

## **Minutes of the Comps Panel meeting held 24th June 2007 in Piedrahita**

Present: Richard Bungay, Matt Church, Russ Ogden, Ulric Jessop, Calvo, Mark Graham, Mark Hayman, Brad Nicolas, Steve Ham, **please add any names I've missed.....or delete those I've included by mistake...**

The main focus of this meeting was to decide on the task dropping issue so that something was in place for this round of the Champs.

A brief discussion took place around the whole issue of task dropping and team selection as they had the potential to be intertwined.

There was a general feeling of dislike towards the FTV dropping system as it was very difficult for pilots to understand.

Ulric pointed out that we only had the ability to score with GAP or PWC99 within the Race2002 scoring program that we currently use. The PWC99 scoring formulae was discussed and felt to be suitable but not as good as the current 1000 point for valid day 500 point min for getting to goal formulae that is currently used in PWC. As we had no way of using the current system the PWC99 system was thought to be OK as it did not have the really steep drop off in points that the circa 2003 formulae used.

The choice of task validation criteria that could be used if we adopted the PWC scoring was discussed. The use of different parameters for each day, constant for the whole round and constant for the whole series was discussed. It was felt that changing the parameters for each day was getting away from the whole point of the validation as you were effectively changing the validation depending on the weather. Again the use of fixed parameters over the whole series was disliked as it was accepted that different locations have different task expectations.

A discussion then took place about what happens to non validated tasks, i.e. those that don't score 1000 points. It was decided that if a task is not validated it would still be counted in each individual Open but would not count towards the Champs. It was also pointed out that if a task was not validated, say only 10 pilots made 30km rather than the declared 20 then the points for the day are awarded pro rata and the day would score  $10/20 * 1000 = 500$  points.

The ratio to be used for task dropping was then discussed with various possibilities being floated, such as 1 in 4 tasks, dropping 1 after 5 then 2 after 8 etc. It was felt that 1 in 4 was rather a large number to drop as the point of task dropping was to allow for the errors of ranking pilots when a small number of tasks are used and the odd mishap such as illness or gliders lost by Airlines etc..

After all these discussions a proposal was put forward to use PWC99 scoring formulae with a validation for Piedrahita of 20 pilots making 30km. The task dropping ratio would then be 1 task after 5 and 2 tasks after 8 with no further dropping. It was also suggested that the validation for St Andre would probably be the same but for the UK would be 20 pilots making 20km.

This proposal was then voted on and accepted unanimously.

The meeting was then closed.

## **Minutes of the Comps Panel meeting held 30th June 2007 in Piedrahita**

Present: Richard Bungay, Matt Church, Steve Nash, Nigel Prior, John Stevenson, Brad Nicolas, Adrian Thomas, Ulric Jessop, Mark Graham, Mark Hayman, Steve Ham, Russ Ogden, Charlie Merrett, Calvo, **please add any names I've missed.....or delete those I've included by mistake...**

To begin with Steve Nash and Nigel Prior were welcomed to the panel as new members. Nigel has come on board to work closely with our sponsors particularly Lighthouse as he has strong connections with Neil Speed. At this point a comment was made about the poor quality of the printing on the competition T-shirts and the very small size of the Lighthouse logo, this needs to be investigated for future T-shirt runs.

The team selection debate started by looking at the options for selecting the next team, i.e. the Europeans next year. It was discussed that any decision made should not include selection based on performance this year (Champs for example) that were not known about beforehand by the pilots. The general feeling was that a selection process along the lines of the current was the most appropriate for the Europeans selection at this late stage. There was debate about whether this should be changed slightly but in the end a Panel vote decided that the selection process would remain as currently advertised.

Debate then moved on to the selection process to be used going forward. Discussion took place around the Panels remit, it was felt that the panels role was to select the best team to represent the UK in a fair and open way and to run a championship series for the majority of British pilots. There was a general feeling that the two processes did not have to be interdependent. It was recognised that for all pilots including our top "professional" pilots, that the time commitment to competitions is very high. It was pointed out that current team members no longer have an inherent advantage as a PWC can now score as much if not more than the worlds for example and that it may well be possible to attend 2 PWC events in the amount of time pilots were away at the worlds.

There was a strong feeling that the selection process chosen should encourage our pilots to fly better and improve the UK's ranking in the world. It was recognised that this was probably far better done by our top pilots attending PWCs rather than concentrating on the 2 ½ weeks of the British Championships. The idea of having the Championships decided on just one of the rounds was discussed but still running the other rounds for the majority of the British pilots. It was realised that selection based on this sort of process would devalue the other rounds slightly as our top pilots would most likely only attend the one round that was the selection decider.

Team selection based purely on the WPRS was then debated. This had the disadvantage that the formulae for the WPRS is outside our control but the general feeling was that the current system seemed to give a very accurate reflection of a pilots true ability in the world stage. It would however have the advantage that it would encourage our pilots to attend PWCs. This would promote both faster racing amongst UK pilots and improve our position in the world within the WPRS. This in turn would also lead to us having a greater chance of being awarded re-allocated places above the current 3+1 allocation. It was thought quite likely that we would get 4+1 or maybe even 5+1 in future events as many countries pilots will fall below the entry requirements of top 500 WPRS (is this correct???) meaning that do not take up all their allocated places.

A consensus was being reached that generally the current WPRS was a better selection criteria than using our British Championships. Discussion then took place around whether this should be entirely WPRS based for all team places available or whether it should be top 3 WPRS plus any additional allocation being discretionary. The discretionary element for re-allocated places was seen to offer the opportunity to reward up and coming pilots that had so far not moved up the WPRS rankings due to the time lag as it is based on 2 years of events. It was also pointed out that to get into the PWCs pilots would have to perform well in Cat2 competitions including our Championships so this selection process would still encourage a large number of our top pilots to attend our series.

A proposal was then put to the panel to vote on 3 options for a selection process. Option 1 was for all places to be based on WPRS ranking, option 2 was for top 3 WPRS places and any additional to be discretionary and option 3 was for some other form of selection process. Option 3 was very quickly discounted and a final vote on options 1 and 2 gave very close results with a vote of 7 to 6 in favour of option 1.

So from 1<sup>st</sup> Jan 2008 the selection process will be based entirely on WPRS ranking for team places. This selection process will remain in place until the Panel votes in a new selection process or feels that the WPRS has again become "broken" in which case we will revert to the old system as an interim measure. It was also pointed out that a team place based on this selection process is no guarantee of financial assistance to attend an event.

At this point the meeting was closed.