

# Minutes

# BFPCR AGM

Date

30<sup>th</sup> October 2011

Venue

Force India F1 HQ, Silverstone

1.	<p><b>Attendees and Apologies</b> Phillip Griffiths-Owens (PGO, Lap counting), John Relton (Revolution), Sam Relton (Revolution), Graham Barton (GB, Wing Racers), Matthew Barton (Wing Racers), Neil Carter (NC, BAR), Darren Carter (BAR), Jacob Spencer (JS, Swebbelli), Chris Featherstone (Apollo), Jes Featherstone (JPF, Apollo), Liz Hawkins (LH, Apollo), Gareth Lloyd (WSRT), John Burt (Atom), Gary North (GN, Atom), Alan Goodman (AG, Goodmaniacs), Jamie Johnson (Team Matrix), Dave Ralphs (Falcon ESU), Geoff Venn (Sharnbrook Scouts), Gill Venn (Sharnbrook Scouts), Peter Johnson (Wildcats), Ada Toms (AdaT, TOG Racing), Antony Hawkins (ADH, Secretary), Mark Williams (MSW, Chairman).</p> <p>Apologies received from Roland Jones (RJ, Swansea), Jim Robinson (JR, Killay), Gary Hollingsworth (GH, 105<sup>th</sup> Manchester), Gary Richards (GR, Scrutineer)</p>	
2.	<p><b>Minutes of 2010 AGM</b> Minutes of last meeting proposed OK by NC, seconded by AG</p> <p><b>Matters arising:</b> None.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Chairman's Report</b> MSW presented his report on the 2011 season, with special thanks to championship sponsors 3DDC. Thanked teams and team managers for supporting races and commented on each race. Thanked all race organisers; specifically thanked Bill Gratrix and Jim Robinson for their many years of work in running Margam. Also thanked marshals, caterers, scrutineers, PGO for lap counting, LH for licence management. Suggested formally writing to each venue to thank them and posed the question of how we develop each event to continue to grow the sport. Cited Blackbushe and Curborough as examples of how events can be grown, with work.</p>	<b>MSW</b>
4.	<p><b>Treasurer's Report</b> MSW presented the final 2010 accounts, which showed a profit for that season. MSW presented the 2011 accounts to date, showing a current profit of £1,196.57. We still have to pay for the 2012 insurance from this; there is also some income from Curborough still to be paid. NC pointed out a discrepancy in the Margam figures (should balance to zero). MSW will investigate.</p>	<b>MSW</b>
5 5.1	<p><b>Proposals for 2012</b> <b>Proposal that the constitution be altered (section 8.5 Registered Office) to reflect the fact that the listed PO Box address no longer exists.</b></p>	<b>Proposer:</b> <b>ADH</b>

<p>5.2</p>	<p><u>Proposal accepted by mutual agreement without discussion.</u></p> <p><b>Proposal that the BFPCR should fund the purchase of the equipment necessary to allow us to transmit live timing and scoring to the internet at all races (dependent on mobile data coverage).</b></p> <p>NC said he had this equipment and that the BFPCR could have it. All the BFPCR therefore needs to fund is a pay-as-you-go SIM card.</p> <p><u>Proposal accepted by mutual agreement without further discussion.</u></p>	<p>JPF</p>
<p>5.3</p>	<p><b>Proposed discontinuation of Sprint, Northern and Southern Championship sub-series.</b></p> <p>NC pointed out these were created some years ago when we removed PC1 and PC2 divisions; all agreed there was no evidence any team had ever targeted these subseries as goals.</p> <p><u>Proposal accepted by mutual agreement without further discussion.</u></p>	<p>PGO</p>
<p>5.4</p>	<p><b>Proposal to make various changes to the British Pedal Car Specification (rules 4, 6 and 10).</b></p> <p><b>(A) Rule 4, Motive Force, should be re-written for greater clarity. Suggested new wording:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>"Motive force must be that of a single driver only, at all times during normal racing. Push starts, kinetic energy recovery systems, etc., are forbidden. It is permitted to push or carry a stricken or failed car clear of the track and to the pits for repairs."</u></p> <p>ADH pointed out there had been instances in this and previous years of teams push-starting having not interpreted the current rule as intended and that this would remove any ambiguity.</p> <p><u>Proposal accepted by mutual agreement without further discussion.</u></p> <p><b>(B) The clarifier sentence of British Pedal Car Specification rule 6, Braking, should be moved to section 10, Safety.</b></p> <p>ADH, JPF, MSW and NC stated there had been issues at various events this year with one or more cars having only one effective brake.</p> <p>The current use of the wording "efficient and effective" was questioned on the basis of how these would be defined. NC recounted the brake testing rig that GR had built in a previous year and how its use had vastly improved the quality of brakes on cars in general, but that younger drivers with weaker grip and smaller hands are not necessarily able to pull brakes with the same effect as</p>	<p>ADH</p> <p>ADH</p>

an adult.

AdaT agreed it was difficult to prove that all drivers could apply a brake as effectively without scrutineering taking all day.

However it was agreed that changes were required to make explicit that brakes must remain effective throughout a race.

Proposal accepted in modified form as below:

A new wording for rule 6 was agreed:

---

"Braking must be effective and balanced on at least two wheels for the entire duration of the race."

---

And the sentence:

---

"All components shall be securely fixed to the car and in good condition."

---

...shall be moved to rules section 10.

## 5.5 **Proposal for improvements to information regarding the mounting of lap counting tags.**

**(A) Have an advisory on how lap counting tags should be mounted on pedalcars.**

PGO

Suggested wording:

- 
- Secured to the car and face on to the direction of travel
  - Not in contact with any metal - eg suspend it by a 'zip tie'
  - No metal or any other material known to shield EM fields between it and the ground
  - No higher than 200mm above ground
- 

Proposal accepted without further discussion, to be inserted to the Race Rules in section 1.1

**(B) Advise competitors that it is their responsibility to ensure their car(s) are 'counting' properly and in the instances of 'missing' laps to check that the tag is mounted as advised.**

PGO

JPF pointed out that it is not teams' responsibility to ensure the lap counting is working correctly and detecting their car. This was agreed.

Proposal accepted in modified form as below:

The following, amended wording was agreed:

"Competitors should ensure their car(s) are 'counting' properly and in the instances of 'missing' laps check that the tag is mounted as advised"

This will also be included in Race Rules in section 1.1

**5.6 Proposals for various changes to the BFPCR Rule Book.**

**5.6.1.a Proposal to discontinue classes PC0, PCD and PC4.**

**PGO**

PGO stated these classes had very few competitors this year and presentations and trophies involved a disproportionate amount of time and money as a result.

NC questioned why PCF was not also proposed for discontinuation?

NC reminded the AGM that PCD had been agreed to be run for a 3-year trial period, last year.

There was general support for PC4, with many attendees noting it worked well as a feeder class for PC3 and older classes. Additionally there was no substantial agreement to discontinue PC0 or PCD.

Proposal rejected.

**5.6.1.b Proposal to review all classes, particularly PC0, PCD and PC4 at the 2012 AGM.**

**CTF**

There was general agreement that classes could be reviewed in any year without the need for a proposal 12 months in advance.

CTF said his concern was that there is a risk we could keep inventing new classes and never remove any that don't really work.

CTF also pointed out that in France (where there is much less of a "health & safety" or "blame" culture), no racers are allowed to be under the age of 16, and asked whether we were right to encourage participation of drivers of 11 years and younger on safety grounds, and whether this naturally led to losing PC4? (Note: He was NOT saying he thought this was a problem; merely asking whether anyone was of this opinion).

There was unanimous agreement that younger racers were not an issue; various people pointed out that age has little to do with driving quality and it is much better to start racers at a younger age where their driving skills can grow with their physical ability and speed.

**5.6.2 Proposal to change rules 1.3.a and 2.2.e and Table 2 (pertaining to 24 hour races).**

**(A) To move the break in the 24 hour race for PC3 and PC4 teams to be from 11pm to 5am.**

JPF

There was general disagreement with this proposal. It was pointed out that this would reduce the amount of night driving available to the younger teams; that racing to midnight was a “special” time; and that cutting an hour off the first portion of their race would merely mean they got up earlier the next morning and would have more racing to do then, so would not be any less tired.

It was also pointed out that with good driver management, the final hour up to midnight can be done with 3 of the 6 drivers, and the first hour in the morning with the other 3, thus giving all 6 a 7-hour break.

It was noted that not all teams do this, particularly the new, inexperienced teams.

It was recommended that guidance to this effect be added to the 24 hour race information pack and pointed out to managers of younger teams.

Proposal rejected.

**(B) That the 24 hour race is taken and scored as 1 event with simply a break in between rather than 2 separate races.**

JPF

Widespread agreement. One comment was taken that this year the two halves had gone in different ways, but broadly there was very little support for the current two-part scoring system.

Proposal accepted.

**5.6.3 Proposal to modify Table 2 (and possibly Table 1) such that the break points in permitted numbers of drivers per class at any given event, and the break points in Championship Points allocated for an event, are in line with each other. This is not a proposal to necessarily change both tables, but a proposal that they should align and a chance to reconsider the break points.**

ADH

ADH explained this proposal came about as this year, Curborough was a new format (7 hours), never before used and as such had the points of a 6 hour race but the PC2 team size of a 10 hour.

NC said he thought one day’s racing should be worth 25 points, with the 24 hour race worth double, and that longer races (such as 10 hours) should not get extra points as is currently the case. ADH agreed; JPF pointed out that the extra points currently awarded for 10 hours made very little difference. There was general agreement with this position.

However, there was significant discussion about PC2 driver numbers. JS thought 4 drivers for a race of 7 hours was sufficient; GB

thought that 5 were warranted. ADH questioned why PC2 got special treatment and no other classes got additional drivers for the intermediate duration (and, e.g. PC3 and PC4 have the same number of drivers regardless of race duration).

After further discussion, the proposal was accepted in the following form:

Table 1 shall have race durations modified to be "More than 12 hours", "More than 8 hours, up to and including 12 hours" and "Up to and including 8 hours"

Table 2 shall specify points for "24 hour races" (as present), and points for "Other races" (as present) and the two other columns shall be deleted.

**5.6.4 Proposal to change rule 4.1.a**

**PGO**

Change 4.1 a to read:

---

"All cars must conform to the pedal car specifications defined in the BPCS and have submitted to the Race Official(s) a correctly filled in and signed Team Sheet."

---

It was pointed out that an unsigned Team Sheet is not correctly filled in; but accepted that adding that requirement explicitly was not going to harm the chances of Team Sheets getting signed before submission.

Proposal accepted by mutual agreement without further discussion.

**5.6.5 Proposal for a clarification in the rules in the event of a discrepancy in the result which cannot be resolved before the presentations are made on race day**

**JPF**

**(A) It is up to a team who believe that there is a discrepancy in their score to alert the Clerk of the Course / Race Controller to this.**

**(B) In the event of a discrepancy in their scores which cannot be rectified on the day, a team must inform the Clerk of the Course / Race Controller as soon as practically possible - and certainly before presentations occur - that they believe there is a problem. (Chances are they will have done so during the race.)**

**(C) If the Clerk of the Course / Race Controller then deems that more investigation is needed they can announce the results as provisional and let any teams who are effected know there is going to be an investigation.**

**(D) The teams can then be asked to provide evidence within a mutually agreed time frame and the raw data file from the lap counting should be made available to them as soon as possible.**

	<p>JPF explained the background to the proposals (Shenington 2011).</p> <p>There was a long discussion about how post-race investigations could or could not be done reliably and effectively, centring around “What is evidence?” (or as the original proposal asks, “What evidence is admissible?”) and how easy it may or may not be to do.</p> <p>MSW said he spent a lot of time looking at the complaint post-Shenington and while he could see potential anomalies in the lap count record for the team questioning the result, it was impossible for him to know whether these were all, some or none missed laps, or technical problems with the car, etc.</p> <p>CTF said much the same, plus to some extent the same issues with the other car involved in the fight for the disputed position.</p> <p>There was general agreement that proving a number of laps had been missed, at some time after a race, was very difficult to do with much degree of certainty.</p> <p><u>Proposal accepted as written, to replace current rule section 15.2</u></p>	
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Nominations for and election to the 2011 Committee</b></p> <p>NC reported Gary Richards was happy to stand for committee and continue as scrutineer.</p> <p>Potential race organiser representatives are LH, CTF, JPF, DC, ADH. Also to stand are MSW, NC, GB, AG, GN, GR.</p> <p>NC proposed all of the above, JPF seconded.</p> <p><u>All nominations accepted.</u></p>	
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b>Presentation of 2011 calendar</b></p> <p><b>BPCC events</b></p> <p>Round 1: 6 hour, Wombwell  Round 2: 10 hour, Bruntingthorpe  Round 3: 24 hour, Shenington  Round 4: Sprints, Solihull  Round 5: Sprints, Blackbushe  Round 6: 100 miles (max 5.5 hours), Blackbushe  Round 7:150 miles (max 7 hours, 8pm curfew), Curborough</p> <p>NC complained that this calendar only had 2 sprint events. A brief discussion followed and when MSW said he would be available at Wombwell to be race controller, LH said the event could be sprints.</p> <p><b>Other domestic events</b></p> <p>The presence of Ringwood was noted as a fun day out; ADH also pointed out that, finally, visiting and handing out fliers had garnered interest in and entries to the BPCC.</p>	

	<p><b>European Championships</b> To be held at the 24 hour race at St. Etienne de Chingy, France, mid/late August most likely.</p> <p><b>“Polkuautoilu/Pedalcar World Championships”, Finland</b> We have an invite to this, but little hard information beyond the 26<sup>th</sup> May date. Nothing as solid as a confirmed venue or circuit.</p> <p><b>BPCC events in more detail</b></p> <p><b>Round 1</b> Wombwell is a new venue requiring an absolute minimum in the way of setting up. Power, toilets, showers, even a weighbridge are all available. And a gantry to wave flags from.</p> <p>Date is still tbc and dependant on the model racing car club’s national calendar.</p> <p><b>Round 2</b> Bruntingthorpe is booked. Being a 10 hour the track costs have gone up.</p> <p><b>Round 3</b> Shenington is booked. The race has moved to being a week later than 2011 in a bid to avoid more exams, as this was cited by several teams this year as a reason for depleted or non-attendance.</p> <p><b>Round 4</b> DC is organising again.</p> <p><b>Rounds 5 &amp; 6</b> Blackbushe provisionally booked; this should be confirmed very soon.</p> <p><b>Round 7</b> Curborough booked.</p>	<p><b>Race organiser:</b> <b>LH</b></p> <p><b>CTF</b></p> <p><b>JPF</b></p> <p><b>DC</b></p> <p><b>ADH</b></p> <p><b>JPF</b></p>
8.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b> MSW presented the PC4 Championship trophy to Geoff Venn of Sharnbrook Scouts.</p>	
9.	<p><b>Date of next meeting:</b> Provisionally, 2012 AGM will be Sunday 28<sup>th</sup> October 2012 Venue, Force India HQ again.</p> <p>MSW thanked everyone for coming.</p>	