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Inconsistencies in race adjudication across North American jurisdictions are wildly frustrating for all racing stakeholders.

Examples are plentiful – name the track and year.

Watchmaker: Stewards' inconsistency marred Saratoga meet

By Mike Watchmaker
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NYRA</th>
<th>SoCal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>1,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demotions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Races with RI</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Races with Demotion</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interference Rules Philosophies

• Category 2

• If the interferer is guilty of causing interference and such interference has affected the result of the race then the interferer is placed behind the sufferer irrespective of whether the sufferer would have finished in front of the interferer had the incident(s) not occurred.
Interference Rules Philosophies

• Category 1

  • If a horse or its rider causes interference and finishes in front of the horse interfered with but irrespective of the incident(s) the sufferer would not have finished ahead of the horse causing the interference, the placings remain unaltered.

• Category 2

  • If the interferer is guilty of causing interference and such interference has affected the result of the race then the interferer is placed behind the sufferer irrespective of whether the sufferer would have finished in front of the interferer had the incident(s) not occurred.
Interference Rules Philosophies

• Category 2

  • Benefit favors aggrieved horse regardless of whether “better”

  • Requires significant subjectivity, yielding inconsistent outcomes

  • More frequent demotions
Interference Rules Philosophies

• Category 1
  • Benefit favors “better” horse
  • Reduces subjectivity of stewards, yielding greater consistency
  • Less frequent demotions

• Category 2
  • Benefit favors aggrieved horse regardless of whether “better”
  • Requires significant subjectivity, yielding inconsistent outcomes
  • More frequent demotions
Projected annual demotions per Category

- Category 2
  - 592 demotions
  - 1744 reviewed incidents

- Using 2017 rate of reviewed incidents/demotions from NYRA and Southern California, combined
Projected annual demotions per Category

• Category 1
  • 81 demotions
  • 487 reviewed incidents
  • Using 2017 Great Britain rates

• Category 2
  • 592 demotions
  • 1744 reviewed incidents
  • Using 2017 rate of reviewed incidents/demotions from NYRA and Southern California, combined
Using logical estimates, a switch to Category 1 could yield:

- 72% reduction of reviewed incidents
- 86% reduction in demoted horses

Category 1 produces a more consistent adjudication of the race
Consistency and clarity in the adjudication of the race is a boost to stakeholder confidence and participation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Inquiries</th>
<th>Demotions</th>
<th>Races</th>
<th>% Races w/Inquiries</th>
<th>% Races w/Demotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>7.47%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,453</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Inquiries</td>
<td>Demotions</td>
<td>Races</td>
<td>% Races w/Inquiries</td>
<td>% Races w/Demotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>7.47%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,453</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,455</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arguments against Category 1 are weak

• Negative impact to exotic bettors
  • Tote-heavy jurisdictions such as France, Hong Kong, Japan thrive in Category 1

• Negative impact to owners of aggrieved horses
  • Far worse in Category 2

• Increase in dangerous riding
  • Defies the experience of jurisdictions to transition in recent years (France, Germany, Japan)
Open letter to N.A. racing officials - 2015

• In aftermath of controversy following demotions at Arlington in 2015, then Chairman of ROAP and current NYRA steward Hugh Gallagher suggested North American officials consider alternatives, while citing France as a remaining Cat 2 holdout.

Henri Pouret of France Galop believes that his country’s resolve to stay with category two principles is due to historical and cultural reasons. He has stated that the compelling component to a Category Two approach to inquiries/objections is the deterrent impact-interfere in a horse race and you will be sanctioned through placings (demotions) and suspensions.
France finally comes into line with Britain and Ireland on interference

‘Achieving greater uniformity in raceday rules is important to the development of an international fan base’

Rules will change at French race meetings such as Arc weekend (above)
Edward Whitaker

By Howard Wright and Scott Burton  UPDATED 7:37PM, OCT 3 2017
Since France’s adoption of Category 1...
Since France’s adoption of Category 1…

Pouret reports reviewed incidents are down by 33% and demotions have declined by 50%, without any noticeable rise in dangerous riding.
Regardless of the rules philosophy, communication between stewards and racing stakeholders, particularly bettors, must improve
Suggested communications enhancements

• Incident reports should be significantly more detailed and published within 24 hours

• Non foul-related oversight should be enhanced to satisfy horseplayer concerns regarding questionable in-race tactics

• Stewards should appear on track feeds and interact with media to provide greater insight to decisions
HK$126 million worth of bets refunded as a stray rake wrecks havoc on Happy Valley gates

A garden tool causes the barriers to fail, forcing stewards to create Hong Kong racing history and declare the fourth event void
Pakistan Star jumps with the field but stops to a walk after 200m

By James Lamb 25 June 2017 at 2:34am

Pakistan Star, the horse known for his barnstorming finishes, has caused a sensation at Sha Tin on Sunday for flat-out refusing to race.

The Cruz-trained gelding was first-up off a 56-day freshen but it appears he wasn’t quite ready to return to action.

With two runners ahead, Pakistan Star was head and shoulders above the opposition as he cut the corner

Image: Hong Kong Jockey Club
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