

Session 5 - Jumping Future

The Jumping Committee appreciates all of the comments received from those stakeholders who responded to the Committee's Memo sent out on 4 February in preparation of the Sports Forum. Below is a summary of the proposals put forward in the Memo for discussion at the Sports Forum and the Committee's evaluation of the feedback received on each of the proposals.

I – GAMES & CHAMPIONSHIPS

OLYMPIC GAMES

➤ How great is the need for a change to the format of the Olympic Games?

The recommendations included in the IOC's Olympic Agenda 2020 underline the need for important changes in the Olympic Movement because in today's fast-evolving, diverse and digital society sport plays a more important role in engaging young people than ever before. Putting Olympic Sport at the service of society is one of the Olympic Principles and change is needed if the values of Olympism - excellence, respect, friendship, dialogue, diversity, non-discrimination, tolerance, fair-play, solidarity, development and peace - are to remain relevant in society. The goal of change is progress, which in the eyes of the IOC means strengthening sport in society by virtue of the Olympic values, safeguarding those values and ensuring the success of the Olympic Games. In order to strengthen the relevance of the Olympic message of dialogue, respect for rules, tolerance, solidarity and peace, so important in today's fragile world where we see so much conflict and political, financial and health crises, people have to hear and believe in that message. It is not sufficient just to increase the number of young people watching the Olympic Games; as a sports organisation the IOC has a responsibility to inspire young people to participate in sport by giving them better access to Olympic athletes, Olympic sport, Olympic history, Olympic culture and Olympic values. The IOC proposes to do this through the creation of an Olympic Channel, not only to provide athletes and sports with the worldwide media exposure they deserve during the Olympic Games but also in the period between Olympic Games, as well as to highlight the IOC's many actions in the humanitarian, cultural and social field.

In view of the strong message communicated by the IOC to increase the number of young people involved in sport, the Jumping Committee developed a proposal to allow the participation of more nations in the Olympic Games, in order to increase media exposure and interest in the sport in nations that might otherwise not be involved. The format of 3 athletes per team with no drop score was proposed, not solely for organisational reasons, but also to make the sport easier for the media and public to follow and to provide more exciting sport, both important factors as far as media coverage is concerned.

Outline of Proposed Format:

- 20 teams of 3 athletes, 15 individuals + 20 reserve horses = current quota of 75
- Completely separate Individual and Team competitions, more compact format
- Qualification according to the current qualification system, but with 5 additional team quota places from the existing Olympic Groups

Proposed Qualification System:

| | |
|---|---|
| Teams: 20 teams (NFs may enter 3 athletes as a team, no additional individual athletes) | Individuals: 15 (NFs not represented by a team may enter max. 2 individual athletes) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Host Nation: 1 • WEG: 5 • Olympic Groups A + B: 4 (Eur. Champ.) • Olympic Group C: 2 (Special Qualifier) • Olympic Groups D + E: 3 (Pan-Am Games) • Olympic Group F: 2 (Special Qualifier) • Olympic Group G: 3 (Special Qualifier) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Olympic Group A: 2 (Olympic Ranking) • Olympic Group B: 2 (Olympic Ranking) • Olympic Group C: 2 (Olympic Ranking) • Olympic Group D & E: 4 (Pan-Am Games) • Olympic Group F: 2 (Olympic Ranking) • Olympic Group G: 2 (Olympic Ranking) • Overall Olympic Ranking: 1 |

Proposed Competition Format:

There will be a training session for all athletes the day before the first competition.

Individual event, to be held before the Team event

- 1st Day: one round, open to all athletes (maximum 3 per NF) = 75 athletes (minimum 28 NOCs, maximum 35 NOCs represented)
- 2nd Day: two rounds and possible jump-off for medals, open to 25 best from 1st day
 - First round all 25 start with 0 penalties
 - Second round open to 10 best from first round

One or two rest days

Team event, 3 athletes per team, no drop score, two rounds and possible jump-off for medals (both rounds held on same day)

- 1st round, open to 20 teams of 3 = 60 athletes, one round team competition against the clock (20 NOCs, 2h20' session)
- 2nd round, open to 10 best teams from 1st round, all start with 0 penalties. In case of tie for medal placings, jump-off with 1 athlete per team; teams tied for other placings will be placed according to time of 2nd round. (10 teams, 1h10' session + jump-off).

Rationale for proposed format:

- More flags represented without increasing overall quota (20 teams of 3 and 15 individuals = 75 athletes);
- Selection following the first competition ensures quality in the Final. Separation of individual and team competitions provides more compact competition format, more attractive for OC and TV broadcast;
- Running individual competition before team competition puts focus on nations, rather than individuals and puts less strain on horses. Individual horses jump maximum 4 rounds excluding potential jump-off for medals; team horses jump maximum 6 rounds excluding potential jump-off(s) for medals.
- Heightened level of competition as more NFs can send competitive teams;
- Increased sport entertainment with more drama and excitement.

Areas of consensus on the proposed format:

The majority of stakeholders agreed with the proposal to limit participation in the 2nd round of the team competition to 50% of the teams, based on their classification in the 1st round. There was also consensus on separating the team and individual competitions and on keeping the current qualification system.

Areas of disagreement on the proposed format:

Although several NFs supported the proposal of 3 athletes per team, a majority of the stakeholders who responded were not in favor of the format of 3 athletes per team with no drop

score. The proposal to run the individual competition before the team competition was not supported by all.

Summary of feedback received on the proposed format for the Olympic Games and Jumping Committee evaluation of the main concerns raised by stakeholders:

➤ **Is there a real need to increase the number of flags and how does Equestrian compare to other sports in terms of number of flags?**

Refer to the comments under the first point on page 1 concerning the Jumping Committee's motivation to develop a proposal to increase the number of flags at the Olympics. Although equestrian sport is unique as it involves a partnership with an animal and cannot therefore be compared to other sports, a brief look at some of the participation figures from the 2012 Olympics shows that for some team sports, such as Field Hockey and Basketball, qualification is limited to 12 nations in the men's and in the women's categories, whereas Football has 16 nations in the men's and 12 in the women's, with some overlapping of nations. Some individual sports such as Tennis, which also includes doubles competitions, and Artistic Gymnastics, which includes individual and team events, have significantly more nations represented, with 44 and 55 respectively.

➤ **Would teams of three really mean more flags participating?**

There would be 5 more NFs with teams (20 teams of 3 as opposed to 15 teams of 4). NFs with 3 team athletes may not enter additional individual athletes. There would therefore be new NFs entering one or two individuals.

➤ **If maximising the number of flags is a priority, why not, along with limiting teams to 3 athletes, also propose maximum 1 individual athlete per nation?**

As teams can be composed of 3 athletes it seems logical that the maximum number of individuals any nation may enter is 2 but this can be discussed at the Sports Forum.

➤ **Would teams of 3 with one drop score over the 6 rounds be a good format, or 4 in 1st round with a drop score and 3 in 2nd round with no drop score? Would teams of 4, of which only 3 could take part in the team and individual competitions, be better? The addition of more flags should not be at the expense of horse welfare or quality.**

The proposal of 3 riders per team with no drop score remains on the agenda so that it can be discussed in depth during the Sports Forum, but is not set in stone. If retained, the Committee recognises the need for a possibility for substitution.

➤ **Would teams of 3 and no drop score be more of a concern for horse welfare?**

The concerns about horse welfare can also be applied to the current format; if a team desperately needs to discount a particularly bad score in order to remain competitive, the remaining combination(s) will be under very strong pressure to take part.

➤ **Would teams of 3 and no drop score produce more drama and excitement?**

This depends on perspective; spectators will have a different point of view than a team with a very bad score in the first round, while another team with one bad score may still remain competitive.

➤ **What would be the unintended consequences of introducing the format of 3 athletes per team and no drop score at the Olympics without trying it out first?**

- Could it put the Nations Cup formula at CSIOs at risk?
- How would it affect the other Olympic disciplines of Dressage and Eventing?
- Would the reduced number of places per team impact the owners/athletes who forego the lucrative benefits of high prize money events to try to qualify for the Olympics?
- Reducing the number of athletes per team would have an impact on Additional Accreditation, which is linked to the number of athletes, excluding reserves.

- How would this impact funding levels for some NFs?

The Jumping Committee agrees that it would be beneficial to run some test events to test the format. Whichever format is decided upon, the proposal to run the same format at the WEG would provide an ideal opportunity to fully test the format at the highest level before the Olympics.

➤ **Would the level of the competition have to be lowered in view of potentially less experienced NFs taking part?**

The quality of the competition should not be compromised by more flags being represented; NFs that could not previously field a team of 4 can be competitive with a team of 3. The qualification standard could be raised to ensure all have reached the required technical level. Furthermore, the 1st competition will serve as a selection, much like a preliminary heat in Athletics; of the 75 athletes that start, only 25 advance to the 2nd competition (individuals).

➤ **Would running the individual competition first jeopardise the team competition and would it not disadvantage less experienced nations?**

If a combination had an accident in the individual competition it could compromise the team if there is no possibility for a reserve combination. A solution could be to link competing in the individual competition to eligibility to start or starting order in the team competition and having a reserve horse. The Jumping Committee proposed to run the team event last to put the focus on the Nations Cup as this must remain the priority in order to ensure the sustainability of CSIOs. However, the Committee recognises that equestrian is also an individual sport and there is a risk of athletes not wishing to take part in the team competition if it is run last, preferring to save their horse for example for a high prize money event two weeks later. The order of the competitions must be carefully considered and fully debated at the Sports Forum.

➤ **Would it not be better to emphasise consistency in the team event by carrying forward points from the 1st round rather than starting the 2nd round on 0?**

Having all teams start on a score of 0 in the 2nd round brings more drama and excitement to the sport as any team that qualifies for the 2nd round could be in contention for a medal. This would result in more widespread media interest in the team final.

➤ **Why not allow one qualification place through the WEG for regions that do not have continental Championships/Games, e.g. one place for Groups F/G, as has been done by Dressage for the 2016 Olympics? Could we not make Olympic Qualifying Groups per continent (specifically for Group F)?**

The proposal to allow additional qualification through the WEG (other than the top 5 teams) was discussed by the Committee following the last Sports Forum and was not supported as the WEG should only be used to qualify the very best teams. The issue of continental groups has also been raised in previous years, the priority being establishing balance in each qualifying group; this point can be discussed further at the Sports Forum.

➤ **Why not use the FEI World Cup™ series as a route to qualification, as it is present on all continents?**

This proposal can be discussed at the Sports Forum.

WORLD EQUESTRIAN GAMES

Outline of proposed format:

- The WEG to be run according to the same competition format as the Olympics.
- Participation limited to 100 athletes through a qualification system (25 teams of 3 athletes, 25 individuals, 25 reserve horses).
- Completely separate Individual and Team competitions, shortened format.
- Teams of 3 athletes, no drop score.

- The WEG Team competition will serve as that year’s FEI Nations Cup™ Final.

Rationale for proposed format:

- WEG is primary team qualifier for Olympics, both are categorised as Games and represent pinnacle of the sport, easier for public and media to understand if both have same format.
- Limited participation necessary for organisational reasons and for more exciting sport.
- Selection following the first competition ensures quality in the Final. Separation of individual and team competitions provides more compact competition format, more attractive for OC and TV broadcast;
- Running individual competition before team competition puts focus on nations, rather than individuals and puts less strain on horses. Individuals jump maximum 4 rounds excluding potential jump-off for medal placings; following 1 or 2 rest days, team horses jump maximum 6 rounds excluding potential jump-off for medal placings.
- Heightened level of competition as more NFs could field competitive teams of 3.
- Teams would not have to take part in the FEI Nations Cup™ Final and WEG in same year but will have qualified for both in the same way.

Proposed qualification format for WEG:

| | |
|--|---|
| Teams: 25 teams (NFs may enter 3 athletes as a team, no additional individual athletes) | Individuals: 25 athletes, qualified through the Longines Rankings according to the existing Olympic Groups (NFs may enter maximum 2 individual athletes) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Host Nation: 1 • 18 teams qualified through the FEI Nations Cup™ series • 6 remaining quota places to be filled through a Nations’ Ranking | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Olympic Groups A - G: 2 per Group (the NF qualifies, not the athlete) = 14 • Overall Longines Rankings: 11 |

Proposed Competition Format for WEG (same format as for Olympic Games):

There will be a training session for all athletes the day before the first competition.

Individual event, to be held before the Team event.

- 1st Day: one round, open to all athletes (maximum 3 per NF) = 100 athletes (minimum 38 NFs, maximum 50 NFs represented)
- 2nd Day: two rounds and possible jump-off, open to 25 best from 1st day
 - First round all 25 start with 0 penalties
 - Second round open to 10 best from first round

One or two rest days

Team event, 3 athletes per team, no drop score, two rounds and possible jump-off (both rounds held on same day)

- 1st round, open to 25 teams of 3 = 75 athletes, one round team competition against the clock (25 NFs, 3h session)
- 2nd round, open to 10 best teams from 1st round, all start with 0 penalties. In case of tie for medal placings, jump-off with 1 athlete per team; teams tied for other placings will be placed according to time of 2nd round. (10 teams, 1h10’ session + jump-off).

Areas of consensus on the proposed format:

The majority of stakeholders supported the proposal to limit participation at the WEG and agreed that the team competition at the WEG should serve as the FEI Nations Cup™ Final that year. All were also in favor of limiting participation in the 2nd round of the team competition to the 10 best teams from the 1st round. There was also consensus on separating the team and individual competitions.

Areas of disagreement with the proposed format:

The majority of stakeholders did not support the proposal to use the same format for the WEG and the Olympics. Not all stakeholders were in favor of removing the rotating Final Four competition from the WEG programme, nor were all supportive of qualification for the WEG through the FEI Nations Cup™ series. Although several NFs supported the proposal of 3 athletes per team for the Olympics, a majority of the stakeholders preferred 4 athletes per team with a drop score for the WEG. The proposal to run the individual competition before the team competition was not supported by all. (See the feedback received on the proposed format for the Olympics.)

Summary of feedback received on the proposed format for the WEG and Jumping Committee evaluation of the main concerns raised by stakeholders:**➤ What is the justification for using the same format for the Olympics and the WEG?**

From the point of view of the public and the media, both the WEG and the Olympics are considered as Games at the pinnacle of the sport and using a consistent format makes it easier for the public to follow the sport. As the WEG serve as the primary team qualification for the Olympics and as Olympic qualification is related to NOC funding, the WEG and Olympic formats should be strongly aligned. As owner of the WEG, the FEI can continue to develop and improve the format to ensure we always have our best product for the Olympic Games.

➤ Would teams of 3 with one drop score over the 6 rounds be a good format, or 4 in 1st round with a drop score and 3 in 2nd round with no drop score? Would teams of 4, of which only 3 could take part in the team and individual competitions, be better?

Refer to all comments relating to the format of 3 athletes per team with no drop score under section 1.1 above, as the comments were the same for the WEG as for the Olympics.

➤ Why not maintain the rotating Final, unique to WEG and part of its history, and reduce the 3rd competition by one round?

The reasons for proposing to remove the rotating Final Four from the WEG programme are several. Equestrian sport is unique in that it involves a partnership between a human and a horse. It is this partnership that allows athlete/horse combinations to reach the highest level of the sport and the idea of crowning a World Champion every four years based on several rounds that are not of the highest level on different horses is antithetical to the concept of this partnership. While it is acknowledged that the formula is popular among the media and numerous fans, there is also a growing movement that feels that these extra 4 rounds put additional strain on the horses involved and that there is too much risk of an accident, which could be catastrophic for the image of the sport. Horse welfare must remain our primary concern. The proposal to maintain the current formula with the rotating Final and reduce the 3rd competition by one round to address horse welfare concerns is not a suitable solution as this would reduce the number of total rounds from nine to eight, excluding potential jump-offs for medal placings; if the Final Four is to be maintained, or even if the rotating Final should be only for the athletes competing for the three medal placings, the entire format of the individual competition must be reconsidered.

➤ Rather than limiting the total number of participants at WEG, why not increase the standard for qualification, and require all athletes and horses to qualify as combinations at official competitions? Why not leave the WEG open to all NFs and use preliminary round(s) to filter out the less experienced teams/individuals?

The Jumping Committee is in favour of a rigorous qualification system, both for the Olympics and the WEG, providing all NFs have an equitable path to qualification.

Leaving participation at the WEG unrestricted and using preliminary rounds to separate the more experienced teams and individuals from the rest would not solve the logistical problems relating to space, cost and timetable.

➤ **Would it be a disadvantage to some NFs to use the FEI Nations Cup™ series under the current rules for the qualification of teams for the WEG?**

The Jumping Committee intends to examine the qualification system for Europe Division 2 as it is recognised that many Division 2 NFs do not have the means to travel to 4 events counting for points. For regions where there are no CSIOs, team qualification is based on the points obtained by the NF's 4 highest ranked athletes on the Longines Rankings on a given deadline.

II – EVENT CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM & CSI INVITATION SYSTEM

Event Classification System (ECS)

All stakeholders who provided comments to the Memo of 4 February supported the concept of a new category of 6* events, limited in number and selected through the ECS from existing 5* events. A brief update on the status of the automation of the reporting system for the ECS will be provided at the Sports Forum, along with a summary of evaluations carried out in 2014 and a short presentation on how the ECS could be used going forward for the selection of 6* events and long-term calendar management.

CSI Invitation System

The proposal to link the Longines Rankings to the invitation system and identify 2 types of CSIs (refer to page 8) for this purpose received widespread support. All stakeholders supported the proposed criteria for "Type 1" CSIs and several suggested that these should be compulsory for all CSIO/CSI-W/6*/Finals/Championships. Opinions varied on which option of the "Type 2" events proposed was preferable, although the majority was in favor of allowing ranking points to be distributed in inverse proportion to the number of OC invitations issued.

Summary of feedback received on the proposed Invitation System and Jumping Committee evaluation of the main concerns raised by stakeholders:

➤ **Would it be possible to use an invitation system for all CSIs similar to that of the World Cup, under which invited NFs could enter an athlete of their choice in addition to the other provisions of the invitation rules?**

All proposals relating to the invitation system itself can be discussed at the Sports Forum.

➤ **Would it be possible to extend the wild card system for invitations to CSIs for NFs whose riders will have difficulty getting invitations if OCs invite from the top of the Longines Rankings or sell OC invitations? Could an alternative ranking system be established for nations outside Europe and the USA for this purpose?**

All proposals relating to the invitation system itself can be discussed at the Sports Forum.

➤ **Would it not be better to allow ranking points only to be earned in Nations Cup and Grand Prix competitions?**

The Jumping Committee will discuss all proposals relating to the rules for the Longines Rankings with the IJRC before taking any decisions.

➤ **The proposed "type 2a" with 50% ranking points and maximum 30% OC invitations is easier for the public to understand but "type 2b" with ranking points in inverse proportion to the number of OC invitations allows more flexibility.**

While the proposal to allow ranking points to be distributed in inverse percentage to the number of OC invitations issued was supported by the majority of stakeholders as it would provide more flexibility for OCs and athletes, the Jumping Committee felt, upon closer examination, that there were too many unintended consequences involved with this option, for example:

According to the rules for the Longines Rankings there are different ranking points available depending on the prize money in a class, as established in the various competition groups:

- Group AA = min € 267.500 or US\$ 371.500 offers 150 ranking points to the winner
- Group A = min € 153.000 or US\$ 212.000 offers 130 ranking points to the winner
- Group B = min € 91.500 or US\$ 127.000 offers 100 ranking points to the winner
- Group C = min € 61.500 or US\$ 84.500 offers 80 ranking points to the winner
- Group D = min € 24.500 or US\$ 34.000 offers 50 ranking points to the winner

If an OC inviting a total of 50 athletes opts to issue 30% OC invitations (15), 70% of ranking points would be available at that event under type "2b".

The OC could sell those 15 places for € 20.000 each = € 300.000; the event could then offer a GP of € 268.000 (AA) instead of perhaps € 92.000 (B) without selling the invitations.

Even with only 70% of ranking points available, the winner of this € 268.000 GP would still earn, in addition to the increased prize money of € 176.000, more points than he would have earned in a € 92.000 GP with 100% points available. (70% of the ranking points for an "AA" GP [150 x 0,7 = 105 points], represents more than 100% of the points [100 points] in a "B" GP.) For this reason the Jumping Committee proposes the following two types of CSIs to be identified, according to the number of Longines Ranking points available:

| | Type 1 | Type 2 |
|---|--|--|
| | CSI (100% ranking points) | CSI (50% ranking points) |
| Home athletes* (number of home athletes not counting the home athletes invited in descending order from the Longines Rankings) | Participation of home athletes according to percentage established in invitation rules for the star level of event concerned and stated in schedule: Proposal: CSI5*: 10% - 35% CSI4*: 20% - 40 % CSI2* & 3*: 30% - 50% CSI1*: Min 30% (for invitation rules only, N° of ranking points n/a to CSI1*) | Participation of home athletes according to percentage established in invitation rules for the star level of event concerned and stated in schedule: Proposal: CSI5*: 10% - 35% CSI4*: 20% - 40 % CSI2* & 3*: 30% - 50% CSI1*: Min 30% (for invitation rules only, N° of ranking points n/a to CSI1*) |
| OC invitations** | Max. 5 | CSI4* & 5*: Max. 30% CSI3*: Max. 40 % CSI1* & 2*: Max. 50% (For CSI1*, applies to invitation rules only, N° of ranking points n/a to CSI1*) |
| FEI invitations | 1 for CSI5*, 2 for CSI2*, 3*+4* | 1 for CSI5*, 2 for CSI2*, 3*+4* |
| Remaining athletes (foreign and home athletes) | Completion of quota of athletes to be invited: Athletes taken in descending order from Longines Rankings with disregard to nationality | Completion of quota of athletes to be invited: Athletes taken in descending order from Longines Rankings with disregard to nationality |

NB: The above applies to CSI2* to CSI5* events worldwide at which invitations are restricted. If the event is open to all athletes, 100% ranking points can be distributed. The type of event (type 1 or 2) must be indicated in the FEI calendar when it is published.

* Home athletes: If the NF is unable to enter the minimum number of home athletes as per the percentages established for the star level of the event, these places are filled from the Longines Rankings in descending order.

** Definition of OC invitation (heretofore commonly referred to as OC wildcard or paycard): an invitation extended by the OC to an athlete who has not been invited in descending order of the Longines Rankings or entered as a home athlete by the home NF or nominated by the FEI to

receive the FEI invitation. Detailed conditions under which OC invitations are issued must be clearly stated in the Schedule.

* * * * *

Additional points for consideration

The additional points for consideration (dress code, national identification, names of horses) included in the Jumping Committee's Memo of 4 February were not for discussion at the Sports Forum, but for the Jumping Committee meeting to be held following the Sports Forum. The Committee is grateful for the comments received from stakeholders on these items.

19/03/2015