



MOUNTED ARCHERY ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AFRICA

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

DATE	Wednesday 12 July 2023
VENUE	Virtually, via ZOOM
TIME	19:00

PARTICIPANTS:

NAME	NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Diane Horn (President)	0845498119	President2@mountedarcheryassociation.co.za
Deirdre Janse van Rensburg (Secretary)	0833471143	admin@mountedarcheryassociation.co.za
Maretha Kruger (Athletes Rep)	0823243936	athlete@mountedarcheryassociation.co.za
Callie Kruger (Vice President)	0729864244	vp@mountedarcheryassociation.co.za
Rozelle Talma (GP Chair)	0784881403	rozelletalma@gmail.com
Amy Diack (KZN Chair)	0745521380	bumblebee300@gmail.com
Vicky van Zyl (NW Chair)	0828366482	galopvirjesus@gmail.com

APOLOGIES:

NAME	NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Petro Wium (Treasurer)	0716793818	finances@mountedarcheryassociation.co.za

MINUTES:

	POINTS	DISCUSSION/DECISION	TASKS
1.	Meeting Formalities		
1.1	Opening of meeting	The President opened the meeting & welcomed everyone.	
1.2	Attendance register & apologies	Members of council attending recorded, apologies recorded.	
1.3	Quorum	It was established that a quorum was present	
2.	Matters arising from previous Minutes		
2.1	KZN Constitution Ratify	Diane ratified, Rozelle seconded. KZNMA to arrange AGM & present ratified constitution as a motion to be accepted & implemented.	Amy: Arrange KZNMA AGM
2.2	Acceptance of minutes	Vicky accepted, KZN seconds	Deirdre: Send final minutes to Diane to sign off. Then upload to website and send to MAASA members.
3.	SAEF AGM Feedback (Diane)		
3.1	Feedback	<p>Diane attended the SAEF AGM on Saturday 8th of July, some feedback on issues that affect or are of interest to MAASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lotto application has been submitted, after consolidating all the Discipline Associations proposals. Some disciplines' proposals were modified (e.g. SASJ) because SAEF had to stay under the R10m ceiling that they were allowed to request. 2. SAEF has two options to use to request funding – Lotto and DSAC (Department of Sports, Arts and Culture). They need to meet the criteria for funding, especially Transformation and Development. 3. GEF (Gauteng Equestrian Federation) is in the process of applying for their NPO 	

		<p>number. Once that has been issued, they will apply for funding and grants from the GSC (Gauteng Sports Council).</p> <p>4. KZNEF does not currently exist. At the conclusion of the disciplinary process, the KZNEF President was suspended. Arrangements are being for the general election on the 2nd of August in the province to elect a new KZNEF council.</p> <p>5. SAEF is considering a re-structuring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. FEI Assembly maintains that SAEF are not compliant with FEI regulations, as they represent FEI and Non-FEI disciplines. They are considering splitting into two separate bodies, FEI Disciplines and Non-FEI disciplines, each with its own council. b. SAEF structures must be streamlined, discussions are ongoing with regards to other structuring options, from club level up to national level. The issue of small clubs starting up to sway votes needs to be urgently addressed in the re-structuring discussions. c. It was suggested that the SAEF suspends members who are not compliant in terms of constitution, financial reporting, structures etc. <i>MAASA is compliant in all aspects with the exception of the number of active provinces. We currently have three properly constituted provinces, but only two of them are active. We need to get activity going in all our provinces, as this could affect our application for Protea colours.</i> d. There is an urgent need with the re-structuring to reduce the number of committees that each discipline needs to manage. There are not enough volunteers to serve on committees as they are now. e. Prof Sanne is adamant that the process of re-structuring is going to be tabled before the next AGM. <p>6. Judicial report – most cases have been concluded, there are currently only 2 disciplinary matters before the JC, and one Dispute. The JC tries to avoid litigation at all costs, and makes use of the Arbitration and Mediation option to ensure that SAEF stays out of costly court battles.</p>	<p>Need to make a plan to help North West to get a more action/members etc.</p> <p>Try to get Eastern Cape constituted as well.</p>
--	--	---	---

4. International Test Match – SAEF Colours Committee (Diane)			
4.1	Letter to SAEF Colours Committee Discussion	<p>Diane sent proposed letter to SAEF Colours committee to the MAASA council for discussion.</p> <p>A letter needs to be sent to the SAEF Colours committee to inform them of MAASA’s intention to host a test match against France for the purposes of giving athletes the chance to earn their Protea Colours by competing internationally in a competition approved by SAEF and the colours committee.</p>	Diane: To add hunt track to the letter. Then send to SAEF Colours Committee.
5. Protea Team Selection Criteria (Diane)			
5.1	Suggestion (Diane via email)	<p>Diane & Deirdre had a meeting with Sharlene Venter, SG of SAEF, to get advice on the process of getting Protea colours for MAASA’s top riders. We need to have a discussion regarding MAASA’s standards for selecting Protea riders going forward.</p> <p>Current MAASA criteria states that to be eligible for selection for Protea team, the rider needs to have maintained an HA3 level across two qualifiers and Nationals.</p> <p>Sharlene reiterated more than once, that the riders we select to represent South Africa and earn their Protea colours, should be <u>the best of the best</u>.</p> <p>Diane feels, that MAASA’s best riders would be HA3 and upwards, but <u>the best of the best</u> should be better than HA3 level and would like to propose that from 2024, we seriously consider amending our selection standards to only allow HA5 riders and above to be eligible to represent SA as Proteas, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection criteria has not been updated since 2018/2019, except for the change regarding the juniors – initially juniors only had to shoot HA2 levels, but now they are the same as the seniors. • The criteria were set when the sport was very young, and there were few riders. Our numbers have now increased, as has the skill of our riders – we have a lot more riders reaching HA levels now, and faster than a few years back. • If we want our riders to compete favorably against the top riders internationally, we need to send riders who are on the same level as the top international riders – see the following table as taken from the IHAA rankings: 	

	Grade	Riders
Australia	HA5	Adriana Franca
Canada	HA7	Lance Bishop
Finland	HA9	Mihai Cozmei
France	HA8	Jules Boisson
Germany	HA6	Johanna Pfister
Malaysia	HA3	Erina Ismail
Netherlands	HA6	Siem Budding
Poland	HA7	Wojtek Osiecki + 1
Russia	HA6	Sergey Odinkov + 2
South Africa	HA7	Jacques Horn + 1
Spain	HA2	David Rubio
Sweden	HA6	Emil Erikssen + 3
Switzerland	HA5	Roger Ittig
UK & Ireland	HA4	Michael Ruby + 1
USA	HA7	Greg Ogburn

NB: *NB: France has 8 riders on HA7, 8 riders on HA6, 12 riders on HA5.
In contrast, we have 2 riders on HA7, 1 on HA6, 2 on HA4 and 3 on HA3.*

- IHAA gradings are easier to get than MAASA gradings, but even taking that into account, you can see from the above that with the exception of three countries, the rest all have archers who are graded well above HA3.
- When invitations were sent out for the World Championships, they invited teams which had been selected via their countries national selection criteria in the first round of entries, and in the second round the minimum level of individual entries who were eligible to participate, was HA5. It we had decided to send a national team (as it is now), we would have sent a team consisting of some athletes who don't make the minimum grade as stipulated by the event organizers.
- By making HA3 our benchmark for selection, I am concerned that we take away the competitive motivation from our athletes – if a rider has shot HA3 levels over the required competitive events, they are eligible for Protea colours – what motivates them to then aim higher? They've already reached the "top" and qualified for National colours.
- Because we are getting more riders qualifying according to our present criteria, we are ending up with a large team of athletes, instead of a small team of the best of the best. A smaller team of fewer individuals would fare

		<p>better against international competitors, and would be more economical to fund (or at least assist financially) with our limited resources.</p> <p>It is suggested that we consider raising our minimum selection criteria to HA5 as we want to give our athletes the best chance of competing favourably against the best international riders. This change will need to be introduced as a motion at the next AGM, and will therefore only come into effect at the end of 2024.</p>	
5.2	Comments (Petro via email)	I agree 100%. Maybe we should move the Maasa grading to the IHAA system as then we can really see where our riders are. Maasa I would say is more difficult than IHAA?	
5.3	Comments (Deirdre via email)	<p>I would have to declare a conflict of interest and so would many of us in this committee that are potential protea riders or parents of potential protea riders. I have thought long and hard on this topic and have tried to distance myself as a rider from this decision and to try to see it in the interest of the growth and development of our sport and not in the interest of myself as an athlete.</p> <p>In essence I am in favour of raising the standard of selection criteria for national team and Protea colours. I agree with Diane that the best of the best should be higher than HA3 and that our riders have become stronger as the sport has become more established in South Africa. Although shooting at an HA3 level average is still a difficult task for most, I will admit that it has become fairly easy for those shooting at a higher level and I agree that it should not be easy to get Protea colours without working and training hard for it.</p> <p>I do however feel that a MAASA HA4 grade would be more suitable at this stage and that the standard should again be reassessed in 2 or 3 years' time to MAASA HA5. My reasoning for this is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The MAASA and IHAA standards of grading GREATLY differ. I do not believe that IHAA scores are an accurate or real indication of what your grade really is, the MAASA grading system is much stricter and is much more of a real indication of what a rider's true grading is. In MAASA in order to get a certain grade you need to shoot that grade in the <u>tower and raid</u> at the <u>same competition</u> on the <u>same horse</u> and you have to achieve this at <u>two competitions</u>. For the IHAA grade you need to shoot the grade <u>twice for the raid and twice for the tower</u> BUT <u>you can submit</u> 	

		<p>scores that you shot at home with a witness (not at competition), you can <u>submit 4 scores from 4 different occasions on 4 different horses</u>. This means they can use a fast horse for the raid and a slow horse for the tower where we have to use the same horse for Raid and Tower in MAASA. If I can use myself as an example, I am an IHAA HA5 level archer (and only 1 score away from an HA6 archer), in MAASA I'm an HA4 archer. When I shoot at home I often get HA7 scores, yet this does not make me an HA7 level archer. When I go and look at the average scores I shot in competition last year I was consistently shooting an HA4 average between the raid and tower. This to me indicates that my true grading (even though I'm graded higher in IHAA) is an HA4 level archer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Just on that note with regards to the use of different horses, Petro suggested that the IHAA and MAASA gradings should be the same, so MAASA should change their grading system to align with IHAA's. I was on the board when we made the decision to do it differently from IHAA and the reasoning for doing it that way was very sound in my opinion. It was to promote good horsemanship and to develop strong archers. It is very easy to use a fast horse for the raid event and then use a slow horse for the tower event. It is much harder to train your horse to be able to go fast and slow. I believe our horses and our archers are much better athletes because of this and our horses are much better trained because of this and I am definitely not in favour of lowering our standards in order to align with IHAA's standards.• I don't mean to discredit any of the IHAA riders, if I look at the names in the HA6, HA7 and HA8 categories on the IHAA grading lists these riders really are the best of the best. But I don't think it is fair to compare our HA5 to IHAA HA5 level. If I take Jacques or Marli as an example, they are both HA7 both within IHAA AND in MAASA, they truly are HA7 level archers. I do believe that especially the French team's riders really are great riders, as they are consistently shooting incredibly high scores during competitions, I don't believe that many of the other worldwide riders on the IHAA grading list are truly on the grade that the list claims them to be as many use scores shot at home and not in competition.	
--	--	--	--

		<ol style="list-style-type: none">2. I went and had a look at the list of archers competing in the IHAA World Championships and then went and searched what the grading of each rider is. Of the 48 names on the list, 20 of those people did not have an IHAA grading (or if they do their country has not submitted their names and scores to the IHAA gradins list). If we leave those out and work out the average of the riders attending the event it averages out to HA4.8 (lets round that up to HA5 level). There are riders of HA1, HA2 and HA3 on that list, and they landed up on that list via their country's <u>national selection</u>. I would agree that an average of an IHAA HA5 grading is a good and strong level of competitors participating in the World Championships but once again that is IHAA HA5 and not MAASA HA5.3. Another thing to keep in mind is that Mounted Archery is still a new sport in SA, although we have been going for 9 years and Maasa is in its 7th year of existence, we had to figure things out from scratch and had a very slow and uneducated start. Countries like France and Hungary have been riding and teaching for a lot more years and are definitely way ahead of us.4. Another consideration is junior versus senior. As we all know and as is very apparent the world over, it is much easier for those that start as juniors to learn faster and go higher up the grades and faster up the grades than those that started the sport as adults. Most of the HA7 scores on the IHAA gradings list are juniors or started in the sport as juniors. If you look at the top adult archers in the world that didn't start as Juniors then there are very few of them and their archery journey has been a lot longer and slower: Mihai Cozmei (HA9) has been doing horseback archery for over 20 years and Wotjek Osiecki (HA7) has been doing it for over 15 years. If we look at the majority of our riders they are seniors and started doing the sport as seniors. Senior riders that started riding/shooting as seniors have a definite disadvantage with regards to development and ability to shoot such high scores. (Hence my reasoning that we gradually adjust our requirements for national colours and don't just jump from HA3 to HA5). Our requirements will grow as our archers grow.5. The aim is to have teams compete for national colours and not just individuals. If the standard is raised too high in comparison to what our average archers are shooting	
--	--	---	--

		then there will be no opportunity for teams to be able to participate and there will only be individuals able to compete.	
5.4	Discussion on council:	<p>Diane: After email discussion within council regarding the matter she is still not keen for HA4 to be the level (still deems it to be too low) and proposes HA5 as the minimum level. This will need to go through a normal process of voting it in. (If approved by council) it will need to be added as a motion and will only be voted on at the next OGM in 2024.</p> <p>Maretha: MAASA standards are much higher than IHAA standards. HA4 (MAASA) makes more sense for the moment unless we use HA5 level from IHAA and not from MAASA.</p> <p>Amy: Agrees with Maretha & Deirdre. HA5 is very unattainable for new provinces. Decreases the amount of riders that will be able to make the team. When starting the sport she had aspirations to become a Protea rider (motivates her to do the sport) & HA3 felt attainable with lots of hard work. HA5 feels unattainable & demotivating.</p> <p>Rozelle: Agrees for HA4. We don't want to make it so difficult that it is unattainable for everyone & discourages them from doing the sport altogether.</p> <p>Callie: MAASA HA4 is a very high level. If SAEF is concerned about the best of the best getting colours then we can justify that MAASA HA4 is a difficult level and is equal to IHAA HA5 level.</p> <p>Deirdre: It is still very hard for HA3 level to be attained. Jacques & Marli went from HA3-HA7 within 2 years which may make it seem that getting HA3 is easy to attain, but getting to HA3 for most people is much harder than that. Claire Sawyer (from UK) only just got her HA3 now and she literally wrote the book on mounted archery and has been practicing it for many many years. Suggestion is to look at implementing different categories of protea colours. IHAA rates 3 star competitions as (HA3-HA5) and 4 star competition (HA5 and upwards). Instead of just having a seniors/juniors category we could bring in a masters category or have more categories which will open up the possibility to have more individuals/teams earning their colours.</p> <p>Diane: The sport is still too small to implement categories at this stage but not a bad idea for</p>	Council can start thinking about developing more

		exploring & implementing in the future. Rozelle: Agrees to the idea of categories. Currently only Junior and Senior and Student Archer & Horse Archer. It will be better to pool riders of the same skill levels against each other. There is a very big difference between HA1 and HA7 skill level yet they compete in the same category.	categories
5.5	Decision:	Council agreed to propose raising the selection criteria requirement to HA4 level, to be submitted as a motion to be voted on at the next OGM early 2024. Next OGM is scheduled for January/February 2024. We will need to submit the motion to raise the selection criteria to HA4 at the next OGM to be implemented in 2024 competition.	Need to submit proposed new selection criteria of HA4 as a motion to be voted on at the next OGM start of 2024.
6.	General		
6.1	Procedure to become a MAASA judge.	Amy: What is the procedure for someone to become a MAASA judge.	Diane will send Amy the document for judges requirements.
7.	Closing		
7.1	Next meeting date	To be confirmed.	
7.2	Meeting Closure	The president thanked everyone & closed the meeting.	

Greetings



Diane Horn (Chairman).”

Signed at Pretoria on _____ day of _____ 20/11/2023 _____ 2023.