



Member Information Document

Member Information Sessions

Memorandum of Understanding between Equestrian South
Australia (ESA) & Equestrian Australia (EA)



Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
SUMMARY	3
OUTLINE	3
ACTION ITEMS.....	6
QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS	7
APPENDIX 1.....	8

INTRODUCTION

The Board of Equestrian South Australia held two member information sessions regarding the recent Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Equestrian South Australia (ESA) and Equestrian Australia (EA). The sessions were held over two nights, Tuesday 29 October and Thursday 31 October via Zoom.

EA Chair, Christie Freeman and Director, Lucy Galovicova were invited as guests to provide context on the role that EA will play in the MoU.

Members were advised at the beginning of each session that it was being recorded for the purposes of providing a document to all members including all questions and answers.

SUMMARY

The meetings the MoU including the discussions initiating the signing of the MoU, the need for efficient resource allocation, and the importance of member consultation. EA Chair, Christie Freeman and Director, Lucy Galovicova emphasized the goal of streamlining operations, improving communication, and enhancing grassroots support. The MoU aims to streamline operations, reduce costs, and improve services. Financial considerations, such as potential savings from shared services. The process will involve regular reviews and KPIs to measure success, with a focus on better serving members and improving the sport's overall efficiency. Specific metrics like saving \$100,000 annually by not employing an Executive Officer. Concerns about asset management, staff impact, member engagement and the need for financial modelling were addressed, with assurances that state assets remain under local control and staff and member input is valued.

OUTLINE

Below is an outline of the discussion topics, including key points.

Welcome and Introduction to the MOU

- ESA Chair, Scott Donner welcomed members from ESA and representatives from Equestrian Australia (EA) to discuss the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two boards.
- Scott invited Christie and Lucy from EA to provide an overview of the national reform process and key issues.

Overview of the National Reform Process

Christie Freeman, Chair of EA spoke in relation to the National Reform process and the MoU. Key points from Christie included:

- Thanking ESA members for inviting themselves and Lucy and emphasizing the importance of engaging with the members to understand their issues.
- Discussed the history of Equestrian Australia, including the voluntary administration and the challenges faced over the past 10-30 years as well as the challenges faced and the need for responsible spending of members' money.
- Highlighted the need to streamline resources and operate efficiently to focus on the core activities of the sport.

- Explanation of the MoU as a collaborative effort, not a top-down directive, to improve ESA as an organisation and ensure smooth operations and aims to build the best EA possible.
- Emphasized the non-binding nature of the MoU and the importance of engaging in constructive discussions.

Historical Context and Challenges

Lucy Galovicova, Director of EA spoke in relation to the MoU and its conception. Key points from Lucy included:

- Providing a historical perspective, mentioning her long involvement in EA through EWA and the reform process.
- Explanation of the reasons for the voluntary administration, emphasizing the need for national policies and procedures to deliver consistent opportunities across Australia, including expectations from FEI, AOC, and the need for consistent policies and procedures.
- Discussing the journey of developing the MOU, including multiple revisions and consultations with various stakeholders.
- Mentioning the extensive review process and the importance of member feedback.

Details of the MOU and Member Consultation

Scott Donner, ESA Chair provided members with some context regarding the conception of the MoU and Member Consultation. Key points included:

- Emphasizing the importance of the MOU in a non-binding document for the two organizations to continue discussions and avoid breakdowns.
- Explanation of the MOU as a non-binding agreement to facilitate discussions and ensure continued negotiations as well as address the issues raised by the reform process.
- Discussion on the importance of member input and the need for a structured process to address all issues, emphasizing an open book policy.
- Confirming that the current funding agreement with the Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing is secure and emphasized the importance of securing future funding.
- Explanation that the first step is to review the process and set up regular meetings, with a review of the MOU in six months.
- Clarity on the roles that the Discipline Committees will have moving forward and explanation regarding why they were not consulted prior to signing the MoU.

Confidentiality and Member Consultation

- Scott addressed the ambiguity in the confidentiality clause and the intention of the ESA board regarding this issue, as well as emphasized the importance of member input and the need for a transparent process.
- Scott reiterated that the MOU is a communication device to inform members and ensure their involvement in the making process.
- Clarification on the importance of regular communication with members and seeking their feedback throughout the process.
- Lucy explained the extensive review process and the goal of sharing the final product for member feedback.

- Discussion on the importance of good governance and the need for a structured process to address all issues.
- Scott clarified that all negotiations and decisions will be communicated to the membership in due course, with a focus on member consultation before any constitutional changes are recommended.
- Scott recapped that any constitutional changes require member approval and the importance of a structured process.

Financial and Structural Considerations & Shared Services

- Addressing questions about the financial implications and the need for a structured process to address all issues.
- Discussion on the potential benefits and savings of shared services and the importance of securing funding and structured processes to address all issues.
- Lucy provided details on the costs of shared services, emphasizing that there are no additional costs for ESA and that the savings will come from streamlined operations.
- Christie and Lucy discuss the potential savings from eliminating the executive officer role and having that filled by EA and the benefits of upskilling current staff to take on new responsibilities.
- Scott, Christie and Lucy confirmed that all hours worked by the Advisory Group members would not be financially remunerated as they are volunteering their time.

Asset Management

- Scott addressed the future of ESA's building and the potential for liquidating assets.
- Christie and Lucy clarified that the decision on the building will be made by ESA members, and that all assets will remain under ESA's control.
- Lucy emphasized that the asset is ESA's asset and for ESA to decide how to manage it in the future.
- Scott and Lucy discuss the importance of making sensible decisions based on an analysis of the situation and the needs of the sport.

KPIs and Measuring Success

- Scott discussed the parameters for measuring positive and negative changes in the trial period.
- Christie explained the importance of process flow mapping and understanding member needs to implement meaningful KPIs.
- Lucy confirmed that KPIs will be implemented after the first six months to measure the success of the process.
- Christie and Lucy discussed the importance of clear communication and understanding the processes to ensure effective measurement and improvement.

EA Restructure Model and Member Consultation

- Christie explained that the previous model proposed by the Strategy and Restructure Group was not considered the best option due to its complexity and inefficiency.
- Christie and Lucy discussed the benefits of the discipline structure model, emphasizing the need for national representation and support for state and regional committees.

- Lucy highlighted the importance of delivering resources to the grassroots and ensuring that the sport is vibrant and well-supported at all levels.

Staff Consultation and Future Planning

- Scott addressed the consultation with ESA employees and their involvement in the process.
- Christie and Lucy confirmed that staff have been kept up to date and have provided suggestions for improvements.
- Scott emphasized the importance of involving staff in the decision-making process and ensuring that their concerns are addressed.
- Lucy and Christie discussed the potential for upskilling staff and making efficiencies to ensure the success of the restructure.

Final Questions and Closing Remarks

- Scott addressed the administrative tasks EA has been paid for prior to the MoU.
- Christie confirmed that EA has absorbed some costs for ESA, emphasizing the importance of collaboration and support.
- Scott and Lucy discussed the importance of financial modeling and provided detailed information to the members for their review and approval.
- The meeting concluded with a commitment to continue the discussion and address any further questions and concerns raised by the members.

ACTION ITEMS

The following Action Items were taken from the sessions for actioning by the ESA Board.

- Provide regular communication updates to ESA members on the progress of the MoU and reform process.
- Develop key performance indicators (KPIs) to measure the success of the shared services trial within the first 6 months.
- Conduct financial modeling to demonstrate potential cost savings and resource allocation under the proposed restructure.
- Ensure the current funding agreement between ESA and Sport and Recreation is secure for the period of 2022 to 2026.
- Develop a regular communication strategy to update members on the reform process and seek feedback.
- Update and sign the MoU to provide greater clarity on remuneration to Advisory Group Members.
- Determine the two Advisory Group members.
- Develop policies to support the trial.

The following Action Items were taken from the sessions for actioning by the EA Board.

- Ensure equal representation and consideration of smaller state interests in the reform process.
- Clarify the process for managing state-based assets and discipline-specific reserves under the new structure.

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

For the full list of questions asked by members prior to the sessions, at the sessions and after the sessions, including the ESA Boards and Christie and Lucy's responses, please see Appendix 1.

APPENDIX 1

The below table outlines the questions received from members prior to the Information Sessions, the Category in which they relate to the MoU the answer from ESA and EA Boards and the members who asked the questions.

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Christine Gibbons	Advertising and Announcements	Has ESA received any formal written advice from the Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing regarding a possible merger with Equestrian Australia. If so, will this information be released to the membership so that the members can make an informed decision?	The Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing have been made aware of the proposed restructure, no issues have been raised, save and except it is important for ESA to resolve the differences that led to the resignation of the previous board.
Christine Gibbons	Advertising and Announcements Funding & Liabilities	The current funding agreement between ESA and the Office of Recreation, Sport, and Racing encompasses leadership, policies, and administrative services. Are the terms of the agreement between ESA and the Office of Recreation, Sport, and Racing secure for the period of 2022-2026, in the event any changes are made?	ESA needs to apply for grants each year, this year we needed to satisfy ORSR of our working relationship with EA and must continually satisfy them over the social media posts of members.
Christine Gibbons	Confidentiality Advertising and Announcements	There appears to be some ambiguity in the confidentiality clause, since most of the facts of this agreement will need to be communicated to the membership. What is the intention of the ESA Board regarding this issue?	This clause is required to maintain confidentiality of information not normally shared with each other. It is not intended to hide the process or results from the membership.
Gayle Manning	Meetings Advertising and Announcements	It is nearly 4 weeks since the signing of this MOU - have weekly meetings begun? Will the membership be receiving progress updates before the end of the 6 month agreement period?	Meetings have not yet commenced; members will be informed as the trial progresses. Members are encouraged to make comment and suggestions to the EA restructure email and ESA Admin email.

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Sharon Cimarosti	Nature of this MoU	It is apparent the intent of this document is a Memorandum of Agreement disguised as a Memorandum of Understanding please explain how the ESA Board has taken this approach without member consultation.	The MOU has been prepared to undertake a trial that will see ESA and EA work to undertake a restructure with the end-goal of a completion of the restructure of Equestrian Australia. ESA has acted within the 'Purposes of the Association' there is no specific requirement to consult on every decision of the board.
Sharon Cimarosti	Nature of this MoU	Please explain why the correct registered name has not been included on this document.	The Association is named sufficiently for the parties to identify each other. To be amended if the MOU is amended.
Bridget Dunn	Nature of this MoU	What due diligence was done and what factors were considered by the ESA board before they decided to sign this MOU?	The ESA board considered the potential for the sports to be run without interference from a State board, with little or no sport knowledge. The potential cost savings to members which could be returned via the disciplines committees. The board considered it was appropriate to explore a more modern efficient model. The board has not determined this is the appropriate model just a chance to trial change, it will ultimately be the members who (if they vote) determine any permanent change.
Bridget Dunn	Nature of this MoU	Was independent legal advice sought before signing this MOU?	Yes.
Bridget Dunn	Nature of this MoU	Was the ESA board unanimous when deciding to go ahead with signing this MOU?	Yes, the motion was passed by a vote of the Board.

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Judith Newton	Nature of this MoU	Why did the Board take this step? Assuming it was taken in good faith, what was the purpose of taking this step now?	To improve the sport as a whole.
Sharon Cimarosti	ESA Constitution	<p>Why did the Board of ESA fail to affix the Common Seal to this document?</p> <p>Why did ESA fail to have 2 Board members sign the document as referenced in the ESA Constitution?</p> <p>Why did ESA choose to ignore the rules contained within the Constitution and the Incorporations Act?</p>	<p>The Company Law Review Act 1988 (Cth) removed the legal requirement for companies to use company seals. Therefore, companies can now execute documents through the signatures of certain company officeholders.</p> <p>The MoU is non-binding and not a legal document.</p> <p>The signing of the MoU was a resolution of the Board and undertaken in accordance with rules 15.1 and 18.3 of the Constitution, the resolution provided the Chair with authority to sign on behalf of the ESA Board.</p> <p>The requirement in clause 25(b) for 2 signatures applies to a document where the Common Seal is affixed.</p>
Wendy Hunt & Gayle Manning	Scope	<p>What are the exact timelines of the steps for ESA in the MOU?</p> <p>There is no clearly defined timeline on this document - it makes reference to 6 months within the document - assuming that it will end on 3rd April 2025? Please confirm.</p>	There is no pre-determined timeline, but ESA think from commencement of the trial 12 months is sufficient. There is a lot to be agreed before a trial can commence.

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Sharon Cimarosti & Gayle Manning	Scope	<p>Could you please confirm that the ESA Board intends to approve structural changes without consultation with the membership?</p> <p>If this is incorrect, could you please advise where in the document it states that ESA will consult with the membership before implementing any structural changes?</p> <p>Under Part A - Scope dot point 4 - it states 'The parties each agree any structural changes will be thoroughly investigated and impacts determined and agreed before implementation' - At no point does this mention agreed via membership vote - who actually decides to move forward with the changes?</p>	<p>Structure change will only be approved following a vote of the members approving changes to the ESA and EA constitutions.</p> <p>The MOU is an agreement to trial structural change, the permanent formal implementation will require changes to the constitution.</p> <p>This clause reflects the consideration before trialling changes, to implement changes on a permanent basis requires changes to constitutions. Changes to constitutions is in accordance with the various constitution.</p>

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Sharon Cimarosti Jo Crosby	Scope	<p>As a result of the number of social media posts generated around this issue, it has become apparent that Equestrian Australia has yet to finalise the preferred model. How does the ESA Board explain its decision to implement a discipline model as outlined in the agreement?</p> <p>This is the first consultation held with ESA members regarding the restructure, and yet the MOU has already been signed. Will the opinion of the members be considered in any future decisions regarding the MOU? eg - whether to progress it further once the timeframe of the MOU is reached? What opportunities will the members have to voice their opinion or to support or veto progress?</p>	<p>The MOU is an agreement to commence discussing options to trial a restructure, including a Discipline Model and Shared Services.</p> <p>ESA board will still exist and still accept feedback from members. As stated previously to fully implement it will require a vote of the members.</p>
Gayle Manning	Scope	<p>With most trials, there are usually parameters that are clearly set out so that there is a clear starting point and clear finishing point - what parameters/data points will you be measuring to capture any positive/negative changes?</p> <p>The bulk of the administration work usually falls around the month of July with membership and performance card renewals - as the trial period falls outside of this busy time, how can you be sure that you will be collecting relevant comparative data?</p>	<p>ESA will be gauging members satisfaction, are members getting better service and experiences.</p> <p>Membership renewals and any increase in membership due to changed categories and costing will be considered. There will be a review of membership fees and categories.</p> <p>It will be important for members to be supported in a shared services model to an appropriate standard, this will evolve through the trial.</p>

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
		What data will you provide to the members? Will it be based on the number of transactions? How promptly transactions are performed? How promptly emails are answered?	There will also be some KPI (4/5) that will get put in place at the 6 month mark.
Gayle Manning	Scope	<p>There has been much discussion from the various states with regard to the EA restructure - There was an EA Strategy and Structure Advisory Group established by EA which recommended a different model to the current restructure model being proposed now.</p> <p>The EA Board apparently disregarded the Advisory Group recommendation and went forward with their own model. There is obviously division about which is the best model to work towards. There has been no membership consultation. How can you be sure that this is the best model if there have been no other options presented?</p>	Discipline model is the only model going forward (after extensive research). The Discipline model still has numerous details that need working out. This is the perfect opportunity to embark on that journey.
Judith Newton	Scope	Further, if the new EA Board alters the current path, where does that leave ESA? Is it possible that ESA could be “absorbed” into EA while other state branches remain intact?	The ESA cannot be absorbed (takeover) unless the members vote for it. The ESA can exit the MOU at any time.

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Wendy Hunt	Goals and Objectives	When do ESA members get to vote on the MOU that ESA has signed with EA?	ESA members will not get to vote on the MOU, they will however be in a much better position to vote on constitutional changes proposed (if necessary) to fully implement any new model. They will have experienced the model and have evidence to support or reject changes.
Bridget Dunn	Goals and Objectives	Why did ESA board decide to enter into this MOU with EA without consulting its discipline committees?	The plan to trial the restructure was discussed with the discipline committee chairs.
Gayle Manning	Goals and Objectives	How do you foresee improvements to the state based disciplines if they already have contact and input from the National Discipline Committees - how will this change and/or improve member experience?	EA wants to deliver equal opportunities and pathways to all the members around Australia. This also includes top to bottom squads, safety, horse welfare programs. By streamlining the processes and linking the states closer to the national body EA will deliver better services and allow the disciplines to run themselves with support.
Jo Crosby	Goals and Objectives	<p>If the proposed restructure goes ahead, equestrian sport will be run by its discipline committees. How will the day to day running of state discipline committees change with the restructure? What exactly will their terms of reference be? How will they be funded?</p> <p>The same questions could be asked about National Discipline Committees. In addition - will they all use the same model. At present, some are skills based, and others are state based.</p>	<p>There will be a paid sport officer in each state to support the disciplines. However, each discipline will have a committee that will run their sport.</p> <p>New terms of reference for National Discipline committees is being prepared.</p>

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Sharon Cimarosti	Roles and Responsibilities	Can you clarify how the ESA Board is able to agree to a review of the future role of the ESA Board without consulting the membership?	If and when there are changes to the future role of the ESA Board the members will be consulted and asked to vote in accordance with the requirements of the current ESA Constitution.
Sharon Cimarosti	Roles and Responsibilities	Due to the agreement and in light of the fact that ESA has agreed to an independent review of EA Integrity, who is responsible for the payment of the independent review?	EA is happy to cover the costs.
Sharon Cimarosti Gayle Manning	Roles and Responsibilities	<p>Could you please explain how Equestrian Australia can name a Director who is running for re-election at the moment?</p> <p>What would be the consequences to this document if Ms. Galovicova is not reappointed to the EA Board?</p> <p>What if Lucy does not retain her position on the EA Board? Does this make the MOU null and void?</p>	<p>Director Lucy Galovicova nominated to be the EA Board representative well before the election process commenced. Should she not be re-appointed the EA Board will nominate another Director to replace her.</p> <p>The MoU will not be null and void should Lucy not be re-elected.</p>
Wendy Hunt Gayle Manning	Roles and Responsibilities	<p>What ESA members are on the “Advisory group”?</p> <p>Who are the two members from the ESA Board who have been nominated to the Advisory Group? How were they selected?</p>	<p>To be determined.</p> <p>The ESA board has not yet determined the two members. It will be determined by a vote of the ESA board.</p>

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Gayle Manning	Roles and Responsibilities	As there are employees who rely on ESA for their income, have they been adequately consulted on the process moving forward and been given an opportunity to provide suggestions on improvements?	Yes, to both.
Sharon Cimarosti	Funding & Liabilities	Is it the intent of ESA to remunerate the member(s) engaged on their behalf on the working party? Can you please explain the reasoning behind the suggested remuneration for time? Who gave authority for such payment?	No. This is for expenses incurred outside normal duties of a board member. To be amended in new document? No payments have been made therefore no authority has been sought from the ESA board.
Sharon Cimarosti	Funding & Liabilities	Is the Equestrian Australia Director aware that if they are paid for services, they will lose immunity from personal prosecution under Work Health & Safety laws?	There will be no remuneration.
Wendy Hunt	Funding & Liabilities	What are EA's exact costs for EA's "shared services"?	To be determined. At present it is the cost of the 3 employees.
Wendy Hunt	Funding & Liabilities	What are savings with 3 existing ESA staff and cost of EA's shared services?	The 3 existing staff will be remunerated at the same rate, saving will come from a reduced Executive Officer cost.
Wendy Hunt Jo Crosby	Funding & Liabilities	What happens to ESA's building at end of MOU? The Restructure document talks of liquidating assets. Will our office building be sold?	The MOU requires development for the ESA assets (including tangible and financial) for future use in the various disciplines in ESA's home state only.

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
		What guarantee can be given that the ESA building will not be sold to pay for EA's IT program?	This would be further reinforced with a contractual agreement.
Wendy Hunt Gayle Manning	Funding & Liabilities	Why isn't there any financial modelling for this MOU and the proposed structure? Why has there been no financial modelling or member consultation prior to signing this MOU?	This is yet to be finalised Financial modelling is being prepared; members consultation is not required to trial this model.
Gayle Manning	Funding & Liabilities	What administrative tasks have EA been paid for prior to this MOU and what has the cost been to date?	ESA has recently engaged Holly Fulker to assist with the AGM, ESA will be charged an hourly rate for this service.
Jude Sonnefeld	Funding & Liabilities	Can the current Discipline "Reserves" account balances be defined as to how much (if any) is actually available to the individual Disciplines to draw on? This has been an "unknown" quantity for many years and the reasoning provided is that it is 'held up in the building' Asset.	The idea is that each discipline will get funding based on number in the state. The division of the current funds would follow the same process. Everything that belongs to the discipline should be available to draw on pending the approved budget.

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Wendy Hunt Bridget Dunn	MoU Conclusion	<p>What are the steps for dissolving the MOU?</p> <p>It has been stated that this MOU is non-binding. What if any are the repercussions and what is the process ESA would have to take to cease the MOU?</p>	<p>Either EA or ESA board(s) resolve to discontinue the agreement.</p> <p>There are no repercussions if ESA withdrew from the MOU be passing a motion at a board meeting to that effect.</p>
Gayle Manning	MoU Conclusion	<p>With a National membership base of just over 20,000 members with ESA making up approximately 1100 members, how can you be sure that ESA will not lose its voice over the states with higher membership numbers? Smaller states will definitely have their voice drowned out! This is a major concern.</p>	<p>EA's Constitution allows all Participating Members to have a say and vote, therefore no changes to members opportunity to have a voice.</p> <p>EA have discussed solutions to this on the board level. There will be a base layer for the smaller states substituted by the larger states. ESA will benefit from the restructure and allow for equality for their members.</p>
Bridget Dunn	MoU Conclusion	<p>It states that there will be an agreed period for the home state (SA) to continue business as usual in regards to its annual awards, state championships and any other major events. What happens after this agreed period? Does SA lose its identity? Its heritage? It's state based awards? It's state championships?</p>	<p>South Australia would not lose its identity but ultimately if implemented permanently there may not be state memberships, but funding to state discipline committees is dependent on membership so there will be some link. State based awards and championship will continue as normal, but for events the supervising body will be the EA discipline committee, not the State board.</p>

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Jo Crosby	MoU Conclusion	Will ESA / state branches continue to exist as an association? If not, how will the assets be managed? (On page 29 of the Restructure document under State branch assets and funds: it states that State boards will elect investment committees to ensure the proper use of historical funds...How is this done if ESA is no longer an incorporated body)	To achieve the intent of this statement, there will need to be some significant legal advice and options provided. The intent of EA which will not change is for State assets and funds to remain as State assets and funds.
Jo Crosby	MoU Conclusion	If it is legally possible to manage the assets of the association as described in the proposed Restructure document (ie state assets retained and managed in trust), will each discipline committee have access to the proportion of the funds as currently described in the financial report within the Annual Report? Or will the assets be split evenly between disciplines?	Discipline committees will retain access to all their current and future funds
Jo Crosby	MoU Conclusion	Will there be a shop front in South Australia for the provision of member services?	There are no current plans to sell the ESA Mt Barker premises, it is however always on the table to convert this asset into an equestrian facility with a building for some staff.

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Jude Sonnefeld	MoU Conclusion	<p>Whilst the initial MOU doesn't appear to address any changes to the handling of the Financials of ESA going forward - a full restructure which is being proposed by EA MAY affect the funds available per state.</p> <p>This is relevant particularly in relation to each States Assets and as such each Committee needs to know IF they are going to be able to utilise them prior to any further agreements.</p>	<p>Agree financial modelling is required on this point</p> <p>Is there a question</p>
Judith Newton	MoU Conclusion	<p>Is it possible for the SA Board (and ESA) to walk away from this MOU in the event that discussions with ESA membership recommend this?</p>	<p>Absolutely, MUO is non-binding.</p>

The below table outlines the questions received from members following Information Session one, the Category in which they relate to the MoU the answer from ESA and EA Boards and the members who asked the questions.

Member Name	Category as per MoU	Summary	Answer
Bridget Dunn	Nature of this MoU	<p>If this MOU is to work towards EAs discipline model why did the ESA board not consult its discipline committees? They are the ones that will be primarily affected by this proposed model.</p>	<p>EA and ESA have entered into this non-binding agreement on the basis that the members of the sport voted overwhelmingly for reform at the time of the Voluntary Administration. Both boards have the responsibility to act on the basis on which they were elected. In the case EA board, this is to implement reform. In the case of ESA, it is to remediate the dire situation in which ESA was left 12 months ago. Collectively we have a view on the future of the sport which has been shaped by this background as well as input from individuals such as yourselves, and this is that a discipline model is the only sustainable future for our sport.</p> <p>This consultation process has included representation from your discipline committees, though not necessarily every individual. As the detail of the model is defined, you will have further opportunity to shape your sport.</p> <p>The chair of ESA has advised the Discipline chairs of the plan to trial the restructure. The chairs were asked to keep confidential until the MOU was published.</p>

Bridget Dunn	Scope	<p>I asked the question at Tuesdays meeting what would happen to our state awards/ championships after the agreed period of business as usual written into the MOU. The chair of both EA and ESA responded that our state awards and championships will not be affected by this agreement or the proposed restructure at any stage in the future. If this is the case why is it in the MOU?</p>	<p>There are events such as state championships and awards nights that we expect are still important to members, and if anything we would like to be able to support these better through things such as larger sponsors partnerships, national discipline specific budgets, key event support, insurance cover for major events to protect organising committees etc.</p> <p>The answer is simply that if there is a demand then these events will continue.</p> <p>There are events such as state championships and awards nights that we expect are still important to members, and if anything we would like to be able to support these better through things such as larger sponsors partnerships, national discipline specific budgets, key event support, insurance cover for major events to protect organising committees etc. The reference to an agreed period is for the trial, if fully implemented policy will be developed to move the responsibility from State Branches to National Discipline Committees. Policy will be required to ensure this.</p>
--------------	-------	---	--

Linda Clark	Scope	<p>I appreciate that the Board of ESA and EA have a lot to consider and have been pretty busy over the last 12 months. In the meantime, support for Equestrian disciplines has been minimal at best over the previous 12 months. Communication has been little to non-existent and when the committees do receive communication it is autocratic in style. There has certainly been no discussions and there has been a discontinuation of the valuable joint discipline committee's meetings.</p> <p>Is this a style to be expected for the coming year?</p>	<p>The lack of scheduling of these meetings is an oversight, the board will undertake to review this and re commence as appropriate.</p>
Linda Clark	Scope	<p>How does the Board aim to continue supporting the positive functioning of CURRENT equestrian activities in SA whilst most of its time and energy is focused on restructure?</p>	<p>The working group will need to determine how this will occur, approved by each board but until constitution change the current ESA will still oversee its sub-committees.</p>

Linda Clark	Cope	<p>I do not want to underestimate the value of a restructure and indeed I'm not against the idea in principle. But it will all take considerable time and South Australian equestrian is struggling now with dwindling attendance at events. The Board working in isolation from its discipline committees is a recipe for disaster.</p> <p>I would also like to point out that although current Board members may have been on discipline committees in the past it was exactly that... in the past. The functioning of committees has changed enormously and become increasingly professional with many of us under going training for committee management and sports integrity as encouraged by our previous EO. For Board members to state they understand and know the functioning of current discipline committees because they were on one 10 years or more ago is to gravely underestimate the skills and functioning of current discipline committees.</p> <p>So what are the Board's plans to constructively support its disciplines now, so we actually still have a sport worth restructuring?</p>	<p>The ESA board and working party members will need to consult with Disciplines committee and members from time to time to implement appropriate policies for the trial</p>
Wendy Hunt	Funding & Liabilities	<p>It was stated on Tuesday nights meeting by ESA Chair that ESA is losing \$100,000 per year. Why is this? This was the reasoning to go with EA. Could this be clarified?</p>	<p>Not sure the EA Chair used the words above, but the context is that an EO's salary is likely to be in the order of \$120,000 pa therefore if there is no EO employed there is a \$10,000 per month or \$120,000 per annum cost saving.</p> <p>Any member who has reviewed ESA financials can see that it is not sustainable to continue to operate under</p>

			the current model. The objective is to share resources so that we can eliminate costs between EA and ESA.
Wendy Hunt	Funding & Liabilities	It was stated that we would save EO costs but not explained EAs cost for the shared services? Could this be clarified?	The shared service cost will be approximately \$50k for the first 6 months which is the equivalent of the wages costs for our current 3 staff members, therefore effectively saving the costs of an EO.
Bridget Dunn	Funding & Liabilities	On Tuesday nights meeting there was a question about remuneration to the advisory group. The chair of EA and ESA advised that no one would be paid for this service. Please advise why it states in the MoU point 6. Funding and Liabilities that each party will fund/remunerate their own people for their time and expenses on the advisory group and this project.	The MoU anticipates that there may be some costs involved each stage which would be born by each party. These may include things such as legal advice or reimbursement for costs incurred such as parking or travel related expenses. The Board members are volunteers and are not paid for their time, whether it be on their own board activities or on the MoU related activities. Out of pocket expenses will be considered in accordance with ESA Branch policies.
Sharon Cimarosti	Other	Considering that Equestrian Australia has decided not to grant voting rights to the Equestrian Northern Territory members, what assurance has Equestrian SA received that the members will retain their voting rights?	It is not EA or the Board that has not granted NT members the right to Vote, this was a decision of the State Branches at the adoption of the current Constitution in 2020. The EA members will determine the question regarding the NT at a SGM of EA members in November not EA. SA members constitutional rights, unless changed by a vote of the members they will retain this.

Wendy Hunt	Other	We have a Board member monitoring emails but who is the person to which ESA members write that would normally go to EO. (Eg to ESA board, complaints etc) As our constitution refers to the EO throughout what legal implications are there? Eg public officer?	<p>ESA members continue to write to the Manager There are no legal ramifications of not having an EO Scott is the public officer at this time.</p> <p>This has been addressed in the Constitutional Changes proposed for resolution at the 2024 AGM which members received yesterday via Nominate.</p>
------------	-------	---	--