



Slalom Committee

Thirteenth

Annual Consultative Meeting

26th November 2016

Location: British Canoe Union HQ, National Water Sports Centre
Adbolton Lane, Holme Pierrepont, Nottingham, NG12 2LU

Minutes



1 Welcome by the Chair

The Chair thanked British Canoeing for the use of the premises. He then welcomed 42 people, to the meeting; between them, they held 79 votes.

Apologies were received from David Joy British Canoeing, Mike Carter of Viking Kayak Club, Michelle Grudzinski Managed Calendar Officer, and Matthew McKnight of CANI.

Anna Gray and Stuart Meakins were appointed tellers for the meeting.

The Secretary proposed a change to the Agenda, handling motion **6.7 Promotion from inshore classes in Div 4** before **6.6 Rule B4.2.2**, as adoption of 6.7 makes 6.6 redundant. This was accepted nem con.

2 Minutes

2.1 12th Annual Consultative Meeting

The Minutes of the 12th Annual Meeting were accepted as a true record. Proposed by SCOTS and seconded by Mold Canoe Club. This was adopted nem con

2.2 2015 / 2016 Committee Meetings

Minutes from the 2015 / 2016 Slalom Committee meetings were tabled for information

3 Reports

3.1 Chair's Report

A report was tabled and is available on the Canoe Slalom UK web site.

In the report, the Chair reminded everyone of the excellent international results this season including the Olympic K1M gold medal. All underpinned by the strength of our domestic competition structure, delivered by individual canoe clubs. That we have a strong and vibrant competition structure is due to the dedication and tireless efforts of the many volunteers committed to the sport. He took this opportunity to thank all involved.

He then highlighted the significant changes within British Canoe with the appointment of a new CEO, David Joy. Under David's leadership a long-term strategy is being developed and there has been widespread consultation throughout the many parts of the canoeing community. Changes in the composition of the Board of British Canoeing and several staff changes have also taken place along with closer cooperation between the CEOs of the four home nations. Welcoming Anna Gray (Sports Development Manager), and Gemma Wiggs (International Affairs Manager). Gemma will assist all disciplines with plans to host major international events in the UK and liaison with the ICF. We are working with Gemma to produce bids to host senior World and European events in the next few years.

The report went on to note that slalom, as in many other sports, competitors are increasingly becoming consumers rather than participants. We need to concentrate on encouraging and developing active participants to ensure that our vibrant competition continues. It is these individuals who will become the volunteers who support the next generation of paddlers.

The decline in Division 4 entries, and the lack of take up for additional funding to support Division 2 races on more challenging courses were also noted, the committee, and the entire sport must continue to look for ways to improve the paddling experience at these levels.

He went on to thank the members of the committee for all their efforts during the year, highlighting the commitment of Jacky Brookes who is standing down from the committee this year after many years of service.



3.2 Treasurer's Report

The Accounts for the year ended 31 October 2016 were published during the week. The treasurer talked through the salient points.

- Following the reduction to 40% (from 45%) for levies at lower divisions; the income from levies had dropped slightly
- This year the British Open is included in these accounts, traditionally this has been an end of season event, this year the event was earlier so was included.
- Total expenditure reduced by £15,496 compared with the previous year. This was mainly due to salary costs saved following the retirement of Jim Croft and because 2014 / 15 included £5,000 of UK support towards running the World Championships.
- The British Canoeing grant was not paid this year, on the basis that we have substantial reserves and are operating at a small surplus

Acceptance of the accounts was proposed by Stafford and Stone and seconded by Viking Kayak Club. This was adopted nem con.

A vote of thanks was given to Andy Koszary for his work during the year

3.3 Reports from Co-ordinators

Reports were tabled and available on the canoe slalom uk web site from

- Competition Co-Ordinator (Jacky Brookes)
- Event Management (Peter Curry)
- Publicity (Jacky Stokes)
- Technical Support (Andy Grudzinski)
- Volunteer (Hazel Ridge)

3.4 Reports from British Canoeing and Home Nations

Reports were tabled and available on the canoe slalom uk web site from

- British Canoeing (Craig Morris)
- England (Dave Royle)
- Northern Ireland (Matthew McKnight)
- Scotland (Chris Baillie)
- Wales (Mark Abbott)

3.5 Athlete Representative (Martyn Setchell)

A report was tabled and is available on the canoe slalom uk web site.

Thanked all the competition organisers, and their volunteers, for all the work they had put in during the year. Explaining that this was requested by athletes during the year.

4 Elections

4.1 Chair

David Spencer was proposed and seconded by the Slalom Committee. In the absence of any other nominations he was elected unopposed.

4.2 Treasurer

Andy Koszary was proposed and seconded by the Slalom Committee. In the absence of any other nominations he was elected unopposed

4.3 Committee Members

After long faithful service Jacky Brookes (Competition) has decided not to offer herself for re-election, but will continue to volunteer at competitions. The Chair thanked her for the many hours she has put in over the years and the positive effect she has had on the sport. The meeting unanimously offered a vote of thanks to Jacky.



Nick Taylor, and Hazel Ridge were nominated, leaving a casual vacancy that can be filled by co-option.

In the absence of any further nominations, the above were elected unanimously

The other elected committee members are Martyn Setchell (Vice Chair / Athlete rep), Colin Woodgate (Secretary), Peter Curry, Andy Grudzinski, and Jackie Stokes

Appointed by other bodies: Dave Royle (England), Matthew McKnight, CANI), Chris Baillie (Scotland), Mark Abbott (Wales), and Craig Morris (British Canoeing – performance).

It was noted that the Athlete Representative will need to be re-elected before the start of the next season.

4.4 Other Officials

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| TUTTI Maintenance | Andy Hounslow | Ranking Officer | Nick Penfold |
| Entry Cards | Susan Paterson | Ranking Status Officer | John Woods |
| Ranking Officers | | | |
| Premier Men | Tracy Wells | Men's Canadian Singles | Carole McGranachan |
| Division 1 Men | Nick Penfold | Women's Canadian Singles | Mark Shaw |
| Division 2 Men | Les Saunders | Canadian Doubles | Stuart Meakins |
| Division 3 Men | Penny Scaife | Veterans P/1 All Categories | Mike Carter |
| Division 4 Men | James Hastings | Veterans 2/3 All Categories | Terry Griffiths |
| K1 Women Prem & 1 | Sally Atkinson | Officials Compiler | Amanda Woodgate |
| K1 Women Divisions 2 & 3 | Tanya Gibbons | | |
| Bib Issue | | | |
| Premier Men | Tracy Wells | Men's Canadian Singles | Carole McGranachan |
| Division 1 Men | Nick Penfold | Women's Canadian Singles | Mark Shaw |
| Division 2 Men | Les Saunders | Canadian Doubles | Stuart Meakins |
| Division 3 Men | Karen Crowhurst | Veterans P/1 All Categories | Mike Carter |
| K1 Women Prem & 1 | Sally Atkinson | Veterans 2/3 All Categories | Terry Griffiths |
| K1 Women Divisions 2 & 3 | Tanya Gibbons | | |
| Team Bib Hire | Dave Lomas | | |

The above were elected en-bloc, with no objections.

5 Awards

5.1 Ed Ecclestone award

Nominees for the Ed Ecclestone award this year are:

- Jacky Brookes
- Andy Hounslow
- Andy Kettlewell
- John Sturgess
- Esther Matthews

The award was won by Jacky Brookes. As the nominations say:

“Jacky has been the mastermind behind Division 1 and Premier Judging for longer than most of us can remember. She was one of our best judges for a long time before that, representing the country at many World Class events, and at two (or was it three) Olympics.

Jacky has been a permanent fixture at division 1 and premier races, rarely missing an event.

She has also been on the slalom committee for a long time, tirelessly working to make sure the sport runs smoothly.

In the recent two years Jacky has been on the international panel, more evenings and weekends given up for the good of the sport, giving a welcome focus on volunteers and bringing experience of the athletes' performances at events during the year, and in some cases before they came on the international Panel's radar.”



6 Motions

6.1 ICF Rule Changes

As this is an Olympic year, there will be a number of rule changes proposed by the ICF Slalom Committee. The majority of these will be accepted by the ICF board (Technical Rules). If available these will be circulated at or before the ACM. Other changes (General Rules) will need the approval of the ICF Congress. A summary of the changes has been posted on the chat line and will be displayed at the meeting.

Where 2017 season ICF rule changes are known before the Yearbook is published, they will be reviewed by the Secretary and adopted as appropriate.

This motion was handled under article 5.9 and voted on immediately. It was adopted nem con.

6.2 Ranking of new C2 crews

Rule B2.3 page 45 and Rule B2.4.2 page 46 differ on the ranking for a new C2 Crew that contains two paddlers who are ranked in division 3. In order to resolve this, Rule B2.4.2 (Page 46) will be deleted.

Rule B2.4.2 be deleted with the subsequent rule renumbered:

This motion was handled under article 5.9 and voted on immediately. It was adopted nem con.

6.3 Yearbook Section A

Section A of the yearbook has been made more consistent, and has been circulated as part of the papers.

Motion: To accept the revisions to Section A of the Yearbook as circulated.

This motion was handled under article 5.9 and voted on immediately. It was adopted nem con.

6.4 Officials Competition

There has been a lot of discussion regarding the officials' completion and the ban on having a ranking run and taking part if the officials' event. In particular this affects those who wish to compete in the officials' event, but are asked to also compete with a novice in a C2. There is a danger that competitors wish to take part in multiple ranking races and the officials event, making it almost impossible to find time to perform official functions. The proposal is to allow participation in both types of event, at the discretion of the Organiser. If the individual makes the time they can officiate too restrictive, the organiser does not have to accept the officials' entry.

Where practice is restricted (e.g. Division 1, or Premier) participation in both types are event is still not allowed as it could provide unfair advantage.

With the reduction in advance entries to the officials' event, the second part of B6.1 is never invoked so can be removed. The entry to officials' events is split between two places in the rules. These changes bring the rules in one place.

..... Page 52

B6.1 These are not open events. Entrants must be able and willing to do judging or other official duties as requested by the Organisers. Entry is limited to a maximum of 60. ~~Any competitor who enters an officials' event or fails to attend and or notify the Organiser prior to the event may be reported to the Committee.~~

At Division One and Premier races a competitor may not enter both a ranking or Championship event and an Officials event in the same or different categories. At Division 2 to 4 competitions such double entry is at the organisers' discretion, and subject to completion of the officials' duties.

..... Page 55

~~C6.1.2A A competitor may not at one competition enter both a ranking or Championship event and an Officials event in the same or different categories.~~

An amendment was proposed so that the officials and ranking run must be in a different class Proposed by Kingston Kayak Club, seconded by Brecon Kayak Club, this was voted on receiving 47 votes for, 19 votes against and 15 abstentions.



The amended motion then read

B6.1 These are not open events. Entrants must be able and willing to do judging or other official duties as requested by the Organisers. Entry is limited to a maximum of 60. ~~Any competitor who enters an officials' event or fails to attend and or notify the Organiser prior to the event may be reported to the Committee.~~

At Division One and Premier races a competitor may not enter both a ranking or Championship event and an Officials event in the same or different categories. At Division 2 to 4 competitions such double entry in different events is at the organisers' discretion, and subject to completion of the officials' duties.

..... Page 55

~~C6.1.2A A competitor may not at one competition enter both a ranking or Championship event and an Officials event in the same or different categories.~~

The amended motion received 62 votes for and 5 votes against, with 12 abstentions. It was therefore adopted.

6.5 UKC19.8 Staying In The Finish Area After Your Run.

Two aspects to consider in this rule

UK C19.8 After their run a Competitor MUST stay in their boat within sight of the finisher, or (if defined) within a clearly indicated distance from the finish, until the next, and next but one Competitor has finished, in case they are called upon to act as rescue boat, UNLESS the Organiser, having made other rescue arrangements, has specifically indicated that this is not required or the paddler has arranged an alternate to provide this safety cover. This regulation applies equally to team events. Failure to comply with this rule will result in disqualification from that run (DSQ-R).

- *Is the Competitor required to stay in the sight of the finisher, or where the Competitor can see the finisher? Very different prospects*
- *Should we extend the rule to include any paddler behaviors that are included in the safety plan? E.g. at Grandtully the suggestion was that three paddlers should stay at the finish, despite the rules. At Lee Valley we may decide that staying by the finisher is not required, but staying above the lake bridge is sufficient. Similarly, if the safety plan excludes access from an area, or requires behavior above start, there is currently no sanction, short of complete disqualification from the competition, and using that rule requires interpretation.*

An amendment from Kingston Kayak seconded by Windsor to change 'rescue to safety was accepted nem con.

An amendment was proposed by Stafford and Stone seconded by Green Star that the penalty should be disqualification from the race rather than the run. The amendment received 48 votes for and 12 votes against, with 14 abstentions. The motion was therefore amended.

A further amendment was to include official practice run as well as run, with the final wording to be defined by the committee. Accepted nem con.

A further amendment to allow additional or alternate arrangements proposed by Green Star and seconded by Halifax Cane club, this was accepted 63 votes for with 2 objections, 13 abstentions the motion was therefore accepted.



The Amended motion changed the rule to read:

UK C19.8 After their run, or official practice, a Competitor MUST stay in their boat within sight ~~of~~ from the finisher judges' position, or (*if defined*) within a clearly indicated distance from the finish, until the next, and next but one Competitor has finished, in case they are called upon to act as ~~rescue~~ safety boat, UNLESS

~~- any alternate safety arrangements have been published by the Organiser, having made other rescue safety arrangements, has specifically indicated that this is not required or~~

~~- the paddler has arranged an alternate to provide this safety cover,~~

~~- or the paddler is released by an official.~~

This regulation applies equally to team events. Failure to comply with this rule, including any alternate safety arrangements published by the Organiser, will result in disqualification from that ~~run (DSQ-R)Event (DQB)~~.

The amended motion received 61 votes for and 3 votes against, with 15 abstentions. It was therefore adopted.

6.6 Promotion from inquorate classes in Div 4

Proposed by CR Cats, seconded by Pinkston Panthers

1 paddler in 5 is promoted where the race is quorate (an event is quorate with 3 or more competitors).

Additionally, even when the events are quorate, C1, K1W and C2 are promoted when their modified score would have earned promotion in the K1M event. The modified score is calculated by dividing by 1.12 for K1W, 1.08 for C1M and 1.2 for C1W and C2. E.g if a K1 women had a best time of 112, then their modified score is 100. If 100 would have been promoted in K1M, then the K1W is promoted. (fortunately Ken Trollope's program works all this out for the organiser).

Until the end of 2014 modified scores were used for Div 4 C1W and C2, but not for C1M or K1W where raw scores were compared. This was deemed inequitable, and modified score was applied to all events (ACM 2014 Item 6.5). The rule is there to avoid the absurdity of not promoting an unusually good paddler just because their event is unusually good or, more likely, inquorate. But making the rule follow modified scores can make promotion to Div 3 absurdly easy, especially if the K1M field is weak. We have seen cases where every Div 4 paddler in C1 or K1W was promoted.

Most Divisions 4s run alongside Division 3s and so it makes little difference to racing opportunities, If they do a couple more races in Division 4, they will get better and then get promoted as they will be fast enough compared to Div 4 K1M. Often some of the paddlers are just trying out C1 and C2 at a starter race and this would also have the benefit of them not having to apply for a bib too early either. It would also be easier for both competitors and organisers to understand..... Page 49

B4.3.1 Promotion from Division 4 to Division 3

For Division 4 an event is deemed to be quorate if 3 or more competitors start. (See Rule UKC5.1)

~~K1 Men All events:~~ 1 in 5 (*or part thereof, if quorate*)

~~K1 Women / C1 Men / C1 Women / C2:~~ 1 in 5 (*or part thereof, if quorate*) ~~or when a Competitor's modified score would have gained promotion in the corresponding K1 Men's event. (modified scores are defined in B4.2.2) rounding down to the accuracy of the event.~~

~~If an event is not quorate, then competitors are promoted if the Competitor's raw score would have gained promotion when compared to another quorate event as follows~~

~~C1M/C2/K1W: if they would have been promoted in the K1 men event~~

~~C1W if they would have been promoted in either the K1W or K1M event~~

In all cases where two, or more, paddlers are tied on best run scores for the last promotion place from Division 4 then all such Competitors are promoted.

An amendment to the motion to change raw score to 'score' was proposed by judging and seconded by Brecon. This was adopted nem con.

The motion received 54 votes for and 12 votes against, with 13 abstentions. It was therefore adopted.



6.7 Rule B4.2.2

This motion became redundant with the passing of the motion above, so was withdrawn

6.8 Promotion Points to be the same for C1 and K1

MOTION AMENDED TO REFLECT PORTABLE POINTS TARGETS

Proposed and seconded by CR Cats

Promotion is based on getting the following points from 5 races or 3 race wins (or paddle up wins). These are all based on the current 1000 points system.

| | K1 Men/Women | C1 Men/Women | C2 |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|------|
| Div 3 to Div 2 | 4150 | 4000 | |
| Div 2 to Div 1 | 4500 | 4250 | 3350 |
| Div 1 to Prem | 4750 | 4650 | |

So, the promotion points for C1 classes are currently less than K1 classes.

Historically, the lower targets in C1 were there to compensate for the effect of very small fields. Today's C1 numbers are much larger and the differential has become an anomaly. The proposal is to equalise points targets for K1 and C1 classes.

If you look at the ranking statistics, a bigger percentage of paddlers are getting promoted in the C1 classes because the promotion points are less. Leaving C2 aside for now, would clubs support a motion to standardise the points so that promotion is the same for K1M, K1W, C1M and C1W? Page 49

B4.3.2 All Kayak and Canadian Singles Events

Division 3 to Division 2: on gaining **1060** points from the best five events or achieving maximum points at three events. or a combination of maximum points or achieving the 'paddle up standard' in three events.

Division 2 to Division 1: on gaining **2250** points from the best five events or achieving maximum points or more at three events or a combination of maximum points or achieving the 'paddle up standard' in three events.

Division 1 to Premier: on gaining **4750** points from the best five events or achieving maximum points or more at three events or a combination of maximum points or achieving the 'paddle up standard' in three events.

Delete Rule 4.3.3, renumbering following sections

The motion received 73 votes for and 6 votes against, with 0 abstentions. It was therefore adopted.

6.9 Promotion Points to be increased for C2

MOTION AMENDED TO REFLECT PORTABLE POINTS TARGETS

Proposed by and seconded CR Cats

Currently you only need 3350 points to get promoted from C2 Div 2/3 to Prem/Div 1. Paddlers are getting promoted too quickly to Div 1 before they are ready to race at this water level. Those C2 paddlers who can race on harder water will be able to do so under Portable Points.

This motion proposes to increase the points required to be promoted from 3350 to 4000 points. Page 49

B4.3.2 Canadian Doubles

Division 2/3 to Premier/1: on gaining ~~3350~~**2250** points from the best five events or achieving maximum points at three events. or a combination of maximum points or achieving the 'paddle up standard' in three events.

The motion was amended to set the target at 2250 points the same as for all other classes was proposed by Stafford and Stone seconded Manchester. This amendment was accepted nem con.

The amended motion was accepted nem con.



6.10 Race Formats

(CW)

There are a variety of different formats defined in the yearbook. There has been confusion during the year over progressions and points allocation. In order to simplify this, rules B1.2, B1.3 and B1.4 should be deleted and replaced with a clarified set.

Delete Rules B1.2, B1.3 and B1.4 replacing them with

B1.2 Race Formats

Competition organisers have the discretion to run competitions using one of three racing formats:

B1.2.1 Classic

This is the format to be used if no other format is listed in the yearbook.

Each competitor has two timed race runs.

The final result for each event in the competition is in order of their best run from the two runs

B1.2.2 Super Final

Each competitor has a timed qualification race run. After this run the top x boats in each event proceed to the final. The remaining boats have a second timed qualification run. After this run the top n boats in each event proceed to the final.

The final is one run starting in the reverse order of their qualification result, those starting from the first heat starting after those qualifying from the second heat.

Course changes can be made for the final at the Organiser's Discretion.

The final result for each event in the competition is:-

- The finishing order of the finalists based on their final result only,
- The heat 2 competitors in order of second heats run
- The remaining competitors in order of their first heats run

B1.2.3 'Championship' - (two day event)

Each competitor has a timed qualification race run. After this run the top x boats in each event proceed to the semi-final. The remaining boats have a second timed qualification run. After this run the top n boats in each event proceed to the semi-final.

The semi-final is one run starting in the reverse order of their qualification result, those starting from the first heat starting after those qualifying from the second heat. After the semi-final run the top n boats in each event proceed to a one run final starting in the reverse order of their semi-final result.

Course changes can be made for the semi-final at the Organiser's discretion.

The final result for each event in the competition is:

- The finishing order of the finalists based on their final result only,
- The finishing order of the semi-finalists based on their semi-final result only,
- The heat 2 competitors in order of their second heats run
- The remaining competitors in order of their first heats run

B1.3 Progression

Where there is a progression, the number of boats qualifying from each phase must be defined and published with the start list or at least 7 days in advance, whichever is the earliest.

The motion was adopted nem con. It was therefore adopted.



6.11 Portable Points

Proposed by, Halifax seconded by Kingston Kayak

At the 2015 ACM it was decided to delay the implementation of Portable Points to explore options to address the various concerns raised with the original proposed format of Portable Points with the intention of bringing a revised proposal back to the 2016 ACM. The following is a revised proposal based on discussions to address these concerns for the introduction of Portable Points for the 2017 season.

Concerns raised at the 2015 ACM have been addressed as follows:

- **Loss of multi-division events** – the proposals have been revised to allow lower division events to remain multi-division events (e.g. Div 2/3 events), aiding the financial viability of these events and ensuring that families and clubs can take paddlers to events that suit the needs of a wider range of paddlers.
- **Carrying forward all points on promotion** – the proposal now allow only points earned by paddling up in the high division to be carried forward upon promotion to that division, rather than allowing all points to be carried forward into the new division.
- **Impact of paddle ups on host division points** – the proposals have been amended so that host division points are calculated as if paddle up paddlers were not there. Those paddling up are awarded the same points as the host paddler with the closest (better) score.

Introduce Portable Points for the 2017 season, amending the rules as set out in the published supporting document. Additionally, to ensure that events in the managed calendar for 2017 are accordance with the Competition Designations set out in the revised rules.

The motion received 51 votes for and 21 votes against, with 6 abstentions. It was therefore adopted.

Following the adoption of this motion, the points targets were adjusted in the previous motions to reflect the changed divisional maximums. This was as originally proposed with each motion and agreed by the meeting.

6.12 Restricting Paddle Up

Proposed and Seconded by Proteus Canoe Club

This proposal was withdrawn as the Portable Points proposal was adopted

6.13 Simplification of the Paddle Up Rules

(CW)

This proposal was withdrawn as the Portable Points proposal was adopted

6.14 Additional fee for on line entry

Proposed and seconded by Shepperton Slalom Canoe Club.....Page 62.

For many years everyone has been keen to see online entry systems introduced, but such systems cost money. Even with volunteers developing the systems in their “spare” time, there are still transaction costs charged by the companies that process the credit/debit cards and there are also hosting costs to consider.

Shepperton has successfully trialled a system this year, but was required to request enhanced fees in order to charge a small transaction fee. If, as we hope, the system is rolled out more widely for 2017 and beyond, it does not make sense for all competitions to have to individually apply.

The following examples apply specifically to the system developed and used for Shepperton, but we believe that similar figures would apply to any system and the proposed rule is therefore more generic.

This year the system used by Shepperton charged 2.2% + 20p per transaction. (Our card processor has a similar pricing structure, hence the 20p base line)

- For a double div 1 this works out at 89p or 2.9% of the entry fee.
- At the other extreme a single div 3 entry would incur a charge of 38p or 4.8%
- Div 4s are not covered by the system but if they were a single div 4 entry would incur 31p or 6.2%



However, with the above we have not covered costs and may need to increase this to, say, 2.6% + 20p (this may depend on how many competitions use the system). This would result in:

- Double div 1 – £1.01 or 3.3%
- Single div 3 – 41p or 5.1%
- Single div 4 – 33p or 6.7%

Regarding cancellations, Shepperton did, this year, return all transaction fees when refunds were given, but depending on the supplier of the payment service this might not always be possible.

(Note that the system used by Shepperton will only be available to other clubs if transaction fees can be charged)

Create a new rule:

UK C11.6.5 A competition that provides for paddlers to enter and pay on-line, may charge an additional transaction fee for on-line entries, without applying for an enhanced fee. This fee must be clearly distinguished as an online transaction charge at the time of payment and cannot be levied against entries received via other means. Where a refund is given (whatsoever the reason) there is no requirement for the transaction fees to be returned. Alternative valid methods of entry must be accepted and given equal treatment.

An amendment was put by Aberdeen Kayak Club, seconded by SCOTS to broaden the scope of the motion to cover other payment methods, and accepted nem con, the motion then read:

Create a new rule:

UK C11.6.5 A competition that provides for paddlers to enter and pay via an alternative method, other than cheque or cash, may charge an additional transaction fee for such entries, without applying for an enhanced fee. This fee must be clearly distinguished as a transaction charge at the time of payment and cannot be levied against entries received via other means. Where a refund is given (whatsoever the reason) there is no requirement for the transaction fees to be returned. Traditional valid methods of entry must be accepted and given equal treatment.

The substantive motion was then voted on, receiving 59 votes for and 4 votes against, with 16 abstentions. It was therefore accepted.

6.15 Division One Practice

Proposed by Strathallan CC seconded by Breadalbane CC

It has been observed that many Division 1 paddlers require significant course practice to master moves following course changes. It is also noted that at many Division 1 venues water time is limited so additional practice may not be available. It has been observed that many new Premier paddlers find the significant step change difficult to contend with as practice is not permitted. In order to try and rationalise the system and to promote more graded paddler development it is proposed to limit course practice at Division 1 events to a single official practice run. This will focus paddler development to include for race preparation in advance of promotion to Premier and should improve the transition. It should also encourage the potential for Officials entries at co-located races to provide additional water and race time. Page 68

UK 22.1.1 At Selection and Premier competitions there will be no training runs. **At Division 1 only a single practice run is allowed, in start race schedule.** At Divisions 12 to 4 at least one run must be available additional practice runs are permitted at the Organiser's discretion.

UK C22.2.1 For each official practice run it is necessary that:

- There be a specific person who is the general overseer and that the directions of this person are adhered to.
- The runs take place with start numbers and in numerical (start) order.
- They are carried out according to the competition rules.
- Usual safety precautions are observed.
- A Rescue Squad is in place when it is required.



- At Championship, and Division 1 competitions and at other competitions when so directed by the Organiser or the Chief Judge, each gate is negotiated once only. A second passage of a gate is allowed only when it is one of a combination of gates that constitutes a single technical manoeuvre so recognised and published in advance at Race Control by the Course Designer(s).
- UK C22.3 Premier and Division 1 Competitors may practice on the course after the conclusion of the Race schedule their individual runs if time is available. At Division ~~2~~ 4, periods for additional practice runs and free practice and procedures for the control of organised free practice must be detailed in the start list. Free practice is allowed at the discretion of the Organiser subject to adequate safety and control provision. During all practice ~~se~~ there should be at least two persons supervising safety, one at the start to organise regular starts and at least one other along the course to ensure that full runs only are attempted where required by the rules or by the Organiser.

The motion received 36 votes for and 39 votes against, with 3 abstentions. It therefore failed.

7 Approval of the Calendar for 2017

Risk management plans have been received from the majority of the competitions. Where the plan has not been received, there is a risk that the organisers will not be insured. Where the plans have not been submitted, risk management plans must be submitted by 15th December, or the event will be removed from the calendar.

Changes and Additions requested after the closing date, but before the Agenda was published, were discussed. These changes were accepted with a short debate.

Where known selection qualification races will be identified in the calendar.

A motion to accept the calendar was proposed by Brecon Kayak Club, seconded by Halifax Canoe Club and carried nem con.

The formal part of the meeting was completed by 15:40



8 General Discussion

8.1 Division 4

A short discussion was led by Jacky Stokes around the statement “The participation figures show a steady and dangerous decline, what can / should we do?”. The new British Canoeing marketing manager is on board to assist in development and will be running schemes to promote canoeing in general, including slalom.

Peter Curry informed the meeting of the changes in the BC / SCA / CANI insurance arrangements. The limit of liability is £10m. This will continue to be monitored and information provided. Steve Rayner asked for any useful topics of enquiry to assist in understanding the new Welsh insurance policy.

8.2 Encouraging people to judge

Martyn Setchell led a debate around the statement “There is a shortage of judges at many events, sharing ideas on how we can develop more judges and encourage people to judge”. An issue seems to be ‘on bank confidence’.

Martyn is running sessions aiming at spreading judging knowledge and confidence. Giving practical experience and knowledge.

Ways of getting people to proactively volunteer, were discussed. Organisers should consider accepting volunteers, even if it shadowing more experienced judges.

Working in advance and asking people to come and assist at a race, with confirmation of the sort of role they will take. This works for section judging and timing teams.

8.3 The Future of C2

Martyn Setchell led a debate around the statement “With C2 dropping out of the Olympics, this has had a huge effect on funding at the top level, how do we encourage the event in the UK, and what changes should we consider for the next ACM?”.

The meeting felt that it would be advantageous if C2 could be run as a single division with the ability to paddle at any division and get points appropriate for that division. This cannot be an instruction to the committee as there is no motion. Further discussion noted that with portable points, C2s can enter whatever level of event they want until they have amassed too many points. With the target being set higher under motion 6.9 the situation should be monitored but no change is required.

8.4 Consortium Organisers

This seems to work well in Yorkshire. Are there any lessons we can learn for the rest of the country? John Sturgess described the way the Yorkshire clubs work together across the board, not just running events.

8.5 TUTTI-2

Andy Grudzinski described some of the issues we have had during the year with TUTTI, stressing the need to report faults and losses. It is important that clubs confirm that the kit they pick up is complete.

He then introduced the meeting to the replacement timing and communications equipment for divisions 2 to 4. The communications system will be like that used at Premier and Division 1 races. Additional waterproofing will be considered. Headsets will be lighter and more comfortable. The intention is to move towards a timing system as used in Scotland. This looks to TUTTI bit also backs up all the times and provides a till roll of the start and finish times. Currently accurate to 1/10 second, and allows extension to use beams etc.

The aim is to have communications, available for the start of the season, with timing available in a similar timeframe.

8.6 Course design and hanging

There was a discussion of the fundamentals of course design. This continued into when competition courses are hung. A general recommendation for all organisers is that the competition course should be hung as close as possible to the actual race. Except in exceptional cases the race course should not be hung until the day before the race.

The meeting closed at 16:30.