

## **EA BOARD HIGH PERFORMANCE REVIEW PANEL (HPRP) April 2013**

<http://www.equestrian.org.au/sites/default/files/Equestrian%20Australia%20High%20Performance%20Review%202009-2012.pdf>

<http://www.equestrian.org.au/news/equestrian-australia-releases-findings-after-london-2012-campaign-review>

During the selection for the London Olympic Games in 2012, riders from all sports appealed non selection– Amy Graham (J), Emma Mason (E), Megan Jones (E), Sonja Johnson (E) – withdrawn, and Hayley Beresford (D) . All National Federation (NF) Appeals Tribunal appeals were declined, with two riders going on to appeal to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS). In all cases the CAS appellants were unsuccessful.

The HPRP identified that the appeals created significant disharmony and discourse within the sport and the Olympic Games teams/HP management. The disharmony created was the most damaging in the sport of Dressage and substantially affected team preparation, cohesion and morale. The brand of Australian Dressage was also damaged by the media reporting of this appeal.

The HPRP found that discretionary selection pathways/policies are high risk in their capacity to continue to incite criticism and to generate grounds for appeal that are almost never likely to be successful. The provision for discretionary selection in all three policies is a most significant risk factor for selection appeals and criticism. The discretionary components of the policies are the most difficult for selectors to apply. However, there is overwhelming support from within the sport and the HP management for the continuation of discretionary powers within the policies and the value that they give to appropriate team selection. The HPRP advises that there is a greater onus on the HP program and its policy application to better communicate the basis of any discretionary decision making to all interested parties in a clearer, more transparent manner.

-----