

EEF Position Paper

2017 FEI Sports Forum - Jumping



Belgicastraat 9, box 2, 1930 Zaventem Belgium

Phone: + 32 2 478 50 56 Fax: +32 2 478 11 26

Email: info@euroequestrian

04 April 2017

FEI Nations Cup Jumping

In addition to the proposal that has already been submitted to the FEI for Division 2, the following questions posed in the supporting document for the FEI Sports Forum have been answered in preparation for the Forum:

1. Do we believe the concept of qualifiers and a Final is a good concept from a sports and marketing perspective?

Yes, it is interesting from all points of view: sports, marketing and media. From the marketing aspect, the format must be attractive and with a good value. The format must be competitive within the market.

The NC Division 1 must also determine qualification for European and World Championships and for Olympic Games. Double Longines ranking points to be offered in the NC.

2. Is it possible to reduce the number of qualifiers and increase the financial contribution to them if available?

We do not feel there is a need to reduce the number of qualifiers, but we think each region should manage their own qualifiers or their own qualification system. If the Series continues to be global, each region should have the chance to qualify for the Final. The current FNCJ qualifier is not understandable for audience. The concept is better explained when all qualifiers count.

3. Should all qualifiers be of 5* level (based on prize money and ECS)?

We don't believe that all qualifiers should be of 5* level, otherwise we would kill Europe Division 2 and North America, Central America & Caribbean leagues. At least not for a few years, helping the development of some regions.



4. Do we need to try to involve the CSIOs that are not part of the series and if so how?

We don't think that we need to involve CSIOs that are not part of the series but we would like to clarify that the team competition at CIOs must still be allowed to be called a Nations Cup also if the CIO is not part of any series.

5. At the qualifiers, is it an option to merge the NC and the GP into the NC competition by merging the prize money and offering prize money for team and individual performance as well as allocate more points for the Longines ranking?

No, we believe that the NC and the GP can coexist. We also think that more Longines points should be allocated for performance in the NC. We agree that the NC should be the highlight of the event. It is important for each event to accommodate 15 to 20 home riders who would have little to compete for if the NC and GP were merged.

6. Do we need to review the competition format for qualifiers? How can we make it more interesting for a wider audience?

The competition format over two rounds is a unique selling point of the Nations Cup and should not be changed to a one round competition with jump-off because it is felt that this would turn the Nations Cup into an ordinary Grand Prix competition. A majority of the Division 1 OCs is of a different opinion though which is not shared by the EEF.

It is furthermore proposed that the NC organizers are contributing at least with a part of their investments in public relations for the series.

7. What would be the minimum prize money needed in the FNCJ Final?

In an ideal situation, a rider from the winning team should earn an amount of money that is comparable with a rider that wins a CSI5* GP. We consider that 1,5M€ on prize money for the Final must be a minimum requirement. We also consider that instead of giving a bonus in prize money, it should be given in Longines ranking points.

It could also be interesting to offer the same amount of Longines Ranking Points for the NC Final as for the WEG.

8. Should the FNCJ be used as a qualifier to allocate some quota places for the Olympic Games?

Using the NC as a qualifier to allocate some quota places for the Olympic Games is one of our core proposals. We would recommend to base the qualification on a team ranking over a period of three years preceding the Olympic year (not only based on one NC Final).

9. During a WEG year should we integrate the Final of the FNCJ in the WEG as the Jumping Team World Championship?

No, we propose to keep these two events separate.

10. How can we increase the identity of the FNCJ and make it more consistent at events?

There is room for improvement with regards to global communication. Especially in order to reach out to a new audience we need emotional involvement and a guided story telling. We understand that for the general media and audience the identity of each of these traditional shows, in most cases, supersedes the identity of the series.

11. How can we further increase the value of the potential sponsor?

Leave the streaming of the NC available for free and don't limit it to pay-TV (FEI-TV). Improve the fan engagement on the screens and on the site.

12. We understand Europe wants to maintain Division 1 but how can we better integrate the other European NFs (Division 2) in the FNCS?

Please see separate EEF proposal that has been submitted for Division 2.

Harmonization of CSI/CSIO requirements

➤ **Is there a need for CSI/CSIO requirements? If so, what should they cover?**

Yes, there is a need for such requirements and they should cover what they cover now. The details of the various requirements must be reviewed regularly but no structural change is necessary.

➤ **What are the rights and obligations of athletes to organizers and of organizers to athletes?**

Both athletes and organizers need to act with goodwill and respect each other. The details approved in the FEI event schedule must be correctly followed by both parties.

➤ **How should events be funded at the lower level, at the top level?**

There are different ways of funding equestrian events and the current market shows that organizing Jumping events is lucrative. Events are normally funded with a combination of entry fees, sponsorship and/or patronage and as long as organizers stick to the FEI rules the organizers should be given as much flexibility as possible to apply business models that suit their individual situation. The EEF would like to point out again that it has proposed an invitation system according to which the Ranking List points would be distributed in relation to the personal invitations issued by the OC (= the more invitations, the less ranking points), this would give significant freedom to organizers and transparency for riders.

➤ **Can existing small events held once a year in temporary facilities, versus events held several times a year in permanent facilities, survive under the current CSI requirements and the new invitation system? Should CSI/CSIO requirements differ for various parts of world?**

Yes, they can survive under the current CSI requirements and the new invitation system. Yes, the CSI/CSIO requirements may differ for various parts of the world.

➤ **Are minimum requirements effective? Could a more free-market system that rewards excellence work?**

Yes, minimum requirements are effective but only within the framework of the Event Classification System (ECS) with a flat fee on three levels. The current system already reflects a market that is free enough and the number of events being organized show that there is also an excellence rewards system. Minimum requirements will have to differ due to different regional/continental conditions.

➤ **Are the prize money ranges for the different star levels appropriate? Should prize money alone determine the star level?**

Yes, in general the prize-money ranges for the different star levels are appropriate but they need to be reviewed regularly. For CSI4* events the prize-money requirements may have to be amended because it appears to be a problem in real life. No, prize-

money alone should not determine the star level, we need the Event Classification System (ECS) as a basis for that.

- **What should an entry fee cover? Should the entry fee be in relation to the prize money offered?**

The entry fee should cover all cost for a rider/horse combination without any further hidden fees because riders and NFs need to be able to plan their annual budget. No, the entry fee shall not be related to prize-money. It is necessary to review the defined details of entry fees in regular intervals.

Additional EEF comment: It would be desirable to establish a stronger link between the event classification and the Ranking List. In Tennis for example, athletes only get points at events that have gone through a development and evaluation process.