



Name

Address

Email

Phone

*(If applicable)* Your position on an ESNZ discipline board, committee, club, NEC Or ESNZ board

The name of your board, committee or club if you are submitting on their behalf, and whether your submission represents the whole board/committee/club

## **ESNZ'S PURPOSE** *See page 7 of Constitution Discussion Document*

*To identify and develop the best structure and governance framework for ESNZ, we need to decide what the organisation is here for – what's its main purpose?*

1. Do you agree with the Constitution review panel's statement that ESNZ's primary purpose is:  
To act and speak on behalf of **ALL** Equestrian Sports within NZ and within the international sports community.  No  Yes

2. If you don't agree with the Panel's statement about ESNZ's primary purpose, what do you consider its primary purpose is?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## **ESNZ'S STRUCTURE, VOTING RIGHTS AND PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION** *See page 6 of Constitution Discussion Document*

*The current structure has many tiers (see ESNZ structure diagram). Things to think about:*

*For such a small organisation, can we sustain this structure?*

*Does the current structure enable your view as a member to be adequately represented?*

*Do the structure and voting rights currently deliver good representation across the country and across all disciplines?*

3. Do you think ESNZ, in close consultation with members, disciplines and Area groups, should consider different structural options for how we organise and deliver our sports?  No  Yes

4. If you answered **YES** to above question, taking a 'whole-of-sport' approach, what do you think would be an appropriate alternative structure for the efficient and effective delivery of equestrian sports?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**UNITARY STRUCTURE** *See page 6 of Constitution Discussion Document*

ESNZ structured as a unitary organisation affects:

- \* Representation
- \* Voting rights
- \* Decision-making
- \* Membership

ESNZ has historically been structured as a unitary organisation controlled directly by its members through participation in Area discipline committees which are not separate legal entities but exist within ESNZ. Parts of the organisation have assumed rights and powers which have not been delegated to them by the ESNZ Board, the only part of the organisation accountable and with a full governance role.

**VOTING POWER – MEMBERS ARE OUR OWNERS!** *See pages 8 - 12 of Constitution Discussion Document*

Voting power at the Area discipline committee level has existed since ESNZ was established as the New Zealand Horse Society. With limited exceptions, universal voting by financial members of ESNZ is restricted to election of the President and Vice President. Voting on changes to the constitution is restricted to the ESNZ Board and delegates chosen by each Discipline.

If you support changing the current structure and voting rights, please answer the following questions.

5. Should Area groups retain their current representation of members' views in terms of voting for their Discipline representatives?  No  Yes

6. If you answered **NO** above, do you want all members to vote individually?  No  Yes

7. If you answered **NO** to both the above questions, describe the voting system you would like to see please.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION** *See page 10-12 of Constitution Discussion Document*

Voting by Area groups may not fairly represent voting by individual members because the Area discipline committees have remained largely unchanged in a geographic sense for over 50 years, yet the location of members has changed so that they are not evenly spread between Area groups. Area group member numbers range from 57 in Taihape to over 1,000 in Auckland, Canterbury and Waikato.

Across the organisation there are at least 60 Area groups and 10 clubs.

For such a small organisation, can we sustain this structure?

8. What is your view on the current number of Area Groups and the geographic locations that they cover?  
(See Members by Area Graph) Should there be further division or consolidation of some areas? What would this look like?

9. If you answered **YES** to Question 5 above asking whether voting for Discipline representatives should stay with Area groups, then should there be proportional representation? ie larger Area groups would get more votes based on the number of members they have. *(See Members by Area Graph)*  No  Yes

10. If you agree that proportional representation is a good idea, what ratio do you think should be applied to this?

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---

11. If you answered **NO** to proportional representation do you want the status quo *(as in Members by Area Graph)* or do you want some other form of voting for Area groups?  Yes (status quo)  No (other - what?)  
*please state other below*

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---

**ESNZ BOARD COMPOSITION AND TENURE** *See pages 13 - 15 of Constitution Discussion Document*

*Leadership of the organisation is closely linked to its future sustainability but also needs to represent you - its members. The four options proposed for the make-up of the ESNZ Board include various combinations of a skills-based and discipline-representative board.*

12. Which Board composition option of the four presented do you favour and why?  
*(See pages 14 - 15 of Constitution Discussion Document for description of each option and what they include). All options result in nine Board members.*

Tick One

- Option 1 - Status quo  Option 2 - Skills based Board
- 
- Option 3- Skills based, elected Board members by proportional representation by Area groups  Option 4 - Modified Status quo
- 

**LENGTH OF AN ESNZ BOARD MEMBER'S TERM** *See page 15 of Constitution Discussion Document*

*The ability of a Board member to come up to speed on Board issues and make an appropriate contribution as a Board member within a one year timeframe can be an unrealistic expectation. A minimum two or three year term may be beneficial, with a total maximum tenure also specified.*

13. Do you support a minimum two or three year term for Board members? Two years  No  Yes Three to five years  No  Yes
- 
14. Do you support a maximum term of five years for a Board member's tenure?  No  Yes
- 
15. Do you support two consecutive terms of five years each, a total of 10 years?  No  Yes
-

**ROLE OF PRESIDENT AND/OR PATRON** *See page 14 of Constitution Discussion Document*

*Does ESNZ need a President? And if so, how should the President be appointed and what does the President do?*

*We are asking the same questions about the role of an ESNZ Patron.*

16. Should ESNZ retain the role of President?  No  Yes

17. Should ESNZ have a patron/patrons as well as a president?  No  Yes

18. If YES to Question 16 above, how should the President be appointed?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

19. If YES to Question 16 above, what responsibilities should the President have?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

20. If YES to Question 17 above, how should a patron or patrons be appointed?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

21. If YES to Question 17 above, what responsibilities should a patron/patrons have?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## DISPUTES PROCEDURE See page 16 of Constitution Discussion Document

ESNZ is reviewing its Disputes Procedure alongside the Constitution Review.

Members' views are being sought on this via a separate consultation process however, the background and how our disputes procedure relates to our constitution are described in the Consultation Document.

## THE PLACE OF NATIONAL EQUESTRIAN CENTRES (NECS) IN ESNZ See page 19 -21 of Constitution Discussion Document

How should ESNZ approach the ownership and development of facilities such as the NECs in the future so that equestrian sports remain accessible and viable?  
Things to consider before answering the consultation questions to determine the best ownership options for NECs.

**What is the role of ESNZ in the provision of a network of equestrian facilities across New Zealand?**

To date, this role has been limited to the establishment of the NECs and this may be the best outcome in terms of ownership. However, there is also an advocacy role for ESNZ, especially in the large metropolitan centres as the result of an increasingly structured approach by Local and Central Government investment in sports facilities.

How should ESNZ approach the ownership and development of facilities such as the NECs in the future?

Is the current approach of devolving leadership for facility development to local groups within the sport the approach that will yield the best outcome for equestrian sports nationally in the future?

Do local groups have the required expertise to run these facilities well?

22. How integrated or autonomous should the NECs be? The options and their pros and cons are outlined in the *Constitution Discussion Document* starting at page 19

Tick One

Option 1 – Status quo

Option 2 – Divest ownership in a Company

Option 3 – Divest ownership in a Trust

### TO SEND YOUR CONSULTATION FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE TO ESNZ:

Attach the form to an email and send to [review@nzequestrian.org.nz](mailto:review@nzequestrian.org.nz) or

Print out and post to the address below, or

If you printed out a copy and hand wrote your responses please post to:

Constitution Review  
Equestrian Sports NZ  
PO Box 6146 Marion Square  
Wellington, 6141