



MEMORANDUM

TO: Clerks of Course and Stewards at Historic Race Meetings

SUBJECT: Qualifying at Historic Race Meetings

Reference

CAMS 5th Category Regulations section 2.1.2 (page 1, Section 2. Events in the CAMS Manual of Motor Sport):

Qualifying: In any race exclusively for historic vehicles all starters should have qualified within a maximum lap time variation of 130%. This limitation may be varied in that starters not meeting the limitation may be permitted to run on the recommendation of the Clerk of Course, subject to the individual approval of the Stewards of the Meeting. Regrouping of vehicles in other events should be considered as a means of achieving compliance with the 130% requirement.

Background

This regulation amplifies requirements set out in section 5.4 of the Race Meeting Standing Regulations which have for many years included a 130% qualifying limitation as a guideline for historic cars. Events for historic cars commonly include vehicles with much wider performance differentials than events for modern vehicles and careful control is required to ensure that the speed differentials involved and the frequency of lapping situations do not create unacceptable levels of risk. The rule requiring consultation between Clerks of Course and Stewards prior to any variation in the 130% limitation was introduced following a fatal accident at Phillip Island which occurred in a lapping situation involving vehicles of widely divergent performance.

The rule ensures that appropriate risk management standards are maintained through the requirement that the Clerk of Course make individual recommendations concerning each competitor qualifying outside the 130% limitation. The agreement required between Clerks of Course and the Stewards should ensure that the risks created by the speed differentials relating to each competitor are reviewed with appropriate care. This memorandum provides some guidelines to assist that review process.

Guidelines

- Primary responsibility for the identification of competitors not meeting the 130% requirement lies with the Clerk of Course who is then accountable to the Stewards to ensure that the rule is complied with.
- If the situation can be addressed by regrouping of vehicles in other events then consultation between the Clerk of Course and the Stewards will not be necessary unless the Stewards' approval to a programme variation is required in terms of NCR 169(xiii). When considering regrouping options the most appropriate solution will often be the regrouping of the fastest qualifying car or cars rather than those at the rear of the field.
- If regrouping is not considered appropriate or is not possible for any reason and the Clerk of Course considers it reasonable to proceed with the event notwithstanding a qualifying variation in excess of 130%, then his individual recommendations must be submitted to the Stewards justifying the inclusion of each of the slow qualifiers. It is strongly recommended that these recommendations should be discussed and considered jointly on a constructive and consultative basis, and that where appropriate a Targeted Risk Assessment be completed.

Issues to be reviewed when presenting and considering these recommendations, and completing a Targeted Risk Assessment, will commonly include the following steps:

1. Determination of whether qualifying performances are properly representative of each vehicle's expected performance in the race. Situations often arise where a failure to meet the 130% requirement has arisen because of difficulties precluding the competitor's achievement of proven past performance levels.

Where the competitor can satisfy relevant officials that he (or she) has previously met the qualifying criterion in the same vehicle at the same circuit, the risk may be assessed as LOW and the competitor permitted to race.

Where the competitor can satisfy relevant officials that he has previously met the qualifying criterion in the same vehicle at a different circuit, the risk may be assessed as MEDIUM and the competitor invited to take part in a discretionary practice session where practicable.

Where the competitor can not satisfy relevant officials on the above matters, the risk assessment will move to the next step.

2. Review will be undertaken of the likely frequency of lapping situations having regard to the qualifying time differential involved, the circuit length and the number of laps to be completed in the event. Multiple lapping situations involving vehicles of widely divergent performance should be avoided and, in some situations, consideration may be appropriate to shortening the event.

Where no lapping situation is likely to occur during the event, the risk may be assessed as LOW and the competitor permitted to race.

Where a lapping situation is likely to develop, the risk may be assessed as MEDIUM. If the length of the event cannot be adjusted, the risk assessment will move to the next step.

3. Review will be undertaken of the past experience and driving records of both the faster and slower cars which would potentially be involved in lapping situations that would involve the competitor who is outside the qualifying criterion.

If the review leads to the conclusion that experience levels of drivers of both the slower and the faster cars are sufficient, then the risk may be assessed as MEDIUM and the competitor permitted to race.

If the review leads to an opposite conclusion, the risk may be assessed as HIGH and the competitor not permitted to race in the subject event.

4. In all cases, consideration should be given to the possible need for specific discussions prior to the event with the drivers of both the faster cars and those likely to be lapped. Such discussions may be appropriate in order to highlight the potential dangers involved, to remind competitors of the need for careful attention to flag signals and rear view mirrors, and to encourage their maintenance of properly considerate standards of driving behaviour. In such discussions competitors should also be reminded of the requirements of 5th Category rule 2.1.3 with particular regard to the restrictions on competitors improving their position in lapping situations. While those issues will commonly have been covered in drivers meetings which include all competitors, a more specific reminder will often be appropriate for those who can clearly be identified as likely to be directly involved in speed differentials outside the normal 130% limitation.

CAMS Historic Commission
1st September 2006

Attachments: Targeted Risk Assessment example