to drop the CIC classes. I think we have near enough now to one sport. If “one sport” and there was a range of distances to use such as in CCI only, I think we would have OCs using the minimum requirements most of the time. There is a problem now with Federations putting on qualifiers that are not up to standard and with CCI only this would probably create a bigger problem again.

As an Official working in the sport, I have no problems working around the different classes and using what suits each venue. The specifications now are getting to the stage where they are easier to understand and use and more relevant throughout the world. I am particularly in favour of the efforts being linked to the distance to control intensity and find it works well also at the smaller venues.

I don't believe the formats are difficult to understand, perhaps it is just the way we are promoting it that is the problem. Athletes seem to understand the difference between CCI and CIC, every one I talk to insist that the longer version must remain and not be shortened even to the extent that major events are now. They seem to understand the relevancy between the classes and I think use CICs well to gain their MERs.

I am not in favour of reducing alternatives at 1\*/2\* levels, we must not lose sight of the fact that the majority of athletes derive much joy just from completing and testing themselves. They are not concerned too much with winning, they just try to be competitive. The way alternatives and options are presented is more the problem, it is important that they are of a similar level and if done correctly help to maintain confidence and trust between horse and rider. This in itself will encourage them to go up the grades with the correct exposure and training to all types of obstacles and tests that they will encounter in their careers.

The difference between classes comes down to better officiating and training and perhaps a stronger stand. I know it is difficult in a lot of situations but OCs need to know what is required with the courses before they attempt to organise CICs etc. I do think that some fences can be shared but technical efforts must be of the correct standard. There is a process to work through to encourage CDs to add unshared efforts to their tracks and perhaps we need to introduce a timeline for this to be done.

The traditional order of tests is vitally important, it is what our sport is all about. I believe we have a horse welfare issue with running the cross-country last. Every time I have witnessed this I have not liked it. The effect of riders pushing their horses to be under time goes against everything we are trying to do to reduce dangerous riding. Having the showjumping last helps the more skilful rider and well trained horse and exposes those who are not.

The CIC-W format should be retained. If you have only “one sport” and then pick and choose which events or formats you want to use you are making the sport more difficult to understand. As a CD I quite like having the challenge of producing a CIC-W course.

It does seem that most people think the eventing qualification system is workable but whether it is achieving the right result is debatable.

Qualifications need to be more performance based rather than just completions. Athletes who wish to remain at their comfortable level are not really worried about performance versus completions.

Qualifications should only be achieved by finishing in the top 50% of finishers, that way there is a bench mark to actual riding ability. Athletes are riding to achieve a qualification, not a performance. Inevitably they are guided by this in their decision making.

Criteria may not be wrong, there is no clear understanding of what is involved in competing at a higher level.

The eventing qualification system is discouraging NFs etc from taking up their responsibility. There needs to be more training to help athletes achieve the correct levels, parents, trainers and sponsors need to recognise the actual ability of their athletes and make sure they are capable of competing at the level they wish, not just achieve a MER and go on.

A one format sport with more emphasis to NFs would ensure that the FEI would lose control of the standards by which athletes obtain MERs.

My feedback is that the technical requirements are okay but perhaps we need to allow 2 clear and 1 with 20 at a CIC or CCI. As suggested above, a more performance based requirement would be much better.

I don't think a slower progression would be bad, some athletes who are in the business of producing horses wouldn't like it but it might produce a better result overall. The only way for them to get a positive experience is to have more state based training for both young riders and new riders to the sport rather than rules and regulations.

A rider licence system may be too subjective and create further problems.

A reverse qualification process could be used but only in the case of repeat offending or clear performance failure during competitions.

The achievement of a MER as a combination is vitally important at the higher levels and at championships.

National competitions could be better integrated as part of the overall qualification process. In our case CICs are always run over the same course as a CNC and there is

absolutely no difference in the standard. Perhaps we could utilise existing FEI Officials on site at a competition to assess this and approve a qualification if needed.

I believe it is the duty of larger NFs to help and assist the smaller nations with an exchange of Officials and administration. It should be quite easy to achieve this.

As a final word, to increase participation in our sport across the board and to help ensure a positive experience, we must consider that many athletes compete to finish an event. They are satisfied with the joy of completion only- *they are the heart and soul of our sport.*





# 2011-07-14 various anonymous responses from IEOC members

Question	IEOC Responses
<p><b>1. Should we just have one sport?</b></p>	<p>By having two types of the sport we are engaging more than one level of horse and rider on a more frequent basis surely this is good for the sport and reaches more individual goals of the lower level riders</p>
	<p>Yes we should and possibly make a bigger spread of the distances etc in each level or have only CIC type for */ ** and then have split at *** in preparation for ****. I don't know that at */ ** the distance and or severity of CCI has that big an impact as typically the CCI would have most of CIC with some additional more difficult fences.</p>
	<p>CCI/CIC: I believe now that the steeplechase and roads and tracks are gone forever, and I think that the current CCI appears to be working well. I agree that the lines are somewhat blurred between the CIC and the CCI, and the suggestion that we allow National Federations to conduct its own events, with a FEI TD and/or a FEI CD appointed to ensure standards are to the required level is a good one.</p>
	<p>Not necessarily, I think the sport is working fine as it is.</p>
	<p>It doesn't really matter as long as the integrity of the CCI3* &amp; CCI4* are maintained, in essence all are prep for the these two</p>
	<p>One Sport needed but then the Qualifications need to be reviewed.</p>
	<p>There is some confusion re the 2 sets of rules.</p>
	<p>Formats: There is no obvious difference in formats CCI/CIC, especially for the non-expert public. If CCIs are to be kept as format, I propose to restrict CCIs to national and international championships and to clearly define their distances as significantly larger than CICs of the same level. I wonder whether today there is a clear definition of the goals to be reached by extended distances. Turning the system into 1 format definitively will make the qualification system more transparent.</p>
	<p>Concerns: Alternatives at 1 / 2 star level: Especially at the 1* level we often have beginners; in order to keep them in the sport, we should take all measures to enable them to complete the competition and therefore offer alternatives at "critical" fences, e.g. water jumps etc.</p>
	<p>Qualification events for international championships on the other hand should reduce the number of alternatives to an absolute minimum in order to avoid qualifications just achieved "on the chicken way".</p>
<p>Discussion points</p>	
<p>CIC = one-day event: this seems to be unrealistic in view of the fact that the number of participants in international events in general will not allow to have the event being limited to 1 day.</p>	
<p>Traditional sequence of event: I am very much in favour of this, since in my eyes a successful competition is only reached with a horse still passing the veterinary control one night after the completion of the cross-country part. In addition there are – to my knowledge – only rare cases of horses being eliminated due to veterinary concerns after the cross country, when that is the last part of the competition.</p>	
<p>CICs for WCs only: I do not understand what the benefit of this</p>	

	regulation should be.
	The main problem in our sport is the existence of two types of competitions: CIC and CCI. The understanding of the difference between these two types of competitions for the public is very difficult. Originally when the CCI had 4 phases (A, B, C, D) it was clear. But now it is not easy to understand for public. It's clear that the tendency is going go the type of CIC. Then it will be better to have this type of competitions only.
<b>2. Should this be a new type of CCI – or as it is?</b>	Format of CIC; for important events the “conventional” schedule (3 days, show jumping last) should be obligatory. Luhmühlen 2011 CCI**** was a very good example.
	I like the two types of sport. It sets goals and ambitions for everyone
	Distance of the CCI3* & CCI4* is the only real differentiation any more - but the distance and a few extra efforts really sorts the wheat from the chaff.
<b>3. Should we get rid of CIC's as they are now, and allow every Nation to run 'equivalent level' qualifying competitions in their own country, using one approved FEI International TD to make sure that the appropriate FEI standards are adhered to?</b>	To have one TD responsible for this both puts far too much power in the hands of one individual and potentially allows those with more spare time rather than skills develop into these roles, which as we have seen stops those who have skills and are seen as a threat.
	Harmonization of national and FEI rules is of utmost
	This would certainly reduce the total cost for countries and make it more attractive for them to run shows and try and qualify horses and riders. Would obviously have an effect on revenue for FEI. Many countries would possibly need to change their local rules to align them with FEI, to accommodate this. Not too big an issues in the bigger scheme of things as would think most are very much aligned now
	A good idea, though it poses many questions. For some nations, it would be very difficult, time wise, to implement changes if the CC is not up to standard.
	No, because the equivalent level, around the world is NOT Being achieved in National classes at the moment. We could certainly simplify the rules and requirements for CICs to make them cheaper to run but they do serve a purpose. One of those purposes is to expose both competitors and officials to the differences of International competition
<b>4. Qualifications ... a very wide subject</b>	
<b>a. Is the system working at the moment?</b>	Difficulties at 1* level; efforts should be made to get national rules into a more consistent framework and to get levels more consistent
	No, too many are qualifying for levels, where they are not ready to compete.
	MER needs to be looked at and NFs must be strong enough to refuse to send competitors abroad who lack competence. (Maybe some sanction???)

	<p>Eventing qualification system - In my opinion this problem will remain as long as there is not a strict quality standard being enforced by course designers. Qualifying results must be reached on courses which have an international standard, and these results must be imported into a data base at the FEI, which is accessible for each show office for control of the qualification of each horse and each rider.</p>
<p><b>b. Does anyone have any alternative / fairer ideas?</b></p>	<p>Probably is, but only think that there should be a system to force horses and riders down, if not achieving at a certain level</p> <p>The system works but is understood by few, particularly riders. I would like to see MER'S even tougher for 1* and 2*. I feel that some National qualifications are not preparing Juniors / Young Riders and Horses sufficiently.</p> <p>Fairer no, but perhaps a total number of qualifying results must be achieved before progressing to CCI 3* and then some further before CCI4*. For instance for each level jump the combination need a certain number of "qualifying results" usually two. Perhaps a combination must achieve 6 FEI qualifying results before being allowed to compete at 3* level and say 10 for 4* (with at least 3 at 3* level).</p> <p>XC courses must be appropriate to the star level to ensure correct progressive education of horse AND rider. When they are run as CIC as part of a National Class there is not always enough difference. They should stand alone as an International. Realise this is expensive so maybe easier said than done</p> <p>Qualifications: In parts of Australia that are fairly isolated (West Australia), getting the required Q is often the main problem, and means riders are faced with a minimum of 4,000+km round trip to Adelaide to gain a Q. Huge costs and time factor involved, with 8,000KM round trip to Sydney/Melbourne. I don't believe we should lower the qualifications; maybe add a couple more variations to give the riders more opportunities. i.e. additional CNCs if a CIC not available?</p> <p>Riders must have completed a CCI1* sometime during their career before going CCI2*. (This would give YR's and Juniors additional experience).The rider gains a CCI licence once a CCI1* has been completed?</p> <p>MER should be as combination of Horse and Rider.</p> <p>Qualification system: In my eyes the biggest problem is at the lowest level: qualification for 1*. Here qualification standards have to be newly formulated.</p> <p>MER: not clear on the national level</p> <p>Discouraging: every rider, trainer, sponsor etc will be eager to participate and to compete at higher classes. So keep control at a level independent of directly involved people.</p> <p>Experience of riders and horses: MER system should automatically enforce gaining of experience. A limitation can be imposed that horses and riders can step up only 1 level per year; e.g. a new horse can only compete in 1* and 2* during the first year.</p>

	<p>Riders' licence: In Germany every rider needs a national licence which ensures his/her qualification for given classes. This should be similar in international competitions.</p> <p>Reverse qualification: I am not in favour of dictating every detail. I believe that existing instruments like yellow card, dangerous riding etc are sufficient to control this. An option could be to limit the validity of qualifying results to a period starting with the horse show and ending at the end of the following year.</p> <p>MER as combination: I believe that this is not needed, since riders who qualified with a different horse should have sufficient experience to self-critically analyse whether they will be able to compete with a new horse qualified under a different rider.</p> <p>Qualifications based on national results: Much effort should be taken in order to get national standards to the level of international shows (German VL = CIC*). Again this is predominantly a task for course designers. When this goal is achieved, I do not see reasons why not to include national results in the qualification scheme.</p> <p>Help for small by large eventing nations: this should be kept at the discretion of the respective countries.</p>
<p><b>5. Is there anything fundamentally wrong with the sport at present; e.g.</b></p>	
<p><b>a. The present age restriction on FEI eventing officials; i.e. "compulsory" retirement after the year of their 70th birthday</b></p>	<p>If we change this, who will make the decision - those who are potentially close to these people and the old boys club????</p> <p>Possibly employ extension process 'by invitation' and the approval of the FEI.</p> <p>Officials: I do believe this system of compulsory retirement at 70 is very outdated, and needs review. Many people of 70 are still working in their chosen profession, and are fit and healthy to continue their Officials appointments. It should be decided by compulsory attendance at Seminars conducted by the FEI, if necessary more frequently, to ascertain the person's fitness to continue, regardless of their age.</p> <p>A never ending discussion: raise the limit to 75 and otherwise leave it to the event organisers</p> <p>No need to change. The Sport needs new people continually coming through with fresh ideas to take the Sport into the future. These officials can always put back to the sport as Jean has. They could be listed as mentors and consultants.</p> <p>This needs to stay in order to encourage new officials to join the ranks. The present system encourages those who have the time and money to pay their own way and does not encourage younger, usually more time and money poor to be part of the sport.</p> <p>Retirement of Officials...yes need to make way for younger people but several who ask me say they can't afford time/money to do this. British Dressage / British Eventing fast tracked top riders and trainers onto List 1 and 2 - but few of them now give up the time to do even a one day event- and then often only at the top competitions.</p>

	OAPs still have a place in the sport. Is retirement at 70 legal?
	I do feel that the compulsory age restriction of 70 is fair, and should continue without exceptions made. My concern in this area is to make opportunity to the younger Judges, TD's and Course Designers in the future.
<b>b. Appointment of officials for Eventing Championships – who is responsible and is it a fair system at present?</b>	Having had the privilege of being a TD at championships, and now not, it is not a transparent process at all. When dropped you get no communication and it is very disheartening, for me having had a disagreement with someone who is on the FEI Eventing committee, it feels that they hold the destiny of our involvement in our sport and are not accountable to reasons for selection or non selection.
	Far too much power sits with the FEI paid staff. What is the process???? Retired officials and members who make comments about officials who are not in their inner group seem to have far too much influence and flaunt it (something that apparently has happened down under and is widely known internally)
	Should be done by an FEI commission with recommendation of 1 judge of previous Championship being kept and the other 2 being changed. CD being selected from the CDs having been responsible for a 4* course in the previous year.
	I agree that there should be a transparent, clear process of appointments to Championships and other Internationally significant events. At present, there is no clear transparent process as to how appointments are made, or why someone is appointed over another person of equal standing etc.
	When was the last time there was a TD or CD at a Championship appointed from outside of Europe? It doesn't happen often and needs to happen much more regularly.
	What is the system? "Jobs for the boys" - it is very difficult to get away from this thought.
	Championship appointments should be more open: FEI /OC /NF??
	It's hard to understand how the FEI makes choices for these responsibilities. Are they selected on the recommendations of the NF's? If so, who at the NF is responsible for recommendations and how do they make them?
<b>c. Should there be a clear structure - with transparency - for these important appointments?</b>	If we look at how many FEI Eventing committee members get appointed it is very biased, where is the development of new officials or younger officials - especially non European.
	Yes
	Yes very much so
	Yes, absolutely

	<p>I would certainly like to see a fair and transparent system used for all important appointments. There seems to be a small group that gets used over and over. I also think there should be a limit to the number of big championships one person can officiate. Most International Eventing judges and TD's spend years and years getting the experience that they hope will put them in a position to be asked to one of these championships, or even to a 4* event. So it would make sense that with so few opportunities in a lifetime, no one should do more than 1 Olympics or WEG!</p>
<p><b>d. Should FEI Eventing officials be made "accountable"?</b></p>	<p>Absolutely in a fair, open transparent manner</p>
	<p>Yes in an ethical but not in a judicial sense</p>
	<p>Believe so yes</p>
	<p>Yes -Transparency for all structures is most important for them to work successfully. Even if the structure is not successful, at least it has been transparent.</p>
	<p>Eventing Officials must be accountable, though I believe the vast majority of them always act in a professional, accountable manner now. There has to be a pathway for complaints and compliments, for suggestions and recommendations to be put forward by riders or other officials in an objective, non vindictive manner. Perhaps a committee could be formed to hear these complaints/recommendations. IEOC would be ideal vehicle for this, along with rider's association's representative.</p>
	<p>Yes - All officials should be open to education and improvement, rather than 'accountable'. (e.g. who TD's the TD?)</p>
	<p>Eventing Officials are accountable, if only to themselves, and it seems a big call for the FEI to make officials more accountable, when the FEIs own record in recent times makes it somewhat 'unaccountable'.</p> <p>Officials should not be randomly overruled by a secret committee. If something goes terribly wrong, a publicly accountable committee of respected officials of the highest FEI level should be appointed to investigate. Perhaps 5 people including two FEI officials from other sports and one senior rider (not from a country involved), their report and findings should be made public and be final and not subject to random veto by the FEI.</p>
	<p>Complaint procedure difficult.....ERA could be involved I feel but Competitors must not rule us. We are volunteers and must be careful we do not end up being legally responsible for our actions. Riders already quick to complain, but it's essential that we listen and respect them.</p>
	<p>I can see only benefit to some system of accountability for officials. This would need to be approached in a careful structure....perhaps use a simple survey card with a number rating and optional comment to be filled in and mailed separately at each event. This could be mandatory for officials and optional for competitors and organizers.</p> <p>I would think that the IEOC should have an important role in this matter and that they could be the ones to receive them and investigate. It</p>

	would seem that this could only help to improve the quality and professionalism.
<b>e. Should this be to the FEI, other Officials, Organising Committees, riders etc?</b>	A neutral body of non eventing and eventing people headed by a non eventing person
	Yes to all.
	Judicial responsibility is with FEI / FNs
	Yes, system should exist where complaints etc should be lodged with the next highest official of the event to deal with it.
<b>f. If not – then should there be a system put in place to allow for complaints etc?</b>	Isn't this the responsibility of Appeal Committee and CAS?
<b>g. If so, who would receive them – and “mediate/investigate”?  Could this be – initially - the IEOC?</b>	No, needs to have neutral people heading it.
	Appeal Committee and CAS
	Yes if above the TD and also all other to be copied to IEOC.
	Why not the IEOC?
	Why not, but the committee of people should be drawn from a wide pool
<b>h. Should the Event Riders Association [ERA] / Professional Event Riders Organisation [PRO in the USA] also be involved?</b>	Yes they are a key part of the sport.
	Should be asked for advice, if needed.
	Do believe so – and through the riders' rep for a specific event / show.
	Yes. Every National Federation should be encouraged to have an Event Riders Association, run by riders.
	Not necessarily these organisations as they represent a small pool of riders, but yes a rider should be part of a review committee.
<b>6. Do you have any other points that you would like to raise?</b>	Course directors how are they chosen, why is there such a bias to Australian people and how do long standing officials who are interested and in some cases have considerably more experience and commercial skills get on this list????
	Avoid too extensive 'autocracy'

	<p>Current Officials system for G-J and change to the way most countries do it. Have an overhaul X-C Judge / President of Ground Jury and then bring in specialists for the Dressage and S-J. Would stimulate the growth of X-C Judges and most certainly in smaller countries. X-C judge would be overall judge together with each specialist judge for that test. Another suggestion would be to allow dispensation in smaller countries i.e. RSA, to allow for the TD to do more classes or sections where numbers are small. Here at times we can have 30 competitors in 3 sections / Classes and need 2 TD's for the job.</p>
	<p>What about the issue of having the same CD for a number of years at the same course. Should we have a ruling that a CD can only be the designer/builder of a course for a certain period of time, before a change, again, to ensure standards? Is it ok to have the same CD, even if they are doing a good job, or, like changing TDs, and Ground Juries, should we have to change our CDs every so many years?</p>
	<p>For CIC's, I would like to see a non competing rider from 3* or 4* take over from the Ground Jury members after the dressage. This would not impede safety and is another set of eyes to run over the CC.</p> <p>For CCI's I would have the President of the Ground Jury stay to complete the team with the CD, TD and Non Competing Rider to officiate.</p> <p>For Games and Championships I would leave it as it is.</p> <p>These ideas are partly cost related but deep down we have to get away from G/J members who either have never ridden Eventing or are past it!</p>
	<p>Why are meeting minutes, e.g. Safety forums, FEI Eventing Committee, etc still highly sanitised, usually very late, and sometimes impossible to get a hold of?</p>
	<p>The Global Education Programme is excellent - but perhaps there is also some 'fast tracking' - too quickly.</p>
	<p>Improve the structure of the FEI Courses and the feedback.</p>
	<p>Bigger nations should help, but not sure how they can do more than at present other than play truly by the FEI rules!!</p>
	<p>The FEI should do more to appoint appropriate Officials to help this.</p>
	<p>I don't understand the system of FEI TD contributions (level 3 and 4stars) when this is paid from the funds of the OC</p>
	<p>Another area of concern is the future education and qualification of officials. The FEI recently added a specific rule requiring that FEI Eventing judges must also hold a certain level of national dressage license in their countries. But they then qualified the rule by saying that there could be some sort of "equivalency". In our country that concept is open to interpretation and has created much debate. None of our new FEI officials now hold any kind of USEF dressage licensing. I</p>

	wonder if this same situation exists in other countries?
--	--

FEI Rules Revision 2013 June 21 2011

We would like to thank the Eventing Committee for the recent communication regarding the 2013 rule change process. We look forward to the Open Forum in Luhmuhlen and would like to share with all members the following thoughts for consideration:-

### **Competition Formats**

It would be very good to amalgamate CICs and CCIs and one and two star level for the following reasons:

- there is little or no difference between them now anyway since there are no longer phases A, B, and C
- the two levels present unnecessary qualification challenges
- CICs do not really have an identity; essentially they are CNCs
- many of the more 'amateur' riders have a goal of riding at a one or two star level whereas 3 star upwards is the preserve of the more 'professional' riders
- we see little reason to have one and two star CICs; they cost OCs a lot more to run than CNCs and they consequently cost more for riders/owners to enter than CNCs
- the two formats are confusing outside the sport
- the horse inspection requirements at CICs are a nightmare for GB to administer correctly and efficiently given the volume of competitors

CIC\*s\*s – we believe that they should remain since they are qualifications for major championships and provide the opportunity for horses to 'maintain' their level of qualification. However, if there is a mechanism whereby these can also be done away with and make NFs responsible for ensuring/validating the ability/competence/experience of horses and riders then we would be supportive of this. There is no doubt that there is confusion between CICs and CCIs in the minds of the public but we are not convinced that this is sufficient reason to change.

However, there is undoubtedly a case to be argued for just one format, the CCI, and to keep the CCI3\*s and CCI4\*s as they are but to adjust the CCI1\*s and CCI2\*s

Suggestion for discussion:

1 star competition – distance 2500m-3500m  
2 star competition – distance 3000m-4000m

Championships

1 star – distance 3000m-4000m  
2 star – distance 3500m-4500m

### **Other factors**

If the decision is to do away with CICs:

Time – time is money (as the expression goes) and so we would like to see the following discussed please:

For 1 & 2 star competitions: have flexibility and not insist that the traditional CCI format continues. Let the OCs choose the format that suits them (see order of tests further in the document). The benefit

of this is that it could allow less time on-event which can only be good for participants, owners, and organisers.

For 3 & 4 star competitions – stay with the existing CCI format

Lead time for introduction – should there be a change there needs to be careful consideration as to how the change is introduced so that OCs have time to make the necessary financial investment and changes and NFs can consider the full implications. Some can react more quickly than others.

### **Order of tests**

1 and 2 star level:

- should be at the choice of the OC, should be run over 2 days max, preferably over 1 day if possible to assist with costs. If on one day then the cross country must be last, if over 2 days then the OC can choose the format to suit their timetable and event.

3 star level if CIC\*\*\*s remain: at OCs discretion but if over 1 day then the cross country must be last in the interests of horse welfare

World Cup: history has demonstrated that this series is not popular in GB; riders are not supportive (much higher prize money – first prize of £6k in EWC v £850 in CNC - does not attract riders from the traditional format of dressage, jumping, cross country), events are not very supportive given the FEI Conditions which are financially too demanding, and the public do not really care about it since it has bumped along the bottom since it started.

### **MER**

We still believe that insisting on clear rounds on the cross country for all qualifications is not a good idea. The reasons for this remain as before plus it seems that there are occasions where CDs are, for example, numbering fences separately rather than as a combination (a/b/c) in order to facilitate clear rounds in CIC\*\*\*s. We feel that this is not good practice and there are instances when competitors will take alternatives/slow routes thereby avoiding a particular question in order to obtain a MER. Point of principle for the Committee to consider

Another option for consideration – should it be felt that one format, the CCI, is the way forward and that NFs are responsible for ensuring that their own competitions and competitors are of a standard to give MERs that have value, is there a solution whereby an independent party can visit national courses, particularly at 38 level to ensure that they are up to standard?

Addressing the questions asked in the circulated document:

- the only way to ensure that riders take horses to competitions with the relevant experience is to increase the MERs. This is a big step and we feel needs full discussion before going any action is taken. We are not convinced that this approach is correct or will achieve the right result
- combining MERs, rider licenses, education, and NF responsibility, is key
- cost of the sport is another element to be considered, we must not price the sport too high
- if there is only one format in the future the MERs should become more easily understood provided NFs are honest
- riders have to assume responsibility for their actions
- performance based downgrading for horses and riders should be introduced
- larger NFs should assist smaller NFs if wanted

## **Other**

Maximum permitted top spread at 1 star level is too much, it gives a very flat fence and so we believe that it should be reduced to 1.20m

Why do we need to insist on spurs in the dressage? Tradition is not a good enough reason any longer since there are 'dummy' spurs in use. It is a rule which can be done away with

Rider licenses – we feel that these should be introduced at some stage and they can assist with the issue of MERs

CIC\*\*\* format should be available for specific competitions if it is felt that any such competitions will be of genuine benefit to the sport as a whole

Fixtures – not a rule matter but it would be good if there is a FEI Fixtures Protocol to avoid clashes

Reconsideration of the automatic 21 penalties for the activation of a safety device/mechanism; the reasons for this request have been explained/shared several times in the last 2 years plus there is no doubt that this rule impacts on cross country course design. The primary reason for the request to reconsider is that officials have no control over the mechanism, it is not a black and white science and put officials in a very difficult situation. This situation will be particularly difficult at a major international competition and it is strongly felt that this is an unfair position for officials to find themselves in

MES, CE, British Eventing      July 2011

**Da:** [Christian Landolt](#)  
**A:** ["Giuseppe Della Chiesa"](#); ["Catrin Norinder"](#)  
**Cc:** ["Jean Mitchell"](#); [andygriffiths\\_uk@yahoo.com](mailto:andygriffiths_uk@yahoo.com)  
**Data:** domenica 17 luglio 2011 21:46:46

---

**Dear All**

Firstly, thank you for giving us an opportunity to air our views regarding the potential new rules. Here are some of my thoughts:

#### 1.CCI vs. CIC

I believe both format have their place in our sport today. It is clear that the CCI is the ultimate in our sport and must be preserved. The CIC is a useful format and is vital to ensure "foreign views" on each event which in turn ensures some quality and standard control. I would at this stage make a suggestion: The CCI being the pinnacle of our sport they are quite rightly most of the time of maximum dimensions and difficulty. Course designers do not like their event to be a dressage competitions and so often build tough tracks. With that in mind, it is can be difficult to find an event which is suitable as a first time for the level. Therefore I would see the CIC as a stepping stone towards the CCI, in the sense that the dimensions have to be respected, yet the technicality could be on the softer side enabling younger horses and athletes to begin at the level. In such event I would not recommend the use of alternatives. Bearing this in mind I would advocate that CIC gives the MER for the CCI of the same level but only CCI results give MER for the higher level.

I do not see any conflict in rules between the two formats.

To leave CIC as national competitions only would surely have an impact on the standard of horses and athletes coming to CCI, but for a handful of countries.

At CCI on a horse welfare ground, I would urge to maintain the order of the tests as we have it!

Finally, each sport has its intricacies we therefore must not let the public opinion dictate what is right or wrong for us. If they are interested, they will inform themselves appropriately.

#### 2.MER

As mentioned previously, CIC only to qualify for the CCI of same level. CCI to qualify for CIC of the level above.

I would say only CCI to give MER, and ask for two "qualifying results". In view of the ever improving standard, I would also view positively the tightening of requirements for each test

I would like to see that for 4\* level, MER to be achieved as a combination horse and athlete.

I believe an education program – presented by top trainers, riders or judges - should be put in place for NF, trainers, riders, owners as well as officials regarding the acceptable way of riding XC. Maybe at 1\* and

2\* the German way of marking the XC round is worth considering and should be part of the MER?

Various:

1. I would be grateful if the roles of judges during the Jumping tests at 3-4\* could be clarified, or even if the whole GJ is needed. All too often there are too many people in the judges box, and the jumping judge takes over regardless. In such situation, the members of the GJ are superfluous and maybe could actually go home earlier.
2. Due to the physical demands of our duties, I would support the maintenance of the 70yo age limit for our officials.
3. In our FEI courses, I would welcome the introduction of the role play of a crisis management situation, in order to prepare us all calmly to the eventuality of such incident.
4. In event of fatality, I feel some counselling should be offered to the officials affected.
5. I would appreciate proper debriefings as a routine, possibly including the rider's rep, as well as some structured feedback to the GJ/TD/CD in order to help us raise our game.
6. Finally, if Officials do not show the requested knowledge and standard, I believe a system of demotion should be in place and be used! For this, I believe the riders should have a clearer and easier way to have their voice heard.

Thank you again for this opportunity, and I hope that any anonymous reply will be ignored, as we all need to stand up for what we believe in.

Best wishes

Christian

Federation Equestre Internationale

June 2011

## EVENTING COMMITTEE Consultation process for the 2013 Rules revision

The Eventing Committee chaired by Giuseppe Della Chiesa, consisting of Anne-Mette Binder Deputy Chairman, Clayton Fredericks (AUS), Robert Kellerhouse (USA), Alec Lochore (GBR) and Pierre Michelet (FRA), together with the FEI Eventing Department would like to collect views from all parties involved and open a discussion on the main topics that could be part of the statutory Rules revision for 2013.

For this reason 3 Open Forums for Eventing will be organized:

1. Luhmühlen (GER) during the European Championships **Thursday 24 August 2011** after Dressage
2. Guadalajara (MEX) during the Pan Am Games Eventing on **Friday 21 October 2011**
3. Australia November 2011 or New Zealand early 2012 date and place to be confirmed

In order to prepare the discussion topics for these forums the Committee wish to present the following document for review by the NFs, OCs, Riders and Officials and would very much like to receive feed- back **by 18 July 2011**.

The feedback from all parties is very much appreciated to allow full involvement by all for the future development of the Eventing Sport.

The intention is to start an overall consultation process to take place until **May 2012** in order to prepare the needed rules revision and changes for presentation to the FEI GA in November 2012 for implementation **1 January 2013**.

Your initial views on the following points to be discussed are much appreciated:

### 1. COMPETITION FORMATS (CIC-CCI)

This issue has been much discussed inside and outside the Eventing Committee and it has become apparent that with the current evolution of the sport after the deletion of the Steeple-Chase and roads and tracks maintaining a clear difference between the two formats (CIC-CCI) is becoming increasingly difficult.

Hence the questions:

- Is it still relevant for the international sport of Eventing to keep two different competition formats? *yes*
- If we retain the two different competition formats should there be a clearer difference between the formats?

*There is a clear difference there just needs to be better promotion of the differences*

- Is the flexibility we currently have with the two formats a positive attribute and if so how do we ensure that the two formats remain different?

*ODE National, 3DE International. But the standard of National ODE's MUST consistently be to FEI dimensions, rules & regs*

- Does having the two formats create confusion around the different rules?

*Not if 3DE's were International and ODE's were National at the correct standard*

- Do we need two formats to ensure we maintain robust MER principles? Or could the overall structure of “qualifications – minimum requirements” be simplified by restructuring the competition formats.

Should the sport be concerned that:

- The specificity of each format is often difficult to understand for the insiders and nearly impossible for the general public.

CIC & CCI could be replaced with other terms. e.g. Tour Eventing -ODE and Grad Prix or Grand Slam -3DE (similar to tennis)

- Are there any small changes that could be made to simplify and strengthen the sport? (i.e. minimize alternatives at 1&2 star level, ...)

Don't minimize at CCI. Even at 1\* level the CCI should be the top horses of the sport at the level. Strengthen the 1\* & 2\* levels

- Especially at the lower levels (1&2 star) distances and number of efforts in some cases tend to blend together and the only difference is often represented by a loop and maybe one or two more fences.

1\* & 2\* are not really lower levels especially in developing countries. The CCI1\* & 2\* could have longer/stronger CC?

- Maintaining at international level the two formats requires a greater level of complexity in rules and regulations

many sports have complexity of rules & regulations we just need clearer terms of the basic rules. Other sports don't change the basics

Your initial views on the following points to be discussed are much appreciated:

- Could the international sport of Eventing be defined as “one sport” based on the current CCI format leaving the one day (CIC) to be used at national level only? would work for AUS. But care needs to be taken that sub-standard national level events are not allowed for horses or riders to compete at CCI when they don't have the experience or ability
- Is the tradition order of tests important or not – does the Dressage, Cross-Country, Jumping order of tests represent eventing and does it have any influence on the public perception of “horse welfare” ?  
very little effect on the public perception of welfare
- If there was a single format should the CIC format be retained at 3 star level for certain special competitions i.e. the right to retain the format for WC's etc?  
if ODE's were National and 3DE were International the WC final should be 3DE. Maybe a Nations cup?  
Each NF can nominate a team from CNC events but the rider/horse must still have 3DE MER's

## 2. QUALIFICATIONS OF ATHLETES & HORSES (MER)

It is agreed that the international Eventing “qualification system” has had and currently has a huge impact on all involved in the sport.

It has often been criticized for being too complicated and often misleading for the wrong perception that having obtained a qualification for a higher level automatically would imply “competence to compete at that level”.

The change of definition from Qualification Result (QR) to MER (Minimum Eligibility Requirements) does not seem to have improved the situation and National Federations still find it difficult to reject an entry to an international competition by riders/horses that have obtained the MER also if they are not considered competent to participate at that certain level.

**Hence the question if the Eventing qualification system is fulfilling the right role in the sport today and if not, how it could be improved.**

The overall qualification system has often been perceived to be too complicated and the original policy of using the same criteria for horses and riders has made it very difficult to make justice of the great variability of cases.

After ten years of the current system it might be useful to reconsider the whole system and it's foundation.

ODE's should qualify for ODEs. 3DE should use 3DE qualifications + ODEs. But each level is currently different for FEI making it too complicated. the AUS MER's for national are the same for all levels.

So suggest: for ODE 3 x MERs to move up a level (1 may have 20 CC)

for 3DE 1 x MER at CCI to move up a level+ 1 x CNC establishment at entered level.

e.g. To go CCI2\* - 1 x CCI1\* MER + 1 x CNC2\* MER (they would have been required to have at least 3 x CNC1\* MER's)  
All horses and riders MUST have a CCI1\* MER. (presently this can be skipped)

To streamline the discussion on the review of the Eventing qualification procedure your initial views on the following would be greatly appreciated:

- Is the current Eventing qualification system achieving the right result ?  
Maybe not at 2\* (both CIC2\* & CCI2\*)
- Is the meaning of "minimum eligibility requirement (MER)" clear to national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors ?  
Getting there, but every time the terminology changes it makes it harder
- Is the Eventing qualification system discouraging national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors to take up their responsibility ?  
no
- If we adopted a one format sport and gave more emphasis to NF's would we lose the control of the standards by which athletes obtain MER  
Yes in some NF's
- Are technical requirements for MER strong enough ?  
Yes except for CIC2\* ( currently only 1 x CIC1\*)
- How important is it for the sport of Eventing to ensure that new horses and riders get the right positive experience before stepping up the levels also if this would necessarily mean a slower progression for horses and riders ?

Yes very important. New horses, riders & NFs may need a slower progression. NF's must have all CNC1\* & above at current CIC standard

- Could a different approach for riders and horses improve the system (riders licenses) ?  
It is just changing the terminology and every change takes time for understanding
- Could a "reverse qualification" (downgrading) in the case of a clear failure of performance improve the system and increase the level of responsibility of all involved ?  
Yes, this should happen. If common sense prevailed 2 or 3 failures at a level should alert the rider that they or the horse needs to go back a level but doesn't always happen.  
### Please see suggestion at the end of the document.
- How important is the achievement of a MER as a combination ?  
For a 'new rider' important
- Could performances at national competitions be better integrated as part of the overall qualification process ?  
Yes
- Could larger nations assist smaller nations to establish better national qualification structures and processes ?

Yes financial implications should be considered. A budget for the support of developing nations to access expert advice and checking of dimensions/rules is needed.

### 3. OTHER TOPICS

The Committee welcomes any other topics proposed by NFs, Riders, Officials, Organizers or others that could be included for discussion point at the Open Forums. It would be appreciated if these topics proposed could be of general interest and/or related to the 2013 Rules revision to all involved.

Eventing NSW appreciates the opportunity to have a 'voice' in the decision making and the structure of this document it is relevant and very helpful to the future of the sport of Eventing. We suggest that consideration could be given to an experienced 'Rider' join the GJ from the Official course walk and only the President of the GJ stays for the complete event. Additional judges/members are not required for CC & Jumping phases.

We look forward to reading your comments and thank you for forwarding your comments and proposals by **18 July 2011** addressed to the FEI Eventing Department, Catrin Norinder ([catrin.norinder@fei.org](mailto:catrin.norinder@fei.org))

Yours sincerely,

FEI Eventing Committee:

Giuseppe Della Chiesa (Chairman); Anne-Mette Binder, Clayton Fredericks, Robert Kellerhouse; Alec Lochore, Pierre Michelet.

### We suggest penalties are accumulated over 6 starts. Any combination that accumulates 200 points (Cross-Country only) MUST go back a level and re-establish the MER's.

20 pens - 1 refusal CC. 40 pens - 2 refusal CC. 60 pens - 3 refusals CC. 80 pens - Fall of Rider CC

100 pens - Fall of horse.

125 pens - Dangerous riding penalties (this is only for dangerous riding CC ...not a yellow card for other reasons)

- Could the international sport of Eventing be defined as “one sport” based on the current CCI format leaving the one day (CIC) to be used at national level only?

We can imagine to have CCI( the longer format) for international competitions and the CIC( the short format) for national competitions. The mission of CIC will be to prepare horses and riders in the relevant level to compete in international

- Is the tradition order of tests important or not – does the Dressage, Cross-Country, Jumping order of tests represent eventing and does it have any influence on the public perception of “horse welfare” ?

The CCI must keep the original spirit of our sport: dressage first followed by cross country(long distance with some fences) and finished by show jumping; this last test must show the capacity of the horse to have a quick physical recuperation.

The CIC must be shorter than CCI and the test should be :dressage , show jumping( more technical and difficult than in CCI) and cross country. For me CIC could appear like a “training” before the international competition.

We can also imagine to organize national championships with CCI, good solution to prepare the international events .

It is necessary to have the same rule in the same level in CCI and CIC except for the distance, the number of fences and the technical difficulties in cross country and in show jumping.

My proposal higher could simplify the process of qualifications and it could be more easy for everybody to understand the spirit and the rules

- If there was a single format should the CIC format be retained at 3 star level for certain special competitions i.e. the right to retain the format for WC's etc? In the World Cup the competition is organized on 3 days. It is better to keep CIC(one day) for national eventing.

- Is the current Eventing qualification system achieving the right result ?

In general yes

- Is the meaning of “minimum eligibility requirement (MER)” clear to national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors ?

I think that it's clear enough

- Is the Eventing qualification system discouraging national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors to take up their responsibility ?

They have to accept the system and to ask changes if necessary

- If we adopted a one format sport and gave more emphasis to NF's would we lose the control of the standards by which athletes obtain MER

no

- Are technical requirements for MER strong enough ?

For me yes

- How important is it for the sport of Eventing to ensure that new horses and riders get the right positive experience before stepping up the levels also if this would necessarily mean a slower progression for horses and riders ?

It's important to give enough time between the official qualification for one higher step and the new level: for instance if you are qualified in Mai to go in \*\* you have to wait until the next year to be allowed to run in \*\* : during the second part of the year the eventings are often more difficult than during the first part and we have problems with new qualified riders or horses.

- Could a different approach for riders and horses improve the system (riders licenses) ?

- Could a "reverse qualification" (downgrading) in the case of a clear failure of performance improve the system and increase the level of responsibility of all involved ?

yes

- How important is the achievement of a MER as a combination ?

- Could performances at national competitions be better integrated as part of the overall qualification process ?

yes

- Could larger nations assist smaller nations to establish better national qualification structures and processes ?

Yes ,sure

2011-07-17 Sylvia Roberts (AUS)

---

From: Sylvia Roberts [<mailto:sylvia.r@bigpond.net.au>]  
Sent: dimanche 17 juillet 2011 15:16  
To: Catrin Norinder  
Cc: Jean Mitchell  
Subject: Consultation process for 2013

**FEI Consultation process feedback.**

**Thank you for giving me the opportunity to provide some input to the consultation process. I think this is a great idea to give all FEI Officials a say. Well done.**

**I have outlined some of my thoughts below.**

It would be easier for our sport if we only had one format – CCI – as at the moment it is confusing for competitors, organising committees and the general public.

If the FEI does change to the one format we need to ensure that they maintain a stringent qualifying system (MER) to ensure our athletes are adequately qualified for each level.

As a FEI course designer and National Technical Delegate I all too often see cross country courses below standard in dimension and technicality for the required level of competition. Therefore these athletes gain qualifying results (MER) over courses which do NOT prepare them for upgrades. If we are to use national events as MER for FEI CCI events the FEI would need to ensure that each of these events meet some type of suitable qualifying requirement.

Possible requirements could be;

- FEI TD & CD
- The cross country courses at 1 & 2 star need to meet a minimum requirement of at least 50% or up to 75% to be in the maximum dimensions range as per the cross country course guidelines. (I have just been the TD at a National event for 2\* where only one single fence and two complexes were up to 2\* standard. All other fences were well below standard in technicality and dimensions. Most were of a 1\*

standard and some even below. This gives an athlete a qualifying 2 star run over a potential 1 star course.

- Minimise alternatives at these levels.
- If they are not able to jump clear over these courses at a minimum of at least two different events then they should not be able to upgrade. By stating they should be different events/courses would eliminate the possibility of getting qualifying results at courses which are familiar to the athlete or a training ground for them which they could be using often.

I would prefer to maintain the traditional order of tests as I believe that this is what eventing is all about. The show jumping becomes the climax for all persons involved, competitors and spectators alike.

Introducing riders' licenses' could possibly give a clearer picture of the riders capabilities at each level similar to a grading card for horses. eg. a licence which gets upgraded when the rides and horses reach each level – 1,2 or 3 star.

The downgrading system is a very good idea as consistent bad performances need to be monitored better – regular falls or refusals on course. I know of a couple of competitors who fall regularly but as they do not appear to be riding dangerously the officials are not in a position to stop them competing. This type of system might help to prevent a dangerous situation.

The promotion process for Officials at FEI level is also crucial to our sport. Not all countries are able to give officials adequate training and competition experience at a quality events. The GEP is an excellent program and I was fortunate to be involved in this program. Exchange programs and peer reviews systems for all our officials is possibly the only way we can ensure that they have the required experience and qualifications to do their roles correctly.

Sylvia Roberts

FEI Course Designer and National Technical Delegate.

Australia

17/7/11

---

From: lorna alexander [mailto:lorna.alexander1@btinternet.com]  
Sent: dimanche 17 juillet 2011 18:43  
To: Catrin Norinder  
Cc: Jean Mitchell; Andy Griffiths; alec@musketeer.co.uk  
Subject: Re: FEI Eventing - Consultation Process for 2013 Rules Revision

Response to consultation regarding the proposed 2013 rules changes  
From Ronald Alexander GB

The FEI has never really formally spelt out the purposes or differences between a CIC and a CCI, apart from the obvious ones of distance and the number of efforts, however the difference in standard is implicit in that minimum results in CICs are required before competing in CCIs of the same level. Most countries, apart from some in Western Europe and the States, do not have the benefit of a National programme of competitions going all the way up to CNC 3star. International competitions begin at CNC 1 Star level with no national competitions and in these countries the CICs have a vital training role in providing an introduction to each star level, and should be designed accordingly, before moving on to the pinnacle of the sport – a CCI. I believe competitors support the retention of CCIs as the supreme test of balancing fitness and skill, developed over the years of training, that has made the sport of Eventing what it is, and I hope the sport will resist the pressures to amalgamate the CIC and CCI.

I can see no problem with Eventing being defined as One sport despite having two types of competition. After all golf has its “Matchplay”, “Strokeplay”, “Four Ball”, “Greensome”, etc. types of competition, and cricket has its Test Matches, 50 Over games and 20/20 matches, and yet both golf and cricket would surely be defined as one sport, and each type of these competitions has only served to widen the support within each sport, rather than diminishing it.

As regards the order of tests, it is difficult to imagine dressage being anything but first, and whether show jumping precedes or follows Cross Country in a CIC format I don't consider important, so long as, if Cross country is held first, then there must be sufficient time for horses to show stiffening up, etc. before a Veterinary inspection before the show jumping.

As I very much hope there won't be a single format, I won't argue the point about the World Cup, etc., except to say that it is a clearly different competition yet again. This is not a training competition, and therefore the normal design criteria of the CIC being an introduction to the level does not apply.

Finally, to answer the 3<sup>rd</sup> point of "should the sport be concerned that: Especially at the lower levels distance and efforts tend to blend together..." If it was understood that the CIC was the introduction to a level, and the CCI the final test at that level, then it would be a bad CCI that simply had two extra fences on a loop extra over the CIC. There should be a lot of fine tuning along the way.

If the distinction between the CIC and CCI is as I have outlined and I believe it to be, then this is a very useful tool in the training and development of the Sport, and the failure has been that C.D.s, T.D.s, and G.J.s have not been properly briefed at seminars, etc. about the purposes of the two formats.

Ronald Alexander

2011-07-18 Barry Roycroft (AUS)

Da: [Barry Roycroft](#)  
A: [Sandra Lecoultre](#)  
Cc: [Catrin Norinder](#); [Giuseppe Della Chiesa](#)  
Oggetto: Re: FEI Eventing - Consultation Process for 2013 Rules Revision  
Data: lunedì 18 luglio 2011 07:02:20

---

Hi Sandra,

I think the system on the whole is working well, However the continuous changing of some rules and terminology is the thing that causes confusion, When you had to Qualify everyone knew what it meant. Along comes MER and people said what is that!!!

Making it compulsory to have no faults has meant many riders refuse to go straight and take options which are often too soft, and a false qualification is achieved. Allow 1 mistake during the period of qualifying. A reverse Qual. system could work and be worthwhile. Please keep the long and short format, but reduce the cost of CIC's .eg halve the TD fee, Reduce FEI fee,s for CIC's. Do not add more costs to riders by having a License fee on top of the FEI fee for horse and riders. These are a few of my idea's, it is mid winter in Australia and eventing is in recess.

Barry

Chair eventing Victoria

**Answers and Ideas of the GER NF to the Eventing Consultation Process**  
**- Draft -**

### 1. COMPETITION FORMATS (CIC-CCI)

- Is it still relevant for the international sport of Eventing to keep two different competition formats?  
*We think that the current system is working well and the FEI standards set by the rules for CIC/CCI are fine. There are no real alternatives:  
 If putting both together you will still need to differentiate between the two lengths, then it is more confusing than it is now as riders & officials are working well with the current system.  
 If deleting the CICs and replacing it by CNCs there won't be enough starters in Germany and less "better to sell" international competitions. Furthermore we better keep the qualifying system as it is.*
- If we retain the two different competition formats should there be a clearer difference between the formats? Is the flexibility we currently have with the two formats a positive attribute and if so how do we ensure that the two formats remain different?  
*We suggest to have real differences in the lengths between both because the CIC should be the preparation for CCI  
 Furthermore the CIC should be made easier and cheaper to organise:*
  1. The Horse inspection to be carried out only by Vet and TD.
  2. No rule to have a preparation 20x60m arena for dressage
  3. Allow and simplify to organise "One- Day-Events" as FEI CICs also in future
- Does having the two formats create confusion around the different rules?  
*Actually not, but please adjust the officiating requirements for Officials and don't differentiate between CIC and CCI functions.*
- Do we need two formats to ensure we maintain robust MER principles? Or could the overall structure of "qualifications – minimum requirements" be simplified by restructuring the competition formats.  
*It works well as it now, no change required. Due to gaining experiences in CICs the combinations largely are well prepared for the levels.*
- Should the sport be concerned that:
  - The specificity of each format is often difficult to understand for the insiders and nearly impossible for the general public.  
*No. It is all "Eventing" with different formats. Championship format (CCI) and Preparation format (CIC).*
  - Are there any small changes that could be made to simplify and strengthen the sport? (i.e. minimize alternatives at 1&2 star level, ...)  
*Especially at the lower levels (1&2 star) distances and number of efforts in some cases tend to blend together and the only difference is often represented by a loop and maybe one or two more fences.*
- Maintaining at international level the two formats requires a greater level of complexity in rules and regulations  
*We are used to that!*

Your initial views on the following points to be discussed are much appreciated:

- Could the international sport of Eventing be defined as "one sport" based on the current CCI format leaving the one day (CIC) to be used at national level only?  
*It absolutely makes sense to have the current CICs on an internationally comparable level. This is really important for the qualification process especially in those countries that have not enough riders to fill up demanding competitions on the different levels. GBR is an exemption!!!*
- Is the tradition order of tests important or not – does the Dressage, Cross-Country, Jumping order of tests represent eventing and does it have any influence on the public perception of "horse welfare" ?

*We should allow both orders for CICs in the future and leave the decision to the relevant OC. There should be the possibility to organise a "One-Day-Event" esp. on 1\* and 2\*-level.*

- If there was a single format should the CIC format be retained at 3 star level for certain special competitions i.e. the right to retain the format for WC's etc?  
*Yes! But not only for that! It is very important to let the horses and riders get enough experiences on CIC level without too much mileage. The comparability is important!*

## **2. QUALIFICATIONS OF ATHLETES & HORSES (MER)**

It is agreed that the international Eventing "qualification system" has had and currently has a huge impact on all involved in the sport.

It has often been criticized for being too complicated and often misleading for the wrong perception that having obtained a qualification for a higher level automatically would imply "competence to compete at that level".

The change of definition from Qualification Result (QR) to MER (Minimum Eligibility Requirements) does not seem to have improved the situation and National Federations still find it difficult to reject an entry to an international competition by riders/horses that have obtained the MER also if they are not considered competent to participate at that certain level.

**Hence the question if the Eventing qualification system is fulfilling the right role in the sport today and if not, how it could be improved.**

The overall qualification system has often been perceived to be too complicated and the original policy of using the same criteria for horses and riders has made it very difficult to make justice of the great variability of cases.

After ten years of the current system it might be useful to reconsider the whole system and its foundation.

To streamline the discussion on the review of the Eventing qualification procedure your initial views on the following would be greatly appreciated:

- Is the current Eventing qualification system achieving the right result ?  
*Yes – horses and riders mostly are well prepared.*
- Is the meaning of "minimum eligibility requirement (MER)" clear to national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors ? *Yes – more or less.*  
Is the Eventing qualification system discouraging national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors to take up their responsibility ?  
*No – not in our country..*
- If we adopted a one format sport and gave more emphasis to NF's would we lose the control of the standards by which athletes obtain MER  
*Yes.*
- Are technical requirements for MER strong enough ?  
*Yes! Even a bit too strong, except for CIC2\* where we think there could be one more MER.*  
*We suggest to differentiate between a stop (punished with 20 penalties) and a run-out/technical refusal (punished with only 10 penalties) so that an MER is less than 20 penalties at obstacles – irrelevant whether it is the CIC or the CCI. A run-out happens very easily (and often is wanted by the course designers!) and horses shouldn't have to travel thousands of kms in the lorry to fulfil the standards. A stop shows that a horse should not move up to the next level same as two run-outs.*  
*Another topic: A CCI2\* MER should be usable for CCI3\* qualification for the lifetime of the horse – only the CIC3\* results must be up to date.*

- How important is it for the sport of Eventing to ensure that new horses and riders get the right positive experience before stepping up the levels also if this would necessarily mean a slower progression for horses and riders ? *Current rules are fine*
- Could a different approach for riders and horses improve the system (riders licenses) ? *No, but please keep the possibility of exemptions for qualified riders.*
- Could a “reverse qualification” (downgrading) in the case of a clear failure of performance improve the system and increase the level of responsibility of all involved ? *Yes, but depends on the case.*
- How important is the achievement of a MER as a combination ? *Important for beginners, not important for professionals.*
- Could performances at national competitions be better integrated as part of the overall qualification process ? *Difficult with the standards. Ok as it is.*
- Could larger nations assist smaller nations to establish better national qualification structures and processes ? *How?*

### **3. OTHER TOPICS**

*Art. 522.2.4 Fly shields*

*Fly shields should be allowed for the dressage by the rules (as in the rules for dressage events)*

*Art 510.1.1 Change of horses after closing date of entries*

*Due to many international competitions riders have to be more flexible with the choice which horse needs what competition even less then 4 weeks before the event. Usually organisers are ignoring this rule but unfortunately some stick to it producing unused costs for the riders/owners.*

*Add CIC4\* to the different levels and have the possibility to invite good enough riders for special “Grand Prix” competitions.*

*Delete the starting box as it makes many horses nervous, but keep the way of starting maybe with a timeframe of 20 sek..*

*Have the finish line in XC 15-30m after the last fence.*

*Find a better solution for the circling rule and the use of alternative obstacles it is confusing and not understood by most of the riders. We think it is a topic for the course designers’ meeting.*

*Yellow Card: Sometimes it would be better to have the possibility to fine someone for dangerous riding and 25 penalties without the rule to give a yellow card as well. The Ground Jury should have the possibility to decide in certain cases to do without a yellow card (Fritz OE’s cases).*

*The sizes of sponsors’ logos at saddlery and dress are less practical for round or oval logos. Please delete the sizes of the vertical and horizontal line and leave it with the overall size (e.g. 200cm<sup>2</sup> instead of 10x20cm).*

18/07/2011- Philine Ganders-Meyer (after consultation with Hans Melzer, Rüdiger Schwarz, Chris Bartle, Fritz Otto-Erley, Mathias Otto-Erley)

## **1. COMPETITION FORMATS (CIC-CCI)**

**This issue has been much discussed inside and outside the Eventing Committee and it has become apparent that with the current evolution of the sport after the deletion of the Steeple-Chase and roads and tracks maintaining a clear difference between the two formats (CIC-CCI) is becoming increasingly difficult.**

**Hence the questions:**

**Is it still relevant for the international sport of Eventing to keep two different competition formats?**

Yes and no. It depends on how we want develop our sport. There are many variables to consider: horses, competitors, organizations, federations of countries, country financial situation and European financial situation, etc.

2 different levels are very important. But these 2 levels need to be totally different to stimulate riders, organizations, officials, etc.

**If we retain the two different competition formats should there be a clearer difference between the formats?**

Yes there should be a clear difference and a way to protect those riders who want to be in a professional level.

**Is the flexibility we currently have with the two formats a positive attribute and if so how do we ensure that the two formats remain different?**

It is in fact a positive attribute. Today the financial cost to organize CCI competition is much higher than a CIC. In many countries it is very difficult to organize a CCI competition because of all requirements and financial investments.

For riders and horses a CCI is more physically demanding competition which makes safety very important. Among that many things can be discussed and if the security is so important to this sport the stringency increasing of MER for CIC and CCI are very important.

**Does having the two formats create confusion around the different rules?**

As the system is I think so. The rules should be separated, an easy and good understanding.

**Do we need two formats to ensure we maintain robust MER principles? Or could the overall structure of “qualifications – minimum requirements” be simplified by restructuring the competition formats.**

**Should the sport be concerned that:**

**The specificity of each format is often difficult to understand for the insiders and nearly impossible for the general public.**

Yes

**Are there any small changes that could be made to simplify and strengthen the sport? (i.e. minimize alternatives at 1&2 star level, ...)**

Yes

**Especially at the lower levels (1&2 star) distances and number of efforts in some cases tend to blend together and the only difference is often represented by a loop and maybe one or two more fences.**

Agree

**Maintaining at international level the two formats requires a greater level of complexity in rules and regulations**

All questions or statements posted above are relevant and important. I think this sport need more objectivity. Is overcomplicating, often with rules between levels that make no sense as 1 star and 2 star. I think the levels should be clearly defined.

**Your initial views on the following points to be discussed are much appreciated:**

**Could the international sport of Eventing be defined as “one sport” based on the current CCI format leaving the one day (CIC) to be used at national level only?**

I think so. I completely agree, although it has financial repercussions for those who normally organize CIC.

NF must have more responsibility for the evolution of this modality.

**Is the tradition order of tests important or not – does the Dressage, Cross-Country, Jumping order of tests represent eventing and does it have any influence on the public perception of “horse welfare” ?**

On y opinion the order is correct. I think the welfare of animals is well protected.

**If there was a single format should the CIC format be retained at 3 star level for certain special competitions i.e. the right to retain the format for WC’s etc?**

## **2. QUALIFICATIONS OF ATHLETES & HORSES (MER)**

**It is agreed that the international Eventing “qualification system” has had and currently has a huge impact on all involved in the sport.**

**It has often been criticized for being too complicated and often misleading for the wrong perception that having obtained a qualification for a higher level automatically would imply “competence to compete at that level”.**

**The change of definition from Qualification Result (QR) to MER (Minimum Eligibility Requirements) does not seem to have improved the situation and National Federations still find it difficult to reject an entry to an international competition by riders/horses that have obtained the MER also if they are not considered competent to participate at that certain level.**

**Hence the question if the Eventing qualification system is fulfilling the right role in the sport today and if not, how it could be improved.**

**The overall qualification system has often been perceived to be too complicated and the original policy of using the same criteria for horses and riders has made it very difficult to make justice of the great variability of cases.**

**After ten years of the current system it might be useful to reconsider the whole system and its foundation.**

**To streamline the discussion on the review of the Eventing qualification procedure your initial views on the following would be greatly appreciated:**

**Is the current Eventing qualification system achieving the right result?**

Probably not! Need to be reviewed. Need more objectivity.

**Is the meaning of “minimum eligibility requirement (MER)” clear to national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors?**

No, is not clear. It's confusing.

**Is the Eventing qualification system discouraging national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors to take up their responsibility?**

Yes.

**If we adopted a one format sport and gave more emphasis to NF's would we lose the control of the standards by which athletes obtain MER**

If the national federations are responsible for their actions, work more rational and professionally, monitor and send the national results for FEI, I do not think there will be loss of control of the MER.

**Are technical requirements for MER strong enough?**

I think it could be more demanding. Often the results do not match the quality of the horse or the quality of the rider.

**How important is it for the sport of Eventing to ensure that new horses and riders get the right positive experience before stepping up the levels also if this would necessarily mean a slower progression for horses and riders?**

I agree, provided that all participants in the sport were involved with training sections for all people involved on this sport, coaches, parents, officials, organizations, etc... All people involved shall have responsibilities. The progression of the riders and horses need be consistent, secure and real.

**Could a different approach for riders and horses improve the system (rider's licenses)?**

Today, to drive we must have a driving license and we have to know the traffic rules! Many riders do not know the rules of the sport they are practicing. That's worrisome. Should a system should be implemented on this basis to ensure a better understanding of the rules and safety.

**Could a "reverse qualification" (downgrading) in the case of a clear failure of performance improve the system and increase the level of responsibility of all involved?**

Yes.

**How important is the achievement of a MER as a combination?**

**Could performances at national competitions be better integrated as part of the overall qualification process?**

As mentioned above, I think so. After all, all riders start with the most basic level. In this phase they structure their mentality, education and respect for the sport.

**Could larger nations assist smaller nations to establish better national qualification structures and processes?**

I think would be positive!

## 1. COMPETITION FORMATS (CIC-CCI)

This issue has been much discussed inside and outside the Eventing Committee and it has become apparent that with the current evolution of the sport after the deletion of the Steeple-Chase and roads and tracks maintaining a clear difference between the two formats (CIC-CCI) is becoming increasingly difficult.

Hence the questions:

- Is it still relevant for the international sport of Eventing to keep two different competition formats?

It is still relevant for the sport to maintain two different competition format, this is important for the development and preparation of both horse and rider.

The CCI format is the preferred format for all 4\*, World Championships and Olympic Games events and any future international pinnacle events.

- If we retain the two different competition formats should there be a clearer difference between the formats?

There is opportunity to improve the clarity between the two formats by:

- Clarity of difference in the Cross Country phase distance.
- Ensuring that format supports STAMINA as a key test within the CCI format.
- Changing the rules so that only the CCI format can be held over 3 days, with the CIC format restricted to a maximum of two days, requiring at least two phases to be held on the same day.
- Change the name of one format – this will make it easier for the public to understand.
- Is the flexibility we currently have with the two formats a positive attribute and if so how do we ensure that the two formats remain different?

The current flexibility is a positive attribute. It allows Eventing to be held at venues where space is restricted and also supports a condensed format which can be used to showcase the sport to a wider audience.

We believe the flexibility should be changed to support CCI's keeping longer distances and being a greater test of staminal with CIC's being able to be shortened further. This is a better use of flexibility than allowing a merging of the CIC and CCI formats.

- .Does having the two formats create confusion around the different rules?

Yes there is some confusion created by having the two formats. A lot of this is caused by the similarity of the abbreviated names - CIC and CCI - and the different qualification requirements for performance for a Minimum Eligibility Result. Going forward we believe that increasing the alignment of rules between the formats should be a focus wherever they do not affect the integrity of the format concerned.

Minimum Eligibility Results could easily be the same for both formats - the same dressage, jumping and cross country performance should create an MER regardless of format. The two formats could retain a different number of MER results required, but a MER should be a MER.

- Do we need two formats to ensure we maintain robust MER principles? Or could the overall structure of “qualifications – minimum requirements” be simplified by restructuring the competition formats.

MERs could be developed using CCIs only or in combination with national competitions. By differentiating the 2 formats further, the relevance of using one format as qualification for the other will be lessened even further.

Should the sport be concerned that:

- The specificity of each format is often difficult to understand for the insiders and nearly impossible for the general public.

Yes this is a concern, but difficult to avoid due to the nature of the sport. At the most basic level the sport internationally must provide a spectacle for the public allowing those who are "captured" by the excitement of the sport to learn the more subtle nuances involved as they watch more. This could be compared to the sport of cricket and the three forms of the game that exist at present.

The name of the sport is still a significant point of confusion for the general public.

- Are there any small changes that could be made to simplify and strengthen the sport? (i.e. minimize alternatives at 1&2 star level, ...)

Thought being put into removing the black flag options and replacing them with alternative fences (say up to 5 per course) that incur a penalty if they are jumped (say 5 faults). This may be an option to simplify rules around option fences and also better support the MER and qualification system. Currently riders can gain a MER without jumping the main 'questions' on the cross country phase if they have a black flag option. AT 1 and 2 star, where the combination is still developing the number of options should be left to the course designer but the emphasis of the option should be that it is the same fence type which is slightly easier. There are the grades where the options should be encouraged to ensure the correct development of the horse. Options are also important to encourage riders to think.

- Especially at the lower levels (1&2 star) distances and number of efforts in some cases tend to blend together and the only difference is often represented by a loop and maybe one or two more fences.

There needs to be clear differences in the distances between the two formats, at least 2 - 3 minutes longer cross country distance for CCI. The requirement for stamina, fitness and galloping needs to be included in the sport at the lower levels to encourage the correct development of horses and riders through the levels of the sport. This also support correct training of horses from their start in the sport.

- Maintaining at international level the two formats requires a greater level of complexity in rules and regulations

These rules need to be the same where ever possible but should maintain the distinction between the nature of the two formats.

Your initial views on the following points to be discussed are much appreciated:

- Could the international sport of Eventing be defined as “one sport” based on the current CCI format leaving the one day (CIC) to be used at national level only?

This is a possibility which would see the sport greatly simplified in the eyes of the general public. Although the international 'short-format event' should not be underestimated as a means of promoting the sport.

- Is the tradition order of tests important or not – does the Dressage, Cross-Country, Jumping order of tests represent eventing and does it have any influence on the public perception of “horse welfare” ?

The CCI should maintain its format of dressage followed by CC followed by Jumping with each phase completed on a separate, consecutive day. This format makes the best use of the full range of attributes that can be tested by the sport - obedience, training, stamina, speed, preparation and athleticism. It also tests the riders ability to work with the horse to get it through the event in a condition that allows it to perform at its best in the Jumping on the final day.

Short format competitions, CIC, should have rules that state that they must be run over either one or two consecutive days, allowing for either 2 or 3 phases to be held on the same day. With this inclusion the order of the cross country and jumping phases is less important.

- If there was a single format should the CIC format be retained at 3 star level for certain special competitions i.e. the right to retain the format for WC's etc?

There is definitely a place for competition under short-format especially at 3\* level. This helps to give the top horses more opportunities to compete without too much "wear and tear".

## 2. QUALIFICATIONS OF ATHLETES & HORSES (MER)

It is agreed that the international Eventing “qualification system” has had and currently has a huge impact on all involved in the sport.

It has often been criticized for being too complicated and often misleading for the wrong perception that having obtained a qualification for a higher level automatically would imply “competence to compete at that level”.

The change of definition from Qualification Result (QR) to MER (Minimum Eligibility Requirements) does not seem to have improved the situation and National Federations still find it difficult to reject an entry to an international competition by riders/horses that have obtained the MER also if they are not considered competent to participate at that certain level.

Hence the question if the Eventing qualification system is fulfilling the right role in the sport today and if not, how it could be improved.

The overall qualification system has often been perceived to be too complicated and the original policy of using the same criteria for horses and riders has made it very difficult to make justice of the great variability of cases.

After ten years of the current system it might be useful to reconsider the whole system and it's foundation.

To streamline the discussion on the review of the Eventing qualification procedure

your initial views on the following would be greatly appreciated:

- Is the current Eventing qualification system achieving the right result ?

It is agreed that achievement of an MER is not a guarantee that the horse/rider is competent to compete at that level. At present the search for an MER, particularly from a CIC\*\*\* has meant that riders have stepped up to these competitions before the horse has been ready instead of consolidating at 3\* level on the national circuit. This has in fact had a detrimental effect on safety compared to years gone by where riders got their horses confident at CNC\*\* and CNC\*\*\* competitions and then went to a CCI with a confident horse, safe in the knowledge that most horses went better than ever after completing the steeplechase phase.

The dressage MER of 50% good marks has no effect on safety whatsoever and should be removed or modified.

The 16 jumping faults in the Jumping phase could easily be reduced to 12 faults or 3 rails down.

The requirement for a clear CC round at CIC\*\*\* to compete at a CCI\*\*\* is a poor rule for countries with limited qualification opportunities as it can lead to defensive "play it safe" riding, including the use of options rather than taking the direct routes to develop both horse and rider skill and confidence. This type of riding is in itself dangerous and can lead to combinations who are not really up to achieving an MER achieving one. A "glance off" or "run-out" 20 penalties at a technical fence is not necessarily a sign that a combination is not competent to compete at that level.

We recommend the revision of the requirement for a clear CC phase be adjusted to 20 faults for all MERs.

- Is the meaning of "minimum eligibility requirement (MER)" clear to national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors ?

There is room for education that emphasises the "spirit" of the MER to such people as distinct from the "letter" of such laws.

- Is the Eventing qualification system discouraging national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors to take up their responsibility ?

The MER system does not discourage such responsibility but certainly does not encourage such responsibilities.

- If we adopted a one format sport and gave more emphasis to NF's would we lose the control of the standards by which athletes obtain MER

There is danger in loss of control and it is important that the qualifying system is an objective system rather than being allowed to become subjective. Significant discrepancies between countries is not desirable.

- Are technical requirements for MER strong enough ?

We believe the requirement for clear cross country is not necessary, this should be changed to 20 penalties across the board. The dressage phase is irrelevant to safety and the Jumping phase could be reduced from 16 to 12 penalties.

- How important is it for the sport of Eventing to ensure that new horses and riders get the right positive experience before stepping up the levels also if this would necessarily mean a slower progression for horses and riders ?

This is obviously important and it is provided for within the current qualification system. It is the responsibility of the rider, their trainer and their support team to ensure that horses and riders are correctly prepared in a positive manner. No level of 'rule' will ever manage this. Effort should be made to ensure people have the knowledge to prepare horses correctly.

- Could a different approach for riders and horses improve the system (riders licenses) ?

There is potential for an alternative system to be better, however any change must be objective rather than subjective in nature and must reduce rather than increase bureaucratic and administrative processes for both riders and event organisers. A concern is that a rider license could be seen as another barrier to participation.

- Could a "reverse qualification" (downgrading) in the case of a clear failure of performance improve the system and increase the level of responsibility of all involved ?

Riders competing with "fear of failure" as a primary thought in their mind is not a desired outcome as it could lead to increasing levels of conservative riding to 'maintain their qualification' rather than riding positively to develop themselves and their horses in preparation for the next key event.

Competitors must be encouraged to examine their performances critically and to compete only when they are confident and "on-form".

A reverse qualification would be detrimental to the sport.

- How important is the achievement of a MER as a combination ?

For the experienced competitor achievement of a MER is not that important, by the time a horse and rider reach 3\* level you would expect most riders to be able to safely ride most horses. However for safety's sake there could be thought put into making combination-based MER requirements more fundamental. Perhaps there could be a requirement for ONE combination based MER before competing at 3\* or above level.

- Could performances at national competitions be better integrated as part of the overall qualification process ?

The opportunity to better integrate national competitions into the qualification process is significant up to 3\* level. At 4\* level a robust MER requirement at international (FEI) events should be retained.

A fully integrated qualification process using both national and international events is a desirable outcome for 1 - 3\* events. This will encourage more positive riding at international events as riders will be able to better use their national events for preparation and qualification. This is especially relevant in most of the Eventing nations where the number of FEI events is relatively limited.

- Could larger nations assist smaller nations to establish better national qualification structures and processes ?

The one size fits all system that is currently in place ensures safety at FEI events but does not really encourage smaller nations to progress due to the costs and complications of hosting FEI events relative to national events. Thought should be put into varying the MERs for smaller nations who cannot afford to run a large number of FEI events. The opportunity identified to integrate national events into the MER processes for international events is an important opportunity to support this.

Larger nations could certainly support smaller nations reviewing their rules, standards, course design and competition formats to help them provide competition environments that can be integrated in qualification processes for international events.

If a larger nation "sponsored" a smaller nation and helped them with the provision of technical officials across all aspects of an event this might help smaller nations afford the transition between national and international events. They might also be able to provide expertise - administrative, event management, course design and technical training.

### 3. OTHER TOPICS

The Committee welcomes any other topics proposed by NFs, Riders, Officials, Organizers or others that could be included for discussion point at the Open Forums. It would be appreciated if these topics proposed could be of general interest and/or related to the 2013 Rules revision to all involved.

We look forward to reading your comments and thank you for forwarding your comments and proposals by 18 July 2011 addressed to the FEI Eventing Department, Catrin Norinder ([catrin.norinder@fei.org](mailto:catrin.norinder@fei.org))

Yours sincerely,

FEI Eventing Committee:

Giuseppe Della Chiesa (Chairman); Anne-Mette Binder, Clayton Fredericks, Robert Kellerhouse; Alec Lochore, Pierre Michelet.

I think the two categories, CIC and CCI, are not useful at 1 and 2 star level and so the CICs should be abolished.

At 3 star, we should go back and remember why the CIC category was introduced. In those days, the CCI was a full event with steeplechase and so the CIC was the 'One Day Event', clearly very different from the CCI. Now that we have the short format CCI the differences are very small – really only the length of the cross country course. Therefore we have great confusion in the minds of the public and press who do not understand the difference – and I don't blame them!

It would be good to keep the CIC but only if we can again make it clearly different. In the UK, this is possible because of the way we run our events, fitting everything into two days at most and having the cross country last. Incidentally, with this pattern having been used here for 50 years, we have seen no evidence that it compromises horse welfare in any way – provided of course the cross country is quite short. If CICs are run exactly like CCIs they really are pointless and would be better abolished.

A formula for the World Cup or other short competitions would be good, but again it should not look like a CCI! A short cross country as the final phase is much the best way to distinguish these competitions.

Incidentally, I think there should be a 'ban' on the use of 'CIC' and 'CCI' in all communications that go to the public or press! Who do we think understands them?! The competitions should be described as 'Eventing' events or competitions, keeping the jargon for internal use within the sport only.

As to qualifications, I do not think we should be too dismissive of what has been achieved over recent years. Horses and riders really are much better prepared now than they were. We must certainly not hold back experienced riders with younger horses – in general I think that when a rider has attained a certain level and been successful at that level (by which I mean winning things, not just completing) he/she should be able to decide whether a horse is ready to compete or not. While it may well be appropriate for horses and riders to progress slowly up each level in turn to start with, experienced riders should be able to 'fasttrack' horses. I do not consider it is right to impose qualification 'as a combination' and I believe this was introduced in the first place as a knee jerk reaction to a single accident.

I believe that the FEI should trust NFs much more to classify their national competitions as equivalent to international level of difficulty.

With both NFs and riders, I think that trusting their judgement should be accompanied by much stronger and swifter sanctions in cases where horses or riders that are not properly prepared come forward into international competitions. When we ask an NF to certify a horses/riders competence, we should sanction the NF and indeed the rider immediately if in fact they are clearly judges, by the Ground Jury, to be incompetent.

I would like to mention that I would like to see more flexibility for CDs and TDs at 3 and 4 star competitions to adjust the number of jumping efforts to the length of course and, more importantly, the terrain. The same course distance at say Badminton and Burghley are quite different in the test they impose on a horse's fitness and ability and I think it should be possible to make allowances for this and to trust our leading 3 and 4 star officials to use their judgement.

Finally I would like to see a little more differentiation between the 3 and 4 star levels by increasing the difficulty of the 4 star Jumping Test. The dressage tests are different, the cross country tests are different, but curiously the Jumping tests are the same. The 4 star height should be increased to 1.25m and an additional jumping effort allowed.

**Hugh Thomas, Event Director**  
Badminton Horse Trials Office  
Badminton, S. Glos., GL9 1DF  
Tel: 01454 218272  
Registration No. 3270324 - England  
Registered Office: The Estate Office, Badminton, Glos., GL9 1DD

---

From: Raf Desmedt-Floren [mailto:rafdesmedt.floren@pandora.be]  
Sent: lundi 18 juillet 2011 14:40  
To: Sandra Lecoultre; Catrin Norinder  
Subject: RE: FEI Eventing - Consultation Process for 2013 Rules Revision

Dear,

Please find these propositions:

1. It should be better too have one format : CIC
2. We need a minimum jumpable width :
  - 1 \* : 150 cm
  - 2 \* : 130 cm
  - 3 \* : 120 cm
  - 4 \* : 110 cm

there should be a maximum of 3 minimum jumpable width fences.

With kind regards,

Raf Desmedt  
Belgium

## 1. COMPETITION FORMATS (CIC-CCI)

This issue has been much discussed inside and outside the Eventing Committee and it has become apparent that with the current evolution of the sport after the deletion of the Steeple-Chase and roads and tracks maintaining a clear difference between the two formats (CIC-CCI) is becoming increasingly difficult.

Hence the questions:

- Is it still relevant for the international sport of Eventing to keep two different competition formats?  
*yes, specially for 1 & 2 \* competition to prepare horses and Rider before upgrading*
- If we retain the two different competition formats should there be a clearer difference between the formats?  
*the distance of the XC*
- Is the flexibility we currently have with the two formats a positive attribute and if so how do we ensure that the two formats remain different?
- Does having the two formats create confusion around the different rules?  
*No*
- Do we need two formats to ensure we maintain robust MER principles? Or could the overall structure of “qualifications – minimum requirements” be simplified by restructuring the competition formats?  
*2 format are OK*

Should the sport be concerned that:

- The specificity of each format is often difficult to understand for the insiders and nearly impossible for the general public.
- *Maybe its needed to explain more often to the public but also rider should often read the rules..*
- Are there any small changes that could be made to simplify and strengthen the sport? (i.e. minimize alternatives at 1&2 star level,...)  
*no alternative fence where is an MER to oblige rider to be more experienced before upgrading this is special for 1 & 2 \* again*
- Especially at the lower levels (1&2 star) distances and number of efforts in some cases tend to blend together and the only difference is often represented by a loop and maybe one or two more fences.  
*Only 1 level pro event, is this possible? for the organizer?*
- Maintaining at international level the two formats requires a greater level of complexity in rules and regulations.

Your initial views on the following points to be discussed are much appreciated:

- Could the international sport of Eventing be defined as “one sport” based on the current CCI format leaving the one day (CIC) to be used at national level only?

*Yes the CIC for preparing the horses for the big event, this is different for countries with less event possibility*

- Is the tradition order of tests important or not – does the Dressage, Cross-Country, Jumping order of tests represent eventing and does it have any influence on the public perception of “horse welfare”?

*personally I think SJ should come after the XC*

- If there was a single format should the CIC format be retained at 3 star level for certain special competitions i.e. the right to retain the format for WC's, etc?

*yes*

## **2. QUALIFICATIONS OF ATHLETES & HORSES (MER)**

It is agreed that the international Eventing “qualification system” has had and currently has a huge impact on all involved in the sport.

It has often been criticized for being too complicated and often misleading for the wrong perception that having obtained a qualification for a higher level automatically would imply “competence to compete at that level”.

The change of definition from Qualification Result (QR) to MER (Minimum Eligibility Requirements) does not seem to have improved the situation and National Federations still find it difficult to reject an entry to an international competition by riders/horses that have obtained the MER also if they are not considered competent to participate at that certain level.

***Hence the question if the Eventing qualification system is fulfilling the right role in the sport today and if not, how it could be improved.***

The overall qualification system has often been perceived to be too complicated and the original policy of using the same criteria for horses and riders has made it very difficult to make justice of the great variability of cases.

After ten years of the current system it might be useful to reconsider the whole system and it's foundation.

To streamline the discussion on the review of the Eventing qualification procedure your initial views on the following would be greatly appreciated:

- Is the current Eventing qualification system achieving the right result?  
*To easy for some inexperienced rider*
- Is the meaning of “minimum eligibility requirement (MER)” clear to national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors?  
*If you look for you can find it in rules book.*
- Is the Eventing qualification system discouraging national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors to take up their responsibility?  
*Sometimes easy to find an excuse*
- If we adopted a one format sport and gave more emphasis to NF's would we lose the control of the standards by which athletes obtain MER?  
*more work for the FEI*

- Are technical requirements for MER strong enough?  
*no*
- How important is it for the sport of Eventing to ensure that new horses and riders get the right positive experience before stepping up the levels also if this would necessarily mean a slower progression for horses and riders ?
- Could a different approach for riders and horses improve the system (riders licenses)?
- Could a "reverse qualification" (downgrading) in the case of a clear failure of performance improve the system and increase the level of responsibility of all involved?  
*Yes but lot of work to make control*
- How important is the achievement of a MER as a combination?  
*for 1 & 2 \* rider experience needed*
- Could performances at national competitions be better integrated as part of the overall qualification process?
- Could larger nations assist smaller nations to establish better national qualification structures and processes?

### **3. OTHER TOPICS**

The Committee welcomes any other topics proposed by NFs, Riders, Officials, Organizers or others that could be included for discussion point at the Open Forums. It would be appreciated if these topics proposed could be of general interest and/or related to the 2013 Rules revision to all involved.

*MER with maximum 65 or even 60 penalties in dressage and at CIC also without penalty in XC and asking for more as 2 MER to be able to upgrade specially at 1& 2\* event*

2011-07-19 Delano Bastos De Miranda (BRA)

---

From: DELANO BASTOS DE MIRANDA [<mailto:delanomiranda@ig.com.br>]  
Sent: mardi 19 juillet 2011 03:27  
To: Catrin Norinder; [jeans.mitchell@virgin.net](mailto:jeans.mitchell@virgin.net); Sandra Lecoultre  
Subject: Consultation Process

Dear all

Regarding to the Consultation Process, I would like to suggest 2 topics to be discussed:

1- Amend to the item **3.2 (Elimination must be applied in the folowing cases)** of the **Article 532 SCORING**, *because it's not specified in the rules:*

(Maybe as number 7). *"Jumping or incurring a fault at an obstacle, flagged or not, that is not part of the course in wich the rider is competing"*

2- Rewrite the item **1.2** of the **Article 539 TIME CORRECTIONS** in the way the text becomes the same of the **Articles 212 & 232** of the FEI Show Jumping Rules, in accordance with the e-mail I sent you in february (below).

## 1. COMPETITION FORMATS (CIC-CCI)

Is it still relevant for the international sport of Eventing to keep two different competition formats?

*Yes, it is the sense of the committee that there is a role for both the CIC and CCI in the sport of Eventing*

If we retain the two different competition formats should there be a clearer difference between the formats?

*Yes, however, there must be more differential between the CIC and CCI. If the CCI should be increased in length we feel it imperative that the intensity be decreased.*

Is the flexibility we currently have with the two formats a positive attribute and if so how do we ensure that the two formats remain different?

*No, it is not a positive attribute which is what has led to the insiders and general public's inability to distinguish between the two formats.*

Does having the two formats create confusion around the different rules?

*No, because there are not many differences. The differences that exist revolve around the horse inspection, stabling requirements and the required number of officials.*

Do we need two formats to ensure we maintain robust MER principles? Or could the overall structure of "qualifications – minimum requirements" be simplified by restructuring the competition formats.

*Yes, we do feel two formats are necessary. The CIC was created specifically to ensure athletes from developing nations would be sufficiently prepared to compete in an international forum. It also provides a fail-safe for those NFs that have not set stronger Minimum Eligibility standards.*

*While a small number of National Federations have worked to ensure riders are prepared to compete at the level, the majority have ignored the FEI exhortation to add additional requirements. Restructuring the competition format is an essential step to establishing robust MER principles.*

Should the sport be concerned that:

The specificity of each format is often difficult to understand for the insiders and nearly impossible for the general public.

*We feel this statement is untrue.*

Are there any small changes that could be made to simplify and strengthen the sport? (i.e. minimize alternatives at 1&2 star level, ...)

*We feel there are small changes which could be made and strongly agree that perhaps one of those changes should be to minimize the number of alternative routes on the cross-country courses at the one and two star level.*

Especially at the lower levels (1&2 star) distances and number of efforts in some cases tend to blend together and the only difference is often represented by a loop and maybe one or two more fences.

*We agree this to be the case but would ask why this happens if the FEI officials have been duly trained in the principles and goals of course design?*

Maintaining at international level the two formats requires a greater level of complexity in rules and regulations

*There are not, in fact many differences between the rules for the two formats which relate directly to competitive conditions.*

Your initial views on the following points to be discussed are much appreciated:

- Could the international sport of Eventing be defined as "one sport" based on the International sport of Eventing be defined as "one sport" based on the current CCI format leaving the one day (CIC) to be used at national level only?

*No, please see our response above, under point five in this section (Competition Formats). Also, the CIC is essential to ensure riders are properly qualified who represent those National Federations that do not impose additional requirements for qualification.*

- Is the traditional order of tests important or not – does the Dressage, Cross-Country, jumping order of tests represent Eventing and does it have any influence On the public perception of “horse welfare”?

*We feel that in the case of the CCI they are not only important but essential. We believe that the purposes of horse and rider preparation are best served in the CIC format by requiring the Dressage phase to be followed by Show Jumping in all cases.*

- If there was a single format should the CIC format be retained at the 3 star level for certain special competitions i.e. the right to retain the format for WC's etc.?

*In view of our responses thus far this question is not applicable.*

## **2. QUALIFICATION OF ATHLETES AND HORSES (MER)**

.... To streamline the discussion on the review of the Eventing qualification procedure your initial views on the following would be greatly appreciated:

- Is the current Eventing Qualification system achieving the right result?

*No, we believe the current system is not achieving the right result.*

- Is the meaning of “minimum eligibility requirement (MER) clear to national Federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors?

*No, we do not feel that it is clear to all that it is a minimum and national federations must consider the inclusion of additional requirement as called for under article 506.1.*

- Is the Eventing qualification system discouraging national federations, riders, trainers, sponsors to take up their responsibility?

*Yes it does, by clearly discouraging national federations from setting stronger Minimum Eligibility standards by the use of the word “encouraged” in Article 506.1 rather than stronger language.*

- If we adopted a one format sport and gave more emphasis to national federations would we lose the control of the standards by which athletes obtain MER?

*Yes, although we believe the US Federation would maintain control we feel it is likely that other national federations which have not set stronger Minimum Eligibility standards may lose control.*

- Are technical requirements for MER strong enough?

*We feel the answer is yes, however there is concern that disallowing 20 Cross-Country jump penalty points for CIC's may actually encourage athletes to use alternative routes rather than taking the more challenging route and thereby being better prepared to move up a to a higher level of competition.*

- How important is it for the sport of Eventing to ensure that new horses and riders get the right positive experience before stepping up the levels also if this would necessarily mean a slower progression for horses and riders?

*We feel it is imperative!*

- Could a different approach for riders and horses improve the system (riders licenses)?

*Yes, we feel a system of licensure for riders established at a level would be most helpful provided the license would carry with it an expiration date e.g. failure to achieve another at the same level or higher in the ten year period following establishment would result in a loss or appropriate downgrading of license. In addition, we feel that if any licensure provision should (like the current provision for Permanent Athlete Qualification) apply only to three and four star level athletes.*

Could a "reverse qualification" (downgrading) in the case of a clear failure of performance improve the system and increase the level of responsibility of all involved?

*We feel the answer to this question is yes. Since implementing such a system in the United States three years ago we have seen positive indications that athletes will make the right decision on their own volition (e.g. retire on course rather than press on at risk of elimination and potential "loss of establishment").*

- How important is the achievement of a MER as a combination?

*We feel that that it is not important for MER to be achieved as a combination.*

- Could performances at national competitions be better integrated as part of the overall qualification process?

*Yes, we believe that the stronger Minimum Eligibility standards implemented by our NF have shown positive results.*

Could larger nations assist smaller nations to establish better national qualification structures and processes?

*Yes, however smaller nations are not necessarily well served by directly modeling their qualification structures and processes after those of nations with a long history in the sport*

### **3. OTHER TOPICS**

In differentiating between the two formats (CIC & CCI) we feel it is important to moderate the number of requirements with financial impact placed on organizers e.g. reduction of the number and type of officials and fee for FEI date application.

Additionally, in order to avoid confusion among the public, sponsors, etc. we suggest the FEI consider a change in name from the current use of CIC and CCI. A distinct name for each would prove helpful to all concerned.

From: Karen C. Adams [mailto:kcadams@usef.org]  
Sent: vendredi 22 juillet 2011 21:56  
To: Catrin Norinder  
Cc: Shealagh Costello  
Subject: ADDITION to USA NF Comments: FEI Eventing - Consultation Process for 2013 Rules Revision

Dear Catrin:

Apologies, but we have received some late comments. Please see below. If you are able, please include these in the documents that are sent along to the FEI Eventing committee for their revision review.

Many thanks,  
Karen

**Karen Adams**  
Executive Assistant to the President and CEO  
United States Equestrian Federation, Inc.  
(859) 225-2046  
[kcadams@usef.org](mailto:kcadams@usef.org)

If we retain the two different competition formats should there be a clearer difference between the formats?

*Yes, however, there must be more differential between the CIC and CCI. If the CCI should be increased in length we feel it imperative that that we should be allowed more efforts, however there must always be a relationship between efforts and distance for example a minimum of 110 meters per efforts for a one star, 120 meters per effort for a two star, 130 meters per effort for a three star and 140 meters per effort for a four star.*

- Is the traditional order of tests important or not – does the Dressage, Cross-Country, jumping order of tests represent Eventing and does it have any influence on the public perception of “horse welfare”?

*We feel that in the case of the CCI they are not only important but essential. We believe that the purposes of horse and rider preparation are best served in the CIC format by requiring the Dressage phase to be followed by Show Jumping in all cases and Cross-Country last.*

---

- How important is the achievement of a MER as a combination?

*We feel that that it is not important for MER to be achieved as a combination. Once competitors have obtained a certificate of capability at a level. First timers attaining a new level should achieve the MER as a combination, therefore we need a two tier MER system.*



**CANADIAN EVENTING COMMITTEE**  
 A committee of Equine Canada  
 2685 Queensview Drive , Suite 100  
 Ottawa, Ontario, K2B 8K2 CANADA  
 Tel: (613) 248-3433 Fax: (613) 248-3484  
[www.equinecanada.ca](http://www.equinecanada.ca)

**Equine Canada –Canadian Eventing Committee Response to FEI Rules Consultation Process**  
**2013 Rules for Eventing**  
 July 18, 2011

The Equine Canada - Canadian Eventing Committee thanks the FEI for the opportunity to provide input into the revisions of the 2013 FEI Rules for Eventing. We look forward to participating in the Open Forum scheduled to be held October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2011 during the Pan American Games in Guadalajara ,Mexico.

The following is a summary of our initial feedback to the questions posed:

**1. Competition Formats (CIC/CCI) ;**

- Equine Canada - Canadian Eventing Committee believes that the two formats needs to be re-visited While there may be a need to monitor the qualifying levels of CICs - one issue is there are too few CICs for North American based horses, especially Canadians who must travel extensive distances to secure CIC qualifications.
- The Canadian Eventing Committee encourages the FEI to research ways to make the hosting of CICs more affordable for organisers.
- There should be a clearer difference between CIC and CCI competition formats
- The majority of flexibility exists in the number of judges and officials and domicile of same. The ability to use national officials in one and two star competitions is valuable as it provides mentoring /education opportunities with the FEI officials.
- Some of the Rules around the two formats must be homogenized so that they apply the same internationally - for CIC's it cannot be that the order of phases dictates when a horse inspection occurs -those competitions who have cross country as the final phase do not have the same scrutiny of the horses as those competitions that run show jumping last. This gives an unfair advantage. To eliminate this discrepancy in CICs – modification must be made to either the Horse inspection protocols or the organiser's discretion to reverse the cross country and show jumping tests. Also instituting a first horse inspection prior to dressage at CICs should also be considered.
- The Canadian Eventing Committee recognises the value of CICs as MER qualification and preparatory competitions especially for CCI 2 star competitions and higher. Two formats were born out of discrepancies of standard and degree of difficulty at the National horse trial level competitions .... until this is remedied then the two formats must exist.
- CNCs held under the supervision of foreign FEI Technical Delegates would not be a viable option to CICs.
- Perhaps the national levels should all agree to run only CIC's at the two star level and higher thus insuring consistency in the degrees of difficulty.
- It is extremely difficult for the general public to understand the various levels of CIC, CCI and CNCs (national horse trials). Removing the coefficients in dressage scoring – a move that has been adopted by several NFs. could possibly improve the public's understanding of the scoring system in general

Consideration would need to be given on the current penalties assessed for faults in show jumping and especially cross country.

- Regarding minimizing alternatives at 1&2 star level --- alternate routes on cross country , if that is what is being referred to, are important for safety and horse education...
- Agree that differences of distances and number of jumps between formats at one and two star level must be more standardized so that a simple loop or one more jump does not change the category of the event...the entry fee differences is being paid more for qualifications and judges than it is for a better/tougher course....in some cases, not all.
- Canadian Eventing Committees does not view the order of tests as a horse welfare issue but TD's and ground juries should have a say in this order of levels at an event. Despite a need to offer the higher levels as "crowd pleasers" it is unfair to have the most taxing phases (2 star and 3 star) run in the heat of the day or on the worst ground.

## 2. Qualifications of Athletes and Horses (MER)

- The current Qualification system appears to be achieving the right result except for the lack of CIC's available to North American based competitors as mentioned earlier.
- The MER is not that clear for non-competitors.
- The rules regarding Establishment of MER and Extension of Establishment are not that clear for competitors or coaches.
- Because of the lack of CICs available – the rules concerning the Extension of Establishment for CICs should be the same as for CCI's.
- The non-allowance of a single refusal on cross country at a CIC has created issues for competitors because of the lack of opportunity to re-qualify.
- At present Canadian Eventing Committee would not support giving more control to NF's on MER
- It is vitally important that new horses and riders get the positive experience before moving up a level – however this should not necessarily impact the qualification system resulting in a slower progression for horses and riders – It is heavily dependent on the quality of the competitive experience provided
- Canadian Eventing Committee does not support implementation of riders' licences at this stage...would require more detail on how it would work
- Reverse qualification could be a consideration – however the yellow card system and suspensions already addresses this situation to some extent - The Canadian Eventing Safety Committee is currently considering the implementation of a reserve qualification system for national competitions.
- Many NFs including Equine Canada - Canadian Eventing Committee currently integrates performances at national competitions into the national qualification process and requires a qualification as a combination for CCI's. Believes an NF should have the flexibility to institute this kind of requirement depending on the competition environment of their country. Does not support a regulation of this kind for CICs.
- MER achievement as a combination is most important when a rider is not very experienced at the level he/she is attempting to compete...for the top professionals in the sport there needs to be the flexibility to allow for "catch rides"
- While Equine Canada –Canadian Eventing Committee would be happy to share it's information – it recognises that, due to the structure and competitive environment of smaller nations - they may not find the information applicable.

## 3. Other topics

- Consideration of the institution of a weekend "helpline" at the FEI office – for officials and competition organisers.



Federazione Italiana Sport Equestri

## Consultation process for the 2012 Rules Revision Feedback ITALY

### 1. Competition Formats (CIC-CIC)

We feel that at a lower level (1\* & 2\*) there should be no distinction between the 2 formats. At a higher level there could be a distinction between CIC3\* and CCI3\*. The CIC3\* format could be used for such competitions as Aachen, World Cup Qualifiers or other special competitions.

If we are to retain the 2 formats there should be a clear distinction other than that of the technical specifications:

CCI\* - Dressage – Cross – Jumping

CIC\* - Dressage – Jumping – Cross

One of the great advantages of the CIC format is the fact that the OC are pretty free to organise the running of the competition to suit their needs (1 day – 2 day – 3 day, Dressage-Jumping-Cross, Dressage – Cross – Jumping).

CIC's run on 2 days are inevitably going to be less expensive for riders and OCs with respect to CCIs run on 3 days.

Careful thought should be given if we have only 1 format on how the event should be run and the overall impact that this could have on the OC and organisation of events (would the OCs be found themselves in financial difficulty running a 3 day competition instead of a 2 day competition?)

As it stands the qualification system would certainly need to be adjusted if there was only 1 format, but this needn't necessarily weaken the MER principles. The overall structure of the "qualifications- minimum requirements" can surely be simplified (please see part 2).

The use of 2 formats surely creates confusion for both insiders and outsiders especially if you look at the CIC format – again → (1 day – 2 day – 3 day, Dressage-Jumping-Cross; Dressage – Cross – Jumping), horse inspection before – after, non horse inspection before – after) etc.

Viale Tiziano, 74 - 00196 Roma  
T. 06 36 85 83 26 F. 06 36 85 86 11 W. [segreteria@fise.it](mailto:segreteria@fise.it)

P.I. 02151981004 C.F. 97015720580

[www.fise.it](http://www.fise.it)



If the 2 formats are maintained there is a greater need to drastically reduce the number of jumps and combinations in the CIC format, and as you have indicated the difference between a CCI and a CIC in the same competition is often minimal (this is an obvious consequence of running 2 competitions of the same level – OCs are trying to save money).

## 2. Qualifications of Athletes and Horses (MER)

It has to be said that the qualification system continues to be COMPLICATED. In Italy only a handful of people understand these qualifications (and these are not the riders, trainers and owners!), but this is in no way automatic – each time there is a doubt and there has to be continuous consultation with the rules – not to mention the more complex situations, top level horses that are returning after injury that have lost their qualification status at CCI3\* level, as well as the possibility of competing in CIC3\* level – this becomes really complicated! In our country for example we only have one CNC3\* a year (due to costs and number of participants), and regaining qualification for a CCI3\* by competing in 2 competitions of the same level without using CIC3\* is therefore impossible.

The Eventing qualification will surely discourage all to take up their responsibility, once upon a time when qualifications did not exist, it was up to the trainers, riders etc. to understand if horse and rider were ready to go up a category, but once upon a time there was little attention paid by the public and the media. Nowadays we are in the line of fire and all eyes are watching. So it is understandably difficult and may be dangerous to hand over responsibility.

At the moment the qualifications for a CIC2\* are nonexistent with respect to the other qualifications. We think that most problems from a risk point of view can come from youngsters with little experience and amateurs who wish to climb a level – from 1\* to 2\*.

As far as the qualification for the CCI3\* is concerned it seems absurd that combinations who are competing regularly at a CIC3\* level have to go back to a lower level (CCI2\*) to qualify. The CIC should, from a technical point of view be the same as a CCI, in fact in many cases it could be said that a CIC is technically more difficult because of the number of jumps/efforts that are introduced in a shorter distance.



Federazione Italiana Sport Equestri

---

What is certain is that expert riders should have an easier way of qualifying their horses. May be riders who are qualified for life at 3 or 4 star level should have some kind of waiver?

If one format is adopted or not we strongly believe that the qualifications, if this system remains, should be according to the level and not according to the type ie. a CIC2\* should count the same as a CCI2\*.

We feel that the technical requirements should be a little more constrictive in some areas:

- Cross Country time – we feel this should be shorted to 60 seconds, attacking the jumps at a slow speed cannot give a true indication of the capabilities of rider and horse.  
In some occasions when weather conditions are such that no combination enter within the time, may be 60 seconds from the best time of the day should be counted.
- Show Jumping - this could be lowered from 16 jumping penalties to 12 jumping penalties.

It is extremely important that new horses and riders get the right positive experience before going up a level and this is one of the reasons for which we think a license system could be more viable.

In Italy we have used a licence system for many years and this seems to work well. The horses are also divided into categories - non expert – medium – expert. To advance a category each horse and rider has to obtain a number of qualifying results at a certain level. Once a horse or rider has achieved the qualifying results the rider can decide if he wishes to go to the next level. At the moment once a rider or horse arrive at a certain level they will stay at this level for as long as they wish.

Combinations can compete in a competition according to their levels. eg. Expert rider with expert horse can compete at 3\* level

This would be one way of slowing the progression of the youngsters, but at the same time an expert rider who has a horse which has been out of work for some time would have no problem competing at top level again without going through the whole qualification procedure.

Viale Tiziano, 74 - 00196 Roma  
T. 06 36 85 83 26 F. 06 36 85 86 11 W. [segreteria@fise.it](mailto:segreteria@fise.it)

P.I. 02151981004 C.F. 97015720580

[www.fise.it](http://www.fise.it)



Federazione Italiana Sport Equestri

---

We believe that achieving a MER as a combination can be restrictive especially for an expert rider. If an expert rider is given an expert horse to ride he should be able to compete immediately at top level without going through the qualification procedure.

Qualification as a combination at championship level should still be considered as a valid system.

The reverse qualification (downgrading) could be a very important part of the qualification system. Obviously it needs careful thought. It is not sufficient to be eliminated in cross country 2 or 3 times. It must be understood why the combination has been eliminated. Nowadays some results, especially from Germany have a very detailed explanation on motives for elimination etc. We are in the process of modifying our system so that we know the exact reason why a combination has been eliminated. May be the FEI should look in to receiving all results with this distinction? It could also help the control and collection of data for risk management purposes.

Larger nations could assist smaller nations in establishing a better national qualification structure, but surely this should be the role of the FEI?

### 3. Other topics

- ✓ One topic which we feel should be taken in to consideration, not necessarily at the forums, is the role of the scoring team. This group of people is decisive to the smooth running of the competition. To date there is no mention in any rule book of the official scorers having some kind of qualification, or however having to be in a list of approved scorers by their National Federation. They are not even mentioned on the schedule!

Many of the results which we receive are without dates!!!

- ✓ In the recent past we have had a number of occasions when our riders who are based in other countries have entered International competitions directly without our knowledge and have actually competed without having any kind of authorisation from us as NF! The OC cannot accept entries directly from the riders without the authorisation of their NF. This has been taken up directly with the NF of the OCs but we feel that this could be a problem – no control of qualifications – risk management ecc.

Viale Tiziano, 74 - 00196 Roma  
T. 06 36 85 83 26 F. 06 36 85 86 11 W. [segreteria@fise.it](mailto:segreteria@fise.it)

P.I. 02151981004 C.F. 97015720580

[www.fise.it](http://www.fise.it)

Before answering the questions I think it is relevant to highlight the factors I feel are important to address, which have a bearing on how I view these issues.

- 1) The modern format for CCI's has produced some distressing images at the end of the XC in particular in 2011 at Badminton and to a lesser extent at Rolex. To yellow card the leaders for finishing on very tired horses is a PR disaster but it is a serious issue that needs to be addressed.
- 2) Athletes are not always preparing their horses adequately for the physical demands, but find that tired horses recover better than after the long format. We need to find a way of impressing upon athletes that a more appropriate long-term equine fitness regime would enhance the sport.
- 3) The FEI needs to keep control of standards of competition worldwide in order for competitors to be prepared for international championships. Even in North America 3\* tracks tend to be at the level but softer than in the UK and Western Europe. To allow National competitions to further encroach in to the MER would be a big mistake. Therefore 2 types of FEI competition need to be provided, so CIC's are used to qualify in part for CCI's at the same level.
- 4) The use of National dressage judges as Presidents of the Ground Jury creates problems of consistency in dealing with issues. A qualified FEI judge should always hold that position of responsibility in order to guide their fellow judges. The FEI TD may not be able to do this and maintain standards due to time constraints etc. Errors in judging in these circumstances reflect badly on Judges and the FEI as a whole.

Is it still relevant for the international sport of Eventing to keep two different competition formats?

Yes

CIC's should be used by athletes to prepare for the ultimate test of CCI's. Successful outcomes in CIC's partly indicate that MER have in fact been met. If we only have CCI's the demands on equine athletes could become excessive if they complete an increased number of CCI's in a year.

If we retain the two different competition formats should there be a clearer difference between the formats?

Yes

CCI's and CIC's should have same level of Dressage and SJ test but with CIC's having a shorter XC with fewer jumping efforts, as is the current rule. The CIC should not be as technically demanding as the CCI. It should be seen as a preparatory step to competing at a CCI.

The XC technicality at a CIC should be softer in some aspects of the course, so that the CCI's are seen as a definite "step up" both in the questions asked and endurance. This is clearly more important at 3 and 4 Star level, but is also an important stepping stone for inexperienced combinations at the lower levels.

At 1\* & 2\* level clarity between a CIC & CCI could be shown with greater differences on the XC course.

CIC's are currently being used in part for equines that are less fit and sound, due to the less taxing endurance aspect of a CIC . The less rigorous Horse Inspection process also works for them especially if the XC runs last. The problem is that issues of horse welfare are less easy to address in this format.

We could use this opportunity to redefine the timetable of events and the roles of officials especially the GJ, and ensure horse welfare is maintained as a priority.

The format of Dressage XC SJ for CCI's must not change as this offers the ultimate test at the highest level. They are however wasteful of time. Officials should have their formal XC walk round on the Wednesday, followed by the Horse Inspection and Briefing. All of this could happen on the Wednesday afternoon.

Thursday, Friday and Saturday as normal.

On Sunday the formal Horse Inspection, and Show Jumping course walk, unless the course can be made ready the night before, enabling officials to inspect it on the Saturday evening.

The Judging of the Show Jumping has been contentious for many years for various reasons. The S.J judge is a good idea as too few GJ members are experienced SJ judges, with few routinely judging SJ even at national level.

There is no point in all the GJ being involved in the Judging of S.J, but in order for the FEI Eventing rules to be adhered to the President of the GJ or a nominated member should oversee proceedings.

CIC's should have a definite format, to clearly define them. This should be achieved even though it could upset some events with traditional formats enjoying "Big" SJ days on the Sunday with spectator appeal.

The CIC format should be Dressage S.J then XC.

Horse welfare is best supported by two formal inspections, before the dressage and after XC, prior to the SJ, but in order for there to be a clear definition between the CCI's and CIC's, using different formats, we could rethink the inspection process.

The First Horse Inspection prior to the Dressage is really valuable, but

costly in time for competitors if they have to arrive a day early in order to attend the Horse Inspection. We could therefore have only one, less formal inspection after the final XC phase at CIC's.

At CIC's during the Dressage, Ground Juries should be encouraged to send any horse that gives reasons for concern to the FEI vet. Every horse that has been referred must then be assessed at a later stage by the GJ, along with the vet, before it can progress through the competition.

There can be resistance in juries to doing this as not all members will have seen or evaluated the problem with similar marks... This necessitates the need for events to use experienced FEI officials as President, which is not the case at all UK events.

If there is no formal inspection before the Dressage, the next useful opportunity is after the XC (being the last phase). This inspection should become more of a formal affair, rather than what is happening at present. The athlete should present his horse to a GJ member and a vet within a stated time e.g. 20- 30 mins of finishing.

There could be a designated area next to the finishing area, on a grass surface for the horse to be presented and trotted up, to confirm that the horse has finished in an "acceptable condition".

We have seen too many tired or "winded" horses finishing and athletes should be made more aware of the fitness of their horses at the end of the course in order to encourage them to prepare more appropriately and not pay the consequences for "over doing" it on the course.

The vet at the end of the XC could supply statistics of how each horse has finished and recovery times if necessary.

This could be highly contentious but through widespread discussion I think we could come to a sensible conclusion as to how this can be adjudicated for the benefit of the sport.

In so doing we could place the responsibility back on to the riders, who are in the best place to make judgments as to how their horses are travelling and what they can reasonably expect of their horses.

Knowing that they will present their horses on finishing may sharpen their instincts in the right direction. – Contentious, but worth discussing.

Is the flexibility we currently have with the two formats a positive attribute and if so how do we ensure that the two formats remain different?

Does having the two formats create confusion around the different rules?

No, we can make the differences clearer.

**by 18 July 2011**

## **1. COMPETITION FORMATS (CIC-CCI) Consultation 2013 Rules Eventing – FEI Eventing Committee 2**

Do we need two formats to ensure we maintain robust MER principles? Or could the overall structure of "qualifications – minimum

requirements" be simplified by restructuring the competition formats.  
Should the sport be concerned that:

- The specificity of each format is often difficult to understand for the insiders and nearly impossible for the general public.
- Are there any small changes that could be made to simplify and strengthen the sport? (i.e. minimize alternatives at 1&2 star level, ...)
- Especially at the lower levels (1&2 star) distances and number of efforts in some cases tend to blend together and the only difference is often represented by a loop and maybe one or two more fences.
- Maintaining at international level the two formats requires a greater level of complexity in rules and regulations

Your initial views on the following points to be discussed are much appreciated:

- Could the international sport of Eventing be defined as "one sport" based on the current CCI format leaving the one day (CIC) to be used at national level only?
- Is the tradition order of tests important or not – does the Dressage, Cross- Country, Jumping order of tests represent eventing and does it have any influence on the public perception of "horse welfare" ?
- If there was a single format should the CIC format be retained at 3 star level for certain special competitions i.e. the right to retain the format for WC's etc?

It is agreed that the international Eventing "qualification system" has had and currently has a huge impact on all involved in the sport.

It has often been criticized for being too complicated and often misleading for the wrong perception that having obtained a qualification for a higher level automatically would imply "competence to compete at that level". The change of definition from Qualification Result (QR) to MER (Minimum Eligibility Requirements) does not seem to have improved the situation and National Federations still find it difficult to reject an entry to an international competition by riders/horses that have obtained the MER also if they are not considered competent to participate at that certain level.

***Hence the question if the Eventing qualification system is fulfilling the right role in the sport today and if not, how it could be improved.***

The overall qualification system has often been perceived to be too complicated and the original policy of using the same criteria for horses and riders has made it very difficult to make justice of the great variability of cases.

After ten years of the current system it might be useful to reconsider the whole system and it's foundation.

## **2. QUALIFICATIONS OF ATHLETES & HORSES (MER)**

### **Consultation 2013 Rules Eventing – FEI Eventing Committee 3**

To streamline the discussion on the review of the Eventing qualification procedure your initial views on the following would be greatly appreciated:

- Is the current Eventing qualification system achieving the right result ?

No qualification system is perfect, some inexperienced combinations are getting through to 3 and 4\* level who have not absorbed the ethos of MER.

Inexperienced riders, i.e those not classified under: 506 (8) should have

to complete, as a combination, two CCI's at the preceding level.

- Is the meaning of "minimum eligibility requirement (MER)" clear to national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors ?
- Is the Eventing qualification system discouraging national federations, riders, trainers, parents, sponsors to take up their responsibility ?

Every National Federation should have a "watch list" and anyone who is on it should not be free to compete at a level where they have given cause for concern. This restriction being removed once improvements are confirmed.

National Federations should be more proactive in endorsing the proficiency of their athletes. The FEI could request confirmation that the NF wishes their athlete to compete at that level.

Events could access an updated database of "watch list" competitors before accepting entries.

- If we adopted a one format sport and gave more emphasis to NF's would we lose the control of the standards by which athletes obtain MER
- Are technical requirements for MER strong enough ?

National competitions are not an acceptable substitute for qualifications at FEI competitions.

We can't give dispensation to competitors at British Eventing events, because we feel BE standards are equivalent to CIC's and therefore acceptable but those from Asia are not.

Less experienced riders should have to successfully complete two CCI 3\* in order to proceed to 4\* level. The combination should qualify together.

Experienced riders e.g. those with exemption in 506:8 could have one result with the horse at CCI3\*. This ensures the combination has qualified to compete at 4\* level by successfully completing a CCI 3\* .

CCI's should be the dominant qualification in order to proceed up a level. CIC's being used to prove current fitness to compete.

- How important is it for the sport of Eventing to ensure that new horses and riders get the right positive experience before stepping up the levels also if this would necessarily mean a slower progression for horses and riders?
- Could a different approach for riders and horses improve the system (riders licenses) ?

Positive experiences are vital to the progression of riders and horses. A slower progression is not necessarily a bad thing. With the modern format well produced horses have a longer competitive life, rushing through the grades is not necessarily an advantage to their physical or mental development.

Rider Licenses are an interesting concept where all matters regarding the

riders' qualifications, proficiency and infringements of rules could be stored.

This could help to clarify when a rider has recurring problems which need to be addressed and where downgrading could be implemented.

- Could a "reverse qualification" (downgrading) in the case of a clear failure of performance improve the system and increase the level of responsibility of all involved ?
- How important is the achievement of a MER as a combination ?
- Could performances at national competitions be better integrated as part of the overall qualification process ?
- Could larger nations assist smaller nations to establish better national qualification structures and processes ?

The Committee welcomes any other topics proposed by NFs, Riders, Officials, Organizers or others that could be included for discussion point at the Open Forums. It would be appreciated if these topics proposed could be of general interest and/or related to the 2013 Rules revision to all involved.

There are other matters giving cause for concern that I think should be looked at after these important matters are addressed.

In particular deployment of judges at 4\* and all Championship levels, so that there is a balance in Juries using experienced judges along with opening opportunities for progressing judges who have shown high levels of competence.

The names CCI and CIC have no meaning to the public or for that matter to most interested parties. We should find a better name for each after a decision has been made regarding their format. This should help to clearly define them as different competitions.

Thank you for the opportunity to express these views, there is so much more to add,

Best regards,  
Sue

Dr. Ernst Topp, Wiefelstede (GER)

For the discussion of the 2013 rules revision I would like to make the following remarks from my point of view.

#### 1. Competition formats

It is more attractive for the riders to have two different formats, because the athlete needs a goal to work for, i.e. after having completed a few CICs at a certain level, the rider wants to finish a CCI at this level.

On the other hand it might also be more attractive for the public (and TV managers) to offer different types of eventing formats. If you look to other sports like Biathlon, where they changed the formats and put some more attractive ones to it, you could watch the enormous increase of public attraction and interest of this sport.

We will perhaps have to think about quite different formats to the existing ones and also have to put a clearer difference between the special formats.

As in all parts of life, rules should be as simple as possible without any exceptions. If we can achieve to find clear and simple rules for all formats, we can avoid to create confusion also for those who are not "in the sport". That means, it makes Eventing more attractive for the public. (Again we may look to Biathlon.)

I think that two formats make the principle of qualification easier to understand and also easier to handle.

To have the CCIs as only international format and leave the CICs to national format would –in my opinion- not be helpful. Two international formats do produce more variety and attractivity. As the levels of riding, coursebuilding and- designing, judging etc. differ so much between the "larger" and the "smaller" nations there will not develop a good working system of qualifying by leaving the CICs to national level.

The traditional order of tests is in my opinion a fundamental part of eventing and gives a good reason for horse welfare to the public perception.

#### 2. Qualification of Athletes and Horses

The current qualification system has produced a good result in the past, whereas the meaning of MER appears not to be clear to some NFs, etc. in which our sport is not that spread.

For our sport it is very important to have regulations to ensure, that new horses and new riders have enough experience before the step up to next level. This is one of the main subjects to make our sport safer. It should also include a different approach for riders and horses.

As mentioned before the national competitions are in my experience too different in their standards to work for a good qualifying system.

And finally , it is the duty of the more experienced nations to assist the less experienced nations to establish a proper system of qualifying and develop our sport as a whole.

Ernst Topp

---

From: Ryckewaert Tom [mailto:Tom.Ryckewaert@blosso.be]  
Sent: lundi 25 juillet 2011 10:05  
To: Catrin Norinder  
Subject: RE: FEI Eventing - Consultation Process for 2013 Rules Revision

Hi Catrin,

Better late than never I send you some reflections on the sport.

We should look for only **one format** with, for each level, minimum and maximum distances.

The during of the competitions should be kept a short as possible.

I agree that the top riders should be able to "fast track " their horses.

The qualification system works well, but I think we are one of the only sports were the top professional people compete at the top level in the same competition as the amateurs.

The level of the competitions to qualify must be the same so people cannot slip trough the system by choosing the " easier" events.

We should stop combinations to qualify by taking too many alternatives in the xc.( taking note of the risk by sending people the direct way)

The safety management is improving all the time. Most of the accidents are rider mistakes, we must continue to encourage the education and experience of riders and horses.

At many occasions I see ,even experienced, riders "taking a gamble" at some fences without it is considered as dangerous riding. If it works they are stars, if not they are in hospital.

Kind regards,

Tom Ryckewaert.

In South America, because the huge distances between cities and countries, I am sure that we should use long distances (CCI) and not CIC after a big travel. It's so expensive!! If you live in Porto Alegre (south of Brazil) and want to take part in a competition in Rio de Janeiro your horse will travel more than 2000 km in a truck. It's so long a journey to compete in one day event or with a cross country with 5 minutes! Furthermore it's so confused for everybody not involved know what means CIC or CIC and the difference.

Only for local competitions, in a military place or in a Club, we use one day competition, specially for beginners.

Sometimes, because we need qualifications, we do CIC. However with two days.

I am sure that now, using the new qualifications system, the riders are better prepared than before. No doubts that we must keep in this way!

There has been much discussion regarding the CIC and CCI format.

It has long been felt in the UK that the CIC format is often a pain and unnecessary due to the standard of national competitions. It is unclear why the additional cost is so high considering there is hardly any difference between the national xc course and that used for the International class!

That said, on an international level it is clear that we have to have a standard that is used around the world so that riders are able to prepare knowing what standard to expect. A few riders are clear that they appreciate the consistent level supplied by the FEI. If the CIC format is removed it must be clear that National events provide a set standard around the world! How is this enforced?

Riders do not feel that the trot up is a necessary part of the CIC. Any concerns can easily be seen by the ground jury in the Dressage test.

The 2 formats do not create confusion they assist with progression through the grades. The rules surrounding them could be simplified where possible along with the removal of the Trot up.

CIC's are to help with progression through the grades ready for CCI's. This is felt by riders to be correct when in countries where the national courses do not conform to the required standard. If the national federation provide a standard that complies with the FEI standard then these national events must be considered in the qualification rules

One sport....Is this a step too far at this moment in time. This should be our long term aim

Traditional format of the sport. Riders are split on this. Some feel the xc last would enable a better sj spectacle with the emphasis being on the xc. There are just as many riders who feel that the sj should be last so that the atmosphere builds through the competition. Let events decide the format for the CIC's. All CCI's stay in the current format

The use of MER's has been misunderstood. Riders still feel that they are 'ready' to up-grade having attained their MER rather than waiting till confident!

Increase Rider qualification and have different qualifications from that of the horse.

Enable and simplify the re qualifying of horses who have lost their CCI 2\* qualification. The use of National competitions must be considered.

Head covers for use in the dressage. Why are we still discussing this? A recent championship highlighted the confusion. Just allow them as with Dressage.

Sheepskin on the Cheek pieces (This was not my point! , but I do agree) These should be allowed. There is no reason why they are not allowed as they are not blinkers!

I hope this email explains the recent views that have been given to me.

July 27<sup>th</sup> 2011

## Ideas for The FEI Eventing Rules revision:

### 1. Competition formats

It would still be relevant to keep the two formats or rather the branding of two varieties/classes:

- Keep 1\* in one format (CCI)
- 2-4\* in CIC = max 4 000m and higher intensity, more fences/1000 m. Suitable for “Grand Prix” series and “Nations Cup”, like Aachen, Malmo, Barbury, etc
- 2-4\* in CCI = 4 000-7 000 m, 7- 13 min, less intensity, longer, more endurance. The format for Championships, Olympics and the Classics

Formats have to stay clear and defined. A discussion is needed concerning reverse start order in CIC. We are not convinced, out of safety reasons, that we should continue with reverse start order, except for at Championships, “Grand Prix” and “Nations Cup”.

### 2. M E R

- MER has to stay clearly defined by the FEI, implemented by the NF's, understood and respected by the Riders, OC's, Parents, Owners, Sponsors, etc.
- Very important for the Sport that horses and riders get enough right, positive experience before stepping up, so rather slower than quicker through the MER system.
- It could be of importance to allow as an option, in qualifying for 3\*, instead of the CCI\*\*to have 2 or more CIC\*\*.

- Downgrading could be a way of increasing the responsibility, use Yellow cards as its intention, falls, less than 50% in D, more than 16 faults in SJ
- FEI has to secure the equal level and standard of MER Events through their representatives: CD, TD, GJ, Stewards, Vets.
- Important to improve education and the standard of FEI Officials, mentioned above

### **3. Other reflections**

- Would there be ways of making it less expensive for OC's to run the Event as a CIC/CCI rather than a CNC? FEI global Sponsor? Would be of great importance for all countries: to set the FEI MER standard, keep the quality and the control over MER and still make it possible for OC's to run as CIC/CCI.
- Smaller Event needs more support and FEI officials with high competence and dedication. The bigger Events might need stronger direction.
- Nations working together / exchange would be important

Best Regards

On behalf of The Swedish Equestrian Federations Eventing Committee

Tomas Werngren, Chairman

Christina Klingspor

Lars Christensson



**Short Summary of the “Revision of Eventing Rules” from the Board and Advisors of the IEOC, at 12<sup>th</sup> August 2011**

**1. The Board and Advisors of the IEOC recognise that the CCI format is the way forward for the sport**

**2. The CIC should still be available, and be used to obtain Qualifying results. However, National Federations should also be allowed to run qualifying CCNs.**

**IF the CCN is at Three Star level, an FEI TD from the International list {not domiciled in that country} must be appointed, to standardise the XC, and therefore to approve the standard.**

**3. A sub-committee should be set up to evaluate the Qualification System and recommend any changes for the future**

**4. There needs to be a system in place for the ‘accountability and transparency’ of all FEI officials**

**5. The ‘continued education’ of officials through exchange programmes, such as the “Global Education Programme for Eventing Officials” must be sustained.**

**6. On-going review of FEI Seminars to meet all needs, and especially at the Entry Level, with the possibility of “shorter and more local” courses. Also the introduction of “Log “books to include tasks to achieve, which could then be signed off.**