

JUMPING ROUND TABLE

9 April 2013

Executive Summary - Contents

1. Event Classification System	<i>John Madden</i> <i>Chair FEI Jumping Committee</i>
2. Jumping Rules Revision	<i>Stephan Ellenbruch</i> <i>Member, FEI Jumping Committee</i>
3. CSI Invitation Rules	<i>Marco Fusté</i> <i>Deputy Chair, FEI Jumping Committee</i>

1. EVENT CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (ECS)

John Madden presented an outline of the Event Classification System (ECS). The goal of the ECS was to encourage OCs to exceed the minimum requirements. For events looking to improve, the evaluation would provide valuable feedback moving forward and would help to strengthen the FEI brand as well as the sport itself. The evaluation questionnaire was divided into sections to allow specific persons, such as Stewards, Judges, foreign rider, etc. to answer the questions within their realm of expertise; putting the report on-line in the future would make it less cumbersome to fill out and easier to compile scores for analysis. The ECS provided a tangible way for stakeholders to relate to events. This would help OCs to attract more stakeholders: riders, sponsors, spectators, media etc. It would also help motivate and reward Officials by allowing them to provide constructive feedback in such a way that did not penalise the event organisations.

The questions were designed to be objective and could be numerically graded as opposed to a pass/fail system. This would enable us to generate a number score for each show and thus a ranking for all events. For the purposes of scoring an event, the results of the evaluation were weighted for importance. For example, rule compliance and footing quality were both weighted heavier than printed material or press facilities. In continuing to fine tune the process, the questionnaire would be sent to all departments of the FEI for feedback.

Questions and Answers on the Event Classification System:

Eleonora Ottaviani: Do you consider also the quality of the riders for the score?

John Madden: *Yes, the quality of the horse/rider combinations is in itself an excellent evaluation; if a rider chooses to bring his best horse that means it is a good event. One part of the questionnaire is based on which horse rider*

combinations were there, for which we have developed a points system; this is heavily weighted in the evaluation.

Eleonora Ottaviani (IJRC): The IJRC has done a kind of evaluation of events over the years. If you give a questionnaire to different riders you will get different answers, so we used an average of three; this would be difficult for your system.

John Madden: *Yes, to solve this problem we've tried to introduce controlled questions which are then given to different data sources to ensure a fair answer.*

Eleonora Ottaviani: Thank you for your hard work, it is very important for riders, sponsors etc. to know exactly which kind of show they are entering; some 3* events are no better than 1* quality.

John Madden: *That brings up another point, some events are top level but these are not the only ones that need to be evaluated; we also need to evaluate the lower level events that are also important to the sport. We need different types of events so we can develop horses and riders but also showcase our star events.*

Sami Al Duhami (KSA): Our team is always questioning the footing, safety for horses at events; it is important to have that as major component.

John Madden: *Yes, the footing is very heavily weighted, we have a survey from 10 riders for the footing in the Competition arena, practice arena and warm-up area. If an event doesn't meet the minimum numeric score on the footing and technical compliance, it doesn't matter how good their VIP or press facilities, etc. are.*

2. JUMPING RULES REVISION

Stephan Ellenbruch began his presentation of the rule revision by explaining the reasons for periodic rule changes (improvement of fairness, safety, horse welfare and clarifications) and the process followed for the revision: the FEI asked stakeholders (NFs, officials and athletes) for proposals. Approximately 150 proposals had been submitted, of which the Jumping Committee agreed on about 130 cases.

Rather than go through each proposal received, the presentation focussed on the following topics:

- Water Jump, Water Jump with Vertical and Liverpool
- Jump-Offs
- Headgear
- Hind leg boots
- Officials
- Grand Prix Qualification
- Special competitions
- FEI Olympic Athletes Ranking List

Water Jump, Water Jump with Vertical and Liverpool: Clarification was added to the rules to differentiate between water jumps, water jumps with a vertical obstacle and liverpools. The specifications for the construction of the water jump had been introduced to encourage Course Designers to use them so long as they are constructed in the correct way. The Jumping Committee noted that there was a problem with the requirement that the footing surrounding the water jump must be built up and that the surface of the water must be 10cm lower than the surrounding footing; the most important thing was that the level of the water must be lower than the surrounding footing. The specifications have been revised accordingly.

Jump-Offs:

Starting Order: An option has been included to the method of establishing the starting order of the jump-off to encourage riders to not only have a clear round but to try to gain a better starting order in the jump-off by riding the first round slightly faster. This option is at the discretion of the OC and must be stated in the schedule.

Obstacles in the Jump-Off: The reason for introducing alterations to the obstacles that can be used in the jump-off is to provide Course Designers more flexibility so they can make an interesting jump-off using the existing obstacles from the previous round(s). The Course Designer must bear in mind related distances if he's changing a vertical from the initial round to a spread in the jump-off and jumping it from other direction; this will be further clarified in the Memorandum for International Jumping Events.

Headgear: The helmet campaign has been a big success, riders have been complying with the new rules. However, provisions have been added for cases of loss of headgear during a competition; if the athlete does not recover and properly refasten his headgear, he will be eliminated. Provision has also been added that senior athletes are allowed to remove their headgear during the presentation of prizes and the playing of the national anthem only.

Hind leg boots: The Jumping Committee has appointed a Working Group to consider hind boots that are not used for protection only.

Officials :

Education of Officials: The Jumping Committee feels it is very important to focus on the education of officials. For judges this involves not just judging itself, but also knowledge of course design, distances between obstacles etc. The Committee intends to implement a type of quality control for all officials.

Appeal Committee: The Appeal Committee will no longer be compulsory for CSIs and CSIOs; only for Championships, Finals and Games. However, the FEI will have the right to appoint an Appeal Committee for large Tours with many horses as it is impossible for the Ground Jury to check all passports in addition to their other functions.

Grand Prix Qualification: Athletes pre-qualified for the Grand Prix must start their GP horse in at least one other competition prior to the GP so the horse's first time appearance in the arena is not for the GP .

Special Competitions: Rules for the Masters competition have been included as this is a competition held at many events so it is logical that standardised rules be included. Clarifications have been added to the rules for the Top Score competition.

Olympic Athletes Ranking List: Provision will be added to the rules for the Olympic Games that the number of points available in a competition counting for the Olympic Athletes Ranking List will depend on the number of starters in the competition, to avoid the possibility of manipulating the rankings. The percentage of points available will be decreased proportionally from 100% points for 30 or more starters down to 60% of points for 5-9 starters; no points will be available in competitions with fewer than 5 starters.

Questions and Answers on the Jumping Rules Revision:

Fritz Otto-Erley (GER): Is it possible to re-name the Masters competition as many traditional events are already named Masters.

John Roche: *We need all jumping competitions to fit a certain article so we have standardised the rules for this competition. There are events called Masters but these events are run according to FEI rules and they may keep the word Masters in their title. But there is a specific format that must be used should they wish to hold a Masters competition.*

Pablo Mayorga (ARG): With regard to headgear, sometimes the rules refer to persons and sometimes to athletes; we should harmonise the terms. And you can't disqualify a non-athlete, so what do you do if a person doesn't put the helmet on when told to do so?

Stephan Ellenbruch: *The rules are very clear that any person on a horse must wear the headgear, in the arena it is clear that this will only be athletes. A verbal warning and a yellow card can also be given to a non-athlete.*

Pablo Mayorga (ARG): Are seniors allowed to remove the headgear for the lap of honour?

Stephan Ellenbruch: *Seniors must wear the headgear at all times apart from when receiving prizes and during playing of the national anthem.*

Cesar van Waltzel (FIN): Perhaps we should clarify the rule that the helmet must be refastened prior to the lap of honour. Also, regarding the water jump, maybe the water jump judge should be higher status than a national judge. Finally, for the Masters competition, the formula of lowering the fence if the rider has a fault is boring for the public. I suggest that an athlete must complete the course clear and only then may choose an obstacle to be raised.

Stephan Ellenbruch: *I agree with your comment about the water jump judge; this will be on the agenda of the Jumping Committee meeting tomorrow. The Committee will also review your proposal about headgear and the formula for the Masters.*

Karoly Fugli (HUN): For the helmet rule, it would be better to follow the existing rule regarding a fence knocked down by the wind: the time should be stopped and the rider given the chance to recover his helmet without being penalised by the time.

John Madden: *The rider has the responsibility to properly fasten his headgear and should ensure all his equipment is prepared. If we take this responsibility away from the rider it will increase the risk of it happening more.*

Tom Gordin (FIN): Does the pre-qualified Grand Prix horse have to start or finish another competition? I suggest the horse should have to finish the competition with a result.

John Roche: *The intention was that the horse must start only so it participates in one other competition without going into the GP cold, but we will reconsider the matter.*

Eleonora Ottaviani (IJRC): We don't need only judges and stewards who know the rules; we need judges who use a lot of common sense who are able to interpret the rules rather than trying to cover every eventuality in the rules. Judges need to be able to understand situations under the pressure of the Olympic Games. Also Judges and Stewards need to look after the legal cases; we have three different sanctions for the same problem.

John Madden: *The Committee had a big discussion about this and it comes down to quality, which is an aspect we are looking into very closely, how to analyse the quality of our existing officials so we know who is capable of properly adjudicating a case. At the same time the rules must be detailed and clear and strict. One of our priorities is to investigate how we can measure and influence the quality of all our officials.*

Jack Huang (TPE): What happens if the helmet comes off in a triple combination?

Stephan Ellenbruch: *Common sense must apply, we are talking about safety but must also consider horse welfare. Judges have to respect if the rider is in the middle of the combination it is clear that he cannot stop the horse one stride from a fence. We will point this out in the Memorandum.*

Kazuya Hirayama (JPN): For the water jump with a vertical, the length of the poles must be 10% less than the width of the water?

Stephan Ellenbruch: *This was a previous proposal that has since been revised. As some water jumps are 6 m wide this would have meant very heavy poles (5.4 m long) would have to be used. The Committee therefore reconsidered this issue and*

decided that the minimum length of the poles must be 3.50 m, regardless of the width of the water jump.

Sami al Duhami (KSA): Regarding the points for the rankings. We have only 25 athletes in the GP at our events, so this means that they will only get 90% of points?

John Roche: *You raise a good point as this occurs quite often especially in the FEI World Cup Arab League qualifying competitions. This needs to be resolved by increasing the number of riders in the GP to 30.*

3. CSI Invitation Rules

Marco Fusté emphasised that the proposed concept was a proposal only at this stage and that many details still needed to be worked out. The Jumping Committee had taken into account the following parameters in developing the proposed new invitation rules:

- Invitation Rules should not apply to events where the entries are not limited;
- Introduction of a Certificate of Capability for wildcards at CSI5* and CSI4*;
- Provision to allow athletes to be added in descending order from the Rankings
- Consideration to be given to the percentages of home and foreign riders;
- Separate rules for series (FEI World Cup™, FEI Nations Cup™, Global Champions Tour and Riders' Tour) should be maintained;
- On-line entry system.

The proposed new invitation rules, to be applied to CSI5* (worldwide), CSI4*, CSI3* and possibly CSI2* (in Europe), could be summarised as follows:

- XX% of the competitors invited in descending order from the Rankings (up to XXth place); replacements in descending order (e.g. 80% for 5*, 75% for 4*, 70% for 3*)
- OC Wild Cards: XX%, ranked or unranked (e.g. 20% for 5*, 25% for 4*, 30% for 3*)
- FEI Wild Cards: 1 for CSI5*, 2 for CSI4* & CSI3*, none for CSI2*

The exact percentages had not yet been defined but the concept was that the higher the level the event, the smaller the number of OC wild cards would be available. Before finalising the invitation rules, it might be necessary to reassess the deadline dates for definite entries to ensure that riders who wanted to enter a CSI5* but were not accepted would still have the possibility to enter a 4* or 3* on the same weekend. The new on-line entry system would allow for greater control of entries in the future; once it came into effect, we would be able to see how it affected the invitation rules. We would also be able to monitor OC wild cards more closely; the FEI had an obligation to the sport to better control the entries to ensure the sport remained healthy for the long term. At the end of the year the Jumping Committee would review the

information and data on how the new entry system worked to see if modifications to the invitation rules were necessary.

Questions and Answers on the Invitation Rules:

Eleonora Ottaviani (IJRC): We appreciate control on wild cards by the FEI but there is one problem, we must be strict with the deadline date and with the replacements. The IJRC is not totally against pay cards, but there must be strict control. Giving 20% wild cards to the OC is dangerous as most probably 10% will end up as pay cards.

John Madden: *This proposal has come at a very dynamic time. We will be in a new world with the on-line entry system; it will be a huge part of the solution. We will be careful with the dates, by when athletes must tell the OC if they are or are not coming. As for OC wild cards, the exact percentages have not yet been established. In order to be on the ranking list athletes need to be able to get into events. If we exclude the OC wild cards then athletes can never get on the lists. It must be partly open. A big part of why we need to look at this is because we understand there is a pay card issue within the sport, but it is not always clear cut. Referring back to the Event Classification System, I hope that one day it is sophisticated enough, that if an OC takes a number of pay cards it would affect their rating seriously.*

Peter Cooke (AUS): Athletes coming to Europe from overseas come with very little points and therefore can't get invitations through their ranking, they have to count on wild cards to get into an event. It is not always possible for horse/rider combinations coming to Europe for the first time to have a Certificate of Capability; more discussion is needed on how to help these combinations. It is not cheap to bring a horse to Europe so a rider would only do it if he was confident that his horse is up to standard.

John Madden: *We are cognisant of that and we encourage NFs to foster more and more events in their own region in view of the difficulty for their riders to get points.*

Tom Gordin (FIN): The Alliance of Jumping Organisers is pleased with the cooperation with the FEI on this proposal. It is a good system that most of us can work with very well. A rider can buy his way into the sport but he can't buy success, only his skill will count.

Eleonora Ottaviani (IJRC): It is not about the people who can afford to get in, it is about those who cannot afford to buy in who may have really big talent.

Yasuhiko Haruta (JPN): What about the percentage of home and foreign riders, how do we consider this?

John Madden: *The details on that are not yet worked out; we will need to hear from more Federations to understand the issues in specific regions.*

Mark Samuel (CAN): The Jumping Committee must be sensitive to the needs of developing nations as the invitation rules seem to be biased towards Europe and

those in North America who can afford to participate. The remaining 80% of NFs do not have access to events and hence to ranking points. And now qualifications for the Olympic Games is affected through individual slots. The opportunity to access points is so important and we must be open to a different option other than only the list.

John Madden: *There must also be opportunity, not just sensitivity for these NFs. At this morning's Jumping Committee meeting, Max Kühner offered to carry out a statistical analysis on participation figures in all regions; this will allow us to see what numbers need to be used to ensure the needs of developing nations are met.*

Mark Samuel (CAN): The North American teams that come to Europe to develop their riders do not just participate at CSIOs, they will also send four individuals to CSI3* and 4* events. We are concerned that with this proposal we will not be able to use these stepping stone events.

John Madden: *That's an excellent point; perhaps we should consider a composite score for NFs so they can secure some places at these 3* and 4* events.*

Otto Becker (GER): It would be good to know how many home riders are participating at CSI3* and CSI4* events.

John Madden: *This is still a proposal and we need to work out the details. Getting a statistical analysis and seeing how the on-line entry system works will tell us something and help us figure out the needs of different NFs.*

Ali Kucuk (TUR): For those coming for the first time to European circuit from abroad, it is not always an environment where all those involved get ranking points due to the high number and quality of riders. They might get more points in their own region where there are fewer participants than in Europe.

Jakob Leth (DEN) : Regarding the number of home riders, smaller CSIOs need more home riders than the big ones, they are currently only allowed 18 home riders.

Sönke Lauterbach (GER): Otto Becker was referring to the problem of younger riders who want to get invitations to CSIs. Also, has the principal of inviting NFs now gone? I suggest you maintain the idea of inviting NFs.

John Roche: *The details have not yet been worked out; all these issues need to be considered. We will look at the current invitation system when finalising the rules for the new system.*

John Madden: *We are far from finalising the proposal, we don't know yet if it will be necessary to implement this for CSI2* events. It is important for us to see the data we collect under the current situation; we don't want to risk taking something away from our stakeholders.*

Frances Triulzi (ISJC): At smaller shows when the invitations go out, they are not inviting riders, they are sending the invitations to NFs, for two or three riders, relinquishing control over which riders are entered.

John Madden: *Yes, this is the point made by Sönke Lauterbach.*

Eleonora Ottaviani (IJRC): with regard to Otto Becker's comment about home riders, it is necessary to analyse the situation of the home country. Germany is not the same as a smaller NF.

John Madden: *Agreed, this is why we want to carry out a statistical analysis.*