

Constructive SUGGESTIONS & FEEDBACK

FOR THE NEW JUMPING PATHWAY (2)

Ulli

- 1.) Young horse classes: no 4 and 5 year old together!
- | | |
|--------|------------|
| 4year | 0.9 - 1.0m |
| 5year | 1.0 - 1.1m |
| 6year | 1.1 - 1.2m |
| 7 year | 1.2 - 1.3m |

2.) recording of all results from 0.9m but do not allocate grading points and leave it up to the show organiser to set the conditions per class

Example: 1.1m class open to all 4 and 5 year old horses and older horses who had no placings in classes 1.2m and above in the last 3 years (with a point system you would not be able to do this)

Kay Harding

I feel that it is only for the top end of the professional riders and competitions in and around major cities. The majority of riders are really there to keep the profession riders honest. (riding well!)

Your example Ag Show program took away the 1.05 classes and replaced it with 1.10 then removed the 1.35 class altogether and increased the entry fees. This program may suit professional riders but not the grass roots riders. After looking at both sample programs I personally decided not to start the truck due to lack of a number of suitable classes for me. Unless I can jump 2 classes per horse travelling is too expensive just for a day out. (Usually 5/6 horses on the truck)

Only a very select few aspire to making it to the Olympics and these are usually ones who buy or professionally ride, overseas horses. This is not aimed at anyone in particular, just an observation from reading published articles.

Personally I really appreciate the height classes as I know what I am expected to jump. My very local shows are aimed at the amateur/local rider, have been doing height classes for many years and the entries have increased significantly, even though it does not have high prize money. The organisers try to make it possible for 2 starts per horse and that is a main attraction.

Noel Maxwell

My first 2 comments are covered in the "Frequently Asked Questions" :-

Q6 - Disagree to some extent as to "the skill and effort level", as lower graded riders often put in just as much work and conditioning as well as having similar costs to compete eg fuel, feed, farrier, vet costs and show entry fees. It can also be more difficult to gain a placing and thus prizemoney in a lower grade/ height due to the always larger number of competitors.

Q14 – Totally agree that this needs to happen and be policed as at the recent Qld Country Championships a horse with 80+ points competed in the 1.20m class. Just prior it had won a 1.40m Grand Prix at a regional show and at Toowoomba World Cup it entered the Mini Prix. How is this fair on genuine 1.10 – 1.20m horses ?

Junior Riders

I would also like to see some changes to the Junior / Young Rider system (although this may upset some established riders / parents).

I feel that the ages should not overlap . For example Junior 12 to 16 yo and Young rider 17 to 21.

Reasons being

- Inability of younger Junior riders to attain the heights of 17 & 18 yo - possibly cap height at 1.10m except for State and National titles possibly 1.10m max starting height. (evidence of

this problem is seen at major venues where there is a lack of 12, 13 & 14 yo able to compete at current heights.

- Not giving good grounding or encouragement to these entry level riders in the Junior ranks
 - previous experience for a 12yo would be either at :
 1. Interschool probably competing at Primary 90 cm max
 2. Pony Club 12 and under at 1.00 m max.(at state titles)

I also disagree with the proposal of making under 1.00m classes run on “not against the clock “ events . This does not encourage competition amongst riders who may either be unable to progress further because of horse age, ability or size. (not trying to be biased but we have a 13.3hh pony who is almost unbeatable in a jump off yet may now be destined to clear round prizemoney and I know of some riders in similar situations.)

Bettie Lammie WA

The concern I have is with the suggested entry fees charged for competing.

There has been no significant increase in these for at least 20 years but the cost of putting on events has increased and it is harder to find volunteers to help and also cash sponsors for sponsorship. This is an important issue, if events are no longer financially viable they will not be held. We have found that the entry money used to cover the running costs of the event and sponsorship in kind and cash could cover awards and prize money for placegetters. This is no longer the case.

There has to be a balance of entry fees and in all cases the early Classes, the ungraded classes and the second ring will be the cash cow for the remainder of the show. You need to set entry fees at a number which is a balance for all.

I realise these are draft proposals to standardise grading of horses.

Would this be a good time to address the financial side of events as well?

Fred knows about my concerns and agrees it should be addressed at some point.

The bigger height classes average less entries in a normal event and under The new proposal for the 1.40m class you need at least 45 entries to cover The prize money suggested so sponsorship would have to sourced to hold this event.

It is a question of looking at the show as a whole and not on a class by class basis – it is not logical or practical. As with any sport, the spoils (prizemoney) must go to the best performed – you don’t see the under 18 get paid in WAFL – all the spoils go to the AFL.

I don’t know of any event in the world which seeks to cover the prizemoney with entry fees.

The lower classes attract more entries, the prize money is restricted and they have a chance of covering costs under these rules, The Bunbury Show Jumping Classic 2011 the entries for these junior levels were not as many as expected and both rings made a significant loss.

This matter is more of the dilemma – why did we not achieve better numbers in the lower and second ring events?

I feel with the schedule of entry fees as they are shows will depend on

the lower height classes to help fund the higher height classes at an event.

So increase your entry fees.

Event managers will tend then not to offer the higher height classes especially at agricultural shows.

This may well be the case, however there is a fine line balance between putting these events on and the senior riders bringing their young horses as well as their better ones – this goes hand in hand.

With more people working therefore the shift of 'more money- less time' from 'more time- less money' has to be recognised with competitors and volunteers. There are ways to introduce revenue raising to help fund events but to not penalise one group or another will be the challenge.

Some events have introduced a 'helping fee' that riders can either choose to pay or help.

As an organiser, you can impose any fees you wish – there needs to be a balance to the entry fees but helper levies, stable fees/bonds, ground fees, ambulance fees can all be charged.

Does this need to be a formal recommendation I wonder?

(We would like to introduce a bond which would be refundable if the area a horse owner occupies on the grounds is left in the same state that it was found but this will take man power and would have to be out sourced as a fund raiser to another club/non profit community group (eg Football Club) but generally would wind up costing to police.)

The volunteer position is all but over – so we now do charge a non-refundable helper levy and use the funds to pay 2 able bodies, over 18yo blokes whose job is to be in the ring all day (~\$200/day cash)

None of this replaces the need to find some additional sponsorship for the major events. Some clubs run a lower class day or training day in another time to raise funds for the main show (I used to do that with the Summer series and raise money for the State Champs)

I look forward to your reply.

All events require an enthusiastic and energetic person with good club support – like you have for many years, it is also necessary to change to suit the economic times and the generational contribution. Don't let the changes make you too despondent about remaining as the Organiser.

The change to the points/height system will have little impact on your show – but give you more flexibility to design your classes to suit.

WA- Kim Lindsay

If a horse that currently has 10 or 12 points wants to move up and jump in the Open 125cm class (as points for the 125cm class are 16-40) it cannot gain points towards an 'upgrade' even though that may be the height it may be ready to jump. This may be the case for progressive young horses. They cannot get points in the large fields of 115cm classes as the rider does not want to push them around a very competitive jump off but prefer to concentrate on the development of their jumping. They are ready to step up the heights but their points stop them from entering the classes that would give them points - they have to enter the Open instead - which does not

award points. These horses may possibly have to apply for upgrading - would this be a more accessible process, or is there some other way of progressing these horses?

On the flip side I can see that the Open classes without points is good for riders not wishing to upgrade, or those wishing to ride a new horse or come back from break or injury.

It is hard to come up with a system that both supports our grass roots riders who may never jump more than 115cm, and horses without the talent to progress, but also supports the development of our future World Cup and Olympic riders and horses...

QLD – Duke Bowman

My concern some months ago was that in Queensland there had been no meeting for riders and members to either be advised of proposed changes or more importantly voice their opinions and concerns on any proposals. It is now mid July and still there has been no meeting of concerned parties in Queensland, I notice that a survey is to be undertaken in July with a Final Proposal to go to the NJC August Meeting. Whilst it is pleasing that people are concerned about the future of Jumping in Australia and are obviously putting much effort into the new direction, without that direction being what the majority of riders see as their future the framework of our sport may come falling down, and one month is nowhere near enough time for consultation, notwithstanding that most riders will not bother to complete a survey.

What I find interesting is that the new pathway addresses really good points, however I fail to see one area that cannot be accommodated under the present system, with the exception of the IT platform which could be implemented to replace Cards quite simply.

At present the major problems with jumping lie with Course Designers (too much variance in heights and widths for similar classes as mentioned in the pros and cons) and Judges (not completing Performance Cards and not sending sheets into the State Office), after digesting all the information in the Proposal Mark 2 released on July 1st I cannot see how this will change with a new pathway, a lazy Judge will always be a lazy Judge and a bad Course Designer will always have two choices, to kill the horses with ridiculous tracks or be way to soft to have an effective class. This must be addressed.

The other point is with Agricultural Shows, in my local area they are the lifeblood of the sport with 20 Ag Shows within 100 Klm compared to 5 Jumping specific shows and 1 Royal show, at least half of those Ag Shows run at a loss on Jumping events and only persevere with Jumping at all because a few diehards turn up and run the classes for them, (that is the Course Designer who is also the Judge and also the rail steward and volunteers their time, often after paying to get in) when EA starts telling those shows what they can and cannot do, what class of show they are and what officials they can or cannot use the sport of Showjumping will be discarded by most of them as just too difficult to bother with, That is when the base of our sport, the pleasure rider will loose interest due to too few shows and then competitor numbers will fall and the sport suffer.

Jumping will always have the riders at the pinnacle of the sport. those who spend so much to find the horse that will take them around, those with the ability to train their horse and get it to the top, and those talented riders who can ride most horses and shine, but without the base of the sport that is the riders that make up the numbers, those in the sport for the pleasure, this sport will be in trouble and I fear that those riders interests have been overlooked in this new direction.

I sincerely hope that before the August NJC meeting all EA registered Jumping riders are given the opportunity to attend a meeting at a State Level and be presented with all the options and give a clear answer as to whether they are for or against such changes. Then the various State delegates should act with those answers as their guide at the NJC August meeting.