

## Annual General Meeting of Members

Held on: 24<sup>th</sup> November 2019

In Equestrian House at 3.00pm

**PRESENT:**

Fiona O'Hara (Chairman)  
Gary Parsonage (Board Director)  
Chris Tattersall (Board Director)  
Nigel Taylor (Board Director)

Paul Graham (Chief Sport Officer)  
Jude Matthews (Chief Executive Officer)  
Wendy McGowan (Chief Operating Officer)  
Olivia Szajna (Head of Marketing, Communications & Commercial)  
Nisha Punj (Project Manager)  
Alexandra Bright (minutes)  
Emily Dunn  
Renee Groeninx

Mr Dag Albert  
Miss Karen Bartlett  
Mrs Sarah Beadle  
Mr Richard Carruthers  
Mr Alex Colquhoun  
Mrs Jan Cottam  
Miss Lucy Elder  
Mrs Sarah Gairdner  
Mrs Miranda Heynes  
Mrs Jane M E Holderness-Roddam  
Mr Timothy Holderness-Roddam  
Mr Phil Howell  
Mrs Barbara Hurst  
Dr Rachel Lawson  
Mrs Elizabeth C Lyall  
Miss Amy McGowan  
Mrs Liz Murfitt  
Mr Jack Myszkowski  
Mrs Janet Plant  
Mr James Plant  
Mrs Vicky Plant  
Mr John Plant  
Mrs Carolyn Simm  
Lady Mowbray and Stourton  
Mr Alan Thacker  
Mrs Audrey Thacker  
Mrs Tina Ure  
Mr Joe Weller  
David Cottam

**APPOLOGIES:**

Jane Peters (Board Director)  
Les Smith (Board Director)  
Rosemary Barlow  
Nicola Salmon  
Robin Salmon  
David Sayer  
Robert Sayer  
Sue Stewart

### **Chairman's Welcome**

#### **Opening of meeting**

*Fiona O'Hara (FOH)*

The Chairman checked that all attendees had voted before opening the meeting.

The Chairman thanked attendees for making the time to attend and introduced the agenda.

Questions would be taken at the end, although attendees were invited to raise hands if they wished to ask questions during presentations.

The Chairman explained that she had taken over as chair in January 2019 and acknowledged that it had been an interesting year with both challenges and opportunities. Reflecting on the year, BE had continued to invest [primarily in IT], and in the leadership team in Head Office.

Looking forward to 2021, BE would be focussing on growth [of sport and membership] and increasing reach and diversity. It was highlighted that the unaffiliated sector was both an opportunity and a challenge and that BE must differentiate and continue to build on the BE Brand.

### **Approval of Minutes of the AGM held in 2018**

The minutes had been available for some time so attendees had been able to comment. Attendees who were present at the 2018 AGM ratified the minutes as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

### **CEO Review of the Year**

*Jude Matthews (JM)*

JM welcomed the attendees and commented that it was lovely to see so many familiar faces.

JM reviewed the core values of BE and stated that all stakeholders were expected to demonstrate these values.

JM explained that the strategic goals of the business had been reviewed by the Board and management team at the end of 2018 and that the Board were challenging the Head Office team to ensure that any work done relates to these goals. The new website pre and post launch had given many challenges, and in respect of that JM thanked the head office staff for their hard work and dedication.

JM accepted that the Strategic Fixtures Calendar had provided further challenges, but stated that BE remains committed to increasing the transparency of its decision making.

JM explained that there had been some changes in staff and structure at Head Office.

JM reflected that 2019 had been a great year for sport and success with medals at every level of championship.

There had been some improvements made to the structure of the Youth Programme and that the hosting of the Youth European Championships 2020 would take place at Hartpury College.

BE would continue to work on relationships between BE and key stakeholders. During 2019 meetings of Organisers and Officials spanned the country and the new Rider Working Groups were formed in conjunction with Event Riders Association.

There would be new initiatives to roll out over the next 12 months.

The IT Transformation Project was in its final stages, with Entry Secretary and Organiser training about to be rolled out on the new EARS system. JM thanked the IT project team for their monumental efforts.

JM closed her CEO welcome by stating that she was honoured to have the role and looked forward to working with such a passionate group of people.

### **Finance Review**

*Wendy McGowan (WM)*

WM commented that 2019 had been a significantly challenging year financially with a forecasted loss of £500k against a budgeted loss of £84k.

This further loss was due to, amongst other things, additional resource in IT; recruiting a permanent team member had been unsuccessful, so contractors have been the solution.

However, BE has not cut back on services to members and outgoings continue to support the sport.

The 2019 Membership figures were reported and the trend was that full members had declined but Day Pass members had increased, which highlighted a shift in competitors' preferences to a "pay as you go" model

WM explained how income is spent, highlighting that Sport was still the biggest area of spend. Feedback from members indicated that the membership does not fully understand the level of subsidisation provided to events in officials, stationery, insurance, groundcare equipment. The income received from Event Organisers covers approximately half of the cost of what is provided by BE.

The Technology Project is forecast to complete with a cost of £2.6m, of which £1.8m was capital and £900K expended. Of the capital spend, the website development totalled just over a million and the balance relates to EARS.

### **Sport Review**

*Paul Graham (PG)*

PG opened his presentation by expressing his excitement of returning to BE after an eight year break.

PG reviewed the year of Sport, highlighting:

- 2019 was the opposite of 2018 in terms of weather and abandonments during the year. The team had tracked trends on competing and learned from intelligence recorded.
- Membership had stayed consistent for the last few years, but now the aim was for growth.
- Participation figures were presented.
- A successful pilot of the Regional Team Challenge – 40 participants.

Risk management work included the implementation of Continuing Performance Requirements with 189 incidences [the highest incidences being at BE90 and Novice].

The implementation of the Strategic Fixtures Calendar process and subsequent review, which had given learnings.

The launch of new the Entries and Scoring system was imminent. Live on-event testing of the scoring system had taken place and the entries management system had been tested in trial conditions by a group of experts. Challenges that were seen at the start of the year had been overcome.

The new Rider Working Groups were formed [two members present] and the first meeting planned for December.

The Youth programme would continue to grow with the addition of the new BE90u18 programme.

Highlights for 2020:

- Olympics [new team format]
- BE80(T) Championship move to Burghley
- Expansion of the Regional Team Challenge [final to be hosted at Weston Park again in 2020]
- Pilot of CCI1\* Intro class. Chilham, Brand Hall and Blair. Specifically located to give a thorough trial.
- EquiRatings and BE working towards making performance metrics available to members.

2019 saw international success for Great Britain. The Pony Team won Gold, and Paul paid tribute to the team as their Championship success was just a few days after the sad news of the death of Iona Sclater. The Young Rider Team won Gold. The Junior Team won Silver. The Senior Team won Silver. The European Cup [formally CIC2\* Team competition] Team won Silver.

Training and Education: this function of the business was internally reviewed which included a staffing restructure. Training initiatives were aligned with the strategic goals. The Regional Youth Programme would continue to grow alongside the adult Training and Education offering. Training and Education figures were presented, including Regional Youth Programme registrations, training opportunities delivered, volunteers trained and number of BE Coaches.

PG confirmed that a volunteer working group would be formed during 2020.

**Technology Review**

*Nisha Punj (NP)*

NP presented a diagram that had been included in the July ITTP update, showing how the old and new IT systems had been working together and the challenges that this presented.

As a recap, NP explained what the ITTP hoped to achieve, and how it had been approached.

NP addressed the perception that the delays and large costs attributed only to the website by explaining that the project was much larger than that, including: CRM, Entries and organiser portal, website and scoring system.

NP described the necessity to continue with the legacy database during a crossover period in order to take entries through third party systems and to validate entries. The support of the necessary data exchange had created many challenges and used a huge amount of resource. When the new system is completed and in operation, the legacy database will be discontinued and data will be accessed live, reducing much of the risk of data processing.

NP expanded on progress made to date; IT activity during 2019 had included the launch, support and enhancement of the new website, support of third party systems, EARS testing and development, event management portal launch and user training.

During 2020 the focus would shift to the launch of the EARS system and project completion. NP thanked all who had helped with testing and development of system. The first training session was planned for 11<sup>th</sup> December with further dates in December and early next year. Following the launch, resource would shift toward support of EARS when entries open and during the start of the season.

**Commercial and Marketing Review**

*Olivia Szajna (OS)*

OS reassured attendees that BE were listening to members' feedback and focus during 2019 had been improving communication and transparency through working with stakeholders: the marketing team had re-written the content for the new website, implemented Marketing Cloud to deliver more regular and targeted email communications,

delivered “Ask BE” sessions at several events throughout the season, along with online video sessions, and introduced seven day a week support for events on social media.

In terms of engaging with members, OS explained that BE had appointed twelve brand ambassadors, added more member pavilions at high profile events and continued with top-rider yard visits. Rider Working Groups had been appointed and a Summer Membership Offer was trialled.

Members’ benefits had been enhanced by introducing pavilions at both Badminton and Burghley, in addition to the existing pavilions at The Festival of British Eventing and Blenheim Palace (which had a new improved location for 2019). Yard visits had continued to be popular as were the new training videos.

OS described the new initiatives planned for 2020. EquiRatings data metrics would be made available to all members, the BE Ball would return to the social calendar and a Masterclasses style event would be arranged. The pilot of the Regional Team Challenge inaugurated in 2019 was reviewed and details of changes for 2020 would come out in the New Year.

Turning to the commercial side of the business, OS reported that the strive to increase revenues would continue. £73,160 (70%) sponsorship went straight back to events in 2019. New sponsors for 2019 included Science Supplements, SsangYong and Caunton Manor Stud.

OS stressed that members would always be welcome to feedback their thoughts.

### Questions from the floor

**Name: Miranda Heynes**

**Question:** How does BE propose to keep costs low? Is it time that BE offered a loyalty scheme?

**Answer:** JM. BE provides better quality events. Differentiation between BE and unaffiliated often means an increase in cost, for example to provide enhanced medical cover, and higher event standards. We need to explain this better to members. A membership restructure is currently being worked on, and we will consider membership loyalty as part of this piece of work.

**Name: Janet Plant**

**Question:** If the system does not work in the spring, can we still download entries for use on our own systems? Organisers are nervous of trusting the new system.

**Answer:** NP. There is always a contingency, and we will be prepared for plan B, but we are working hard not to have to use that.

**Name: Janet Plant**

**Question:** Sponsor logos traditionally have been available in the magazine but not on the online event schedule.

**Answer:** NP. Logos can now be uploaded to online schedule now.

**Name: Miranda Heynes**

**Question:** Grassroots members think that BE don’t care about what members think. Emails have sometimes not been answered for up to ten days.

**Answer:** JM. We are a small team and are very busy. Some things can be answered more quickly than others; things are prioritised. Expectations from some are inappropriate. We will work harder to have information publically available so reducing the need for emails in.

**Rachel Wilson:** suggested that realistic expectations are set and administrated efficiently.

**Name: Janet Plant**

**Question:** Prize money had been communicated twice with changes in the second version. Couldn’t see how organisers were disadvantaged in the first version and so would request reissuing the first table?

**Answer:** WM change resulted from feedback from an organiser. Calculation is now extended to two decimal placings and as a result of the roundings the tables were slightly different. The calculation is always started at 6<sup>th</sup> place and calculated up the table. We will review again. **Janet:** Prize money cannot be disadvantaged by prize money rising by a higher percentage than the rise in entry fees.

**Name: Rachel Wilson**

**Question:** Membership has been static, and is possibly decreasing. How do you propose to increase/grow?

**Answer:** WM. Full members have decreased, but all other categories have grown. Day pass membership has been more popular. Competing membership has not been impacted as much as you would think, but focus must be on full members.

**Rachel** - What demographic are you looking to attract?

**Answer WM:** We recognise that the strength of the pyramid is at the bottom so we are always reviewing our offering at this level. We believe that the BE80(T) Championship move to Burghley will attract members at this level. We are also looking at other participation initiatives. Analysing data and to make sure routes to championships are clear and available to different groups of members.

**Name: Tina Ure**

**Question:** A lot of the membership is not eligible for any Championships. What are the plans to open up opportunities for these sections of the membership? All riders need a target.

**Answer:** PG. We do recognise gaps in the competition structure. There would be a complete review in 2020 but some tweaks for next year e.g. Corinthian cup eligibility. Rider Working Groups will be consulted.

**Sarah Bean Added:** lots of opportunities for u18s e.g. course walks and training to encourage, but more difficult for adults to progress through levels.

**PG** We are undergoing a review of the T&E offering and this will help.

**Name: Tina Ure**

**Question:** Please elaborate on changes to the Training and Education Department?

**Answer:** PG – Sean Maxwell left BE in August. The strategic direction will be to take a “Less is more” approach to T&E and to concentrate on our unique selling points e.g. access to coaches, with less focus on generic sessions that can be accessed outside of BE. The aim is to support riders with cross country training and increase competency.

**Please could you consult with coaches and people who actually work with the membership?**

**PG** stated that consultation was planned for further down the process.

**OS** added that the first part of the process has been engaging with the members.

**Name: Jan Cottam**

**Question:** As an Organiser has paid two men for two days work to aerovate the ground in preparation for the event, but unfortunately the groundcare equipment was not up to standard.

James Plant added that there has not been feedback from the groundcare holders’ meeting in February. Tines have been ordered and have been the wrong make.

**Answer:** PG will be making commitments to improve process and acknowledged the importance in terms of horse welfare.

**Name: Vicky Plant**

**Question:** Loss of events. Will anything be done about the reduction in the number for events from the 2020 fixtures calendar?

**Answer:** JM. Some organisers have suggested that that a 10% reduction in the number of events would help, and currently events being lost from the calendar are not being replaced unless there is a clear business need. Entries will remain continually under review. We need to balance competition opportunities for members, with viability for organisers. The focus on membership numbers should help. Members also vote with their feet, and we know they will sometimes travel past their more local event to go to another, so we all need to ensure that standards are kept high and that we differentiate the BE brand.

Tina Ure: asked if we should we look at the reasons why events that have low entries and encourage Organisers to think of members as their customers.

**Name: Jan Cottam**

**Question:** The Affiliation Agreement will have new things included e.g. how entries will be paid for. Last year we received them too late.

**Answer:** WM Commitment already made to send out before Christmas.

**Name: Miranda Heynes**

**Question:** In the past training has been subsidised. Would this be possible in the future? Suggest top riders could be given a reduction in their registration fees in return for free training available to all members.

**Answer:** PG. Just because someone is a good rider it doesn’t mean they are a good coach. However, will take forward for consideration at Rider Working Groups. Laura Collett gave a reduced rate for sessions to the u18 programme. Will consider.

**Sarah Bean added:** the geographical spread of the training sessions currently offered is not suitable for all.

**Vicky Plant added:** It is necessary to promote BE accredited coaches more.

**Tina Ure added:** A lot of coaches are currently going through level 4 coaching programme, and they would be great to use for grassroots levels.

**Name: Rachel Wilson**

**Question:** Unaffiliated Events that run on the back of the BE Event will often be as good as the BE Event. How will you use the data that you are getting from EquiRatings etc. to target and encourage members?

**Answer:** PG. Continuing Performance Requirements are a good example of where riders need support and BE will engage with them. Competition stress attributed to errors and cannot be replicated in training environment. Performance data will encourage riders to self-asses.

**Tina Ure added:** riders with young horses will not take them to BE events until they are confident they will not get eliminated.

**Joe Weller:** Encourage Designers to be more proactive with sharing their knowledge so that riders can learn and improve.

**PG:** Value in training days for Course Builders, Course Designers, coaches, riders and Technical Advisers together. Joe Weller ran a hugely successful day at Norton Disney where members shared knowledge with the intention of helping the sport to develop.

**Name: Liz Lyall**

**Question:** Is it time that members were updated on the role of the rider rep in case of questions etc. This would help with explaining certain questions on the course without having to go directly to the Course Designer.

Janet Plant added: sometimes we sit by a fence and listed to advice given by coaches and advice is not always helpful. Sometimes "coaches" are not selected for the right reasons, and they should take into account the rider and the horse.

**Name: Jan Cottam**

**Question:** Asked OS to expand on the seven day a week social media support for Organisers that was mentioned in the presentation.

**Answer: OS** – BE has implemented a rota so that there is a staff member available to look after abandonment and social media every weekend, with the main objective to support Events.

**Vicky Plant** – have been told we can email the office when things want to be shared. Have tagged previously and have been ignored.

**OS.** We can't share everything, we get tagged in a lot of posts and the content shared needs to be relevant, posting too much can impact on the reach and engagement of the channel. We do keep checking and try our best to ensure that crucial information is shared.

**Name: Jan Cottam**

**Question:** Please explain the policy on communicating course inspections when events may be preparing to abandon.

**Answer:** OS. Policy has been that event abandonments will be communicated, but inspections are not always. Will be reviewing policy and will take feedback from Rider Working Groups to find the best and consistent way forward.

Janet Plant added that if people are warned that there is doubt, people will be looking out. Not a single lorry turned up at Weston when abandoned at 5.30am.

**Jan Cottam.** Acknowledged that the last few weeks of the season has been a very difficult time for the Sport and offered thanks to all.

**Name: Jan Cottam**

**Question:** what are the ongoing costs of the IT project?

**Answer:** WM. The project itself will stop once EARS has been rolled out and past that point there will be no further project costs. However, we do have a team that will need to support the new systems, and continue to add enhancements. The ongoing cost specifically of the IT project is not easily measurable, as there are so many interwoven factors. Our priority is to have support available to members.

**Name: Jack Myszkowski**

**Question:** Our Fence Judge training at West Wilts was cancelled due to snow, but was not replaced, why?

**Answer:** PG will continue to provide training opportunities for volunteers and has been working on improving content of courses and looking at providing online learning. As it was before he came into post, PG couldn't say why FJ training at West Wilts last year was cancelled due to not being with the organisation at the time.

**Name: Miranda Heynes**

**Question:** The unaffiliated market is doing a loyalty scheme where you get rewarded for volunteering.

**Answer:** PG. Rewards for volunteers are being looked at. JM added we don't always know who is volunteering, as some volunteers register directly with BE, but many relationships are directly with the relevant organiser. We are also going through a volunteer engagement programme so that we are working with active volunteers.

**Jack Myszkowski:** pleased to hear that volunteer representation is in the pipeline, but this was promised last year by Les Smith. When will this happen?

**PG:** Hope to be in the first half of the year.

**Janet Plant** suggested enforcing each competitor to do a certain number of days volunteering per year.

**PG:** Working on engaging volunteers.

**Name: Sarah Bean**

**Question:** There is a significant difference in entry fees from short format to long format competitions. Can you explain why that is?

**Answer:** Joe Weller commented that the competitor must consider the amount of extras required when running a long format. Judges, vets, accommodation, marquees, flagpoles, venue charges etc.

PG. If an event only offers international classes it means fewer entries for that event. Costs of infrastructure, and producing the atmosphere. It would seem that there is a level of a misconception and lack of understanding regarding Organisers' costs.

WM: Earlier this year we published an article in the magazine to try to educate members on costs of running a national event.

Janet Plant commented that she did not feel it was a correct representation.

**Sarah Bean:** Have noticed that BE has been more transparent over the last few months, which is great. Would like to continue to receive information and explanations on how things work. Please continue to communicate how much things cost. **PG:** Added working on understanding how people absorb information.

**Name: Miranda Heynes**

**Questions:** With reference to the 3.2% decrease in full membership do you have a process to understand why these members have left?

**Answer:** OS from the surveys we understand why people lapse their memberships. Lameness, personal circumstances. Working towards understanding more about people making different choices e.g. changing membership types. Emails are sent out to follow up on members who have left in order to gather more insight on why.

Tina Ure: are you looking at day tickets as the cost seems high? WM reported that we have started a membership restructure to address some concerns which is due for launch in 2021. The impact of unaffiliated market on BE must be taken in consideration.

**Name: Janet Plant**

**Questions:** Have asked WM via email whether it is still possible to run PC sections which was confirmed. Suggest that PC members should compete with entry fee alone and not have to buy a day ticket.

**Answer:** JM. We want to work with PC, but there is a balance with what PC want us to do.

**Name: Janet Plant**

**Questions:** How do we get more people to attend the AGM, as this number is disappointing.

**Answer:** FO'H – We have tried various times/locations for the AGM and have looked at an online format, we did not have the technology in place to do that this year. Content of discussion had today is hugely valuable and our communications will hopefully encourage people to come in the future.

Jan Cottam added – feedback that the time of 3pm was perfect for her but was not suitable for others.

FO'H – Commitment to try to incentivise people to come, but surveying regarding time and date may not be helpful.

**Results of the Resolution**

Votes in favour to approve the reappointment of the auditors Saffery Chmapness 351, against 20 therefore the Resolution was passed.

**Close of meeting**

Fiona O'Hara thanked members for their attendance and the meeting was closed at 5.05pm.

**Pre submitted questions.**

**Justin Renn**

I am writing to ask a general question about cost of entries for competition and the lack of protection for competitors.

There are a number of rules and procedures in place to protect organisers of events, and so there should be as the work these organisers do is phenomenal), but little to help protect competitors for example:

1. Abandonment insurance is passed onto the competitors
2. Even with events still being open and with low numbers, late entry fees are charged  
If a young / inexperienced horse is moving up a level or in-between levels you cannot always plan effectively and have to wait for the last run before deciding to move up or maybe moving down for a confidence run. This make timely entries not always possible
3. Once entries are closed and if entries have not been balloted the organiser does not have to operate a waitlist
4. If an entry is withdrawn after the ballot date and the entry is not replaced from the waitlist (if there is one, see point (4)) then the organiser does not have to refund the competitor, even if the entry is replaced by a new entry also paying a late entry fee  
(I had this exact case this season after withdrawing from Great Witchingham, due to horse injury, and after a lengthy battle with the organisers managed to secure only ½ my entry fee back from a total £180

I am a one person one horse amateur rider, like many in the sport. I believe there are loop holes and unfair rules that impede the competitor. They challenge the rider to perhaps run at an unsuitable level to save money or run a horse that should perhaps be given an opportunity to recover

I also believe that these rules and cost are pushing more and more competitors to unaffiliated events, something I am now considering and is feedback I am getting from friends and colleagues in the sport

**Answers**

1. Abandonment insurance premium is paid by the competitor as it is the competitor's entry which is insured. This allows organisers to retain the entry fees received to cover their costs and the competitor to receive the entry back.

2. We appreciate that there are circumstances where members cannot enter before ballot date, but it must also be appreciated that organisers need to plan their events and this is affected by the number of horses competing. The number of dressage judges is one such example. So it is a fine balance and members are encouraged to enter before ballot date as that is considered a decision The rule doesn't mention waitlist so was the rule not adhered to – Paul??

3. There are many reasons why an Organiser might not wish to run a waitlist, or might not wish to accept entries into a class to replace withdrawn entries. Examples would be weather and ground conditions.

4. Waitlist is not mentioned in the rule so was it that the class was not full and so he wasn't replaced?

---

**Anonymous**

Are BE not concerned that they are moving toward a state within which a genuine amateur is priced out of the sport? For those looking to progress but are not fortunate enough to have sponsors or financial backing it feels like it is becoming harder and harder to achieve progression within the sport if you are just a self-funded rider on an average income.

Thanks for giving us the opportunity to ask written questions, I look forward to receiving a response.

BE have a responsibility to both the organiser and competitor to ensure financial viability and stability within the sport. BE have minimum event standards which we require organisers to comply with, and these do come at a cost. Organisers need to ensure their event can be financially viable so that we retain the level of good quality competitions we are fortunate enough to have in the calendar currently. We also have a responsibility to our membership to do what we can to keep the costs of competing as reasonable as we can. Our latest communication regarding entry fee increases helped explain the rationale, and there was an article in the latest British Eventing Life magazine which explained where the entry fee is spent on event.

**Helen De Heaume**



Regarding the questions for the BE AGM, I would like to ask what the current cash balance is.

**Balance is £1.4M**

**Juliet Thornhill**

Dear Members,

As an owner of a horse that reacts very badly to flu vaccination I was extremely worried by the new compulsory 6 month policy.

My only solution seems to be to event him for 6 months then finish the season early but obviously this is unsatisfactory.

In view of his reaction I believe it is wrong to consider that the components of these vaccines are benign. There is evidence that suggests that increasing the number of chemicals we are putting in to our horses will, in the long term lower their natural immunity.

As the flu viruses are continually mutating and as the flu strains in the vaccinations are in many cases rapidly out of date surely the case for continuation of this policy is weak?

As the vaccinations are supposed to last for over a year and in some cases for up to 10 years it seems unnecessary and possibly detrimental to the long term health of the horses to vaccinate every 6 months.

Please consider the long term welfare of our horses and consider a return to annual vaccination.

Yours sincerely,

Juliet Thornhill

**BEF takes advice from AHT.**

**Jack Myszkowski**

I haven't had the opportunity to check the notes of the last AGM but from memory, I can recollect that in response to a point I made at that meeting, BE would consider the possibility of incorporating and including a volunteer/jump judge representative on one of its working groups. Has any progress been made in this regard?

It is noted that rider representatives were selected in late October.

**The Sport team will look to appoint a Volunteer Working Group in 2020.**

**Susan Hodgson**

My second point will be raised at the meeting, but I wanted to second the point, and that's around volunteer representation. We now have several groups represented, with the addition of the lower Level rider rep this year, so to be fully open we should also have volunteer representation as a key part of BEs ability to hold any event

**BE are committed to working more openly with every stakeholder group, and will be introducing a Volunteer working group in 2020.**