

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	David Goldstrom -Television perspective	Simon Goddard -Warwick Horse Trials Club – Queensland Australia	Alec Lochore Burnham Market - GBR	Dr. Hanfried Haring – DOKR - GER	Val Waters – Kihikihi Waikato - NZL	Claude Prieur – PAU - FRA	Pierre Le Goupil – Martinvast - FRA	Sue Etherington- Smith – Chatsworth - GBR
<p>1. Final: When should the Final be?</p> <p>Is the cycle of qualifiers correct?</p> <p>Should the Final be each year or every other year?</p>	Spring or Autumn (May/October).	The final should be organized every second year. The whole competition should be run in a single year.	Autumn (late September to late October). Final held annually.	The number of qualifiers is fine. Ideally no final. Create a point system (points to 1/3 or 50% of competitors per Q). Final: end of May (following year). Indoor cup proposition (20-25 riders).	As present. Final time does not suit Southern Hemisphere as it is at the beginning of our Spring season. Cycle of qualifiers: suits NZ (end of Autumn season). Final: every other year.	At the end of the season. The cycle of qualifiers could be a 12 month period from Final to Final; or from the 1 st November until the following Final. This would mean one Final per year.	At the end of the season. The cycle of qualifiers should not be too rigid and adapt itself. We do not understand the advantage of a final every other year.	Spring season / early summer. Every other year.
2. Where should the Final be? Do we genuinely believe that owners and riders will fly to Australia or the USA for the Final or should we simply have the final in Europe?	Awarded to a country in which the finals will be extensively broadcast.	The final must be held in a variety of countries around the world.	In Europe in order to get the maximum numbers of competitors. In due course it should become intercontinental.	Support the idea of no final. In Europe in order to get the maximum numbers of competitors. Financial help for the best combinations from AUS & USA.	Australia. Logically, Europe is the place for the Final. (Idea of a permanent venue for the Final).	In Europe.	The final should be anywhere. The WC is worldwide by definition.	In Europe.
3. Should there be Regional Finals to feed the Final?	Yes.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	Only if it represents good commercial sense.
4. How do we get riders to buy in to the concept and to support the Final? Travel allowance? Prize money further down the line?	Devise a realistic qualification format and significant prize money.	Contract payments as prize money (i.e. cricket, rugby). Travel allowance for long distance. More support from the NF (moral, financial and administrative).	Money and facilities (currently no cohesion between qualifiers and finals). More structure. Timing of the final is crucial (avoid clashes). Promote and market the final to competitors. Travel allowance/Prize money. Where does the money come from as it already costs the organizer a great deal?	The qualifiers are already well accepted and will even improve with the new system without a final.	Assistance with travel. Yes, should help attract competitors.	Require a qualifying result in at least one competition abroad. Prize money should be given to more riders. The cost of transport should be paid by national federations at this level of competition.	Increase the prize money and offer a special financial support to riders participating at the final. The WC needs the support from the top riders, riders & NF from all over the world.	Good prize money. Travel assistance and additional qualification perk.

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	Rebecca Broussard – Kalispell (Montana) – USA	Robert Kellerhouse – Temecula - USA
<p>1. Final: When should the Final be?</p> <p>Is the cycle of qualifiers correct?</p> <p>Should the Final be each year or every other year?</p>	<p>Late September to late October.</p> <p>Final held annually.</p> <p>Interesting scenario: "no Final", using points to determine winner. That is actually how we run the Gold Cup Series in the US.</p>	<p>Late Spring time.</p> <p>Every other year.</p>
<p>2. Where should the Final be? Do we genuinely believe that owners and riders will fly to Australia or the USA for the Final or should we simply have the final in Europe?</p>	<p>In the USA in 2010 before or after the WEG in Kentucky (venue: Fork or Tallhassee).</p>	<p>In Europe.</p>
<p>3. Should there be Regional Finals to feed the Final?</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>4. How do we get riders to buy in to the concept and to support the Final?</p> <p>Travel allowance?</p> <p>Prize money further down the line?</p>	<p>Financial support (traveling money or stipends).</p>	<p>Travel allowance based on miles traveled.</p> <p>Prize money does not inspire event riders to travel.</p>

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	David Goldstrom -Television perspective	Simon Goddard -Warwick Horse Trials Club – Queensland Australia	Alec Lochore Burnham Market - GBR	Dr. Hanfried Haring – DOKR - GER	Val Waters – Kihikihi Waikato - NZL	Claude Prieur – PAU - FRA	Pierre Le Goupil – Martinvast - FRA	Sue Etherington- Smith – Chatsworth - GBR
<p>5. Qualifiers: How many qualifiers should there be?</p> <p>Is the calendar right?</p> <p>Do we need to limit the numbers of qualifiers?</p>	<p>Too many qualifying competitions for television.</p>	<p>Too many qualifiers especially in the Northern Hemisphere. Have more qualifiers in the Southern Hemisphere.</p> <p>Our position is that there should be fewer qualifiers OR a return to the non-cumulative points system, as was the case with the original concept.</p>	<p>More rather than less.</p>	<p>All fine as it is.</p>	<p>The present number of qualifiers appears sufficient.</p>	<p>Not necessary to limit the number of qualifiers.</p>	<p>There should be enough qualifiers so that each NF could have 2 to 3 competitions accessible in terms of distance.</p>	<p>Depends on geographical considerations, the number and range of competitors. NF's responsibility in the number of qualifiers.</p>
<p>6. Rules: Is the concept right in its present format?</p> <p>Should we insist on the jumping being last or should we allow OCs to run in whatever order they wish?</p> <p>(There is a case for having the cross country last to differentiate the FEI World Cup Eventing from CCIs.)</p>	<p>Little difference in which order the disciplines are run.</p>	<p>The concept is satisfactory as it is at present.</p> <p>We must insist on the jumping being last!</p> <p>The sequence of dressage, CC and then jumping is the essence of eventing and where it draws its roots!</p>	<p>Yes the concept of the EWC is a good one and we must drive it forward - however it needs more structure and cohesiveness.</p> <p>Yes I agree with this point - I think that it is very important to differentiate between the 2 types of competitions. I think that if this is adopted we should try and run both SJ & XC in reverse order. The arguments that the FEI have against this is that they want a nice mounted prize giving just at the end, however I think that we could still have a significant ceremony but it might on this occasion not include the horses.</p>	<p>We think you should leave the order of tests to the OCs.</p> <p>The idea to differentiate the FEI WCE as a CIC from CCIs is a good one. But also the order with both Cross Country and Show Jumping on the last day should be possible because it is very interesting for the public.</p>	<p>The present format suits NZ as daylight saving has finished. If we had to run cross country last we would not be able to have a prize giving ceremony, which is proving very popular with competitors and the public.</p> <p>Another problem which could occur is a protest, which may take several hours to resolve.</p> <p>Allow OCS to run in order that suits the time of the year being held.</p>	<p>The cross country should be last during the Final.</p> <p>For the qualifiers, it should be up to the organizing committees to decide.</p> <p>In order to maintain the suspense throughout the cross country event, that the two thirds of the couples the least well noted in both the dressage and the jumping should ride in the order stated in the program. Then the top third couples should ride the cross country in reverse order.</p>	<p>In the European continent, it's easier to get spectators when the CC is on Sunday. Show Jumping before CC is better for the show and the experience proves that it does not bother the sport.</p> <p>OCs should always be free to decide what is the best for their event.</p>	<p>OCs must be permitted to run the phases in whatever order they wish (except that dressage comes first!)</p>

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	Rebecca Broussard – Kalispell (Montana) – USA	Robert Kellerhouse – Temecula - USA
<p>5. Qualifiers: How many qualifiers should there be?</p> <p>Is the calendar right?</p> <p>Do we need to limit the numbers of qualifiers?</p>		<p>As many as it take to serve a region to allow for relative ease of participation. (3 or 4 in one country to service the sheer number of competitors).</p> <p>No limitation in the number of qualifiers.</p>
<p>6. Rules: Is the concept right in its present format?</p> <p>Should we insist on the jumping being last or should we allow OCs to run in whatever order they wish?</p> <p>(There is a case for having the cross country last to differentiate the FEI World Cup Eventing from CCIs.)</p>	<p>Should allow OC's to run in whatever order they wish.</p> <p>Sow jumping last but have no objection to others doing it the other way.</p>	<p>Let each organizer choose what best fits their event.</p>

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	David Goldstrom -Television perspective	Simon Goddard -Warwick Horse Trials Club – Queensland Australia	Alec Lochore Burnham Market - GBR	Dr. Hanfried Haring – DOKR - GER	Val Waters – Kihikihi Waikato - NZL	Claude Prieur – PAU - FRA	Pierre Le Goupil – Martinvast - FRA	Sue Etherington- Smith – Chatsworth - GBR
7. If we set criteria then we must adhere to them and so are the present rules/criteria acceptable/correct/the best possible?		<p>a. Timetable: difficult to stage the official trot up between CC and jumping. Run the CC at lunchtime would be better.</p> <p>b. Prize money should be encouraged but not so prescriptive.</p> <p>c. The last rule we think needs fine-tuning is the one where riders can over rule officials and refuse to jump a jump. The inclusion of a deadline for protests would give time to ensure the process can be seen through in its entirety.</p>	The chance to qualify must be inclusive but the final must be exclusive	The present rules are fine.	Yes, acceptable.	See previous answer.	<p>More suppleness in the order of the tests.</p> <p>Rules should incite riders to take part to more qualifiers.</p>	Flexibility on the prize money requirements.
8. Are the rules of the World Cup Eventing simple enough?		Yes.	They are not complicated currently.	Yes, they are not complicated currently. The point system should be changed (see above).	Yes.	Yes.	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Do the rules really encourage riders to compete at qualifiers?</p>	Could be simpler. Essential to have the top 3 automatically qualifying and then some sort of scale points thereafter.
9. Are the obligations that the OC for the Final has to accept ok or are they too much?	Unrealistic to stage the World Cup Final as a stand alone event. Minimise the financial burden on the Organiser.	<p>Prize money is too expensive.</p> <p>Impossible to pay for the transport costs of horses and riders.</p>	Prize money must be high but sponsorship is desperately. I think that the enforcement of minimum levels of prize money would preclude some venues that are worthy of holding a qualifier.	If you keep the final, the obligations will be fine; the prize money must be high in order to make it interesting for the best combinations.	Ok.	Keep the obligations at a high level; whether it is in terms of communication, (TV, Press Room), prize money, technical quality of the competition (ground, quality of jumps, technical difficulties, etc...).	<p>Financial obligations with minimum prize money are quite heavy.</p> <p>The cost of hosting a final is too high regarding the lack of income from a major sponsor and the poor worldwide TV coverage.</p>	Too demanding at present.

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	Rebecca Broussard – Kalispell (Montana) – USA	Robert Kellerhouse – Temecula - USA
7. If we set criteria then we must adhere to them and so are the present rules/criteria acceptable/correct/the best possible?	Ok.	Somewhat. Prize money and TV alone does not necessarily mean an exciting competition. Let the EWC qualifiers develop their prize money and TV opportunities individually.
8. Are the rules of the World Cup Eventing simple enough?	Yes.	Winner of the qualifiers should automatically be invited to the finals. A minimum number of points should be achieved by a rider/horse combination before they are invited to attend the finals.
9. Are the obligations that the OC for the Final has to accept ok or are they too much?	Obligations on OC are too much for most.	- General comment: Be more selective of the site and the OC rather than black and white issues alone.

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	David Goldstrom -Television perspective	Simon Goddard -Warwick Horse Trials Club – Queensland Australia	Alec Lochore Burnham Market - GBR	Dr. Hanfried Haring – DOKR - GER	Val Waters – Kihikihi Waikato - NZL	Claude Prieur – PAU - FRA	Pierre Le Goupil – Martinvast - FRA	Sue Etherington- Smith – Chatsworth - GBR
Commercial issues:								
1. Should the management of the FEI World Cup Eventing be a partnership between the FEI and a 3 rd party?		If there is a third party to be involved then it must rest totally with the third party. We would be happy to deal direct with FEI. However, if a third party was introduced, we would prefer that we deal direct with them and no other.	- I think that it would be good to have a partnership between a 3rd party and the FEI if the FEI don't have enough time to manage the competition.	In order to keep it simple there is no need for a 3 rd party.	Only an advantage if financial and assistance is given too.		Yes. Is this the vocation of the FEI administration to achieve that?	Yes.
2. Sponsorship: would secondary sponsors be better than a title sponsor?	A title sponsor for the World Qualifiers and Final should be a major objective – as this may be the only realistic source for decent prizes and/or prize money. It also helps to bind the whole competition together.	Secondary sponsors are how we currently survive. A title sponsor would make things very much easier. There would be ways of having a title sponsor with secondary sponsors encouraged in a way that does not cut across the title sponsors but still includes the local businesses and supporters.	A title sponsor of the whole competition or a few 'associate sponsors' would allow a far great engagement throughout and could open other marketing streams. An EWC title sponsor might not be the title sponsor at each WCq but they would have a strong presence. The EWC is, or certainly should be, bigger than any single event.	Every organizer likes one more sponsor, but in some cases there will be a problem of exclusiveness. It makes sense to have a sponsor for the overall prize money of the series.	Allow any number of Sponsors. In such a small country we need several.	In our opinion it is far better to have a title sponsor that many smaller sponsors.	Secondary sponsors are safer, but a title sponsor, presenting the WC series, would be very welcome, especially to assume the cost of the global TV broadcast in partnership with each OC.	Secondary sponsorship will be easier to integrate into existing event than title sponsorship to avoid clash of business interests. Recognize to OCs long term agreements with title sponsors.

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	Rebecca Broussard – Kalispell (Montana) – USA	Robert Kellerhouse – Temecula - USA
Commercial issues:		
1. Should the management of the FEI World Cup Eventing be a partnership between the FEI and a 3 rd party?	Yes.	Yes if it means an overall increase in financial gain and visibility for the EWC.
2. Sponsorship: would secondary sponsors be better than a title sponsor?	<p>Sponsors – secondary or title – whatever.</p> <p>How about title sponsor for final and then try to develop in-country sponsors for each country? e.g. one sponsor for 4 US qualifiers.</p>	<p>Title sponsor for the finals and secondary sponsors for the series (this would protect the OC's existing sponsorship base).</p>

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	David Goldstrom -Television perspective	Simon Goddard -Warwick Horse Trials Club – Queensland Australia	Alec Lochore Burnham Market - GBR	Dr. Hanfried Haring – DOKR - GER	Val Waters – Kihikihi Waikato - NZL	Claude Prieur – PAU - FRA	Pierre Le Goupil – Martinvast - FRA	Sue Etherington- Smith – Chatsworth - GBR
3. TV strategy: should there be one or do we let OCs do their own thing?	<p>Organisers/NF's must be able to deliver the television coverage.</p> <p>FEI responsibility for originating the host broadcast coverage.</p> <p>FEI exclusivity to sell the worldwide broadcast rights and to retain the full revenue from all such sales.</p>	<p>If possible, a generic TV strategy would be good. It is very hard to secure TV airtime in Australia unless we pay. If we have a good sponsor then we can afford it. If not, we simply cannot afford to pay for TV coverage.</p>	<p>The FEI and the organizers collectively would need to discuss the issue of existing rights and future use of rights etc, but we would all be stronger as events, and the EWC as a whole, if there was a collective, cohesive and common development strategy.</p>	<p>If the FEI could really guarantee TV for all qualifiers and the secondary rights belong to the organizers/regional TV broadcasters it will be fine.</p> <p>However, we don't believe that this is possible for the FEI and therefore it should be better stay as it is.</p>	<p>Allow OCs to do their own things. Under the present restrictions it is too expensive.</p>	<p>A TV strategy is necessary and this should be drawn up by the FEI in tight collaboration with the OCs in order to avoid making the same type of agreement twice and/or creating disagreements with sponsors. The main points of this strategy should be fixed at least six months before the event.</p>	<p>The FEI in accordance with a title sponsor, the "3rd party" and WCQ OC must have a TV strategy.</p>	<p>There should be a FEI TV Strategy.</p>
4. Is the fee to the FEI acceptable/too low/too high?		<p>The new TD fee and the relevant extra costs (such as Ground Jury travel costs) make the event very expensive.</p> <p>In summary, the fee to the FEI is affordable but we need more moral support from both the FEI and the EFA.</p>	<p>The fee is very affordable for some and significant for others - is it key to the running of the competition or the general finances of the FEI? If a 3rd party was engaged then I understand that it would be crucial.</p>	<p>The fee is too high, the money could better increase the prize money of the qualifier. The use of the fee should be disclosed. Without a final the fee could feed one part of the prize money for the season's winners.</p>	<p>Again too high for a small country.</p>	<p>This should be adjusted according to the amount of money generated by the FEI for the organizing committees (for example: TV rights, sponsorship, contribution to prize money or other amounts...) If not, then the amounts will always seem excessive!</p>	<p>The FEI fee is too high considering what is offered. The absence of global TV strategy does not give us a lot of margin for our negotiations with big sponsors.</p>	<p>Is fine if more were being done but as things stand this is too much. What do OCS get for their contribution?</p>

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	Rebecca Broussard – Kalispell (Montana) – USA	Robert Kellerhouse – Temecula - USA
3. TV strategy: should there be one or do we let OCs do their own thing?	It is too difficult to get any TV coverage at this time that this is not even an issue for us at present.	Let the OC's handle this individually.
4. Is the fee to the FEI acceptable/too low/too high?	The FEI fee is currently too high considering what we get.	Yes for what we are receiving in return. (It should be based on the number of starters in the class).

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	David Goldstrom -Television perspective	Simon Goddard -Warwick Horse Trials Club – Queensland Australia	Alec Lochore Burnham Market - GBR	Dr. Hanfried Haring – DOKR - GER	Val Waters – Kihikihi Waikato - NZL	Claude Prieur – PAU - FRA	Pierre Le Goupil – Martinvast - FRA	Sue Etherington- Smith – Chatsworth - GBR
5. How do we make the concept more attractive to sponsors & TV?		<p>No sponsors or TV without spectators. The concept must:</p> <p>a. Be seen as one of the three pinnacles in Eventing. CICW, WEG and Olympics.</p> <p>b. Not clash with WEG or the Olympics. Held every second year will prevent burnout and keep the qualifiers running.</p> <p>c. Be seen as prestigious by NF's.</p> <p>d. Guarantee riders will attend.</p> <p>e. Personalize riders so the everyday public gets to know them.</p> <p>f. Offer the whole package to a major sponsor/TV.</p> <p>g. Be marketed to the correct target audience (i.e. women who have daughters that are in their teens).</p> <p>h. We must make the events a spectacle with other events.</p> <p>i. Riders should ride in their country colors.</p>	<p>If each event remains a small autonomy then we have nothing to offer as a global marketing tool to a potential sponsor. If everything is more co-coordinated and structured then the EWC is a far stronger proposition</p> <p>Try very hard not to burden the organizers or the individual events with any significant expense or administration.</p> <p>The concept of the EWC is a very good one and similar competitions happen successfully around the world in other sports. The riders want to engage with the competition but we need to build it around their needs - build what you can sell not sell what you can build.</p>	<p>Have the best combinations in the competitions.</p> <p>Better without a final as there will be more use to compete in the qualifiers in order to gain points.</p> <p>At the moment nearly everybody who has taken part in a qualifier may start in the final as not all the places per NF are used.</p>	<p>Allow OCs to make own arrangements without the FEI regulations. After all we are running the Qualifiers for the Sport and the Riders, we are all volunteers.</p>	<p>To motivate the sponsors it is necessary to have good television coverage. In order to achieve this we need a show that will give the public what they expect, especially in terms of suspense. In order to do this do we need to call in a director? What we can do, is to hire a professional show person as a speaker. Today's challenge is to think SHOWTIME, without spoiling the sport.</p>	<p>No TV strategy => No title sponsor. It is a vicious circle. It is a vicious circle.</p> <p>This means that the time has come for a "3rd party" company to take that business in hands and to work hard with the FEI, the EWC working group and the OC's.</p>	<p>We need to have the best riders at the qualifiers buying into the series.</p> <p>Exclusivity: not have too many qualifiers in one nation unless they are linked.</p> <p>Funding is a key factor: in most countries the OC has to pay for any TV coverage.</p>

SUMMARY – 2008 FEI WORLD CUP EVENTING QUESTIONNAIRE



	Rebecca Broussard – Kalispell (Montana) – USA	Robert Kellerhouse – Temecula - USA
5. How do we make the concept more attractive to sponsors & TV?		The odd year final needs to be something that cannot be missed by any top qualified riders to start. That will engage the world wide equestrian media, then the interest can build from there.