

**Minutes of the W.A.E.R.A. SMC Meeting held on
Saturday, 26th May 2018, at the Drakesbrook Motel, Waroona.**

The meeting was scheduled to commence at 10.00am. Due to the lack of SMC members present at the scheduled time (no quorum), the SMC members present decided to wait until Kirsten Melis could join the meeting at midday.

Meeting commenced: 12.10pm.

1. Members Present.

Kylie Van Uden, Joanne Van Uden, Abigail Bartell, Deb Jewell, Richard Jeggo, Ieva Peters, Chris Haddon, Cara Allan, Kirsten Melis.

2. Apologies.

Anne Barnes, Rachell Nell, Lienca Nell, Terry Sweeney, Caren Earl, Carly Arnasson, Deb Ryan.

3. Visitors.

Ian Symington.

Note: At the meeting held on 28th April 2018 it was agreed that we invite someone else to Chair the meeting. Thanks to Ian Symington for agreeing to do that.

4. Welcome by President.

Ieva Peters asked who would be doing the minutes for this meeting. Since nobody volunteered to do the minutes, Ieva assumed that she was still the minutes secretary and would do the minutes for this meeting. Ieva also advised that she would be recording this meeting to do accurate minutes and to record the inappropriate outbursts that were levelled at her, and for her own protection. Richard asked the SMC members present if they were OK with this. Ieva advised that she didn't need permission to record the meeting. Cara commented that there shouldn't be a reason why people don't want it recorded. If you're not prepared to have something recorded, then don't say it. Abigail: with regard to the issue of recording meetings, I have had some legal advice regarding the recording that was made of the Executive meeting and subsequent transcription and distribution of that recording. The lawyer that I spoke to said that, in their opinion, that recording was illegal and breach of the Surveillance Devices Act in WA. Based on that, I would like to move a motion that:

WAERA engages the services of a lawyer who can advise us on this issue so that it can be very clear whether that was illegal or not, and that until such advice is received, that all references to the transcript be removed from minutes and such and that it not be discussed any further until we are clear on the legality of the issue.

The second part of the motion is that:

The two parties involved in that, Rachell Nell, who recorded the meeting, and Ieva Peters, who transcribed and distributed the transcription be suspended from committee until we know whether it was legal or not.

Richard asked for a seconder for the motion.

Cara: we are going off topic, and this is not what we are here to discuss today.

Abigail: it needs to be dealt with. If two members of our committee are guilty of breaching WA laws, don't we want to deal with that straight away?

Cara: firstly, we don't have that confirmed.

Abigail: before we discuss the motion, do we have a seconder?

Deb Jewell seconded the motion.

Cara: I just think that this is not what we are here to discuss today, so this should be held over until the next meeting.

Richard: a part of the discussion we are going to have is directly involved with that transcript, so it does matter. So, if there is no other discussion to be had, there is a motion.

Chris: I have to say, that without legal advice, I'm not sure that we should be voting on this. I don't disagree with what you're saying, but I'm not sure that we should be voting.

Abigail: so the motion is that we get legal advice. The first part of the motion is that WAERA engages the services of a lawyer for the purpose of advising us on that, and I'm happy with my motion if you want to break it down into two separate parts. The first part of my motion is that we seek legal advice and not discuss it any further until we have that advice. The second part of my motion is that the members involved should be stood down from committee until we know. So there is two parts to the motion if you'd like to vote separately, I'm happy to do that.

Deb J: perhaps it should be two motions.

Joanne: if the second motion goes ahead, we are not going to have a quorum. So maybe this should have been brought to our attention before we all hung around.

Cara agreed.

Richard: the meeting has opened with a quorum and I can't see any way that it can't continue if we've opened with a quorum.

Joanne: but you want to suspend leva.

Richard: I didn't say I wanted to suspend leva.

Joanne: but the motion wants to suspend leva immediately, I'm assuming.

Chris: do we want to do the first motion?

Abigail: yes, so the first motion is that:

Motion:

WAERA engages the services of a lawyer for the purpose of advising us regarding the legality of recording the Executive meeting and distributing the transcript made from that recording and we don't discuss that transcript until we are clear on the legality of the issue.

Moved: Abigail Bartell/Deb Jewell.

Richard: as we have an interim chairman, I think it might be a good idea for him to take over from here. Does everybody agree with that?

General agreement.

Ian: a motion has been put forward. Is everybody clear on the motion?

leva read out the motion.

Chris Haddon stated that he had a proxy vote for Anne Barnes. That's probably something that he should have said earlier.

Richard: it's too late, sorry. That has to be presented to the Chairperson before the meeting starts.

leva: not sure about that as it usually applies to the AGM.

Ian: before we vote on the motion, is everybody happy to accept the proxy vote from Anne Barnes?

Cara: what is the proxy for?

Ian: any matters going to vote. Chris has been nominated as Anne's proxy to vote on any matters going to vote.

Richard: would question that. I think it must be stipulated what she is voting for or against. You must know the motion before you cast a vote. It seems a nonsense to me. It seems a nonsense for a proxy vote not to be aware of any motion. At all. That's my opinion.

Chris: I had an email from Anne stating that she is prepared to accept any matters to my way of thinking. I don't have to use her vote, I don't think it's fair, I'm not sure what her thoughts would be. Her email states clearly that she gives me permission.

Ian: once again, I'll put it to the members present if they are happy to accept that.

leva: we've had meetings in the past where proxy votes haven't been accepted. That was in March. Two meetings ago. We had three proxy votes that weren't accepted at that meeting because the agenda didn't list the actual motions. So, theoretically, the people didn't know what the motions were, so how could they vote? We weren't allowed to make phone calls to discuss with the people belonging to the proxy votes to discuss how they wanted to vote. However, in January when we discussed the Quilty venue meeting, we had no proxy votes, but we were allowed to ring them. To me, this is unclear as to what should or shouldn't be done with proxy votes and perhaps there needs to be some kind of policy. Personally, I don't have a problem with accepting proxy votes, but I think it needs to be consistent. If people are allowed to phone when there is a matter that Chris feels that he needs to phone Anne, or any other proxy voter, then that should certainly be allowed. But, at the moment it is just inconsistent. If we allow it at this meeting, and we didn't allow it at other meetings, despite having proxy votes, that's inconsistent and not fair.

Ian: It's up to you to vote on whether you accept this, or not, in this instance, and this instance alone. If you vote for it, then Chris will be able to vote on behalf of Anne. If you are against it, vote accordingly, and he won't be able to vote on behalf of Anne. That's how it stands now.

Richard: would just like to add, when we had this vote where we had the courtesy to make two phone calls, there were two members that weren't present.

leva: which meeting are we talking about? January?

Richard: we phoned the two people absent for their opinions and their vote. Both those persons, after, complained that she didn't get a proxy vote.

Motion: that we accept Anne Barnes proxy vote and allow Christopher Haddon to vote on her behalf.

Moved: Ian Symington (Chair)/Richard Jeggo.

Voting:

5 – For.

4 – Against.

Carried.

Ian: back to the motion on the books.

Motion:

WAERA engages the services of a lawyer for the purpose of advising us regarding the legality of recording the Executive meeting and distributing the transcript made from that recording and we don't discuss that transcript until we are clear on the legality of the issue.

Moved: Abigail Bartell/Deb Jewell.

leva: has concerns about not discussing the matter. I think until we find out the legality of the issue, whatever that may be, doesn't stop us from discussing that transcript and what was in it. What was discussed at that meeting reflects on what we are discussing today, and certainly on my behalf, there is a conflict of interest for those people that attended that meeting and made decisions and had discussions about me, so I think that it should be included, and until such time as we find out "yay" or "nay", we continue on because it's important.

Ian: OK. We have a choice here with the motion: leave it as it is, or alter the motion.

Abigail: leave the motion as it is.

Cara: I also think that we need some clarification about who is going to seek this legal advice. I think that nobody involved should be the one seeking advice. It should be someone that is deemed as "independent". Maybe someone from the Independent Appeals Committee could seek that advice. I think that almost everybody around this table is too invested in the matter.

Richard: I don't think you'll get any solicitor or lawyer that you are going to influence. He is going to look at the case and the legalities.

Ian: we have a motion on the books. First thing to do is deal with the motion. Then we can deal with the issue of what it's going to cost and those things. Any further discussion for or against the motion?

leva: agree with the first bit, but not the second. Get the legal advice but I think that it should be discussed.

Voting:

For – 6 (including proxy vote).

Against – 4

Motion is carried.

Ian: so, at this stage, there is to be no discussion concerning that particular executive meeting. This doesn't mean you can't discuss anything else that is pertinent outside of that meeting. Now we can move on to the agenda.

Abigail: there was a second motion. That the two members involved be suspended from the committee until we have that advice.

Ian: Have we got that written down?

Motion:

The two parties involved, Rachell Nell and leva Peters, who transcribed it and distributed the transcript be suspended from committee until we know whether it was legal or not.

Moved: Abigail Bartell/Deb Jewell.

Abigail Bartell withdrew the motion.

leva: has had legal advice as well, and my understanding is that provided the person involved in the meeting is present, it is not illegal. It is illegal to "bug" a meeting with a surveillance device and not be present. We've recorded WAERA meetings in the past, particularly AGMs. It was also not a private conversation. In all fairness, Rachell Nell should be here to defend herself and not be suspended without some sort of recourse or representation. That is called "natural justice" and I feel if we are doing that, we are back to being a "kangaroo court". Rachell has the right to reply and respond.

Richard: thinks that leva is quite correct. Rachell should have the opportunity and the motion shouldn't apply to Rachell until the next meeting. The motion should be for leva Peters to be suspended.

Cara: I think that this is happening too often. Motions being brought to SMC meetings without being included on the agenda. I think that this particular motion would have been thought about prior to the meeting today. It wouldn't have been something that has just come up as a result of discussion. I think that it is unfair that members that aren't attending the meeting to not be involved, especially when it comes to something that is so important. There's a lot of people that aren't here today and I think that they should be involved.

Abigail: I only made the decision yesterday. Spoke to a lawyer on Thursday and took some time to think about the advice that I was given and what action I would like to take, based on that. I only made the decision yesterday. I feel that I am somehow being accused of doing something nefarious by not having my motion ready by the time the agenda was sent out. But the reality of the situation is that I did only decide that I was doing this yesterday.

Cara: in fairness, I spoke to Rachell and Lienca and said can you give me proxy votes and they said there were no motions on the agenda, so why do we need to give you proxy votes. We should have it on the agenda and people should have time to consider the motions and consider proxy votes. I think, in fairness to people that aren't here but would like to contribute, we should, especially when things are so important, we should have it on the agenda and people should have time to consider the motions and submit proxy votes.

Abigail: in general terms, I agree with you. I can't change what has happened.

Ian: are you keeping the motion as it is?

Abigail: I am happy to amend it to remove Rachell as she is not here, although I would like it noted that I feel that Rachell's opportunity to defend her actions, and leva's opportunity to defend her actions, come at the point when we do receive advice from a lawyer, if the lawyer says yes, it was illegal, then the members will have their opportunity to defend themselves. I'm happy to, based on the feedback here, amend the motion today due to the fact that Rachell is not present at this meeting, and move that leva be suspended and that Rachell's suspension be re-addressed when she is present at a meeting.

Motion: Given that Rachell Nell is not present, I move that Ieva Peters is suspended from committee until we receive legal advice, and that the matter of Rachell's suspension be addressed at the next meeting that she is attending.

Moved: Abigail Bartell/Deb Jewell.

Ian: does everybody understand the motion? Would anybody like to speak against the motion?

Ieva: so, I'm guilty. We are judge, jury and executioner. We don't even know what the legal advice is, but still I'm to be suspended.

Christopher: would like to speak against it. Don't want to vote on this until we have the advice.

Deb: read out an article from the internet that she had found. Just want people to be aware.

Cara: I think determining what is the legal definition of a private conversation needs to be done. I think we should stop discussing this until we actually get legal advice because we are going to go around in circles and talk about things that we don't have 100% clarity on.

Abigail: I agree with Cara. That's why I moved the motion that we do get legal advice. Ieva, I want to make it clear that I am not judging you and you haven't been found guilty.

Ieva: yes, you are. You want to suspend me.

Abigail: yes, because we are talking about a criminal offence.

Ieva: so are the breaches of the Associations Incorporations Act.

Abigail: I feel that this is a serious enough issue to ask for the members to be stood down. If I didn't feel so strongly about this I would not have done this because I realise that both Rachell and Ieva are valuable contributors to our club and committee. I don't want to be suspending people and causing huge disruption to the way our club works, but I feel that we are talking about whether or not a crime was committed. To me, that is serious enough for those members to be asked to step aside until we know for sure. That's why I have moved my motion.

Ian asked for the voting.

Chris: Anne Barnes will be abstaining.

For - 2 – Abigail and Richard.

Against – 6.

Deb Jewell abstained.

Anne Barnes proxy vote was abstained.

Motion is lost.

5. Executive Decisions to be Ratified.

None.

6. Register of Pecuniary and Conflict of Interest.

A transcript of the Executive meeting that was held on the 3rd March 2018 has been distributed to the SMC. Those Executive members that were present at that meeting (Richard Jeggo, Abigail Bartell, Deb Jewell and Rachell Nell) should not take part in any decisions regarding the matters that were discussed at that Executive meeting.

Ian: we've probably just covered that.

Ieva: the above statement as at my request, as I feel that at that meeting there were quite a few issues discussed that involve me, and those people should not be involved in decisions involving those matters, or matters involving me.

Ian: the problem with that is, we've already covered it prior to getting to that stage.

Ieva: I just want it noted.

Deb: just want an explanation. Register of pecuniary and conflict of interest: isn't pecuniary to do with money?

Ieva: yes. It's the same agenda item that is on the AERA agendas. A pecuniary interest is a financial interest and it may not be a direct interest. It may be a family member. I believe it is a requirement under the Incorporations Act to register any pecuniary and conflict of interest at meetings. You may not know if you have a pecuniary interest or a conflict of interest and we address it as we go. It's just there as a reminder, which is something we have discussed in the past.

Cara: it's just a standard agenda item.

Chris: that's fine. But then the items that follow, can they be discussed? We've got Item 6, and then we've got a transcript of the executive meeting. Is that what we need to discuss?

Ian: that's already been discussed. Do you think that's been dealt with?

Ieva: yes. But I reserve the right to bring it up again if I feel the need.

Abigail: we seem to have a repetitive issue where disagreements regarding what exactly is a conflict of interest and at some point we need to resolve that. Ieva has listed what she believes to be a conflict of interest. But is it actually? I disagree. So we need to, as a club, resolve what exactly is a conflict of interest because it keeps coming up and people are accused of having a conflict of interest when they don't believe that they do.

Deb: it's in the constitution, item 24.3. But I've read it and read it, and I'm obviously ignorant or something, but to me it's extremely ambiguous.

Ieva: Google it.

Ian: is there an instance that we are talking about here?

Abigail: let's take this for an example. Do the people listed here actually have a conflict of interest? Should they be excluded from the discussion? Or is that just Ieva's opinion?

Ieva: my opinion is that they should be excluded from the discussion. Because they've already discussed matters, been judge, jury and executioner, disciplinary action has been taken without consultation with the rest of the SMC or the people involved. That is a huge conflict of interest.

Ian: but in actual fact, the vote went the opposite way, so there was no disciplinary action taken.

Ieva: yes, there was. I've still got letters that haven't been addressed.

Cara: two of the items on the agenda are letters from Deb Jewell to Ieva as a result of that meeting.

Deb: I am still very unclear. The letters were sent. The Executive meeting was called. It was called a secret meeting but it wasn't. I found the email this morning where I sent it to the entire committee. What I want to know is, somebody needs some clarifications and it's one of the reasons why I've stepped down as the president because I'm sick of being treated like an uneducated moron and probably I am. When you write to someone and ask them to do something, why is that a judgement? I'm asking the chairman for some clarification because your letter is random, convoluted and went on and on. And so, all that was asked was a retraction of the letter and re-write it and get to the point. Why is that a judgement? I need that explained to me.

Ieva: Mr. Chairman, these matters are being dealt with by the Independent Appeals Committee tomorrow and I don't think we should be discussing those letters anyway.

Deb: and when was that decided? Where was that sent in an email to say that was happening? Someone needs to explain to me what the judgements are, I've asked three times in an email to this committee and no-one will answer me. I need someone to read that letter and tell me what the judgement was. We had a discussion on how to deal with it because I had no clue how to deal with that letter, because it was three pages long. Is the executive not allowed to have a discussion?

Ian: is everybody aware of the letter?

Cara: yes. Letters.

Ian: so does everybody know the content of the letter?

Deb: some of them won't because they're new, but they probably do now.

Ieva: the letters are in the agenda.

Deb: I just need to know, because I don't understand what the judgement was, other than asking for a retraction. Is that a judgement, is it?

Ian: it's not for me to say.

Deb: I have no idea. What judgement did we make?

Richard: can I ask, with this Independent Appeals Committee, what are you ...

Ieva: that's between me and the Independent Appeals Committee. I'm not going to discuss this with you.

Cara: can we please get back to the agenda?

Ian: yes. When we get to that section, we will cover it further.

7. Confirmation of Previous Minutes.

- **WAERA Minutes 24th March 2018.**

Motion: that the WAERA Minutes of the meeting held on the 24th March 2018 (at Collie) are accepted as a true and correct record of the meeting.

Moved: Chris Haddon/Cara Allan. Carried unanimously.

- **WAERA Minutes 28th April 2018.**

Abigail: The issue is that those minutes contain a large part of the transcript of the meeting, and I would not like them distributed to the members while that section is in there. I would like to state very clearly that I don't have anything to hide, I'm happy for the world to know the things that I said at the executive meeting, but I don't think that they should be included in the minutes that get distributed to members at this point in time.

Deb: so they've been read, but they don't have to go out to the public. I don't know what has to happen.

Ian: that's a separate issue. What we're actually asking is would somebody like to move that the minutes have been read and accepted.

Ieva: the issue is whether or not they are a true and accurate recording of that meeting, and yes they are. That is, the document that I read out at the meeting in front of the members present. So, they are a true and accurate recording of that meeting.

Ian: so the motion is pertaining to that. If you want to raise the motion after that that they are then not distributed, that is a separate issue altogether.

Ieva: I don't think we can't not distribute them. I think that every WAERA member is entitled to a copy of the minutes and they're entitled to know what's going on.

Abigail: there is a precedent that we redact confidential issues that arise during discussions at meetings. This section could be redacted.

Motion: that the WAERA Minutes of the meeting held on the 28th April 2018 (Murdoch) are accepted as a true and correct record of the meeting.

Moved: Deb Jewell/Cara Allan. Carried.

Abigail: do I need to move a motion regarding the redacting of the section of the minutes that I don't believe should be distributed to the members?

Ieva: you've just accepted the minutes.

Motion: All content of the transcript of the Executive meeting held on 3rd March 2018 are removed from the minutes of the WAERA SMC meeting held on 28th April 2018 before the minutes are distributed to members, until such time as we receive legal advice.

Moved: Abigail Bartell/Christopher Haddon.

Ieva: would like to speak against the motion because the members are certainly entitled to know what's going on. It's not going to change what happened. The members need to know that this is serious.

Cara: is against the motion, but feels that the executive meeting happened, we all agree that the executive can meet at any time, but if they're going to do it and it's recorded, that's one thing, but why are we seeking legal advice? Because if you met, and did everything above board, then why does anyone care that it was even recorded? Why does anyone care that members are going to know what you were talking about?

Abigail: I don't care. What I care about is whether or not somebody in our club committed a crime.

Cara: does that mean that we are seeking legal advice about all the other potential crimes that have been committed over the last year?

Abigail: if somebody would like to move a motion and get that happening, if it gets voted that we're going to do that, yes.

Voting:

For – 6

Against – 4.

Carried.

Abigail: somebody needs to find a lawyer to answer these questions. Perhaps somebody not on the SMC. Just asking for clarification did this breach the act?

Joanne: Perhaps someone from the IAC?

Cara: you do realise that this is going to cost a lot of money. Perhaps thousands of dollars.

Abigail: make an appointment and clarify if it is a breach of the law. All we're asking is – did this breach the Act?

Cara: and where are we going with it?

Abigail: if this was a breach of the law, then what do we do about it? If the law has been reached, there has got to be a consequence, doesn't there? We can ask the lawyer, if yes, then this is what you do. If not, then you don't do anything. And then it comes back to the committee.

Joanne: would Legal Aid help? Can they answer that question?

Abigail: There is a WA Sports Federation that advises clubs, we could get a membership and pursue that avenue. Would be a cheaper option. We can ask the IAC to find a lawyer and get the advice.

Joanne: Perhaps legal aid? I'm happy to make some phone calls as I'm totally unbiased about this. We want something in writing. Perhaps Ian could do this on our behalf?

Ian: the reason to get somebody independent is because they are not emotionally involved. I would be happy to do it other than the fact that I don't necessarily agree with it.

Joanne: I don't know that we need to go down this path.

Cara: I don't think it's right at all.

Kylie: so if it's legal or illegal, what do you want to happen?

Abigail: I want the law to be enacted. What action gets taken when this law is broken? I don't know.

Cara: there are things that we see are illegal. People going through stop signs, people having conflicts of interest, breaches to the Associations Incorporations Act which we know has happened. Why is it up to WAERA to fund that?

Abigail: I could fund it for myself, but you guys wouldn't be happy with the answer.

Cara: and where is it going to stop? So every time it's deemed someone on the committee does something wrong, we're going to get a lawyer.

Joanne: nephew works in BGC and they have lawyers. I am happy to ask him to do that. If not, go to the IAC and ask them to find someone.

Ian: the AERA has a lawyer.

Ieva: yes, the AERA has a very good lawyer. I have already spoken to John Mullins about things, so you can't approach him. He also charges around \$600 per hour.

8. Matters Arising from the Minutes (Action Sheet).

Defer to next meeting.

9. Correspondence.

9.1 Correspondence Outward.

Date	From	Action
30/1/18	Deb Symington re: answers to AGM financial questions	AB
4/3/18	Letter to Ieva Peters – From Deb Jewell – see below.	DJ
13/3/18	Letter to Ieva Peters – From Deb Jewell – see below.	DJ
01/05/18	Confidential	RN
01/05/18	Letter to Ross and Karly	RN
01/05/18	AERA Letter - New delegates	RN
01/05/18	Deb S- Funding for non WAERA rides- Only local Wheatbelt rides - Vet Fees only	RN
02/05/18	Confidential	RN
17/05/18	Letter- Janice Skinner- Thank you letter for running Raffles	RN
10/05/18	Letter to IAC - Ieva Peters' appeal.	RN
17/05/18	EA - Swabbing invoices.	RN

- **Letter from Deb Symington (as below):** Deb has asked that the correspondence between Abigail Bartell and herself regarding questions she raised regarding the AGM financials is noted in the minutes.

- *Email from Deb Symington and response from Abigail Bartell:*

From: Abigail Bartell [mailto:waeratreasurer@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 10:58 AM

To: Rachell Nell

Cc: Terry Sweeney; Ross McCamish; Richard & Vicki Jeggo; Karly; Ieva Peters; Debra Ryan; Deb Jewell 2; Carly; Caren Earl; Cara Allan; Anne Barnes; iansymo@wn.com.au

Subject: Re: AGM Agenda

Hi Deb,

Thank you for your email and the opportunity to clarify some things for you prior to the AGM. My responses are below in **red**

From the Balance Sheet

1. What is the Amortisation \$11537 *Amortisation is the reduction in value of an intangible asset as opposed to depreciation of a tangible asset. In this case the asset is the use of the improvements we have made at the Collie Ride Base (as we know the actual physical assets don't belong to us). An example is the sound system that was installed last year. We acknowledge that the system will age over time to the point where it is no longer usable and we record the amortisation of that use. It gives us an idea of when we might need funds to replace it.*
2. What is the Cash Draw \$7728 *Cash Draw is where we record funds that have been received but not yet banked. The majority of this figure was the cheque from Jarrahdale*

From the Profit and Loss

1. What is the Other Revenue \$5567 *Presume it was a donation from Jarrahdale and should it be shown as such? A drill down in to the Financial Records will show that it has been recorded as a donation from Jarrahdale. I didn't create a new income account for donations as they are a rare occurrence. I should have mentioned the donation in the Treasurer's Report. I will do it verbally at the meeting.*
2. Who/what did WAERA sponsor for \$4069 *This figure includes sponsorship for TQ17, TQ18, WAAHA Endurance Horse Class at their show and sponsorship for WAERA members who rode in TQ17 in South Australia (This was in the form of a WAERA jacket)*

When looking at the actual income and then outgoings in running rides

Income from members and rides \$66317

Expenses Food, Vets, Fees C/Points

Trophies Aera fees etc \$67743

We are losing money so should ride entry fees be increased to a level to at least break even and this still does not take into account the actual costs of running the Club.

As mentioned in my Treasurer's Report we have seen a significant shift towards WAERA run rides in the last year and I believe this has had financial (an other) consequences for our club. Many of these

rides were not actually run by the SMC but rather by organising committees who didn't have an incorporated body to run the ride so did it under the WAERA banner. This means that the SMC lost a certain amount of financial control. It also meant that some ride organisers were inexperienced and really had no idea what they should be spending. I believe that this has led to some over spending in various areas. I do not believe that ride fees necessarily need to be increased although it's not a bad idea. I think people who are spending WAERA money need to be a little more careful with it. It's a difficult balancing act because the SMC is trying to help new rides get up and running. New rides can be poorly attended & sometimes financial investment by the club is required.

Our Functions costs \$5368
Functions Income \$2952
This also shows a loss

There are a few reasons for this loss:

For one function in particular payments for the meal were included with ride entries. It was very hard to track which was which. Some deposits made to the bank account had narrations but other didn't. Some attendees paid cash at the ride desk & I just received the cash with no break down of ride entries/function income/otherwise. So the function income may be higher.

There is a perception amongst SMC members and club members that we have a large cash reserve and can afford to subsidise these functions and various other events that WAERA puts on. This means that often what we charge for an event is less than what it costs us.

Overall I know we are a Not for Profit organisation but no business can continue to operate at this level of expenditure and have a secure future.

I agree with this sentiment. We, as a club, need to be careful of our expenditure. We need to be aware that the money we are spending is not ours and we need to be good stewards. However, there are many who are of the view that we have large cash reserves and we should get on with spending it.

One of the non-financial effects of having most rides run under the WAERA banner is that I, as the Treasurer, have effectively been a ride Treasurer every two weeks throughout the season. This has taken my focus away from the 'Big Picture' stuff like budgets, projections and financial analysis that I would like to be doing. The information gleaned from these things could then be used to better inform the SMC & members & guide them as they make spending decisions. Having recognised this the SMC and I have made some changes so that things will be different in the coming year. So, from my point of view, I feel positive that things will improve.

I trust that this answers your questions and alleviated some of your concerns. Please feel free to get back to me with any further questions.

Kind Regards
Abigail Bartell
WAERA Treasurer

- **Two Letters to Ieva Peters (as below):** these matters are being dealt with by the WAERA Independent Appeals Committee tomorrow and it shouldn't be discussed here.

- **Letter to Ieva Peters – from the WAERA Executive committee (4/3/18):**
04 February, 2018

Dear Ieva,

This letter is to bring to your attention that your 'Correspondence letter' received at the AGM on the 10th February has not complied with the confidentiality agreement signed by SMC members and was a breach of confidentiality.

Your letter stated names and votes of SMC members.
The letter also quotes unratified minutes.

If the behavior continues, you may be subject to further disciplinary action.

Yours sincerely

Deb Jewell
WAERA President

- **Letter to Ieva Peters – from Deb Jewell (13/3/18):**
13 February, 2018

Dear Ieva,

I have been pondering on your letter for quite some time. I am not sure exactly what your point is. We all agree Debra Ryan can be explosive and quick to make comment, not always in the nicest of language. She has been reprimanded regarding this matter. What is the relevance of dragging up history about Deb which had been dealt with at the time. The letters sent to you from Cs's in regard to her actions in the Vet ring are not relevant either, those were dealt with in the moment. I must point out these letters cannot be submitted to the SMC table as they were addressed to you I consider your behavior in phoning those involved seeking these letters is unacceptable. This kind of letter is divisive and has done nothing but disrupt the committee and cannot continue.

The Committee believes that members have the right to do their portfolios/ volunteering without fear of bullying, harassment and this kind of behavior will not be tolerated.

I would ask you to retract this letter immediately and no further action will be taken.

Yours sincerely
Deb Jewell
WAERA President

Discussion: these letters were sent to Ieva Peters following the Executive Meeting held on 3/3/18 at Richard Jeggo's home. The only SMC members that were present were Deb Jewell, Richard Jeggo, Abigail Bartell and Rachell Nell. All other SMC members were excluded from the meeting. The Executive has no authority to send letters of discipline or take any other action. All matters must be addressed by the entire State Management Committee in accordance with the WAERA constitution. Therefore, these letters should be withdrawn.

- EA invoices: Abigail responded that the matter is still ongoing. We have asked them to prove that they belong to WAERA. Rachell has written to them.

9.2 Late Correspondence Outward.

Nil.

9.3 Correspondence Inward.

Date	From	Action
29/1/18	Deb Symington re: questions regarding AGM financial statements.	Noted. AB responded.
18/2/18	Aspire Committee re: financial subsidy for FEI events.	Noted.
26/2/18	Cara Allan re: Associations Inc. Act and breaches by WAERA SMC. <u>Discussion:</u> Cara suggested that because we are obtaining legal advice in other matters, could we ask for clarification around this matter as well? Also, has there been any progress in training for the WAERA SMC? Abigail: has been researching and looking at the options that have been discussed and I'm waiting for a response regarding some of that stuff. Definitely in the pipeline that we will get training. There are a few options for free training and then there's options for us to pay for training which we would fund through a grant. Paid training would be targeted more specifically to our club, whereas, Sports and Rec and Equestrian Australia offer their set training course. I just want to make sure that I've got all the information before I send it out.	Response and clarification required.
26/2/18	Confidential <u>Discussion:</u> Ieva suggested that in the interests of natural justice, that (removed) should be present during discussions concerning (removed). Defer to next meeting.	Defer to next meeting.
27/2/18	Confidential	Defer to next meeting.
	Confidential	Defer to next meeting.

7/3/18	Confidential	Defer to next meeting.
18/3/18	VERA (Bronwyn Cuthbertson) re: State Vet Panel guidelines. (Forwarded to Anne Barnes)	AB to respond.
22/3/18	<p>Confidential</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> leva: (Removed) is not here, so we probably shouldn't address this matter at the moment. Richard: I don't know about any complaint. Ian: was the complaint made in writing? Cara: yes. Ian: because before you get all this out of the way, how are you going to be able to get on with things. I understand that (removed) not here. But until you get all of these things out of the way ... leva: which was the whole purpose of holding this meeting. Cara: I'm not sure, Richard, how you can say that you don't know what the letter is, because it was submitted on the 22nd March and it has been in the agenda items for the last three meetings. Richard: there's plenty of emails where I have been taken off the mailing list. Cara: it's actually in the zip files attached to the emails for this meeting, and the last one, and the one before that. Richard: this is the first time I've seen any zip file. Ian: OK then, let's pick one where everybody is here. Summerfield's letter.</p>	Defer to next meeting.
22/3/18	Confidential	Defer to next meeting.
14/3/18	leva Peters - Letter of Response to Executive letter received 13/3/18.	Being dealt with by the IAC.
26/2/18	<p>leva Peters - Draft letter to Rosanne Pimm re: sponsorship clarification.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Agree to change the date and send the letter. leva will edit it and send it to Rachell.</p>	Done.
6/4/18	Deb Jewell re: resignation as WAERA President and AERA delegate.	Done.
13/4/18	<p>Ross McCamish re: THISWA logos and correspondence.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Ross has resigned from the SMC and from this position. Deb Ryan sent an email in saying that she doesn't have time to attend the meetings. Create portfolio for someone that doesn't have a job at the moment: community liaison. Next meeting is in 4 days time on 10-12 noon Wednesday 30th May at DPAW Kensington. Cara could attend in the interim, but should have someone appointed to this kind of portfolio. Joanne Van Uden may be able to take this on depending on Wednesday availability but that could be a bit difficult.</p>	Done.
14/4/18	<p>(removed) re: letter of concern (committee, financials, independent audit, minutes on website, infrastructure at CRC, conflict of interest, TQ2020 committee, CRC MOU, AERA delegate selection).</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Cara read out the letter. Ian: that's a very in depth letter. The first part of it, nobody can dispute. I suggest that all these issues are addressed as soon as possible. The (removed) have a good feel around the club. Joanne: why did the SMC get involved with the TQ committee. Ian: the SMC is the governing body. They come under AERA and they represent AERA and then the subcommittee runs the day to day operation of the Quilty under WAERA. leva: the Quilty is an AERA event. The AERA "owns" the Quilty. The state divisions are responsible for running the Quilty, the Quilty committee must be an incorporated subcommittee of the state division. WAERA needs to ratify all members of any subcommittee, not just a Quilty. In the past, we did create our own subcommittees and WAERA rubber stamped it. So there probably has been more input from the SMC than there has been in the past. That's probably got to do with not everybody agreeing on the venue selection and how things are proceeding. Richard: most of the problems stem from the fact that the TQ is going to Collie. It's a screen to block the TQ. The venue has been decided: TQ is going to Collie.</p>	Richard and Abigail to respond and send to Rachell.

	<p>Didn't say we were building a shed. Didn't come from me. The proposed horse hospital was deemed inadequate and wasn't big enough. Was going to be a joint venture between the CRC and WAERA. Deb Ryan has the documents to apply for a grant.</p> <p>Deb J: No disputing the first part of (removed) letter. My problem with the rest of his letter is about the shed is a lot of gossip. Don't know where (removed) got his figures from. We need to write to (removed) and answer his letter.</p> <p>Ieva: we need to address every single thing that (removed) has raised in (removed) letter. Richard Jeggo needs to put something together and send it to Rachell so that she can write back to (removed).</p> <p>Cara: we should go through each item and compose a response. Minutes on the website? Deb Jewell was to do this. They will be done from now on. Deb J will do this. AGM, GM and SMC ratified minutes need to go up. Where has the money been spent and financial position.</p> <p>Abigail: response is books will be audited and a report will be presented at the next AGM. The correct answer is the books will be independently audited, that's enough of an answer at the moment. Minutes and P & L will be on the website. I can try to correct the misconception about the \$60,000 loss.</p> <p>Swab box and the \$8,000 quote – Richard will respond to that.</p> <p>Pump expenses and contribution and levelling of the vet area. Pump is SMTRC donation. Vet area hasn't been levelled. Abigail will do this response.</p> <p>TQ2020 venue and CETRC Conflict of Interest voting.</p> <p>Deb J: was president and didn't deem that there was a conflict of interest. Yes, 3 were members of CETRC. Roseanne did the submission and we weren't involved. I wasn't aware that she was putting CETRC on the submission.</p> <p>Ian went through some of the history surrounding Collie.</p> <p>Deb J: something else that was pointed out to me was when that decision was made without the consideration of the expense of going to Collie, I always see Collie as a venue when we hold a ride there that there is no expense attached, no venue hire, no thought of we'll take the TQ to Collie and the expense. To me the TQ is a 160km ride, we run one every year. Yes, there needs to be a certain amount of infrastructure. Didn't think there would be a great expense.</p> <p>Ian: you're going to get about 100 horses, so don't spend a lot of money there. Make sure it's all transparent.</p> <p>Deb J: we don't have to spend a lot of money and there is already infrastructure there.</p> <p>Cara: back to (removed) question: why were CETRC members allowed to vote?</p> <p>Deb J: because I didn't deem them to have a conflict of interest.</p> <p>Chris: CETRC and CRC on the submission. Should have had WAERA on the submission. WAERA actually has the MOU with the CRC, not CETRC.</p> <p>Abigail: had a lot of discussion about whether or not CETRC members have a Conflict of Interest, and in response we should say that the SMC is investigating the Conflict of Interest matter and seeking advice. Regarding submissions having candidates to attend: CETRC members were privy to submissions. Only thing from Wagin was a letter from the Shire, would have invited people from the Shire of Wagin. Perhaps (removed) feels (removed) should have been invited to attend. Based on the information at the time, (removed) name was not on the submission. When the Expressions of Interest went out, we needed a good combination of venue and tracks, needed support from Council and local people on the ground. In my opinion, a letter of the shire doesn't meet those requirements. I questioned whether Wagin should have even been considered. Abigail will draft something up to respond re: TQ2020 venue.</p> <p>Deb J: SEC was not possible because of access to the course, and Dryandra as a possible future venue because they weren't sure about a course.</p> <p>Cara: next bit is about TQ2020 committee selection.</p> <p>Deb J: is astounded by (removed) response. Basically, they felt they weren't going to be considered. Not true.</p> <p>Abigail: I've been part of the process of forming the TQ committee since a couple of years ago. Lot of people saying what do we do now? Seems everybody involved is unsure of the exact process, what is the order of events. There seems to be some confusion. Apologise for any inconvenience and do not intend for that to be offensive. Response would be that we apologise for any inconvenience or offence and we would value them to be on the committee. We should be writing a process of how to do things.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Richard: at the executive meeting at my house, I asked for a letter to go out asking to form the TQ organising committee and once all interested parties are known, we would have a joint meeting with the SMC and portfolios would be appointed.</p> <p>Ian: and what happened.</p> <p>Deb J: nothing. I was the President at the time. It took Rachell some weeks to send that letter out after the executive meeting. It has gone out and there's only a handful of people interested because there is talk that the old committee people are not wanted.</p> <p>Richard: I haven't spoken to any ordinary member who got the email. I didn't get it.</p> <p>Richard: it was decided in 2016 that the Organising Committee would be confirmed when the site was selected because the geography is very important.</p> <p>Joanne: we need to answer the letter and let them know that they are very valued and very important.</p> <p>Deb J: regarding the MOU - Robert Pimm is the president. Richard J and I spoke to Robert in March while at the CRC about the MOU about renewal and longevity. He said the MOU was and is not in doubt. It will be there and be discussed and renewed. We have a letter to that effect as well. We can't bring the date forward.</p> <p>Richard: in preparing the financials for the TQ at Collie won't be any major expenses before the new agreement is signed.</p> <p>Cara: next item is the AERA Delegate role.</p> <p>Abigail: at the time of writing this letter Deb Jewell and I were the delegates, Richard has since been appointed.</p> <p>Ian: are you two comfortable with the amount of work? Do you feel you have the experience to handle it? So the answer would be that the SMC made a decision and we had a vote.</p> <p>Ieva: from the AERA's perspective, they actually want people to do things. There is also a letter from the AERA that need to be answered.</p> <p>Cara: also some of these issues will be discussed at the SGM. We need a date and the members need to be advised.</p> <p>Ian: so that's the questions covered. This response needs to be done ASAP.</p>	
15/4/18	Deb Jewell re: letter of resignation as WAERA President and AERA delegate (second letter).	Done.
11/4/18	<p>Ali Healy re: appointment as auditor and recommendation for audit.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Abigail explained that Ali is a member of the club who has been doing our auditing for the last couple of years. Ali is not an accountant. Ieva: point of order, we don't have an auditor. Ali "looks" at the books. Our books have not been "audited". Joanne has passed on the contact information to Abigail for Ray McManus from Araluen Accounting Services. Joanne has spoken to him. Abigail has spoken to him. He needs the books to give us a quote. Abigail: Ali has been looking at the books for the last few years. In her letter she doesn't want to do it anymore and she recommends that we appoint an independent auditor which we are in the process of doing. Are we only getting one quote for the audit? Joanne said that she would organise somebody. We already had a quote from (removed) for \$700. It was agreed not to use (removed). He needs to see the financials to give us a quote. He doesn't know if it's a box of invoices he's looking at or if it's computer software. Abigail: he doesn't need the physical books. He can log into our software. Cara suggested we get three quotes. Joanne will find another accountant for a quote. Also, Cara will ask her accountant. We use XERO software.</p>	Joanne and Cara to get quotes.
11/4/18	<p>Ali Healy re: end of year books for 2017.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Abigail: this was the auditor's report. Ali sent it to me in email form for the AGM, but hadn't written a letter and signed it. That was an oversight at the time.</p>	Done.
20/4/18	Deb Symington re: concerns about WAERA financials.	Done.
26/4/18	<p>Cara Allan re: flyer and information about Western Australian Council for Social Services Inc (WACOSS) provides training and resources for boards and committees on the function and elements of organisational governance.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Cara sent this out in a previous email. Becoming a member of WACOSS might be beneficial. They can provide on-going support and can answer questions. \$400</p>	Ongoing.

	membership annually. Training can be discounted. This would be a part of Abigail's submission for our training.	
1/5/18	leva Peters re: request for IAC meeting and appeal.	Done.
7/5/18	<p>Anita Fortsch re: electronic timing system trial.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Anita's letter was tabled. Deb J thought the ETS was brilliant. She was on the departure gate and it worked well. Joanne also thought it worked well but believes there was a lot of extra work for leva and Anita. leva loves the ETS and thinks it works well for the riders, but creates a lot more work for the person on the computer. It is very labour intensive especially when there needs to be alterations done to tags (lost tags) or one of the timing gates goes off line for some reason. It's at least a two-person job and there should be no interruptions i.e. people coming to the office. There should be no distractions. Ideally, there should be more than one laptop going. Both laptops need to talk to each other and the ETS, and the internet. We have used more than one laptop at a TQ before (2015) and there were some serious issues. leva is going to be talking to Steve Swan about this concept. The system that Tom brought over is a "half system". Nobody went down early to Collie to see how it was set up or how dismantle it. Also, if we purchase a half system, who's going to look after it? This is delicate electronic equipment. Shouldn't be in the ride trailer. Which rides will it go to? The half system would cost WAERA around \$11,000. Richard: so, after seeing the system, are we expected to make a decision about purchasing it? leva: no more than SA, Vic, and other states. Qld and Tasmania have purchased the systems for their states. Joanne: can we hire the system? leva: from the AERA's perspective, we have the system there, and I think the AERA could be hiring it out. We'd have to have it at our Quilty. The system works well, but I'm not sure if WAERA should be purchasing it. Kirsten: can't we look at a local system with a tag on the bridle or something? leva: but that's how it works. It's the same principle. If you get an outside system, you still have to make it "talk" to the AeraSpace software, so why keep re-inventing the wheel? Joanne: is Tom going to be coming to our Quilty and could he bring the system with him? leva: certainly this is something that we and the AERA should keep in mind. We may be up for some costs. Not sure yet. Cara: went through Anita's points in the letter. People need to be trained and responsible. I don't think we should buy it at the moment given our current financial situation. Too many questions that need to be sorted. Perhaps we could just hire it. Respond to Anita and thank her for the letter and include her in any future plans regarding the ETS, at this stage we are not looking at purchasing the ETS, further investigation is required before any decisions are made prior to purchase. Cara and leva to put something together. AERA delegates to discuss this at the AERA meeting. Quilty is an AERA ride, so should be available.</p>	<p>Cara and leva to put something together. Rachell to respond.</p>
27/4/18	<p>Cassie Mulcahy re: financial reports and leva Peters.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Cara tabled Cassie's letter. Cassie is concerned about the financial loss that WAERA has had over the last two years. There is a lack of sponsorship and fundraising. Also concern in removing leva Peters from her long-standing position as the AERA delegate and current AERA president and provide a reasoning behind her removal, and to have her reinstated as soon as practicable. Cara has spoken to Cassie about this letter. Cass is happy to help Cara with sponsorship and fundraising. The FEI ride was all sponsored for prizes. Yarloop was about 80% covered. Abigail: regarding the raffles, we note your concern, misunderstanding regarding the matter. Joanne: regarding leva and the AERA delegate position, was this from the last meeting after we left? Would also like to know why, as well. Would like to hear both sides. Abigail: timing of events was the we had the AGM and should have been voted</p>	<p>Cara & Rachell to respond.</p>

about the AERA delegates, but there were procedural issues, nobody was given the chance to nominate. At the March meeting, we discussed this again we asked for nominations for delegates and vote on it because at the AGM, that didn't happen. Three nominations were received: Deb Jewell, Ieva Peters and myself. Deb and Abigail were voted as the AERA delegates. After that, Deb resigned as president and AERA delegate. Not automatic that the previous nominee would get the job. Called again for nominations and voted again and Richard was voted in. Ieva responded: At the March meeting, Anne Barnes specifically asked Richard Jeggo and Deb Ryan if they were interested in being the AERA delegates and they said no. That is also the meeting where the proxy votes weren't allowed to be used, and if they had been allowed, there would have been a different outcome. So then Deb Jewell resigned prior to the April meeting and was again discussed. You both had left (Joanne and Kylie). There was no motion about this on the agenda, so you were not aware of the matter. The process in the past, certainly while I've been on the SMC for the last 18 years, is that if you had three nominations, two were picked. If for some reason one of those people dropped out or couldn't go, the third person was the next in line. This procedure was not followed at the last meeting. It should be noted that my removal as the AERA delegate is nothing to do with my performance. I have always worked hard and am one of the few people that actually do things at AERA level, so as far as I'm concerned, I'm more than capable of doing the job and have been doing it for quite some time, as well as the AERA president's position. The reason that I am no longer the nominated AERA delegate is not based on my performance.

Cara: would like to raise a motion just to clear this up. That based on precedence and Anne's and blank proxy vote being allowed. At the March meeting I gave a blank proxy vote to Ieva, so did Rachell and Carly and the votes were disallowed. I gave the votes to Ieva and I spoke to Ieva and also sent them to Deb Jewell and expressed that I would like the votes to be counted and they were all disallowed. So now we come to this meeting and a blank proxy vote is allowed. Can we vote that if you are sending a proxy vote to a meeting and it can be blank, and the person you've given it to can vote on your behalf? The proxy vote would need to be presented to the secretary prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Richard: so the exception was made today to vote. Wasn't a policy, the decision was made today. The chairman and I both agree, that's not the way it should be.

Ieva: I find that extremely convenient.

Cara: how can it be allowed today, and not before?

Deb: I do recall what happened at Collie after you left. Anne asked Ieva if she wanted to make a phone call. I said no, because the last time we allowed phone calls, you (Cara) raised a song and dance about it. So we said, we're not going to allow phone calls because it bit us on the backside last time.

Ieva: this is double standards.

Cara: I just wrote in a letter, once, that I submitted to the SMC that Carly and my [telephone] votes shouldn't have been allowed, and my understanding of the constitution, because we weren't present at the meeting and we weren't privy to all the conversations prior to being called and saying "who do you want to vote for?"

Joanne: we weren't there [at the April meeting] if we'd known that it would be on the agenda, we would have liked the opportunity to put our proxy votes in before we left. I think if it's not on the agenda, we shouldn't be discussing it and it shouldn't be voted on.

Ieva: to allow our sport to move forward, we sometimes do have motions from the floor, but, we should allow phone calls and proxy votes.

Cara: at the moment, the constitution is inadequate, but in 22.7 it says: *Proxy voting shall be permitted at all State Management Committee meetings*. We never should have denied proxy voting at all. There is no elaboration about that.

Joanne: so why were the other proxy votes denied?

Deb: because there was no mention about what they were voting for. It was blank.

Abigail: the form has a section for voting on motions. Apparently that was blank. The motion that I would put would be to say that a person can delegate a proxy vote for a meeting when they are unable to attend and the proxy will be valid for all motions to be voted at that meeting.

Cara read out what a proxy is according to Google: *A proxy is a person appointed by a member to vote on their behalf at a meeting*. You don't have to state the motion; you can just nominate someone to be your proxy at a committee meeting.

Abigail: so then we need to change the form that we use, because that's where

	<p>the ambiguity comes in when the motions aren't included in the agenda. leva: include a paragraph to vote on my behalf any way they feel they need to, in addition what is already on there.</p> <p>Motion: <i>That committee members unable to attend an SMC meeting can delegate their vote to another committee member who shall then be their representative and vote on their behalf via a proxy vote. Proxy votes must be handed to the Secretary prior to the commencement of the meeting.</i> Moved: Cara Allan/Chris Haddon.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Chris: went through Anne's proxy voting form, and he can vote on anything here today. Cara: we need to be very clear, moving forward, because it's been "yes, no, yes no". Chris: so in your motion, you don't state that the item should be in the agenda or not. Just looking at Anne's form covers what's not in the agenda. Joanne: is that the WAERA form? Cara showed the WAERA form that she had used in the past. leva: our constitution shows how the form is set up. Kylie: if the boxes are ticked and signed, then they should have been accepted. leva: then let's go back to the votes from the March meeting then, shall we? Ian: we are not going to make it retrospective. leva: no, we can't possibly be fair. Cara: this isn't a WAERA proxy vote (Anne's form). This is from the Associations Incorporations Act document, which is a lot clearer than the WAERA one.</p> <p>Voting: Carried unanimously.</p> <p>Motion: that the WAERA proxy voting form be amended to be in line with the form on p.79 of the Guide: Incorporated associations in WA. Moved: Cara Allan/Joanne Van Uden. Carried unanimously.</p> <p>Cara to help Rachell write the letter of thanks and response to Cassie.</p>	
17/5/18	<p>AERA (Kim Moir) re: WAERA delegate nominations.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> leva: the AERA want a response and an explanation. Joanne: so if leva is not our AERA delegate, are you still the president of AERA? leva: that remains to be seen. I don't know. Joanne: is that because you are no longer the AERA delegate? leva: technically, yes. I don't want to say too much. But until the July meeting, nothing changes. Joanne: was everybody aware of that happening? leva: of course they were. Richard: I was aware of some facts. I was aware after the vote. You announced that after the meeting at Collie. But the AERA were aware that the two representatives at that first meeting were "acting" delegates and weren't voted on as we hadn't had a meeting. Deb: I was the other delegate. There's a lot more to this than meets the eye and I don't think it's appropriate that I bring all of that to the table. As far as I am concerned leva and I were "acting" delegates. They wanted leva to be the AERA president. We went to the meeting and the voting happened, and leva was elected president. We came back and had another meeting to discuss these issues. leva put her name forward in good faith, same as me, so did Abigail. It didn't go the way some of us thought it would. A couple of years ago, Deb Ryan put her name forward and didn't get the vote. Joanne: is concerned with the angst and the issues keep coming up. leva: it keeps coming up because we have different standards for different meetings. At one meeting we accept proxy votes, at the next meeting we don't, and the list goes on. In the AERA AGM minutes, there is absolutely no mention of anything temporary or "acting" regarding the votes and nominations. As far as the AERA is concerned, the nominations were accepted at face value and in good faith. So now the AERA has written to WAERA and asked for an explanation and</p>	Richard to respond.

	<p>"because we said so" isn't going to satisfy, which is what we're telling everyone else. They want a far more detailed explanation than that.</p> <p>The nomination forms for Abigail and Richard have not been sent to the AERA yet which was requested on 17th May 2018.</p> <p>Richard Jeggo to respond in writing through the secretary. Richard to circulate this to the committee prior to being sent.</p>	
17/5/18	<p>Ieva Peters re: letter of complaint regarding Richard Jeggo's behaviour at SMC meeting held on 28th April 2018.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Ieva: this is regarding Richard's outburst at the beginning of the meeting held on 28th April at Murdoch. Richard launched an unprovoked and aggressive attack against me. Richard is prepared to apologise. He went off a bit strong. Ieva accepted the apology, but would not tolerate any more outbursts. If Richard has a problem with Ieva, he needs to discuss it with her, and not make assumptions.</p>	Done.
	<p>Chief Steward reports received.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Ieva: raised some issues from the CS reports at the last meeting. Richard: will get (removed) the CS together to discuss this matter, but hasn't been able to organise it yet. Ieva: (removed) Cara: suggested that rather than having conversations, something needs to be put in writing as a letter so we have something to refer back to that the matter has been addressed. It's OK to have a conversation, but then write a summary of what was discussed and resolved and everything is on record. At the moment there is no evidence that matters have been addressed. Richard: at the last meeting, we agreed that I would have a conversation about this. Nothing was said about putting it in writing. Cara: after you have the discussion, write a summary about what was discussed, and then submit it to the committee so that things are on record. Abigail: so recording the discussions in the minutes, would that be adequate? Cara: not necessarily. We don't really know what's been discussed. The same as what's happened with (removed). Richard said he had talked to (removed) but we don't know what was said. (removed). (removed) Joanne: everything needs to be recorded. If you talk to someone, it needs to be tabled as a record. Members have a right to know how we have dealt with a situation. Ieva: there are also insurance implications. We have identified a problem in the first instance and done something about it. We have a second problem and we need to do something about it. We have a duty of care to everyone who comes to our rides to ensure their safety. (removed). Richard will put a summary together about his conversation (removed).</p>	Richard to do a summary.
17/5/18	<p>SES re: MOU received.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> This is the prices that the SES charges us for their services at our rides. 80km ride should be \$500, not \$800.</p>	Rachell to send to SES for changes.
18/5/18	<p>Deb Symington re: ride costs XL spread sheet.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Ian: Deb S has put this together to show what a ride costs to run a ride.</p>	Noted.

9.4 Late Correspondence Inward.

Date	From	Action
21/5/18	Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale re: equestrian sports no longer allowed on the Jarrahdale oval.	Deb J to follow up
22/5/18	<p>Ady McIntosh re: request for refund for the FEI ride.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Ady was advised by EA that her horse was eligible to compete, so she entered the FEI event in good faith. The FEI denied her entry. Apparently, there was a 24 month time frame that wasn't met regarding horse qualifications. It was agreed to refund Ady her \$130 ride entry fee.</p>	Abigail.

10. Portfolio Reports.

10.1 Treasurers Report.

Abigail didn't prepare a financial report for this meeting as we were to deal with issues from previous meetings. However, there is a couple of things that we need to talk about.

- Insurance Quote: need a decision regarding the insurance renewal. Ieva wanted to look over the insurance quote, hadn't had enough time as we only got it yesterday. It is due today.
- Profit and Loss for Rides: Ian asked if this could be done and put into the newsletter as members liked to see that stuff. Abigail will do this and include it in her Treasurer's report for SMC meetings and then also will go in the newsletter with the minutes.
- Credit Card: Abigail suggested that she organise a credit card for the treasurer. Then she won't have to use Cara's card.

Motion: that the WAERA Treasurer organises a debit Mastercard for WAERA expenses.

Moved: Abigail Bartell/Cara Allan. Carried unanimously.

- Ian suggested that all accounts must be paid through authorisation. One person can't be responsible. Authorisation for payments must be done by more than one person. It can be the executive committee. All payments should be tabled at committee level. Ieva went through the process that is used at AERA level: once a week the bookkeeper sends a list of accounts to be paid (and invoices), those are OK'd by the Executive. The bank account is able to be accessed by three people. All payments are electronic and at least two people must electronically sign for the accounts to be paid. All payments are listed in Executive Decisions to be Ratified on the AERA agenda. Works well and everybody is kept informed. There are no complaints. Joanne suggested that all payments and transfers should be pre-approved so that everything is transparent.
- Abigail suggested that on a regular basis, she put together a list of invoices to be paid. Who gets the list? How many respond before payment can be made? Is it just the Executive? One responds and do the payment? How does it work? Ieva suggested the executive gets the list, any two of the executive can pass the approval for payment, and also two to do the electronic payments through the bank. It could be the Treasurer plus one other from the executive. But it's not a one-person decision. Does Cara have to email anybody before she uses her card? She probably should get some sort of authorisation. Or advise that she is going to organise trophies beforehand and what she is going to spend.
- Ian asked about vet payments. Are they paid in cash? Yes. Do they supply an account? Somethings. Are they paid GST? Sometimes. We should be getting a receipt from them. That is proof of payment. Abigail agrees and is currently negotiating a situation with two vets because we have decided not to pay them cash any more. Supports what Ian is saying, but it's not simple, but Abigail is doing her best to get everything that we do need.
Ieva suggested purchasing a little invoice/receipt book and ask the vets to sign prior to giving them cash. We need a paper trail. First priority would be to have payments done by bank transfer or cheque, and secondly, if they want to pay cash and ask them to sign prior to cash payments. Currently, Abigail won't be paying cash or cheque and we have a paper trail.

From the minutes 23rd June 2018 – amendment: Correction: Currently we pay by EFT or cheque, no cash, and it was agreed that was a suitable paper trail.

Joanne suggested that we write to the vets and advise them about payments. Abigail has spoken to most of the vets.

10.1.1 Collie Race Club.

Invoice received from Roseanne Pimm for the use of the canteen by the Corbins for the 2017 Marathon (\$330 inc GST), WAERA ride May 2017 (\$220 inc. GST) and 2017 State Champs (\$220 inc. GST). Total due is \$770.

Discussion:

Richard: the charge for the use of the canteen arose from the year before when Roseanne was ill and couldn't run the canteen. This was a last minute thing when the Corbins were asked to come and do the canteen last year. It's not our bill. It's the Corbins' bill.

Cara: were the Corbins aware that they were going to get charged for the use of the canteen?

Richard: no idea. The whole idea is that Roseanne did the canteen and we have a venue with no overheads. The profit from the canteen was paying for the utilities. That's why she's done it. We've had a venue with no overheads. Now she hasn't raised the money, because she hasn't done the canteen, so the overheads have to be paid.

Deb J: evidently, over Easter last year, they used an entire bottle of gas.

leva: we're on bottled gas at home and it lasts us two months, so that doesn't sound right. They're 40kg bottles.

Richard: it might not have been established at the time, and the Corbins might have gone in there and not knowing that they were going to get a bill for it.

leva: that's my point. We, and the Corbins, are now being charged for something we knew nothing about. I think that is extremely unfair and poor business practice. If the Corbins had known they had to pay \$330, they would have just parked their trailer under the awning, like they have done in the past. My response to Roseanne would be, sorry, but you can't charge us for something we know nothing about, and I take umbrage at being charged for things at the CRC that I think WAERA are entitled to have access to. We've been charged for something we know nothing about.

Deb J: and there's been no correspondence about it until now.

leva: I think we shouldn't pay this, as we weren't advised prior to the events. But if you would like us to pay a share of the costs of the utilities, please send us copies of the invoices and we will pay our share. She has sent us a little piece of paper in the past for payment of utilities. It has always been provided very late as well. We should put a time frame around these things and get these accounts quarterly for utilities. Not two years later.

Ian: perhaps a meeting face to face to discuss this would be better.

Abigail: I've been having discussions with Deb Ryan who has the portfolio for CRC person, would be appropriate to ask Deb to approach Roseanne about this?

leva: one of the executive should be involved, particularly the treasurer as these are money matters. We need to establish a protocol and a time frame. We need to know four times a year what our utilities are going to cost us. It's taken nearly 18 months to get the bill, so should we wait 18 months to pay it?

Abigail: I need to see the water bill and the gas bill etc.

Joanne: can we come to an agreement with them to be able to use the canteen when they're not using it?

leva: at the meeting we held there in March, there was a lot of movement going on in the canteen area. I spoke to Bluey and there was a birthday party taking place. Do they pay? Can we send the CRC an invoice for the use of the toilets for the last couple of years for the races for the amount of \$770?

Ian: we have put a lot of money into the CRC over the years. The issue is if we were aware it was to cost us to use the canteen, we could have made an informed decision.

Chris: we are providing a facility, and we should pay for the facility. If we asked the Corbins to provide the facility, and we should pay.

Ian: the reason some of us don't volunteer down there any more is that we donated all the food and put volunteers in the kitchen. We paid for our own meals, which we donated food for. At the end of it, there was no profit. It was all absorbed into things the club received for nothing.

Deb J: there used to be a time when we donated food for the canteen that Roseanne was running. We never saw a profit and loss, and we never saw the bills.

Joanne: if we're asking the Corbins to do the canteen, should it be a WAERA cost?

leva: didn't think it should be a WAERA cost.

10.1.2 Log Brook Pony Club.

Invoice received from Log Brook Pony Club for venue hire (Yarloop ride) for 2017 and 2018. 2017 was not paid, so this invoice includes 2 years of venue hire. Total due: \$650.

Discussion:

Abigail never got an invoice for last year. Abigail was aware that there was some costs that Ali had paid out of her own pocket because the ride had not been well supported. When Abigail did get the invoice from the Pony Club, she wasn't sure, maybe there was a deal, or Ali had paid it herself. Got the invoice recently for the last two years of ground hire.

*From the minutes of 23rd June 2018 – amendment: Abigail never got an invoice for last year. Abigail was aware that there was some costs that Ali had paid out of her own pocket because the ride had not been well supported. When Abigail did [insert] **not** get the invoice from the Pony Club, she wasn't sure, maybe there was a deal, or Ali had paid it herself. Got the invoice recently for the last two years of ground hire.*

10.2 Secretary.

Nil.

10.3 Veterinary/Horse Welfare/Early Warning System.

Anne sent her report:

There are no additional horses or riders that I can see flagging the EWS. No recent treatments.

Yarloop: Excellent to have new vet Kristine working there – that was a great ride, and she really enjoyed working with everyone and will be back, thanks for everyone looking after her so well.

All the stewards and helpers worked in super well at Yarloop. There were some challenges with social horses unaccustomed to any of the procedures, but ultimately it went OK.

(removed)

I have had a complete re-hack at the strategic plan, sent on late to Deb (Tony is away), sorry not to get it in time for the agenda, but if you want I can send that around or next week when Deb has had a read.

Swabbing steward course: I assume we are paying for the 3 girls to attend, but I have not been able to send in their paperwork which they returned to me, as I do not have a WAERA credit card number – if the SMC is OK for this to be paid for, please let me know the number. It would seem easier to do that than double handle money by me paying then getting reimbursed.

FEI2* - some definite interest in running one this year, but I think ultimately not enough time left to get that sorted. Is it possible to reconsider the motion from several years ago, re not running FEI/state champs together, please?

I think that is everything from me; I should be in front of the computer most of the day if you flick an email or ring if you need.

Regards

Anne

Discussion:

FEI ride/State Champs – holding an FEI ride with the State Champs? Should be discussed at an AGM. Agenda item.

10.4 Ride Calendar 2018.

- FEI 2* ride: has been suggested for this year, but is not going ahead. Late fees involved and importing lots of people from the east coast. Not enough time to do this properly. Maybe next year.
- Quindanning: is definitely not happening. No alternative ride at Collie.
- Deb J to put something on FB about not having a ride.
- Jarrahdale oval: letter from SJ shire about no horse sports on the oval. Deb J and Anne Airey are having a meeting with the Shire of Serpentine/Jarrahdale regarding this matter. We should be able to retain access to a small part of the oval and still use the outside areas. Deb J to confirm.
- Dwellingup ride: can't camp at the oval, but harness club has taken over the golf course. Rob Shaw has a few contacts in the area and see what he can find out.
- Myanup: doesn't look like it's going ahead. Having trouble getting volunteers.
- Kirup: Arun is keen to hold a ride at Kirup in memory of Meg Woodhouse. Perhaps a fundraiser for charity?

10.5 Sponsorship & Fundraising.

Defer to next meeting.

10.6 WAERA Awards and Trophies.

Defer to next meeting.

10.7 Property.

Defer to next meeting.

10.8 Merchandise.

Defer to next meeting.

10.9 Chief Stewards and TPRs.

Defer to next meeting.

10.10 AERA.

Defer to next meeting.

10.11 Website/Facebook.

Defer to next meeting.

10.12 Newsletter.

Defer to next meeting.

10.13 TQ2020.

Defer to next meeting.

10.14 Collie Race Club.

- **Dedication Trees**: dedicate some trees to past members. Plaques are suggested. Defer to next meeting.

10.15 Volunteers.

Defer to next meeting.

10.16 WA Trails.

Defer to next meeting.

10.17 WAERA 2018 Annual General Meeting and Awards Night.

Defer to next meeting.

10.18 WAERA Mid-Year Special General Meeting.

SGM requires a minimum of 14 days' notice. Have an SMC in the morning and the SGM in the afternoon.

Suggested date for the SGM: 23rd June at the Wandu Hall. Ieva to see if the Wandu Hall is available.

SMC meeting at 9am in the morning and SGM in the afternoon around 1pm.

11. General Business.

11.1 Photographers at WAERA rides.

Defer to next meeting.

11.2 SES Memorandum of Understanding.

80km rate needs to be \$500.

11.3 Road Management Plan: There are new requirements for road signs, 4 will be needed for every road crossing, currently we use 2. We will need to place 2 on each side of a road crossing. It was agreed that the Executive could make a decision regarding the purchase of the two required signs.

11.4 Executive Committee.

Abigail would like clarification about the executive committee. Ieva said at one meeting that the executive has no power, that this is a democracy and we all have a say. But then we have executive decisions to be ratified on the agenda. So which is it? Would like this clarified.

Ieva responded that the Executive only has the power to do what this committee allows them to do. If this committee allows the Executive to make decisions about payments (and you might want to put a cap on that i.e. a maximum of \$2,000 or something and anything over that comes to the whole group), then they are allowed to do that. Refer to the constitution. The Executive has no power to take disciplinary action, and that's what I take exception to.

Abigail will make a list of payments made and get approval from one other person, and then, as a part of the financial report list the payments. Is that to go in Executive Decisions to be Ratified or in the Financial report?

Ian responded that everything that is paid out should go in the Financial report. If you get a phone call or whatever, and OK a payment, you need to keep a note of that.

Ieva also stated that the Executive Decisions to be Ratified may not be about financial things. It may be about sending a letter, putting up a motion, it may be different things and not limited to paying things. But those decisions to pay bills in the financial report of the Executive Decisions, doesn't matter, as long as it goes somewhere.

11.5 Horse Health Declaration.

When do our riders need to supply a PIC number. Ieva commented that in Qld that you couldn't get into a ride without a PIC number. Abigail suggested that if riders have been to several rides, then they need to get one.

Richard also suggested that there could be insurance ramifications because they don't have a PIC number; the stock is not registered and that is illegal. Ieva suggested that we put some reminders up on Facebook. Agenda item for next meeting.

12. Meeting Closed: 4.45pm. The SMC thanked Ian for attending.

13. Next meeting: 23rd June at the Wandu Hall around 9am, subject to venue availability.

14. Future Meeting Dates: 18th August, 13th October.