



BRITISH CANOEING

Slalom Committee

Fourteenth

Annual Consultative Meeting

25th November 2017

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

Minutes



“Canoeing and Kayaking are “Assumed risk” – “contact sports” may carry attendant risks. Participants should be aware of and accept these risks, and be responsible for their own action and involvement”.



1 Welcome by the Chair

1.1 Welcome and Appointment of Tellers

The Chair thanked British Canoeing for the use of the premises. He then welcomed 39 people, to the meeting; between them, holding 72 votes, representing 30 Clubs.

Apologies were received from Anna Gray: British Canoeing, Michelle Grudzinski: Managed Calendar Officer, John Stoner: Breakout CC, Steve Briggs Matlock CC and Steve Linksted: Co-ordinator.

Peter Curry and David Lindesay were appointed tellers for the meeting.

1.2 Points of Order and Clarifications

The secretary highlighted some typographic errors in the Agenda and apologised for the errors. These were not felt to affect the spirit of the motions.

It was confirmed that when voting, only a Simple Majority is needed, except for changes to Regulations where 2/3 Simple Majority required.

Some club representatives had not brought proof of National Federation membership with them. The Secretary believes they are members and the meeting approved them exercising their club votes.

The order of business for the general discussion was amended so that the guest speaker does not have to stay to the end.

A method of voting for motion 6.15 was proposed and accepted. This is reflected in the minutes.

The Chair clarified that there will be no voting on designation of motions to be handled under rule 5.9. Any vote would require discussion of the motion and result in longer meetings. As motions handled under this rule are introduced then immediately voted on, if there is not a large consensus the motion will move to debate anyway.

1.3 Introduction of Senior British Canoeing Staff

David Joy, Chief Executive and Guin Batten, Head of Development and Strategy were introduced to the meeting and said a few words.

2 Minutes

2.1 13th Annual Consultative Meeting

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

2.2 2016/2017 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, displayed on the wall of the room and is available on line. In the report the Chair noted (inter alia).

Volunteers are the bedrock that supports the sport. The fact that we have such a diverse racing programme is to the credit of dedicated volunteers across that country who freely give their time and effort. He then thanked all volunteers for their efforts throughout the year. However, everyone experiences changing circumstances in their lives and we cannot rely on the same people being there forever and recruitment of new participants is critical in ensuring the sport thrives in the future.

As reported last year we have seen a steady decline in numbers entering Division 4 competitions and that trend has continued. This is the major area where we recruit and introduce new paddlers into the sport. It may be that we are converting more paddlers into regular participant in the ranking system such that the impact further up the divisions is mitigated and this view may be supported by the healthy numbers further up the ranking system, however, it is an area that we need to focus on moving forward.



Procedures and processes are necessary for the administration and smooth running of our sport. The tasks that are required have increased over the years because of additional regulation and the changing nature of engagement with the slalom community. Using the Internet presents an opportunity for streamlining our processes, but systems need to be built to achieve this. We have been fortunate that volunteers have created online tools that are now seen as commonplace; results database, online entry and website. Thanks to Ken Trollope, Duncan Berriman, Nick Penfold, Dee Lindesay and Alan Adams for all their efforts.

On the world stage our GB athletes have again delivered outstanding results including Mallory Franklin being crowned World Champion in C1W. The excellent performances at Junior and U23 level with more boats getting to finals and coming away with medals demonstrates our strength in depth with the promise of more to come. The Home Nation development programmes continue to support aspiring paddlers and their success is evident in the rising standard of paddling amongst our junior competitors with many pushing towards GB squads; U23 and Senior as well as the Junior team. This success is supported by the strength and breadth of our domestic competition structure, delivered by individual canoe clubs, which continues to provide opportunities for competitive racing for all abilities and across all ages.

The role of Chair would be a thankless task without the support and dedication of the committee. Within the committee we have developed an excellent working relationship and even when we disagree (which is quite often) it is always in good spirits. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee for all their efforts and dedication in supporting Canoe Slalom.

He then paid a tribute to Jim Croft who had died recently. For many years Jim was the Slalom Administrator and was very much part of the fabric of the event. In his 40+ years in the sport he touched the lives of many people in very different ways and I'm sure he will live on in fond memories.

3.2 Treasurer's Report

The accounts for the period ended 31st October 2017 were presented. They show a surplus of income over expenditure of £6,450 (2016 £8,698). Income of £25,925 compares with a budget of £25,500, with gross levies 3.7% higher than 2016. Expenditure of £19,475 was £9,075 below budget with underspends across most cost lines.

The Accounts are unaudited. The British Canoeing external auditors will audit them after the ACM. Following the 2016 audit, no changes were made to the accounts presented last year.

The accounts of the England Slalom Committee (ESC) currently remain within, and are overseen by, the Slalom Committee. As at 31st October 2017, the balance of funds held by the committee on behalf of ESC was £19,964. The Accounts for ESC were prepared in conjunction with the ESC Officers.

Having recorded combined surpluses of £35,027 between 2013/14 and 2015/6; the Committee was unable to justify an application for a British Canoeing Competition Grant in the current year.

As at 31 October 2017, the combined closing reserves stand at £73,667. This is a level which is higher than required for the year-to-year running of the sport. Despite efforts to reduce these, another surplus has been recorded and the reserves have therefore increased. Steps will continue to be taken (by both the Committee and the ESC) to reduce the Reserves in 2017/2018.

The Treasurer asked clubs to consider any possible replacements as he is considering standing down at the next ACM

Ken Trollope announced that the donations to the Lifeboat Society from users of simply slalom totalled £345 last year.

A motion to accept the accounts was proposed by Shepperton Slalom Canoe Club, seconded by Seren Dwr club and accepted nem con.

3.3 Other Reports

3.3.1 Reports from Co-ordinators (Tabled, reviewed en bloc)

Steve Linksted (Divisional Development), Event Management (Peter Curry), Marketing and Publicity (Jacky Stokes), Strategic Planning (Dave Spencer), Technical / Timing (Andy Grudzinski), Volunteer (Hazel Ridge)

3.3.2 Other representatives (Tabled, reviewed en bloc)

British Canoeing (Craig Morris), England (Les Ford), Northern Ireland (Matthew McKnight), Scotland (Chris Baillie), Wales (Mark Abbott) and Athlete Representative (Martyn Setchell)



4 Elections

4.1 Vice Chair

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

4.2 Secretary

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

4.3 Committee Members

Co-opted during the year: Steve Linksted (Divisional Development)

Term Expiring 2017, Co-ordinators: Jacky Stokes (Marketing & Publicity), Peter Curry (Safety / Competition Management), Andy Grudzinski (Technical / Timing).

Retiring at this meeting Nick Taylor (Lower Divisions), Nick was thanked for the refreshing attitude he brought to the committee and the work he had put in.

There are therefore three positions open for two years, and two for a single year.

Term Expiring 2018, Co-ordinators: Hazel Ridge (Volunteers)

Steve Linksted, Peter Curry, Andy Grudzinski, and Andy Neave were nominated for election by the Slalom Committee.

Dee Lindesay was nominated by the meeting.

There being no other nominees Steve Linksted, Peter Curry, Andy Grudzinski, and Andy Neave were elected unopposed. The Committee was asked to allot people to available terms.

4.4 Other Officials (elected 'en bloc')

		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 Premier & 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 Premier & Division 1	Sally Atkinson	Veterans 2/3 All Categories	Terry Griffiths
K1 Women Divisions 2 & 3	Tanya Gibbons		

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

5 Awards

5.1 Ed Ecclestone award

Nominees:

- Gareth Bryant
- Dee Lindesay
- Andy Grudzinski
- Colin Woodgate

The award was won by Gareth Bryant for the tremendous work he has done with Llandysul and Canoe Wales.



6 Motions

6.1 ACM Voting

Proposed and Seconded by Holme Pierrepont Canoe Club

This motion affects the Regulations, so requires a 2/3 majority and approval by the BC board

Canoe Slalom needs to get away from the prehistoric notion that one club's point of view is more valuable than another's.

HPPCC has a privileged position of, I believe, 2 votes, whilst some clubs 3 & others 1.

For the good of the sport ALL clubs should have equal voting powers.

Secretary Note, the base wording has been changed to reflect the current nomenclature (e.g. BCU to BC as the GB national body, including the federated unions).

Article 1..... (page 178)

~~...**Voting Club:** Any Club Affiliated to the BC who has registered 3 ranked competitors or Volunteer Groups, whose members have BC membership, registered with the Slalom Secretary and approved at an Annual Consultative Meeting...~~

Article 6 Voting at Consultative Meetings..... (Page 181)

~~**6.1 Each Voting Club will have one vote**~~

~~**6.2 Each such club will have an additional vote for each Ranking Slalom it has organised in the last full competition year, for which any applicable Administration fees have been paid.**~~

6.1 Each Club, affiliated to British Canoeing who has registered 3 ranked paddlers for the last full competition year will have one vote

6.2 Each Club, affiliated to British Canoeing, who do not qualify for a vote under 6.1 above may qualify for a vote by organising a ranking slalom in the last full competition year where all applicable Administration Fees have been paid.

6.3 Volunteer Groups, where the members are members of British Canoeing, registered with the Slalom Secretary and approved by an Annual Meeting will also have one vote.

6.4 Any one Club or Volunteer Group may only hold one vote. These clubs and groups are referred to as 'Voting Clubs'.

~~**6.3 If a competition is organised by one or more clubs, or a consortium of 2 or more clubs, the vote relating to that competition may be assigned to a registered club and the arrangement notified to the secretary**~~

~~**6.4 There is no vote for any event organised by the Slalom Committee**~~

~~**6.5 A voting Club can have as many voting representatives as it has votes.**~~ Each voting representative must be individual members of British Canoeing.

The motion was defeated with 6 votes for, 62 votes against and 4 abstentions. The Committee were asked to review and consult on options for amending the voting rights

6.2 Division 1 / 2 Competitions

Proposed and seconded by Shepperton Slalom Canoe Club

The introduction of paddle up points (for the 2017 season) included a change to the rules such that combined division 1/2 races would no longer be permitted.

For Shepperton this meant that we ran a division 1 as a single division and trialled running a division 2 as a separate competition the following week. Neither competition was full and there were really insufficient entries to the division 2 to justify the continued running of the division 2 as a separate competition.

The loss of the division 1/2 competitions means that most division 2s are combined with division 3s and there will be even fewer division 2 competitions run on more testing water.

We therefore propose that the ability to run a combined division 1/2 is reinstated.

(Note: a reason given for removing division 1/2s was not wanting to encourage division 3s to paddle up on what was essentially a division 1 course; we believe this is addressed by the last bullet point)..... Page 52



B1.2 Competition Designation

Competition will take one of the forms below:

All Premier Competitions - Single division events, open to Premier paddlers and Division 1's paddling up.

All Division 1 Competitions - Single division events, open to Division 1 paddlers and Division 2's paddling up.

Division 1/2 Competitions – Two-division competition, open equally to division 1 and division 2 ranked competitors.

• In each competition, there is a separate race for each division and separate points and prizes are awarded

• The course is designed to division 1 standard, but may incorporate changes to accommodate division 2 paddlers (e.g. omission of gates, different start points).

• There is no paddle-up option for division 2 paddlers at a division 1/2 competition. (A division 2 paddler beating paddlers at division 1 will be awarded only the points earned against other division 2 paddlers and a division 2 paddler cannot enter the division 1 event as a paddle-up competitor).

• Division 3 paddlers cannot enter a division 1/2 competition as paddle-up competitors.

Division 2 Competitions - Single division events, open to Division 2 paddlers and Division 3's paddling up.

Division 3 Competitions - Single division events, open to Division 3 paddlers, which may be combined with Division 4 competitions.

Division 2/3 Competitions - Two-division events, open equally to Division 2 and Division 3 ranked competitors, which may be combined with Division 4 competitions.

- In each event there is a separate race for each division and separate points are awarded.
- Prizes are offered for both Division 2 and Division 3 competitors.
- The course is to be designed to Division 2 standard, but may incorporate changes to accommodate Division 3 and Division 4 paddlers (e.g. reduction in the number of pumps at Pinkston or a different start point at sites such as Bala Mill).
- There is no paddle up option for Division 3 at a Division 2/3 competition. A Division 3 paddler beating paddlers in Division 2 will be awarded only the points earned against other Division 3 paddlers and a Division 3 cannot enter the Division 2 event as a paddle up competitor.

Division 4 Competitions - Single division events, open to novices and other Division paddlers. May be free-standing or combined with Division 3, Division 2/3 events and open events.

An Amendment was proposed by Llandysul Paddlers and seconded by Viking Kayak Club such that the second bullet point becomes:

The course is designed to Division 1 standard, but 1 or more gates must be change moved or declared as not part of the Division 2 course so as to remove or simplify at least one challenging technical move

This amendment was defeated 21 votes for, 45 votes against and 6 abstentions

The original motion was defeated with 28 votes for, 42 votes against and no abstentions.

6.3 Veterans Ranking

Proposed by Brecon Canoe Club, Seconded by Matlock Canoe Club and Llandysul Paddlers

Following consultation and discussion, both on the bulletin board and via email, the motion below draws together the proposer and seconders views of the debate and replaces all of section B5 (Pages 58 – 60)

B5 Veterans' Ranking

- 5.1 Paddlers aged over 35 may elect to be classed as veterans. Veterans are ranked in a single Division and can enter any ranking competition or Championship event.



5.2 Eligibility

- 5.2.1 A Competitor whose 35th birthday is on or before the 31st December in the year in question may elect to become a Veteran in any event, but not necessarily in all the events in which they compete. For example, a Competitor ranked in Kayak Men and Canadian Men may elect to become a Kayak Men Veteran but remain as a Master in Canadian Men (See Rule C3.5 for Masters).
- 5.2.2 Any such Competitor must first declare to the Veteran Ranking Compiler his/her year of birth and current divisional status (*if any*).
- 5.2.3 Upon application to the Ranking Status Officer (*see B 2.2*), any Veteran may revert to divisional status in an event. The revised ranking will start at the beginning of the next season.

5.3 Calculating points – Quorate Divisional Event

- 5.3.1 If a corresponding Divisional event is quorate (*see Rule UKC5.1*) the following calculations are applicable.

Ranking points are obtained by comparing scores with the corresponding Divisional event. Where a Veteran's score does not correspond exactly with a score in the Divisional event points will be awarded for the next place higher. If the Veteran's score matches the score of more than one competitor in the corresponding Divisional event then the points awarded to the higher placed Divisional competitor will be used.

- 5.3.2 Where there is progression from qualification to (semi-finals and) finals, scores are compared with the corresponding Divisional event scores to decide whether the competitor progresses and the points they are awarded.

For example: for a Vet K1W, if the paddler's score is equal to or less than the score of the last placed Divisional K1 Woman qualifying from the heats, the paddler proceeds to the next stage. Similarly, the paddler must match the score of the last placed Divisional K1 Woman qualifying from the semi-final to progress to the final. Points are calculated by comparison with the scores of Divisional K1 Women at the last stage reached.

- 5.3.3 In the case of a competition hosting more than one Division, scores will be compared with every Division in the same event and the highest points found will be awarded, for instance, at a Division 2/3 race, a K1W Veteran's score will be compared with those of K1 Women in both Division 2 and Division 3 and the higher score so found will be awarded.

5.4 Calculating points – Inquorate Divisional Event

- 5.4.1 If the corresponding Divisional event is inquorate (*see Rule UKC5.1*) ranking points will be calculated against the corresponding Kayak Men's event using the method described in section B4.2.

- 5.4.2 Where there is progression from qualification to (semifinals and) finals, modified scores are compared with K1 Men's scores to decide whether the competitor progresses and the points they are awarded.

- 5.4.3 In the case of a competition hosting more than one Division, where any one (or more) of the corresponding divisional events is inquorate the Veteran's modified score will be compared to K1Ms scores for *that* division and to the corresponding quorate divisional events where available. The highest points found will be awarded.

For example: A Division 2/3 race hosts a Division 3 K1W event that is inquorate and a Division 2 K1W event that is quorate. In this case a K1W Veteran's modified score will be compared with those of K1 Men in Division 3 (using the method described in B4.2.) and her raw score with Division 2 K1W (using the method described in B5.3). The highest score so found will be awarded.

5.5 End of season results

- 5.5.1 Ranking positions at the end of the season are calculated on the best five results obtained in the season.

5.6 Additional Information

- 5.6.1 For single division competitions the entry fee charged shall be the same as for those Competitors entering the divisional event.

- 5.6.2 At multi divisional competitions the entry fee charged will be that for the highest division competing on that day. If this is different across different days of the competition, then Vets will be charged half of the sum of the two double entry.



5.6.2 All registered Veterans must apply to the appropriate bib officer for a bib.

6.3.1 *Committee Amendment*

There is complication in having to compare all results to a single division

5.3.3 In the case of a competition hosting more than one Division, scores will be compared to the highest Division in the same event.

After some debate the amendment was defeated with 7 votes for, 62 votes against and 3 abstentions.

An amendment was proposed that veterans may only paddle up to the highest division in which they have been ranked.

Proposed by Kingston Kayak Club, seconded by Viking Kayak Club

The amendment was defeated with 5 votes for, 59 votes against and 8 abstentions.

The substantive motion was then voted on and was accepted with 59 votes for, 10 votes against and 3 abstentions.

6.4 Super Final Format

The format for super final was adopted by a sizable majority at the 2016 ACM. The committee feels that the feedback from the riverbank is strong enough to warrant revisiting this matter not rejecting it under regulation 5.7 (page 181)

There have been discussions about the super final, a consistent approach is that those not making a final will be ranked on the best of their two qualification runs.

The format in the yearbook was used at the early Grandtully race, this was not popular with paddlers.

The two alternates were discussed together and voted on individually so that one or other or both formats can be used in 2018.

6.4.1 *Qualification from both heats*

The format will be retained, except that for those not making the final, the result will be based on the best result from their two qualification runs.....(Page 53)

B1.3.2 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 qualifying 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 finishing order of competitors taking a second heats run based on their second heats run only.~~
- The remaining competitors in order of their **best run from the two runs. first heats run.**

The motion was accepted, 58 votes for, 12 votes against and 2 abstentions.

6.4.2 *Qualification from first run only*

An alternate would be to have qualification for the final only from the first qualification run.....(Page 53)

B1.3.2 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 qualifying 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 finishing order of competitors taking a second heats run based on their second heats run only.~~
- The remaining competitors in order of their **best run from the two runs.** ~~first heats run.~~

The motion was accepted, 67 votes for, 3 votes against and 2 abstentions.

There are therefore two Super Final formats that can be used in the 2018 season. Competition organisers must declare before 10th December which format they will be using. Organisers were asked to consider that the second format does not work well in the latter half of the season.

6.5 Officials' Competition

75/25

The current rules impose a limit on the number of officials which is artificially high. To clean up the rule book, the artificial limit should be removed. Page 60

B6 Officials' Competition

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.~~

At Division 1 and Premier races a competitor may not enter both a ranking or Championship Competition and an Officials Competition in the same or different events. At Division 2 to 4 competitions such a double entry in different events is at the organisers' discretion and subject to completion of the official's duties.

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

6.6 Promotion Levels

Promotion, and the consequent size of the divisions, are driven mainly by:

- *The promotion targets*
- *The number of races (more races = more points-getting opportunities)*
- *The number of competitors in each race (more competitors = more paddlers getting promotion-capable points, but there is a counter factor: in smaller fields, proportionately more competitors get wins, to count towards promotion either on points or on wins)*
- *A random element – how the points get distributed*

Additional factors in managing divisional numbers are:

- *Short Season status*
- *The demotion cutoff*

Below are the numbers promoted in 2016, with the number who raced in each class and division and the percentages promoted. On current form, 2017 figures will be similar, with a marginal drop in C1 numbers due to higher targets - but this affects mainly promotion from Division 1 to Prem.

	K1W			K1M			C1W			C1M			Totals		
	Prom	Raced	%	Prom	Raced	%									
Division 1 to Prem	14	73	19.18	23	155	14.84	8	34	23.53	10	51	19.61	55	313	17.57
Division 2 to Division 1	22	92	23.91	46	173	26.59	10	28	35.71	20	57	35.09	98	350	28.00
Division 3 to Division 2	32	126	25.40	58	211	27.49	15	28	53.57	22	51	43.14	127	416	30.53

The obvious tendencies:

- *Proportionately more are promoted in the lower divisions*
- *Proportionately more C1s are promoted than K1s*

Division 1 numbers increase by around 50 (net) over the course of each year, Division 2 numbers by about 30.

Promotion Targets

The current targets for promotion to Prem ask the paddler, in effect, to get into the top 5% of the field 5 times – against substantial competition, on fairly tough courses, and with a maximum of 18 or 20 races available. That's pretty demanding.

By comparison, a Division 2 needs to get into the top 10% 5 times, with around 50 races on the calendar. The standard to beat isn't high, partly because talent keeps getting promoted out of the division.



There are two consequences

- Oversubscribed Division 1 races, especially later in the year
- A dumbing-down of Division 2 as talent is striped out.

Increasing promotion targets for Division 2 and Division 3 is proposed. It's hard to predict the impact of any increase, so a phased approach is suggested, with a small increase for 2018, another for 2019 to be reviewed at the next ACM.

The Other Factors

Number of races

It would be pretty negative to try to cut down the number of races, and a regional factor has always been assumed for Division 2 and 3.

The number of competitors in each race

Not something we'd want to limit any more than necessary for the site

Short Season status

Currently those promoted get Short Season status, and protection from demotion, however early in the year they are promoted. At demotion time this is frustrating; we are unable to demote either paddlers who had almost a whole season to demonstrate their worth and failed, or who sat back and did nothing knowing they would not go down. Redefining Short Season as "promoted after 30th June" but the effect on numbers would be small and needs consideration especially in regard to the seasonal divisions

The Demotion Cut off

Here the committee has discretion, although there are expectations – going much above the 1000 mark (which we expect to interpret as 2000, 1000, 500 this year). The large number of short season paddlers means very heavy cuts would be needed to make a difference.

Targets

				2018		Possible 2019	
	Target	5 wins	% 5 Wins	Target	% 5 Wins	Target	% 5 Wins
Division 1 to Prem	4,750	5,000	95	4,750	95	4,750	95
Division 2 to Division 1	2,250	2,500	90	2,300	92	2,350	94
Division 3 to Division 2	1,040	1,250	83.2	1,070	85.6	1,100	88

Page 57

B4.3.2 Promotion in all other Divisions

Promotion will be gained by attaining the following points from the five best results:

Division 1 to Premier	4750
Division 2 to Division 1	2250 2300
Division 3 to Division 2	1040 1070

The motion was accepted, 51 votes for, 11 votes against and no abstentions.

6.7 Inquorate Division 4 Events

There have been events this year where division 4 has been inquorate, but individual paddlers would have finished well up the Division 3 results. As the event was inquorate the paddlers involved were not promoted. Some have used this to apply for ranking status, some have been just ranked in division three by the organiser (there is no allowance for this in the rules).

We want to encourage people to stay in or take up the sport, and not recognising their obvious standard of paddling is counter-productive. This motion offers a way to promote paddlers that are obviously of division 3 standard regardless of whether the division 4 is quorate..... Page 57

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)

All Events: 1 in 5 (or part thereof if quorate)

OR if their score is better than that of a competitor awarded more than 100 points in the corresponding division 3 event

If an Event is not quorate, then Competitors are promoted if their score would have gained promotion when compared to another quorate event as follows:



- C1M/C2/K1W: if they would have been promoted in the K1M 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.

The motion was accepted, nem can.

The Committee were asked to review the position for stand alone division 4 races.

6.8 C2 Ranking

Following consultation with those who have an active interest in the C2 event, changes are proposed in order to foster the future of the event in this country. The basics are that

- we will return to a single division for C2s
- registered C2s can enter any event
- Scratch crews (unregistered) would be able to enter lower division races (division 2 and below) on the day should they wish to do so and the event was not already full and entries are still open.
- All ranking points for C2 crews would be calculated by run time comparison against the K1 Men's run times after a 20% adjustment had been applied to the C2 run times across all race divisions.
- The ranking points shown on the ranking database would only indicate points secured by registered C2 crews but ranking points from the last 5 weeks could be claimed retrospectively when a bib application is made

B1.1 Divisions Page 52

The divisional system of five divisions (Premier, 1, 2, 3, and 4) in each of four events (K1M, K1W, C1M, C1W) and ~~three divisions (Premier/1, 2/3 and 4)~~ **one division** in the C2 event ensures there is a standard of competition suitable for Competitors of all degrees of ability....

B2.3 Changing Event Page 54

Any Competitor wishing to compete in another event, must compete in the division below their lowest current ranking, ~~(for C2s, the lowest current ranking of either paddler)~~ unless it is considered more appropriate for them to compete in a higher division, in which case, application must be made to the Ranking Status Officer.

B2.4 New Competitors

B2.4.1 New competitors, ~~and any new C2 pairings containing a Competitor who has never been ranked higher than Division 4,~~ must compete ~~as a~~ **in** Division 4 ~~crew~~.

B2.4.2 New Competitors, ~~or C2 crews,~~ of proven ability may apply for Ranking Status giving full supporting evidence why they should not have to begin in Division 4. Ranking Status must be taken up in the season in which it is granted.

B2.4.3 New C2 Pairings

New C2 crews, of proven ability may apply for Ranking Status. Ranking Status must be taken up in the season in which it is granted

New C2 pairings that have not applied for ranking status may enter any competition at division 2 or below provided they demonstrate their competence to race on the water conditions at the competition. If the organiser refuses entry based on lack of competency then the crew have right of appeal to the competition Chief Judge

New B4.1.2 (renumbering following paragraphs)..... Page 56

B4.1.2 C2 Points Calculation

Ranking points awarded will be those given to the competitor in the corresponding Kayak Men event whose score matches the Competitors modified score; which is calculated by dividing by 1.2 and rounding down to the accuracy of the competition.

Unranked crews must apply for Ranking Status within 5 weeks of the competition in order to retain the ranking points allocated.

..... Page 57



B4.2.2 In the case where a Kayak Women's or Canadian event is inquorate, points awarded will be those given to the competitor in the corresponding Kayak Men event whose score matches the Competitors modified score; which is calculated by dividing by the following factor and rounding down to the accuracy of the competition.

Kayak Women Singles.	1.12
Canadian Men Singles.	1.08
Canadian Women Singles.	1.20
Canadian Doubles Prem/1.	1.10
Canadian Doubles 2/3.	1.20

B4.3.1 Promotion from Division 4 to Division 3 Page 57

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

All Events: 1 in 5 (or part thereof if quorate)

If an Event is not quorate, then Competitors are promoted if their score would have gained promotion when compared to another quorate event as follows:-

C1M/~~C2~~/K1W: if they would have been promoted in the K1M 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.

B5.1 The Divisional System Page 58 NB may be changed by veterans motion

Veterans are ranked in 3 divisions for K1 and C1 (Division 3, Division 2 and Premier/1) and ~~2~~ **1** divisions for C2 (~~Division 2/3 and Premier/1~~).

B5.2.4 A Veteran C2 crew ~~ranked in Division 2/3~~ may enter any ~~Division 2 or Division 3~~ competition and will be awarded ranking points and be eligible for prizes.

B5.5.2. Premier/Division 1 Veterans Page 60 NB may be changed by veterans motion

Ranking points will be calculated against the corresponding Kayak Men's event using the method described in section B4.2, with the following exception.

Scores will be modified using the following factors before comparison with the K1 Men's results:

Kayak Men Singles	1.20
Kayak Women Singles	1.34
Canadian Men Singles	1.30
Canadian Women Singles	1.44
Canadian Doubles	1.32

..... Page 64

UK C6.1.1 A Competitor may participate in more than one individual event, subject to the Organiser being willing and able to give sufficient start time intervals. In the case of C2, a Competitor may compete with multiple partners ~~in each Division for which they are eligible~~.

An Amendment was proposed by Brecon CC, seconded by Viking Kayak club to amend the motion so that

Unranked C2 pairings may enter any competition at division 2 or below. ~~Competitors may be required to demonstrate their competence to race on the water conditions at the competition. If the organiser refuses entry based on lack of competency then the crew have right of appeal to the competition Chief Judge~~

The amendment and then the substantive motion was accepted, nem con.

6.9 Entry Deadlines

75/25

The positioning of Priority and Entry deadlines in the yearbook make it difficult to get a clear view of the deadlines for entering an event. Moving them to a single location should clarify the rules. Page 55

B3.3.2 "Paddle Up" Participation Conditions

The entry fee payable will be the same as for competitors in the Host division.



Paddle Up competitors must wear their normal divisional bib when racing.

~~The competition organiser may impose a limit on numbers, either in the published calendar or at the time of planning the start list. If such a limit is applied, priority of entry shall be as follows:~~

- ~~a) Up to the priority entry deadline: Host division paddlers, in order of receipt of entries, then “paddlers up”, in order of receipt of entries.~~
- ~~b) After the priority entry deadline up to entry cut-off: both Host division and “paddling up” paddlers in order of receipt of entries.~~

~~Note: the priority entry deadline is the Friday four weeks prior to the competition.~~

Page 68

UK C11.2 The deadline for entries to Ranking Competitions shall be 15 days prior to the first day of the competition (the Friday two weeks prior to the competition).

The priority entry deadline (before which host paddlers get priority of entry) is the Friday four weeks prior to the competition

The competition organiser may impose a limit on numbers, either in the published calendar or at the time of planning the start list. If such a limit is applied, priority of entry shall be as follows:

- Up to the priority entry deadline: Host division paddlers, in order of receipt of entries, then “paddlers up”, in order of receipt of entries.
- b) After the priority entry deadline up to entry cut-off: both Host division and “paddling up” paddlers in order of receipt of entries.

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

6.10 Processing wait lists for oversubscribed races

75/25

The rules and procedures for handling waiting lists are not explicit. Page 68

UK C11.2 The deadline for entries to Ranking Competitions shall be 15 days prior to the first day of the competition (the Friday two weeks prior to the competition).

The priority entry deadline (before which host paddlers get priority of entry) is the Friday four weeks prior to the competition

The competition organiser may impose a limit on numbers, either in the published calendar or at the time of planning the start list. If such a limit is applied, priority of entry shall be as follows:

- a) **Up to and including the Priority Entry Deadline:** Host division paddlers, in order of receipt of entries.
- b) After the Priority Entry Deadline host paddlers in order of receipt, followed by “paddling up” in order of receipt.**

If a paddler is promoted, their entry is treated as a host division entry received at the date the organiser is notified. If the Competitor has an accepted paddle up entry this will be converted to a Host division entry, otherwise they will remain on the waiting list, but with higher (host) priority

After a brief debate, this was voted on and adopted with 48 for 9 against, 12 abstentions

6.11 Late Entry Acceptance

75/25

There is still some confusion over the rules for accepting late entries, particularly where a paddler has just been promoted. The wording below attempts to clarify the position. Page 68ff

UK C11.3 Late entries **will not (made after the closing deadline) will only** be accepted **except**

- ~~(a) from newly promoted Competitors whose promotion has not occurred more than two weeks before the event.~~
- ~~(b) from Competitors whose entry has been returned due to the cancellation of another event that weekend.~~



~~(c) from Competitors whose entry, made on time, has been returned from an over-subscribed event, in the same event/division that weekend.~~

~~(a) at the discretion of the Organiser and,~~

~~(b) where there is space on the published timetable and the entry limit has not been reached-~~

~~A late entry fee is payable, unless the Competitor has been promoted after the closing deadline on payment of an extra charge a late entry may be accepted.~~

The organising club retains the extra charge in each case and may waive the charge at their sole discretion at Divisions 2 and 3 events. There is no late entry charge for Division 4 events. The late entry fees are linked to inflation as in Rule UK C11.6.3.

~~(c) in the case of scratch team entries, without extra charge.~~

This motion was handled under article 5.9 and voted on immediately. 47 for the motion, 19 against, 5 abstentions and a debate ensued.

The motion was amended by agreement as above, and was adopted nem con.

6.12 Event limits

75/25

The rules relating to entry limits are spread around the yearbook, and relate to the days when entries were defeated rather than held on a waiting list they should be consolidated. Many instances have been rationalised / removed in the motions above, a few instances remain..... Page 71

~~UK C12.2 The Organiser must accept all entries which are correctly made and received by the closing date unless the published limit for the competition has been reached.~~

~~UKC12.3.1 Entries received after the limit is reached should be defeated except that the limit may be exceeded in order to make a event quorate. When a correct entry for a event is defeated no further entries should be accepted.~~

~~Where the entry limit is reached, the Organiser may allocate spare places created by scratched entries, but only to those Competitors whose entries had been received before the closing date for entries, but after the limit had been reached.~~

~~UKC12.3.2 The Organiser must return defeated entries promptly.~~

Page 76ff

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

6.13 Entry Refundable

75/25

Although the rules state that entry fees are not refundable, many organisers do refund entry fees if given sufficient notice. The rules should reflect the accepted practice. Page 70

UK C11.6.2 ENTRY FEES ARE NOT RETURNABLE - except:

- where a Competitor is promoted to a higher division and is thus ineligible to compete in an event already entered. The entry fees will be refunded providing the Organiser is notified **AT LEAST FIVE DAYS** before the competition.

~~-if a competition is cancelled prior to the publication of a start list or on or before the Saturday of the immediately preceding weekend, whichever is the earlier.~~

~~- if a competition is cancelled Rule D6 applies and refunds are applicable. -due to circumstances beyond the control of Organiser, up to the time that the course is declared open for free practice, (official practice for Premier/Division 1).~~

~~- If the entry can be replaced.~~

This motion was handled under article 5.9 and 28 against voted on immediately. There were votes for, 43 against and abstentions.

An Amendment was proposed by Halifax and seconded by Viking Kayak so that the motion reads:

UK C11.6.2. ENTRY FEES

Organisers are under no obligation to refund entry fees except:

- where a Competitor is promoted to a higher division and is thus ineligible to compete in an event already entered, the entry fees will be refunded providing the Organiser is notified **before** the competition.



- under Rule D6.

The Amendment and the amended motion were adopted nem con.

6.14 Removing Double Entry Fees

Proposed by Shepperton Slalom Canoe Club, Seconded by CRCATS and Strathallan Canoe Club

The doubles vs single entries complicates things for online entries and to a lesser degree for organisers and newcomers.

It also causes complications for organisers when completing the returns and calculating levies as they have to work out which entries are single entries and which are doubles.

It also complicates multi-class discounts and complicates promotions at Division 2/3 or Division 3/4 ranking races when a paddler competes in different Divisions on Saturday and Sunday

In 2017 there were (approximately):

Division	Doubles	Singles	Notes
Prem	2	5	1 with enhanced fee
1	8	1	1 with enhanced fee
2	23	3	but of the singles, 2 charged enhanced fees
3	40	2	
4	37	7	

Based on these, there would be very little difference to Division 2, Division 3s and Division 4s if we just set the entrance fee to 1/2 the current double rate for all events, (so based on 2017: Division 4 - £4, Division 3 - £6.50, Division 2 - £8.50), and similarly adjusted levies. Division 1 and Prem are not quite so clear cut, but not so far off

Adjusting fees and levies to have a rate-per-entry and ignore the double rate is unlikely to have any significant impact to what competitors pay over the year, or to the income for different competitions. As is currently the case, competitions can apply for enhanced fees.

There are no rules that specify entry fees, so there are no rule changes, there will be simplification of competition returns, and of list of entry fees. In order to preserve the level of entry the rule linking entry fees to inflation will be updated to count inflation from the current year, rounding to 10p rather than 25p as handling 5ps are difficult at events.

An amendment proposed by Brecon and seconded by Mold to leave division 4 entries at £5 per day was with 32 for 28 against and 7 abstentions.

A separate amendment was put that the division 4 entry fee is a maximum rather than an absolute, proposed by Kingston, seconded by Halifax CC. This was defeated with 18 votes for 41 votes against and 6 abstentions.

Llandysul proposed an amendment that Division 1 entry fees should remain the same level as Premier entries this was seconded by Proteus Canoe Club. This was accepted with 34 votes for 33 votes against and 4 abstentions.

Following the acceptance of the amendment, a further amendment was put that the Division 1/premier entry fee be set at £16 /£21. This was proposed by Shepperton CC and seconded by Midland CC, then accepted nem con.

The substantive motion as below was accepted, nem con. Double entry fees will be removed, minimum entry fees will be standard for all races, with double races attracting twice the entry fee of a single. To be financially neutral, single entry fees will be reduced as follows:

Division	Standard	Double	Late Entry	Double Late Entry
Premier / Division 1	£19.50 £16.00	£31.25	£24.50 £21.00	£41.25
Division 2	£10.75 £8.50	£17.00	£15.75 £13.50	£24.50
Division 3	£8.25 £6.50	£13.00	£9.50 £7.80	£15.50
Division 4	£5.00	£8.00		N/A

Change Rule C11.6.3 (page 70) as follows

UK C11.6.3 Minimum Entry Fees will be increased annually by the lower of the increase in Retail Price Index (RPI) or the Consumer Price Index (CPI) according to the formula:

New fee = A + {A x [(B-C) / C]}, rounded to nearest **2510**p. Where

A = the entry fee for **20072018**



B = the index for September immediately prior to the relevant ACM
C = the index for September ~~2006~~2017

6.15 Multi Class Discount

Four motions have been received, all four were debated, then voted as noted in 6.15.5 below.

6.15.1 Remove MCD, and reduce C2 Minimum Entry Fee

Remove Multiclass discount as above, but reduce the entry fee to 50% for the C2 event to encourage and promote the retention of the class.

6.15.2 Proposed by Viking Kayak Club and Seconded by Taunton Canoe Club

Having taken on the processing of Cardington Division 2/3/4 slalom entries for the first time this year, the biggest single headache and thing that would prevent me doing it again was multi class discounts (MCDs). Entries for over 650 boat/days were received prior to the events, about a quarter of these were eligible for MCDs. Of those eligible for MCDs 80% of them were wrong, in the majority of cases (almost 70% of those eligible) the MCD had not been applied. The incorrect entries were not confined to those new to the sport, many of the people who didn't apply MCDs to their entries were in Division 2. Even after having MCDs explained to them at the June event they still failed to apply them for the September event. The other MCD errors encountered were, wrong discount, applying discount to both days of a double entry and applying discount to all classes. Dealing with incorrect MCDs significantly increased the complexity and hence time taken to process entries, increased effort was required for the following tasks:

- *Calculating expected entry fees.*
- *Determining why fees paid didn't match fees expected, this is particularly difficult when an a single check is received for entries for multiple people.*
- *Communicating with people who had submitted incorrect fees including explaining how multiclass entry fees work as they are not well understood.*
- *Obtaining sufficient change to refund unclaimed MCDs at the event.*
- *Refunding unclaimed MCDs.*
- *Recalculating fees along with associated refunds or additional payments when part of multiclass entries changed both before the event and/ or after day 1.*
- *While not a result of incorrect MCDs, completing the MCD sheet of the Slalom Summary spread sheets after the events was also very time consuming.*

The complexities around MCD rules would make them very difficult and time consuming to implement in the online entry system and once implemented would add significantly to the system maintenance overhead (This has been confirmed by Dee Lindsay, creator of the Online entry system).

Conclusions

1. *Organising a slalom event is extremely time consuming and as such there is a very limited group of people who are prepared to do it. If the sport is going to be sustainable every effort should be made to simplify event organisation. MCDs add significantly to the complexity and should be removed.*
2. *The purpose of MCDs is to encourage participation in additional classes. The data collected at this year's Cardington events shows that the majority of paddlers participating in multiple classes do so without the incentive of a discount. MCDs do not incentivise participation in the majority of cases.*

Viking Kayak Club proposes that all references to multiclass discounts are removed from the Slalom Rules. In the 2017 year book this would require removal of the Multi-class entries paragraph below the 2017 Entry Fees on page 102.

6.15.3 Proposed and seconded by Shepperton Slalom Canoe Club

Multi class discount is complex and made more so by being applied across the whole weekend. If double entry fees are abolished, then it makes sense to amend the discount to be half the current rate but to be applied by day.

At Division 2 and below a discount of £1.50 will be offered for second and subsequent individual entries on the same day of a completion, by the same competitor. A single discount may be earned or claimed for each boat. (Only 1 competitor of a C2 crew can claim discount for their individual event).



6.15.4 Proposed by CRCATS and seconded by Strathallan Canoe Club

The multi class discount was introduced to encourage paddlers to compete in more than 1 class without it being too expensive. Multi class discount is complex and made more so by being applied across the whole weekend. If double entry fees are abolished then it makes sense to amend the discount to be applied per day. Paddlers are already paying enough for a the first class and should be encouraged to race in multiple classes so they get more from a race. This should also help make C1 events more likely to be quorate and should encourage C2.

Note this is written on the basis that the previous motion is adopted. If this is not the case, the wording may be altered to retain the purpose of the motion.

At Division 2 and below, the entry fee for an additional entry by the same competitor on the same day will be 50% of the entry fee for the lower Division. For C2, the 50% entry fee applies if either or both paddlers have another entry.

6.15.5 Voting

In order to present the most flexibility, and properly reflect the views of the meeting, votes were held as follows:

That Multi class discounts should be discontinued as suggested by motions 6.15.1 and 6.15.2

The motion was accepted, nem con. Motions 6.15.3 and 6.15.4 were therefore defeated.

Following removal of multi class discounts, and to encourage entry to the event, standard C2 entry fees should be halved as proposed in motion 6.15.2. Enhanced entry fees will not be changed

The motion was accepted, 43 votes for, 10 votes against and no abstentions. Motion 6.15.1 was therefore adopted, and 6.15.2 defeated.

6.16 Division 3 Levies

Proposed by CR CATS and Strathallan

That levies for Division 3 races from Division 2/3 events are brought into line with Division 3 and Division 3/4 races i.e. no levies will be payable on the Division 3 entries at a Division 2/3 race Page 91

D7.10 The percentages for each type of competition will be
Premier and Division 1, 45%
Division 2, 40%
~~Division 2/3, 40%~~
Divisions 3 and 4, nil

There was no one present to put the motion, rather than strike the motion the chair asked the meeting. It was agreed to debate the motion.

The motion was accepted, nem con.

6.17 Rules on practice

75/25

The rules relating to practicing on the course have two small areas that would benefit from tidying up:

- *How is a gate sequence identified to allow repeat practice?*
- *And when can paddlers with restricted practice can have additional time on the course. Page 77*

UK C22.2.1 For each official training 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 **R**escue **S**squad is in place when it is required.



- ~~Official training runs are completed as a single attempt at the course. 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 by the Course Designer(s).~~

UK C22.3 ~~Premier competitors may practice on the course after the conclusion of their individual runs if time is available.~~ At Division 1 to 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, 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.

This motion was handled under article 5.9 and voted on immediately. It was adopted with 1 objection.

6.18 Statutes / Regulations

This motion affects the Regulations, so requires a 2/3 majority and approval by the BC board

This has been 'on the cards' for the past few years. In 2015 BC suggested that they were going to propose a 'standard set of regulations for all disciplines to use'. This standard is still awaited.

Meanwhile the regulations are basically those that were in place before federalisation with a few name changes by the then Secretary. Some of these names have since been replaced, such as 'British Canoe Union'. This committee authorises the Secretary to update the names appropriately. Further it instructs him to press British Canoeing at the highest level for either a 'standard' or guidance in how the regulations should have changed for Federalisation.

The motion was accepted, nem con.

7 Approval of the Calendar for 2018

Clubs are reminded that their competition cannot be accepted unless a Safety Plan has been supplied. Reminders of the closing dates should be sent to all organisers as well as being put on the Web Site.

If possible, the developing calendar should be posted more often.

The organisers were thanked for supplying safety plans for the events. There are still a number of events that do not have a safety plan. British Canoeing would prefer to have safety plans in place before they appear on the Calendar. Plans for all races should be in place by the end of January. The Committee is authorised to remove the ranking status from any events that have not supplied Safety plans three months before the competition.

The Calendar, with some amendments was accepted, subject to resolution of:

- *Provisional changes to the accepted calendar are that Ironbridge 2/3 move to 23/24 June*
- *Bala Mill 2,3,4 move to 16/17 June*
- *Orton Mere and Stone will then move forward one week.*

If these changes are to be accepted they must be confirmed by end of November.



8 General Discussion

8.1 Coaching (Mike Chandler)

Mike Chandler presented the updates currently being rolled out across the nation.

8.2 Back to Back runs vs First Runs, Second runs (Martyn Setchell)

Martyn discussed the options available when running events, and the pros and cons of splitting the events so some have first and second runs in the morning, others have both runs in the afternoon. This allows competitors to be asked to help judging when they are not preparing for a race run. It also mimics the approach being taken abroad.

It is important, however, that any such scheduling is published in advance so that paddlers can plan their day.

8.3 Entry Opening Date (Mark Abbott)

Increasingly, competitions are getting oversubscribed early in the season, with people entering for the whole season very early in the year. The drop off from these entries is often as high as 30% before the race. This is unfair on other competitors, who may not be able to commit so far ahead, so are forever on waiting lists, and on newly promotes who can no longer get entries.

Imposing a date before which entries will not be accepted is intended to reduce the drop off, and allow people a chance to get an entry to the slaloms at the middle and back end of the year.

There was a variation in the experience and requirements. There is nothing in the rules to prevent organisers publicising an opening date, if they want, or having entries accepted from the start of the season. The form sent out for competition details will be modified to include information regarding entry limits.

8.4 Abuse of Officials (Andy Grudzinski)

There seems to have been an increase in the number of occasions where judges, starters and Juries have been approached and abused over decisions being taken. In some cases, these have been carried on not just for hours, but across competitions, and in one case months.

All of those mentioned are volunteers, it was agreed that this is unacceptable.

Club coaches are encouraged to educate their athletes in the acceptable behaviours and the duties

The Code of Conduct should be part of the bib application, and will need signature by paddler and parent for juniors. The Code of conduct will be reviewed.

8.5 Course Erection (Mark Abbott)

The current rules allow for unofficial practice for division 1 paddlers. It is acknowledged that many Division 1 paddlers spend considerable time on courses 'mastering certain moves before a race (or between races on a two-day event sometimes early in the morning). This has the disadvantage that when they gain promotion to Premier they are unable to paddle courses as they are used to numerous practice runs.

The availability of volunteers before the weekend, is another issue for setting up the course. There are also a number of paddlers whose only chance to paddle on water of that quality is the practice runs. Where there are reduced manpower available immediately before the race, gates could be hung on the side of the river, and not moved to the correct position on the Friday night.

It is difficult to change the rules to prevent this, and enforcing such rules is problematic. Clubs are encouraged to consider the perception that race courses are being set up weeks in advance.

Those at the meeting were encouraged to pass on the general disapproval of setting courses too early. The Committee will be asked to write to all organisers stressing the unfairness of setting the final course before the start of the competition.

Meeting closed at 18:34.



Appendix – Club Votes

Club, name, the number of votes, the number of competitions run, the number of entries on the ranking list at attended the ACM (A) or sent a proxy (P)

Club Votes 2017				
Club Name	Votes	Comps	Rankings	ACM
Aberdeen Kayak Club	2	1	21	A
Bala Canoe Club	1	0	9	
Baldock & District CC	1		6	
Bideford Canoe Club	2	1	4	
Bradford & Bingley	2	1	27	A
Breadalbane CC	4	3	30	
Break Out CC	1	0	29	P
Brecon CC	2	1	8	A
Bridgend CC	2	1	9	
Bristol CC	0	0	1	
Cheltenham CC	2	1	10	A
CR Cats	2	3	40	
Essex Slalom Squad	1	0	5	
Forth Canoe Club	2	1	8	
Frome Canoe Club	3	2	15	P
Green Star Canoe Club	3	2	13	A
Halifax Canoe Club	1	0	12	A
Hexham CC	3	2	4	
Holme Pierrepont CC	2	1	66	A
Ibstock Canoe Club	1	0	5	
Itchen Valley CC	0	0	3	
Kingston Kayak Club	2	1	7	A
Kinver KC	0	0	1	A
Laburnum Boat Club	2	1	5	
Leithen Water Paddlers	1	1	0	
Lee Valley Paddlesports	2	1	44	
Llandysul Paddlers	6	5	46	A
Lower Wharfe CC	1	0	17	
Manchester Canoe Club	4	3	39	P
Matlock Canoe Club	2	1	14	
Midland CC	2	1	4	A
Mold Canoe Club	4	3	15	A
Northampton C & K C	2	2	0	A
Pinkston Panthers	2	1	14	
Proteus Canoe Club	3	2	14	A
Reading Canoe Club	1	0	8	
S.C.O.T.S	1	1	0	A
Salisbury CC	1	0	8	
Selkirk Canoe Club	2	1	2	
Seren Dŵr	2	1	26	A
Sheffield Canoe Club	3	2	20	A
Shepperton S.C.C	5	4	24	A
Stafford & Stone	5	4	69	A
Stirling & Falkirk CC	0	0	2	
Stourbridge Arm CC	1	0	6	A
Strathallan CC	2	1	22	
Stroud Valley	1	0	18	
Taunton CC	1	0	16	P

Club Votes 2017				
Club Name	Votes	Comps	Rankings	ACM
Telford CC	2	1	4	
Tees Tigers	1	0	12	
The Sharks	3	2	8	P
Tyne Valley	0	0	2	
Viking Kayak Club	3	2	28	A
West Lothian CC	1	1	0	
West Yorkshire CC	2	1	7	P
Windsor & District	1	0	3	
Winchester & District CC	2	1	7	
Wydean Canoe Club	1	0	22	P
South West Slalom Committee	1	1		A
Yorkshire Slalom Clubs	4	4		A
Timing Team	1			A
Judging Team	1			A



Clubs not Registered	Rankings
Aberfan CC	1
Addlestone CC	1
Adur CC	5
Adur Centre	4
Ambleside AAA	2
Broadland Paddlesport	1
Canoe Slalom NI	1
Castle CC	3
Clywedog CC	2
Colwyn CC	1
Copeland CC	5
County Antrim PS	1
Croesyceiliog CC	17
Derwent Racers	1
Durham KC	1
Dyffryn Conwy Paddlers	1
East Kent Paddlers	1
Edinburgh Schools	1
Evesham Paddle Monsters	1
EyeTee	1
Fife CAG	1
Friends of Allonby	3
Glanford & Scunthorpe CC	10
Gwedraeth Valley Paddlers	1
Hamble Sea Scouts	3

Clubs not Registered	Rankings
Harefield Paddlers	2
Hydrasports	3
Independent	38
Islington BC	4
Kinver CC	1
Lakeland CC	1
Leaping Frogs	1
Lisburn City Paddlers	1
Llangollen CC	1
Llanrwst CC	7
Lloyds Register	1
Loch Centre CC	1
Loughborough University	1
Mad Paddlers	3
Manvers WBC	20
Meridian CC	3
Moray House	1
Ninebanks CC	5
Nottingham Surf Club	1
Packers CC	1
Perth CC	4
Phoenix CC	1
Poole Harbour CC	5