

## Notes from the Comps Committee meeting 13 October 2018

Present: Liz Sparrow – ES, Graham Garnett – GG, Alan Langlands – AL, Matt Page – MP, Benedict Smith – BSm, Richard Hood RH

On Skype: Paul Crabb – PC, Brian Spreckley – BSp, Iain Baker - IB

Apologies: Russell Cheetham, Justin Craig, Matt Davis

### 1. Meeting Admin

ES welcomed everyone to a new Comps Committee season, thanking Lasham for hosting and thanking Jon Gatfield, who has stood down, for his time on the committee.

### 2. Review of purpose & operation of Comps Committee:

In general discussion, CC covered the following:

- overall framework - what are we trying to achieve and how do we measure progress?
- are we doing the right things - what should we do that we don't, what should we do more or less of, what should we stop doing
- what are the focus areas that arise from this
- do we have the right governance / subgroups / way forward for these and if not what is needed?

AL noted that last year we identified the things that need doing (management) and the strategy and aspirational side (big picture, engagement, development):

#### Management items

The way we **enter competitions, buy comp licenses** etc **ACTION – ES and MP** Will discuss with Russell and Mike Fox

Can we use IGC ranking list for **UK rankings** rather than a separate UK ratings list?

Paul spends 4/6 hours on the ranking list each year – relatively easy to pass on.

**ACTION – BSp** to find costs from Reno for including regionals onto the IGC ranking list

**Bids for competitions** – points made were:

- The current process isn't working well as no real site competition
- Should the allocation of nationals not be a bid process – round table process ?
- Noted that a bid process does enable competition on cost for running competitions.
- BSp asked why are we encouraging competition for fees, pilots don't care
  - Significant feedback from comp pilot survey that price is an issue.
  - there is feedback from nationals pilots that entry fees are an issue
- Can we encourage clubs to publish competition budgets
  - Disclosing budgets may be a problem given different cost models, perhaps encourage clubs to show where entry fees go

**ACTION - ES** to put this on the agenda for the directors seminar.

**Awards** – can we start this process earlier so that we don't have a last minute rush.

### **Development items**

**KPIs / key measures** –done intermittently but don't do systematically. Should we?

- RH noted numbers for numbers sake is a bit of a waste of time. Statistics like number of comp entries vs pilots etc. What is the point of these analysis? What do we want to analyse? Should we just focus time on nationals and improving participation?
- can we pull some baseline stats off the ratings spreadsheet?
- PC noted there are no stats associated with ranking list at the moment
- BSp – it is useful to understand who is flying comps – age, experience, gender.
- RH suggested we should have an annual task of collating certain numbers to record a trend. Nationals entries, regionals entries – age, gender etc would be favorable

**ACTION ES** to speak to Pete Stratten about data the BGA holds

**ACTION RH** to look at rating list to get some data. By next meeting

We are here **to promote all forms of competitive gliding**. How are we doing this? We don't promote competition gliding directly.

- General view that we should focus on getting existing pilots flying comps rather than basic gliding participation
- Noted that University gliding clubs are doing a very good job – can we offer support to the inter uni comp?
- Any further support we can give to ICL?
  - Suggestions included finals in the following year, possible structure change of comp
  - Chris Luton who has taken over as the ICL Coordinator will be at directors seminar.

**ACTION ES** – Lucy Wooton chairman of LUGC to be contacted and invited to attend the directors seminar to involve unis in comps;

**ACTION ES** - schedule a session later in year for 'drains up' on comp structure.

### **Team voting,**

- ES said she was not in favor of the current voting and selection systems – we should introduce an objective criterion for all comps. Feedback received from a number of team and thereabouts pilots on this.
- MP - how do other countries do selection, Germany etc?
  - ES – Germans use ranking, French use personal selection
- Should we have two different selection systems if we think they work?
- GG suggested Europeans for development of pilots based on performance at nationals; in discussion we asked can Europeans be used for development? One chance for each person? Don't keep sending same people?
  - GG had a concern that people could be demoralised by poor performance competing at a development comp?
  - PC – pilots in this category can do well and should be encouraged.
- BSp wondered whether we are sending the same people because they are so much better, or do we send the same people because there is a lack of development to enable

others to reach the same high standard? He noted that development needs to take people from club/standard class on into the flapped classes.

- ES/GG – can something like the Phillip wills memorial fund buy gliders to use and sell on at a profit?
- ES – we should review why people who meet selection criteria do not fly competitions.
- BSp – can we look at allocating places in the team based on classes where we have participation. – more funding for club class places, cutting funding for classes with low participation.

**Action ES** to add to a subsequent agenda for British Team review

**Sponsorship working group** – ES updated CC on progress with group (RB, ES, IB, BSm) led by Richard Brickwood on the Exec.

- we are approaching companies who make organise sponsorship, also approaching other sporting bodies to find out how they get top level funding
- approaching BA with proposal for women's team STEM activity sponsorship as well as wider sponsorship of gliding development.

**Team pilot behaviour** – agreed the following points:

- We need to revitalise the contract process where pilots have to sign up to team requirements - should be enforced this year
  - It's in return for funding but doesn't come with a choice of not taking the funding and not signing up
  - this needs to be a public process that people are aware of when they take their place in the team
- needs some penalty for not abiding by contract
  - could be to withhold funding if code of conduct (contract) not met – but would probably have to be in arrears
  - however we reaffirmed the principle that ability drives selection, we select the best not the nicest pilots.

**Action GG** to ensure all team pilots sign up to code of conduct

**Pilots reluctant to take their place in the British Team**

GG noted that many people say they can't give that much time to competing in one comp. BSp pointed out that the idea is for pilots to be able to give up just 2 weeks for a comp, but in practice they tend to be longer.

**UK Glider Racing Platform**

- MP noted that all but 3 comps used Robocontrol
- IB updated us that Andrej had advised that he can't yet work on our proposed partnership on online platform due to other programming priorities.
- Little progress since Sporting Conference ideas to produce user 'stories'
  - Agreed to continue to develop a spec that we can take out to tender.
  - best practice, improving the way comps run, improving participation in uk comps

**Action ES** to agenda for subsequent meeting

**3. Agenda planning for subsequent meetings**

ES – Next meeting to be moved due to availability

#### 4. Directors seminar planning

Seminar scheduled on the Saturday followed by club management on the Sunday. Agenda:

Mentoring scheme – Rose Johnson

Directors report / rules feedback - AL- to produce list of potential rules changes.

Scoring debrief – BS

DHTs - Jim White; DHTs to be discussed in a later meeting on comp structure

Competition survey results – ES

**ACTION AL, ES, BSm** to produce supporting presentations

#### 5. IGC rule change updates

BSp has circulated feelings on this years rules from team members. Options for proposals:

Event markers

Starting

Early Bird starting

Tracker – availability of data to everyone.

- RH noted potential issues with forcing/encourage early starts. Danger of diving at starts.

**ACTION BSp** to circulate proposal for debate and discussion on trackers and initial early bird start proposal - Two options could be EB bonus linked to start line open or linked to pilots actual start time.

#### Club class handicap changes

- ES raised this and reminded CC of the outcome of the Club Class forum – due process was not followed; are we content to leave situation as is? Is there opportunity to reiterate requirements from UK Club Class Nats regarding transition period and mitigating against doubling of entry price for competitive gliders?
- BSp advised that the IGC handicap committee no longer have the power to publish bulk changes to the handicap list.
- Whilst the feeling of club class pilots was that handicap changes are not right, CC in general felt that it's not that significant an issue and that it's too late now to change position.

#### 6. 8.33 radio freqs

Debate summarised as following agreed proposal to exec

	<b>Freq</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>2ry</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>1</b>	129.9	Shared/ ground		As current
<b>2</b>	129.975	CGFF		As current but is it realistic to have a CGFF in the new world? Will sites all have own freq?

				Require sites currently (ab)using 130.1 to use this instead
3	130.1	XC Safety	NONE	New usage – common XC / gaggle communications ONLY
4	130.125	XC Lead /follow	XC SA	As current
5	130.4	Cloud	XC SA	As current
6	New	XC Chat		To keep chat off other frequencies
7	New	Comp	XC SA	XC SA when not in comp use
8	New	Comp	Team	British team training when not in comp use

## 7. AOB

AL – **Feedback re Cheating at the 20M nationals.** ES clarified that this was unauthorized use of radio frequencies, clearly not allowed in the rules and a 500pt penalty but that the penalty wording given who they'd spoken to made it impossible to give more than 100pts – Liz will advise rewording

AL can we debate **structure of the nationals, what are they for, why aren't people entering** – **action ES** as above to agenda a general comp structure review. RH – solutions include handicapped nationals, series events etc

BSm? – Airspace approach needs review

ES – Brian is suggesting an **overseas nationals** at Issoudun alongside their comp – we were happy so long as it doesn't clash with matching UK Nationals **action BSp** to advise dates.