



TASMANIAN EQUINE ENDURANCE RIDERS ASSOCIATION INC

STATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING 12 November 2012 6.30 pm, Latrobe

A special general meeting will be held for Members to discuss the following items.

1. AERA Motions for Discussion (extracted from July AERA Minutes):

11.2 Rule Changes – Motions for discussion and due for Second Vote at the November AERA Meeting

11.2.3 QERA Motion 2

Motions for AERA in relations to the new Accreditation processes:

Motion re Chief Steward accreditation:

That the March 2012 CS accreditation Procedure be adopted and rule A9.7 be amended to read:
A 9.7 A Chief Steward shall be accredited in accordance with the current AERA Procedures.

Motion re TPR accreditation:

That the March 2012 TPR accreditation Procedures be adopted, and rule A10.7 be deleted and A10.6 is amended to read:

A10.6 TPR Stewards shall be accredited in accordance with current AERA Inc. Procedures.

11.2.5 QERA Motion 3

A8 RIDE OFFICIALS

8.4 as is.....

8.5 Ride officials must recognise and respect not only their own rights and responsibilities but also must conduct themselves with due regard to the rights and responsibilities of members, other officials, riders and members of the public.

8.6 Ride officials are to conduct themselves in a manner which maintains the reputation and orderly functioning of endurance riding as determined by the AERA Inc Members Handbook.

8.7 Through the Chief Steward, any designated ride official has the right to refer any matter relating to the irregular running of an endurance ride to their State Management Committee.

8.8 ~~Through the Chief Steward,~~ Any member, other official, rider or member of the public has the right to refer any irregular, abusive or unsuitable behaviour of a ride official to their State Management Committee.

This is a tidy up of the current rule A8. It allows anyone at a ride to make a complaint. Currently the rule does not refer to all of those things. The CS may not address the matter properly at the time. A member has the right to take the matter to the SMC.

11.2.6 Changes to Harness rules regarding logbooks and membership cards.

That Rule 38.1 be altered to read:

“Separate logbooks are not required for harness events. The appropriate page on the existing logbook is to be marked so as to show the horse is competing in a harness event. The horse is assumed to be at novice harness status unless the connections can prove otherwise.”

Rule 38.2 be altered to read. "Drivers need not be issued with separate membership cards', however state registrars must keep a record of novice and endurance drivers and issue membership cards reflecting their status."

Rationale:

Currently rule 38.1 means that one horse can have two logbooks. This causes great confusion in the database. With the low number of horses competing in harness events it is not necessary for separate logbooks and in any case records of all events entered should be kept in the one place.

An endurance horse under saddle, does not automatically qualify as a yellow book harness horse.

12.1 Necropsy.

I have been of the opinion that as the AERA insists that a necropsy is done, then the AERA should pay for it. We then own the document and we can use it to find out why these things happen.

We could include a caveat that the rider/owner/member pays for it eventually. The problem over the years is a) if people can afford to do it b) the tools to do it and the environment. Some people would get upset if this wasn't applied across the board. We have some rules that are just not working properly and this is one of them. If it's obvious that the vet has made a diagnosis of impaction, then there is no real need to perform an autopsy. If it's undiagnosed and unsure of the death, perhaps do an autopsy.

Once a horse is referred to a vet practice, we lose jurisdiction over the horse. It's difficult to then ask for a necropsy. The vet will ask the owner of the horse what to do. We have to be careful on how we insist on having a necropsy done. Location and availability of resources, risk of disease, etc. needs to be taken into consideration. Our vets want to know what is going on.

We can control the situation at the ride, but not at a vet practice. Can we get the vet to decide what the cause of the problem is? Could AERA pay for the necropsy at the event where an endurance vet is available and where the SMC still has control? Pathology also needs to be done. What will we do with the necropsy report?

What happens when we are approached by an animal welfare group about horse deaths in our sport? Would riders/owners abuse the insistence of an autopsy?

What are the statistics of horse deaths over the last 5 years. This would help us make a decision. Perhaps the CS could contact the AERA President (or designated person) prior to authorising a necropsy. Perhaps the AERA could contribute X \$ toward a necropsy.

A vet has the right to refuse to do a necropsy.

It is important for AERA to have information regarding horse deaths and having a necropsy done. Not necessary for all horse deaths i.e. fractures.

Should the chain of process be: horse death at a ride, CS and head vet decide if 1) the horse death is metabolic related or 2) a fracture. If it's a metabolic related death, can the vet identify with reasonable certainty what the cause of death may be? If yes, necropsy is not done. If the answer is no, it's not obvious, we ask for a necropsy following a risk assessment. Paddock necropsy or send to a clinic or hospital?

The new rules for this year cover a lot of what's been suggested.

Process of immediate notification will go a long way to make sure that the rules are followed.

**That V16.8 is changed to read:
The veterinarian shall pass all fees for the necropsy to the AERA. The AERA will be entitled to a copy of the necropsy report and may recover these costs from the owner/responsible member.**