

IRISH CANOE SLALOM RESPONSE TO 2017 SELECTION POLICY SUBMISSIONS

No	Issue	Observation
1	Include both days at Sluice and 3 of 4 runs in Lipto for selection	<p>Sat race only selected due to difficulty in getting experienced judges for Sun race – many of whom choose to paddle in Irish Open on Sun</p> <p>Best result in each of the 3 races is considered the best option for selection purposes, particularly for Juniors who will find Lipto challenging. One race at Sluice and two at Lipto also addresses concerns raised that Sluice was not sufficiently challenging to rely on for international team selection.</p>
2	Uneven alteration of performance %'s over those for 2016 between classes / age-groups.	<p>Introduction of Lipto event for selection in 2017 makes setting of 2017 performance %'s difficult with higher standard of winning K1M (over M Kurt in 2015/16) inevitable in Lipto e.g. Jakub Grigar - No4 World Ranking.</p> <p>2017 %'s have been benchmarked against 2016 performance %'s achieved at Sluice selection races in the various categories (class / age) converted to reflect % against top Irish K1M in each race so are based on the reality of last year's Sluice results for Irish athletes in the various classes.</p> <p>It makes sense to review % standards in Irish terms based on experience over last couple of years to reflect our standard of paddler in the various classes.</p>
3	Comparisons quoted between Irish / GB / Aus selection %'s for certain classes	<p>Actual results in GB selection / Aus Open don't reflect the target performance %'s set for selection in the particular classes.</p> <p>Suggestion of setting our %'s in line with GB for Jun categories do not account for the fact that they have a highly developed talent pipeline with a professional coaching set-up and superior resources and back-up which sets their Juniors at a much higher standard than our pool of paddlers with the result that there has to be a wider disparity between the % standards set for our Juniors vis-à-vis their GB counterparts vs that between our Seniors and theirs. This is also the rationale for the widening of the standards required of our Juniors</p>

		on Lipto vs that for the Sluice given their lack of exposure to courses of that standard vs the Sluice with which they are more familiar and comfortable.
4	Comparison of performance differentials between classes in policy vs World Cup	This pre-supposes that there is the same correlation between the classes based on winning performances at WC level and at domestic Irish level. That is not the case based on Sluice results 2016.
5	Request to extend performance %'s in certain categories against K1 to account for long sprint at start and finish of Sluice course and the suggestion that gap between these classes in Lipto should be less than at Sluice	The %'s selected and on which 2017 figs are based (by reference to actual results in 2016) reflect the reality of using the relationship between K1M and other classes on this course. The extended % standard at Lipto takes a/c of that course being more difficult for C1W and U23/Juniors vs the top K1M. The committee use a mix of internal competition and reach targets to ensure that those athletes selected to represent Ireland show continual improvement and that no athlete can assume selection just by being in the top 3 in their class. The committee believes that the setting of reach targets based on the data from selections and subsequent team member's performance is appropriate. Targets will continue to be set from available data for Irish athletes rather than from the policies of other countries that naturally have a different pool of athletes available. The introduction of the Liptovsky race this year makes selection more challenging for the athletes and helps improve the quality of the team by addressing issues observed in previous selection processes. Following a review, it has been agreed that the performance % should be adjusted for certain classes to account for the increased standard required to achieve selection this year.
6	Dispense with discretionary selection	If we were still only dealing with Sluice for selection this may be desirable. Given the added dimension of Lipto this year it adds an unknown element to the equation and needs testing before we consider doing away with discretionary selection.
7	Change from relating performance to top K1M as in previous years to top Irish K1M	The invitation of a paddler of good international standard against which to benchmark performance worked in previous years when Sluice alone was the selection venue. With the introduction of the Lipto event we would still have had the option of doing so for Sluice but

		then would certainly be faced with a disparity in performance comparison for Lipto given the high standard of SVK K1M as stated above. The most sensible thing to do was to revert to comparison with top Irish K1M in Sluice and Lipto for which a 2016 benchmark could be assessed to decide on 2017 performance %'s.
8	2.1.3 ICF rules on eligibility	The draft policy contained a requirement to be able to race for Ireland under the ICF rules as this is the minimum requirement for the ICF to allow an athlete represent a particular nation. Naturally a country's NGB is free to add any additional requirements that they feel are appropriate in their particular selection policy.
9	Does the policy go to the CI Board for ratification?	The draft and final version of the policy are sent to the board for review and comment in line with the ICS constitution.
10	When will decision to fill team places be confirmed?	Those achieving performance selection will be notified within 7 days of the Lipto event. Decisions on discretionary selection will be notified within 17 days of the Lipto selection event.
11	Course design team	The committee has yet to make a decision on any roles relating to the selection event. As discussed at the AGM this will be considered by the committee when the organizing committee is formed.
12	Acceptance of protests against judging decisions	These will be submitted on a standard form in writing to the event control centre as is usual. A chief judge will be appointed by ICSC who has no potential conflict of interest relating to judging decisions at the Sluice race.
13	Athlete Assessment Panel	This panel will be formed by the ICSC prior to the Sluice selection race under section 7.2 of the policy. The panel will submit their report on discretionary selection applications to the ICSC who will decide on a case-by-case basis and provide written reasons for their decisions on any refusal of applications or applications granted subject to specific conditions. The AAP report will not be published.

14	Clarification requested on 2.1.4 Eligibility Criteria	The eligibility Criteria has been changed following comment and discussion. The requirement of a minimum rate of participation at ICS squad sessions has been removed.
15	Clarification requested on 4.1.2 Pre-selection applications related to the scheduling of a race	4.1.2 is a standing clause in the policy for some years past and is not related to any circumstance foreseen in 2017
16	Clarification requested on 5.2 Selection Ranking System	In the event of a tie on 3 best % performances over the 6 runs, tie-break 1 is on lowest aggregate % performances over the 6 runs and in extremely unlikely event of there still being a tie it will be determined by reference to application of the points to the three retained results. The latter still has the possibility of resulting in a tie (e.g. 2 x first places and 1 x 2 <sup>nd</sup> place for each tied paddler) so this has been modified as follows: 5.2.3 Tie Breakers 2. Tied competitors in the Selection Events will be ranked by awarding points to each athlete in respect of their finishing <u>overall</u> position in each <u>race</u>
17	10.2 Released Senior Boat Places	The pool for selection in any class / age-group are those who put their names forward for consideration. It is open to Junior/U23 paddlers going forward for selection to also put their hat in the ring for senior places.
18	Discretionary selection requested for Jun Euros in Hohenlimburg	Discretionary selection can only be applied for (under 7.1) after selection races take place so this is essentially an application for pre-selection under 4.1.1 on foot of exceptional circumstances: <i>“Applications for pre selection on the basis of exceptional circumstances, such as injury, illness, severe financial constraints, examinations or other unavoidable commitments, must provide evidence that the athlete could not reasonably be expected to attend or compete at the Selection Events”</i> . The case put forward doesn’t meet the “exceptional circumstances” envisaged in the policy.

19	Difference in policy for Jun Worlds vs Jun Europeans	The same selection policy format and criteria applies to both but for Juniors, applications will be vetted on a case-by-case basis based on performance in Lipto to decide on whether to allow entry to the Worlds in Bratislava vs the less challenging course for the Euros in Hohenlimburg.
20	Query on where to find “Total Discretionary Percentage” mentioned on pg. 26 in Appendix A	Total Discretionary Percentage, of the top Irish MK1 time is listed for all classes in tables 1, 2, and 3. On pg. 25.
21	Use of CSI vs ICSC	Table 5, Schedule of dates – amend to: Last Date for athletes to advise <u>ICSC</u> <del>CSI</del> of their intention to seek selection (if they wish the Committee to enter them for the LM race, as opposed to entering directly.)