

Present:

Calvo, Neil Roberts, Adrian Thomas, Mike Aston, Phil Mackereth, Roger Braney & later, Brad Nichols.

Apologies:

Gary Jackson, Steve Ham (available via phone if required), Ulric Jessop, Mark Graham, Nico Preston.

Agenda.

1. Sponsorship.
2. Panel member roles for 2006.
3. 2006 Competitions.
4. Squad training.
5. Budgets.
6. Elections.
7. Rules.

*(As Brad was on his way to the meeting it was decided to start with budgets to allow him to talk about sponsorship).*

1. Budgets.

Calvo presented the panel with the balances of monies in the various accounts. Gary had provided a spreadsheet from 2005 competitions, but it was difficult to tell how much money was made / lost individually in each round.

Championship Account	£ 5,872
British Team Account	£ 9,722
Savings Account	£ 46.25
Cash	£ 129

*Also we still had \$319 from 2003 Competitions (entry fees) due to the poor exchange rate.*

Gary will have the accounts finalised by the NEC / AGM, i.e. end of November. These balances do not include all the Lighthouse sponsorship money which is £ 10,000 paid £ 1,000 per month. We have received £ 2,000 so far which is in the Team Account.

The Competitions Account was in effect approximately £ 7,000 better off than last year, even without the sponsorship money. Adrian wondered if this was due to the competitions having more paid entrants or other factors. After last years' comps. it had been decided to cut back on parties and spend more on retrieves for the pilots to provide better value for money.

A discussion was then held about the level of entry fee for the 2005 Competitions. Was it too low / high or about right?

All the Sponsorship & BHPA monies are now paid into the Team Account to avoid any problems with the Competitions Account, due to the amount of money turned over. This also enables the Competitions to be run separately from funding for Team-training, and Team events, such as the Worlds, Euros & Bleriot Comp.

As there were no figures available for individual 2005 comps, Mike phoned Nico to ask if he could provide the meeting with figures for entry fees for each competition.

Adrian thought that Austria had been expensive due to the additional costs involved for transportation. Calvo was not so sure, but without the figures it was difficult to accurately assess. It was thought that Piedrahita was ok due to having 134 pilots. Adrian asked if we use

Piedrahita again, could the local town get more involved. Possibly use *Tony & the Pinera bar* to help with things. Calvo & Verena had already spoken to him after the comp. It was felt by the panel that the competition entry fees for 2005 had been about right.

The 2005 comps had been more profitable (*i.e. hadn't lost as much money as 2004!*), due to a number of factors; a tighter control of the budget, not spending quite so much on parties & the like & fuller comps with *paid* pilots. It was felt that we are in a good financial state for 2006 and we should build on the success of this years' comps.

*Calvo* mentioned that the deal on offer from Portugal would also save money. We will have to pay for a translator in each mini-bus about 6, normal Marshal day rates, £ 20 per day.

A search on the web for flights only showed Ryanair flying from Stanstead to Porto. In order to minimise costs we should aim to book flights for marshals as soon as they are released. Phil did this for Austria and got them each for about £ 50 return. We could advertise this on the Competition website to encourage pilots to book early. The flights are 06:40 am or 18:35 pm. If a number of pilots made it known we could try to arrange for a coach to pick them up at the airport and take them to Laruco. Calvo had priced taking a van / mini-bus on the ferry and found this to be very expensive ~ £ 900.

## 2. 2006 Competitions.

The possible dates for various competitions were discussed. Neil had already checked the PWC calendar and factored in the Euros which end 16<sup>th</sup> July in Morzine. Calvo is thinking of driving to our competition in Portugal after European Championships. It might be possible to hold the Laruco comp immediately following the Portuguese Open, giving some of our pilots' good practise in this area.

This would give us dates for Laruco Portugal of;

Registration Saturday 22<sup>nd</sup> July

Competition Sunday 23<sup>rd</sup> – Saturday 29<sup>th</sup> July.

Another location for 2006 that had been proposed was Ager, Spain. We had already asked permission from the local club and had had a response via Nicky Moss. Calvo mentioned that previously, we have only used one new competition location each year. Using a well known location like Piedrahita was easier and to some extent a known environment for organisers & pilots alike. All agreed, but Ager is a proven base for hang Glider competitions & paragliding comps also take place there regularly. The offer from Laruco was too good to miss and the only problem could be the weather. Ager have offered us the use of a truck to take gliders up to take off as well as a mini-bus for organisers. I think someone mentioned that the track to take off was now tarmac and retrieves should be ok as the hang gliders go there all the time. *Calvo* knows some pilots in this area.

*Neil* or *Adrian* mentioned that we should think of registering this comp as a pre-PWC. We would need to pay to do this, but it would be good for GB Comps.

Vicky (Paramedic at Piedrahita & Castehõn) has indicated that she would be prepared to help again & an Air Ambulance helicopter would be on standby close to the town.

*Adrian* mentioned that both Steve Ham & Bruce Goldsmith like doing comps here & he thought Bruce would be taking part in some of our 2006 comps.

*Neil* asked if we could have our comp a day earlier, i.e. starting on the Saturday & finishing on the Friday to allow pilots to be able to get to the PWC competition in Tomlin, Slovakia.

This would mean holding registration on the Friday evening. All ok with this & didn't think it would be too much of a problem.

Possible dates for Ager, Spain:

Registration Friday 25<sup>th</sup> August.

Competition Saturday 26<sup>th</sup> August – Friday 1<sup>st</sup> September.

Ager is about 180km from Barcelona, 220km from Reus & 220km from Gerona, all served by low cost operators.

Possible dates for the British round were then discussed. A round earlier in the year, May Bank Holiday (26, 27, 28 May) but this would clash with the PWC in Austria.

*Mike* had assessed the xc flights completed over a number of years, it was generally agreed that only the Long Mynd or SE Wales were reliable enough flying locations to hold a British round at this time of the year. *Adrian* mentioned that the sea breeze can affect flights earlier in the year, here. *Brad* said that the weather data indicated that the months of May & June were usually good, but the last three years the data had not been so defined. It has been a few years since we have held a competition in SE Wales, although the BPCup have been there recently. A base of Crickhowell, near Abergavenny was proposed as the campsite has been sorted and convenient for the Bloreng. Latest possible dates would be the 23<sup>rd</sup> – 26<sup>th</sup> June before the Euros.

Other locations that were mentioned were Snowdonia & the Lake District, but problems with sensitive sites, big walk-ups and possible problems with livestock in May were factors. *Neil* thought it might be better not to hold the British leg over the Bank Holiday as some pilots might not be able to take part due to family commitments.

*Mike* found a contact from the SE Wales website, *Chris White* (01873 856609) & *Calvo* left a message re a poss. Competition. Also spoke to *Paul Darcy* (SE Wales Club Representative) to ask about using SE Wales Club sites. Paul will ask Club formally at the next Club meeting. *Calvo will email him request.* Sounds promising, provisionally OK, subject to confirmation.

#### Problems from the Bishop Castle / Long Mynd round.

Although not an agenda item, this was discussed to try and understand what had happened at the last round of this year's competition and hopefully avoid any future problems.

*In summary;*

Some problems with the farmer who owned the camping field as he did not receive as much money as he thought he should have. Bad feeling from Long Mynd Club members?

There had been problems with showers & toilets at a BPC round held in the same place a few weeks previous to our comp. BPC collected £ 3 for camping and farmer expecting more from our comp as bigger and more competitors!! We collected £ 670 (@ £ 4 a head) from campers and gave farmer £ 500 to use the remainder (£176) to put towards the bill for the facilities.

Farmer given the impression that he would get £1000 for the weekend. We were asked to collect £ 5 each from campers i.e. an additional £1 which we refused to do. Some pilots even queried what they were getting extra as the toilets were taken away on the last day, before prize-giving & the showers not ideal. *Neil* had received a lot of complaints and had had to argue with the farmer after the competition. As a good will gesture for the pilots, the Comps. panel paid the pilots fees for using Bache Hill, about £ 80, however, we still lost money on the facilities and some other bills were larger than expected.

Following the Competition, both *Calvo* & *Neil* have spoken to the Long Mynd Club to try to explain our actions. *Calvo* spoken to *Alistair* (Chairman of the Long Mynd Club) only last

week. The Long Mynd Club would not be happy if we had collected lots of money that was not passed on to the farmer for using the field & facilities. *Calvo will pass on Neil's emails re: what was agreed and all financial documents, showing how much money was taken & where it went for their next committee meeting on November 8<sup>th</sup>.*

We agreed that a sum of money should be allocated for future competitions to be given to the Club for allowing us to use their sites.

Provisional 2006 Competition dates.

SE WALES	23 <sup>rd</sup> – 26 <sup>th</sup> June
Laruco, Portugal	22 <sup>nd</sup> – 28 <sup>th</sup> July
Ager, Spain	25 <sup>th</sup> August – 1 <sup>st</sup> September

*13:00- ish, Meeting stopped for lunch.*

### 3. Competition Rules.

The present rules are wordy and due a revision. *Adrian* to have a look at them, with the aim of simplifying them. As per FAI Section 7, Revise and circulate before publishing on the website.

Cat I competitions are Team events and team frequencies are allowed.

Cat II competitions such as ours are individual events and include local rules so long as they are not in conflict with Section 7. A team frequency without using the safety frequency is not allowed.

Other rules agreed at the last Comps. panel meeting included changing the time allocated to each pilot at take-off depending on the size of take-off.

A number of proposals were submitted by *Ulric Jessop* for discussion. Some of these were quite technical and require further consideration. They included, scoring of stopped tasks, scoring of pilots who land to assist & ignoring spurious precision in GPS track data. [I have included *Ulric's* proposals for consideration].

It was suggested that we, (*Ulric* & / or *Mark*) should try out these proposals on say the last four tasks to see what effect this would have had. *Ulric* may already have done this.

*Ulric* proposes that the score for a pilot who lands to assist should include a factor for that particular day, depending on their position in the task when they landed to assist. Again can we ask *Ulric* to trial this proposal on data from this year to see what effect it would have made?

*Ulric* proposes ignoring spurious data in GPS track. GPS time stamps are only accurate to 10 seconds, so should we only report time to 10 seconds? A number of discrepancies were noticed in Austria this year in the GPS time of different GPS units and also, in the actual position of many units even of the same model! *Adrian* suggests that *Calvo* puts this to the next CIVIL meeting for consideration along with any supporting evidence. If we did adopt this proposal, it would reduce the out & out racing to the goal line as a pilot would only be credited to the nearest 10 seconds. *Calvo to ask Ulric to provide examples of these proposals, before possible submission to CIVIL.*

*Brad* asked about the need for a goal line as well as a GPS goal cylinder. Pilots only get time points if when they cross the goal line. *Brad* asked could we have a goal zone in the form of a cylinder, within the goal cylinder. Difficult for marshals to police. Better for task-setting

committee to set a down-wind crossing of the goal line by having a control turn-point up-wind of the goal turn-point to encourage pilots to cross goal at a safe height. Prevents pilots flying into wind on full bar low to the ground, hoping to make the goal line, (more danger of a collapse without the time / height to recover).

4. Squad Training.

The top 15 British pilots eligible for Squad training are:-

Russell Ogden	Abigail Barr
Adrian Thomas	Louise Burham
Mark Watts	Nicky Moss
Kelly Farina	
Neil Roberts	
Craig Morgan	
Roger Fowkes	
Steve Etherington	
Steve Ham	
Alex Coltman	
Mark Hayman	
Ulric Jessop	

Mark Hayman has put himself forward for consideration to the Comps Panel. He has offered to help with the Laruco competition. He is very competitive and is getting better as a pilot.

*Neil & Adrian* discussed using Bruce & Ulric as mentors for the squad training sessions & also possibly Bob if available. We are unable to decide on squad training locations and dates until funding is finalised from possible sponsorship.

*Calvo* has spoken to a possible sponsor suggesting team training.

*Adrian* asked can we support the Team by encouraging our top pilots to compete in PWCs.

*Mike* argued that we should target the whole squad by doing CAT II events to get points for CAT I comps.

*Adrian* – CAT II events are good for squad training, but not so good for Team development.

*Neil* would like to see the sponsorship used in the following way:-

Elimental	Blériot Cup
Lighthouse	Squad – Training
New Sponsor	Team Events

*Adrian* – New funds should be used for the World Championships (Australia 2007) as nothing that we do now will have an affect other comps. We need to gear training for 2007. Squad choosing needs to be done at least three months in advance, i.e. Dec 2006, as the Worlds are end of Feb., March 2007.

European Championships are the end of June, so pick the Euro Team end of March 2006.

*Mike* – why are we picking the squad now? Decide squad for now, for 2006 not comp. specific. Motivates pilots.

Top three British pilots in WPRS (World Paragliding Raking System) gain an automatic entry to the squad.

Ideally, if funding allows, take a GB squad to a CAT I event.

*Neil* has contacted all the squad members above and has had a reply from everyone regards availability.

*Calvo* putting together a written agreement, stating that pilots will attend events & performance related.

*Adrian* – a proportion of flights and fees paid for by funding, depending on results. Could be something like:

Pilot receives £ X + £ Y depending on result in Comp.

Pilot must agree to wear Team clothing & take part in photo shoots, etc., & produce reports for Skywings & sponsor info. To keep sponsors happy we need to involve them more and give them back something. *Neil* tries to update existing sponsors every couple of weeks with photos, reports and phone calls to contacts. In order to attract more sponsorship we need to appear a little more professional.

*Brad* suggested that a Team photo does not necessarily have to be a posed group shot. Better to have one or two photos of Team members wearing sponsor hats of t-shirts.

*Mike* – Manila, Australia is a pre-PWC comp. is any money available? A number of pilots are thinking of competing. Should we encourage pilots to compete as training for the Worlds? This was not considered necessary as the conditions will be different for the Worlds. We should announce the squad and then later training events, depending on the funding available.

#### 2006 Budget

<i>Allocation</i>	<i>Money</i>	<i>Funding from</i>
Competitions	£ 6,000	Buffer for 2006 Competitions
British Team	£10,000	BHPA
British Team	£10,000	Lighthouse
Not allocated	£10,000	New Sponsor

Funding for the Team is adequate & any new sponsorship should perhaps go towards helping pilots take part in PWC's.

The expected cost of the worlds in Australia, 2007 will be about £1,000 – £2,000 per team member.

The actual cost of each of the 2005 Competitions was discussed but it was difficult to accurately determine without budget & actual costs. Have to wait for Gary's figures.

There will be an increase in Marshal costs in 2006 due to more marshals required, but this was thought to be of more value to the competing pilots.

Equipment required for next year. We are hoping to cut down on the registration process. To achieve this we hope to go paper-less & via the website only have a small amount of data capture to do at the competition itself. To enable this we require another laptop. *Calvo will source.* *Adrian* brought a compact data projector to show us. He could get one at a reduced cost if we wanted one. It was thought that it would be good to be able to display actual tracks from say the top 3 or 5 pilots on the previous day's task. A projector could also be used for presentations to potential and existing sponsors and at the BHPA AGM / Air show -

exhibition. I think it was generally agreed that if we could afford a projector we should get one but I think Mike asked Adrian to let him have a look at the specification of his University one before placing an order. *Adrian to give Mike the price & spec of the projector he can get.*

Phil will take a laptop computer home to look after to do sponsor stuff on.  
Mark Graham will be available to help with GPS & scoring in Portugal.  
We should budget for 100 pilots in Laruco as well as Ager, but probably get more.

It is hoped to open Registration for 2006 on the website at the end of Feb. / start of March. Mark is working on this and an automatic payment system via the website. To do this we need to upgrade the website to increase the level of security. This should mean that we can dispense with the pdq / swipe card machine. *Mark to upgrade the website for registration Feb2006.*

Someone (Phil ?) asked if we could have the competition(s) fees automatically worked out on the registration page of the website, depending on how many rounds entered and when the pilot registers. This would prevent errors in payment.

*Adrian* asked if we could look at getting a *Simbian* mobile phone which would enable us to get live updates of GPS positions from suitably equipped pilots transferred to a laptop using say CompGPS. Mike has looked at two different systems for doing this, using mobiles to send a text message and using packet radio broadcast. A system like this was used on the recent Red Bull XAlps challenge, enabling the website to show the position of the competitors during the comp. Useful safety feature as well as very media friendly.  
*Mike and Adrian to look at a system for the worlds.*

#### 5. Sponsorship.

Previous to this meeting, there had been various discussions & emails about sponsorship, how to get it, keep it and what if anything the person who obtains the funding should get as a reward and for continuing to manage the sponsors.

*Neil* had suggested that we should be aiming for bigger amounts than had previously been targeted. He stressed that we needed to be more involved with the sponsor. Lots of work involved by Phil, Calvo & Co. in getting & keeping the FPR then Kroll / FPR deal.

Unfortunately, due to a change of management this funding has come to an end. A great deal of time and effort is needed to keep a sponsor up to date with news, competition reports, photos, & very important to be able to respond to a sponsor's requests at short notice if required, for example to make a presentation to a potential sponsor.

*Brad* – we need to be focused in the market. For retailers & schools there is a worry that we are losing the youth of today. The market is static at the moment and we are all getting older. The 30 some-things are the group with disposable income.

*Calvo* asked how the person finding & securing the sponsorship should be rewarded. In the past we have had a finder's fee, 10% I think some time ago.

*Mike* expressed concern that the sponsorship side of the comps. Panel should be separate from all other aspects, to avoid any tax & legal implementations. Any person gaining themselves from sponsorship should not be in a position which could leave the panel open to accusations of any kind.

*Brad's* contact, Dale a chartered accountant had also mentioned that there could be problems from the Inland Revenue if we don't sort the above out.

*Phil* asked do we need to do all of this as we are part of the BHPA and submit our accounts to them? Suggest we ask Dick Long at the BHPA office for his advice. We could be fined for not having proper accounts. It depends on how the Inland Revenue deems us. A constitution would define us as a club. Having a separate account for Teams it is probably not sufficient. Threshold is £ 68,000 turnover per year for tax purposes. With competition entry fees we are nearly approaching this.

*Calvo* suggested separating the Comps panel from any sponsorship sub-committee to avoid any problems with funds and rewards. We would need to check the liability side of things with the BHPA. All agreed.

*Mike* suggested a committee of 3 people would better cope with all the aspects of sponsorship, a Go-Getter, an Administrator and a Manager.

[I think we all agreed on the following but I have written that it will be put to the rest of the Panel for discussion and agreement:-]

#### Sponsorship

Administrator	Adrian
Go-Getter	Neil
Manager	Calvo

If Neil was to be the go-getter and receiving a fee for this then perhaps he should not be Chairman of the Comps. Panel as well as this might appear to be a conflict of interests. Calvo volunteered to be Chairman for a year so long as he could delegate some of the work load as required.

*Neil* suggested that the person who deals with sponsors should also look after Team training. This person would receive 25% of any funds secured, to manage sponsorship, expenses and organise team training.

*Mike* proposed that we place a notice in Skywings, asking for volunteers for this post to avoid accusations of a “closed shop”. Also, didn’t we agree to publish the minutes from the Comps? panel meetings. Not yet on the website.

*Phil* – We need to be seen to be asking for volunteers for the Comps. Panel.

Agreed for Neil & Adrian to form Sponsorship Team dealing with sponsorship & Team training. The Comps. Panel will still deal with choosing the Team squad with input from Neil & Adrian. We need to keep any income received for the British Team separate from Competitions.

If Verena takes over from Gary, we need someone to audit the accounts each year. Mike will ask Emily. Calvo does not want to be a signatory on any of the accounts.

#### 6. Panel member roles for 2006. (Provisional, subject to elections).

Ulric Jessop	Chief Scoring Officer / Technical Advisor
Mark Graham	Webmaster
Roger Braney	Safety Marshal
Russell Ogden	Safety Officer
Phil Mackereth	Comp Lines, Head Marshal, In-House sponsorship, database.
Calvo	CIVIL Representative, Meet Director, Chairman of Comps. panel.
Steve Ham	Spanish Liaison Officer
Mike Aston	Vice Chairman Comps. Panel, XC League, Day prizes, (Registration Deputy)



Richard Westgate XC League  
John Stevenson XC League software development.  
Brad Nicholas Chief Technical Officer, (glider scrutinizer).  
Nico Preston Registration  
Chris Harland Clothing, trophies, assist budgeting.

Two new members,

Richard Bungay Presently running the BPCup & good technical knowledge. BPCup Rep & scoring assistant.  
Mark Hayman Entertainments officer, Day Prizes during the Comps.

*Calvo* asked for the Comps Panel to express its thanks for Phil's continued work with existing sponsors & his time dealing with Kroll / FPR. Poss. re-imburement?  
Also, an acknowledgement of John Stevenson's work with the XC League.

*Mike* agreed to be the Vice Chairman and will need to become a signatory on the cheque books. Mike will need someone to help with the XC League. He will ask Richard Bungay.

It was about this time that Mike received the figures from each of the three rounds of this year's competitions from Nico or Gary.

Location	Budget	Actual
Mayerhoffen	£ 12,000	£ 12,470
Piedrahita	£ 15,000	£ 18,710
Bishops Castle	£ 4,000	£ 6,600
	£ 31,000	£ 37,780

7. Any Other Business.

The BHPA / AGM airspace show at the NEC 26<sup>th</sup> 27<sup>th</sup> November was discussed. We have been asked by John Aldridge to return various trophies to be presented after the AGM. We are also organising our own prize-giving hopefully on the Ozone / Airways stand on Sunday lunch time. *Phil to speak to Ozone / Chris Dawes re:-using Airways stand & Judy's trophy.*

Trophies.

Andy Neapolitan	British Paragliding Champion	Russell Ogden
	British Paragliding Champion Female	Abigail Barr
	Best Newcomer	Steve Nash
	British Paragliding Cup	Gareth Aston
	British Paragliding Cup Female	
	XC League	Graham Steel
	XC League Female	Abigail Barr
	XC League Club	Long Mynd

The BHPA receives a grant of approximately £ 30,000 each year from the Sports Council (Sport England). May be worth asking for the Hang Gliding, Paragliding & Accuracy grants separately to see if any more money can be sourced. [Note see BHPA Treasurer's Report, Skywings November 2005, p11]

*Calvo* asked to reply to John Aldridge for short resume of 2005 Comps for the presentation including stats. (Use stats from Adrian's recent *Attitude* email for Skywings).

Also, a request for BHPA Incident reports to be submitted following comps. *Mike will email the following to ask if they have submitted an incident report form following their accidents this year.*

Paul Russell, Pete Taylor, Burkitt Rudd & John Ellison.

*al think that's about it. Sorry it's taken me so long to complete. Please excuse any grammar or spelling mistakes, its 04:53 & I'm tired! Roger.*

Below are Ulric's proposals for reference.

I have three points for the agenda - all to do with the rules:

1. Scoring of stopped tasks.
2. Scoring of pilots that land to assist.
3. Ignoring spurious precision in GPS track data.

#### SCORING OF STOPPEC TASKS

I wish to propose a possible technique for scoring a stopped elapsed time task. I am not suggesting that it be adopted immediately, but the technique would be useful for (2) also. Basically, when the task is stopped, the pilot furthest back in the task is found. The goal is then moved to that pilot's position and the task is then scored. The points available for the task are pro-rated by the distance to the new goal divided by the distance to the old goal.

If this technique was ever to be used, for consistency, it would be logical to score ALL stopped race tasks, but to pro-rate the points available by the best distance divided by the distance to goal.

A major positive implication of this modification to the stopped rule for race tasks is that it completely eliminates pressure (even if only perceived) on a meet director to continue a task until there are pilots in goal.

#### SCORING OF PILOTS THAT LAND TO ASSIST

I propose that, when a pilot lands to assist, their score should be made up of two parts: the average score for all their other tasks in the competition, and a score based on their position in the task when they landed to assist.

The former is simple to compute. All the other tasks flown will be multiplied back up to 1000 points, their average taken, and the result pro-rated back down to the winning points for the task in question. Note that if the pilot lands more than once to assist, only tasks in which he did not do this qualify to form the average score.

The latter score can be obtained by treating the task as stopped at the time that the pilot landed to assist (we need to define how this time is determined - I suggest the time that the accident is reported). We can then temporarily score the task - as normal if it is a race task, or using the method in (1) if it is elapsed time. Having done that, we can determine the pilot's points for the task by multiplying the actual winner's points by the pilot's temporary points divided by the actual task-winners temporary points. Obviously, more sophisticated methods exist for extrapolating the pilot's position at the time of the incident.

The two parts of the pilot's score are then combined to give the overall score as follows, where A is the pilot's average score, P is the score based on his position and F is the pilot's distance flown divided by the distance to goal:  $\text{Score} = A * (1 - F) + P * F$ . Other methods for deriving F could involve determining how the pilot ordering in the "stopped task" matches the final ordering in the actual task.

This computation would be carried out for every task in the competition following the task in question to give a running score for the pilot for the task in question (obviously, it is only necessary to recompute A each day).

As a safety check to prevent possible abuse, the panel should retain the power to award a fixed score (to be done by the posting of provisional results for the day).

I will set up the verification software to produce these scores and update them each day automatically.

#### IGNORING SPURIOUS PRECISION IN GPS TRACK DATA

As we discovered this year, although GPS track data is accurate to the nearest second, errors in the actual position can effectively undermine this accuracy. My initial tests on the absolute accuracy of a GPS traces suggest that timestamps should be regarded as being only accurate to the nearest ten seconds. This means that two pilots arriving in goal within ten seconds of each other can only be measured from the trace as having arrived at the same time.

I therefore propose that we report times in the scores to the nearest ten seconds (or some similar time, depending on further experiments). I further propose that there the panel should reserve the right to override GPS-derived goal times with some form of marshalled goal line, but that GPS-derived times will otherwise be definitive and that no adjustment will be carried out, even when affected pilots can agree on a goal crossing order. This will carry a small safety improvement, as once you are close to the goal, unless you can gain ten seconds on someone, there's no point in heaving on the bar to squeak past someone.

The method for doing this could be as simple as just rounding all times to the nearest ten seconds. This can be a little unfair. I suggest a more sophisticated approach, which attempts to use gaps in the crossing times to group people into ten second groups.

We cannot duck this issue. Once again, I will encode whatever we decide into the verification system.

Sorry this is all so long winded. Hope you have a good meeting.

Ulric