

# Venue Analysis

# Venue Analysis

- 1 Why We Measure
- 2 What We Measure
- 3 How We Measure
- 4 Considerations

# Why we measure

The challenge is in the balance

We must **maintain** (and in some cases improve) **standards** in order to maintain the **importance and skill of cross-country** and to ensure that qualifications obtained will **sufficiently prepare** combinations for higher levels.

We must maintain **acceptable levels of risk.**

# What we measure

The challenge is in the balance

**Clear jumping rates** to assess the standard.

**Fall rates** to assess the risk levels.

# How we measure

We use **sample size** in our calculation in order to ensure that chance and variance are accounted for.



# A 'clear' round...



# Considerations

A clear round is both a qualification and a positive impact to the HFI.

IF a clear round is achieved on paper but in reality the performance was unsatisfactory:

- near misses
- lack of control
- disregard for obstacles
- poor presentation to fences

then we are 'promoting' poor performance and graduating combinations incorrectly.

# Considerations

A clear round is both a qualification and a positive impact to the HFI.



**Course designers should continue to penalise combinations who show poor performance**



**Ground juries should continue to penalise the competitor for dangerous riding where the courses don't**

(We had 7 instances of 25 penalties in 2022 and 6 instances of 45 penalties (20+25) - penalties for dangerous riding)



# Considerations

If we don't make cross-country matter on the SCORESHEET then the standard will either remain static or regress.

The progress in dressage performance is obvious over the past 15 years and easily supported by the scoring trends.

This is because dressage always matters as every error is penalised and better performance is continuously rewarded.

# Considerations

Is this how we raise the bar?

IF we have 50% (or even 75% and in some cases 90%) of competitors scoring zero (jumping and time) on cross-country then **we are telling these competitors that their performance is perfect.**

Is this the actual cases in reality?

# Should we consider that frangible devices are not JUST about preventing falls?

They are ALSO about promoting safer riding (better presentation, appropriate speed, demonstration of control, balance and good footwork)?





By Date

2022



Category	XC Runs	Starters	% Of XC Runs	XCJ Clear Rates	XC Falls	XC Fall Rates	Rider Falls	Rider Fall Rates	Horse Falls	Horse Fall Rates
E	431	465	2.0%	46.4%	34	7.89%	28	6.50%	6	1.39%
D	1304	1381	6.2%	55.8%	77	5.90%	52	3.99%	22	1.69%
C	2725	2931	12.9%	61.8%	169	6.20%	116	4.26%	49	1.80%
B	3559	3798	16.8%	73.2%	179	5.03%	125	3.51%	41	1.15%
A	3038	3259	14.4%	79.0%	113	3.72%	77	2.53%	33	1.09%
A+	1389	1500	6.6%	81.9%	51	3.67%	33	2.38%	11	0.79%
A++	980	1057	4.6%	87.0%	23	2.35%	15	1.53%	5	0.51%
none	7699	8225	36.4%	74.3%	267	3.47%	210	2.73%	46	0.60%
	21125	22616	100.0%	72.5%	913	4.32%	656	3.11%	213	1.01%

**A++** category HFIs are the lowest level of risk category, and signify a HFI greater than **5**.

**A+** category HFIs signify a HFI between **4** and **5**. Most of your XC runs should fall within this range.

**A** category HFIs signify a HFI between **3** and **4**.

**B** category HFIs signify a HFI between **2** and **3**.

**C** category HFIs signify a HFI between **1** and **2**.

**D** category HFIs signify a HFI between **0** and **1**.

**E** category HFIs signify a HFI less than **0**.

White signifies horses who **we do not yet have sufficient data on** to calculate a HFI