

# **BE Stakeholder Group Meeting Summary Notes**

16<sup>th</sup> December 2020, 11.00am Microsoft Teams

## **Participants**

Jude Matthews (JM) – BE CEO Linda Allan (LA) – EHOA Chair Rachael Faulkner – BEOA Representative Bruce Haskell (BH) – ERA Representative Chris Tattersall (CT) – Board Director Helen White (HW) – ERA Grassroots Representative Alexandra Bright (AB) – BE EA

### Discussion:

## > Welcome to new BEOA Chair

JM welcomed RF to the Stakeholder Group and explained that the meetings were an informal opportunity to ask questions and have open discussions, and that Board Directors were always welcome to attend. All agreed that the inceptions of the Stakeholder Group meetings was positive and relationships had been significantly improved. JM commented that the structure provided a useful avenue for receiving feedback which had not previously been available.

## > Minutes of the meeting held 18th November

Amendments proposed and agreed.

Discussion on the FEI MER rule changes, as the situation had moved on since the last meeting. Further to the change to the FEI rule that defined MERs for combinations aiming for 5 star events, an amendment to protect the interests of GBR-based riders was under negotiation. ERA Representative felt that as these competitors were subject to additional requirements, they could be disadvantaged by the need for additional runs required under the rule change.

### Feedback and views from riders

It was reported that riders did not always feel that they had adequate avenues to air and discuss their views. Riders to be encouraged to channel views through ERA. It was suggested that an **ERA/BE virtual Q&A session should be arranged for riders to give feedback and ask questions (anonymously if they wished).** 

It was noted that the Terms of Reference for the Rider Working Groups would be reviewed (as for all BE Committees on an annual basis) and acknowledged that the two groups had been constructive.

It was felt that representative roles on any committees should be formalised to included written expectations and responsibilities.

## > AGM

Association Representatives had sent points of feedback that they had received in advance of the meeting. The piece in Horse and Hound was thought to be well balanced.

It was clarified that it was possible for members to ask subsequent questions during the Q&A session, but that the session was planned to take one question at a time so as not to have the floor dominated.

It was agreed that the meeting with the Stakeholder Group in advance of the AGM had been valuable and that some of the content had been driven by the advice from the Association Representatives.

Attendance of over 300 members was significant.

The reasons for not permitting entry after the first 15 minutes were explained: 1) it was thought to be beneficial for those taking part in the open forum to have listened to the presentations first and 2) if the AGM had been in person, late admittance would not be accepted.

### Election

Association Representatives reported views from members that a Q&A session (arranged by BE) with election candidates would be appreciated.



### > Directors' Responsibilities, Committee Structure

JM stated that a review of committee structure, Terms of Reference and effective representation was in progress.

Association Representatives would like to propose that the Sport Committee is chaired by an independent Chair, accountable to Board, as they felt it would help to balance and streamline the committee. JM and CT would be in support of this in principle. It was felt that the structure should include formal ratification of Sport Committee decisions by the Board, that operational items were not appropriate for consideration by the Sport Committee and that the frequency of meetings should be increased. Association Representatives to make a detailed proposal document on structure for consideration. It was agreed that effective decision making in line with strategic dates was key.

#### Insurance Review

Association Representatives asked whether the review panel would be looking at whether abandonment insurance is actually necessary to continue or not. JM confirmed and explained that the chair was completely independent and would consider the entire spectrum of options. It was suggested that that panel should include some representation from stakeholders who were not familiar with the insurance marketplace.

Association Representatives congratulated BE on the way that this panel had been formed, with appropriate stakeholder consultation. Association Representatives requested further details on time commitments etc. so that appropriate candidates could be sought.

In respect of Public Liability insurance, a review of the market took place during 2019. A further review based on a similar model to the abandonment insurance review could be considered at a later date if thought to be beneficial.

### > Area Festivals

Association Representatives suggested that Organisers had an opportunity when handing out double clear rosettes to inform competitors of the qualifying criteria (i.e., advise the competitor that they only need one more double clear to qualify).

## BE Rules and Members' Handbook

JM reported that it was under consideration to put the online rule book behind a member login. It would be possible for unregulated events to use BE rules, but they would need to state clearly with which rules their competitors were required to comply and which did not apply to their competition (e.g. MERs, medical provisions, BE membership) rather than claiming to be "run under BE rules".

Stakeholder Representatives were in support of this in principle and felt that it would differentiate between BE and unregulated events and highlight the benefits further to members.

#### Items for agenda next meeting:

- Unaffiliated Market Working Group
- ≻ IT
- > Finance
- Sport
- Further items to be added

#### Date of next meeting:

TBC mid-January, two hour duration

There being no further business, the call ended at 12.10pm.