

2017 Rule Change Proposals for 2018 Implementation

Proposals that are presented here are open to further review and comment. Please send your comments to the Zone 8 Rules Coordinator at ruleproposals@zone8.org

After this review period ends on August 25, 2017, the Z8 rules committee will deliberate and determine which proposals to move forward with. The second review and comment period will begin around September 15, 2017.

AX, TT & DE	2
Driving Events Proposal #1 – Clear Point-By vs. Window Net.....	2
Driving Events Proposal #2 – Windows Fully Down OR Up for Driving Events	5
Driving Events Proposal #3 – No Automatic Emergency Braking Systems and other Autonomous Systems in Track Events	8
CONCOURS.....	10
Concours Proposal #1 – No Full Concours Winners in W&S.....	10
Concours Proposal #2 – Wash & Shine Division Clarification.....	12
Concours Proposal #3 – New Division Above Ubergang for Newer Cars.....	14
Concours Proposal #4 – Show Entry Requirement, Relative to Judge Competency....	16
Concours Proposal #5 - New Judge Emeritus Status with Separate Requirements.....	19
Concours Proposal #6 - Waiver for Vehicle Damaged En Route to Concours	22

AX, TT & DE

Driving Events Proposal #1 – Clear Point-By vs. Window Net

Description of Issue or Problem:

A clear point-by is required for safe passing in DE and Time trial. In some cases window nets can impeded the ability of the driver to make a clear point-by. We have already had a car to car contact this year where this issue was a factor.

Proposed Solution:

Window nets should be removed or left down unless the driver is able to make a clear point-by with the window net attached.

ADDITIONAL WORDING for proposed rule change:

"XIII VEHICLE & DRIVER SAFETY EQUIPMENT

.
. .
.

V. The following summarizes the safety equipment that is required for Porsches as they pass up through the classes due to Performance Equipment Points (not total points, do not include Base or Tire Size Points):

.
. .
.

In addition, an SFI-approved Neck Restraint system and arm restraints or window net are recommended for all vehicle occupants at TT/DE events. ***Window nets should not be used, or be removed or left down, unless the driver is able to make a clear point-by with the window net attached.***"

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

This will make it clear that being able to make a clear point-by is a priority. The risk of miscommunication on passing is greater than the benefit of having a window net in place.

Comments:

The biggest problems I encounter in passing are a.) Questionable point-by's because the driver ahead of me doesn't properly extend their arm and point their finger; b.) The driver doesn't maintain their driving line, sometimes encroaching into my path. The last time I tried to pass a driver with a window net, he pointed from inside his car which is very difficult to see through his back window. Unless a window net is specifically manufactured with an adequate point-by opening, I do not see how proper point-by's with window nets can occur.

~0~

I oppose this rule change

I have run DE and TT's for over 20 years. I have never been in a siltation (and I run in the top two groups with race prepared cars and window nets) where as long as I was paying close attention to the car I was overtaking that I wasn't sure of a point by. That said if the following car isn't sure or isn't getting a point-by they always have the election to pull into the pit lane and get some spacing.

I don't think the safety benefit of a safety net in a serious accident of rollover should be compromised.

~0~

The existing rules provide for use of turn signals when point-bys cannot physically be used. The proposed rule should allow this as an alternative to lowering the window net. (Yes, some race cars have functioning turn signals.) This can be stated by revising the proposed wording to: **"Window nets should not be used, or be removed or left down, unless the driver is able to *use turn signals to indicate passing or* make a clear point-by with the window net attached."**

~0~

I disagree. Actually, maybe a case can be made for DE, but force on all for TT is a mistake. Contact on a race track is never due to a point by miscommunication, it's always caused by drivers not paying attention to their surroundings or trying to force a bad move. Have enough experience to know. Forcing drivers to not use their vehicle's safety equipment and endanger those drivers in the case of a crash is crazy. Window nets are there for an important reason.

More on track training for DE students on passing should be part of graduating to TT, which if need be, should be in levels of experience with open passing for advanced competition licensed drivers in race prepared cars. Bottom line for

me is, if I can't use my window net, not inclined to participate with PCA in TT events, because I agree with you, it's all about safety.

~0~

I'm strongly in favor of this change. Window nets should not be used except in true racing events.

Point-by discipline is an extremely important factor in track safety for the DE and TT run groups.

At these events, there should never be any ambiguity about whether a driver who is about to be overtaken is aware of the situation, and approves of the pass! Like Scott Mann frequently reminds us all, THIS IS NOT RACING.

I need to see a hand out the window before I initiate a pass. I don't want to have to interpret a mirror tap, or look for a right hand pointing inside the car, or a "chicken wing" pointing through a net.

Let's keep things simple and dependable.

~0~

The window net proposal of course makes sense.

~0~

When you have a Hans device and a window net, your ability to fully extend your arm up and over the roof to the degree needed to signify a pass on the RIGHT is just NOT physically possible.

Passing is the overtaking driver's process to execute safely and it is the overtaking driver's responsibility to recognize the added challenge of a window net to the point by based passing process.

With proper look ahead track vision techniques the awareness of a window net on the car in front of you SHOULD be known WAY BEFORE the pass.

For some, the challenge of continuing the passing process WITHOUT a point bye and having confidence in the other driver is accepted behavior for both drivers to learn and practice the proper technique for passing during a racing scenario.

BTW, with a window net, the ONLY way to signify a point bye to the right side of the car is from the inside, this was the guidance given at CFOS 2017.

Driving Events Proposal #2 – Windows Fully Down OR Up for Driving Events

Description of Issue or Problem:

It is generally accepted in other sanctioning bodies (PCA PCR's for example) that doing driving events with the windows fully up is acceptable. However the Zone 8 Rules do not allow this. The driver may prefer up on rainy days, hot days (a/c) or cold days (heat), or for purposes of dust or noise reduction. The real concern should be with partially open windows, because glass is strong enough to sever a trapped appendage before it shatters in an accident situation.

Proposed Solution:

Change the Safety rules to allow fully up or fully down windows in driving events.

MODIFIED WORDING for proposed rule change:

"XIII VEHICLE AND DRIVER SAFETY EQUIPMENT

.
. .
.

N. Doors must remain unlocked and driver's window must be ***either*** fully open (down) ***or fully closed (up)***. If an instructor or student is in the car, both door windows must be open (down) ***or fully closed (up)***. ***Partially open windows are not allowed.***"

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

This change allows participants in driving events to have the option of having their windows fully up, but prohibits partial opening.

Comments:

While I much prefer driving with my windows closed to reduce wind buffeting, dust, rain and hot/cold temperatures, having windows 'up' presents a unnecessary distraction to the driver of the car being passed due the difficulty and time required to open their window to make the point-by. I experienced this at Laguna Seca this spring on a rainy morning. Rather than using a point-by, the car(s) ahead of me used his turn indicator. Relying on turn indicators is risky especially if someone forgets to cancel it or accidentally activates it as

I have observed. I'm a believer in proper hand point-by's, with the slower driver being more anticipatory. Fortunately, my '07 C4S has a fully automatic driver's-side window, so it's relatively easy for me to operate. For other cars, I'm unsure.

~0~

I oppose this rule change

I oppose having the window up! This rule makes no sense unless possibly limiting it to an Auto-X and even then we are talking about 45 to 130 seconds and with newer cars where the doors automatically lock and the window up how do you get to the driver in the event of an accident or health issue such as a stroke or heart attack.

How do you handle a point by at a driving event DE or TT with the window up?

~0~

Since the existing passing rule in XVI.F.2 allow turn signals, I suggest that a protocol defining the manner in which turn signals are to be used be included, so that windows-up passing rules are consistent at all Zone 8 driving events. There are two possible turn-signal passing protocols which could be adopted:

- use the turn signal "like a point". That is, blinking on the side the car passing should go.

- use the turn signal in the same manner as used on the public road. That is, blinking on side the car being passed will hold (or, if all passing is on one side, the direction it will move) directing the car passing to do so on the side away from the signal (this is "Nürburgring-style" passing as used at Audi Club North America driving schools).

~0~

I disagree with this change. Driver's side windows should always be down, for the same reason window nets should not be used. Fixed ("permanently-up") plexiglass windows should be prohibited also.

Again:

Point-by discipline is an extremely important factor in track safety for the DE and TT run groups.

At these events, there should never be any ambiguity about whether a driver who is about to be overtaken is aware of the situation, and approves of the pass! Like Scott Mann frequently reminds us all, THIS IS NOT RACING.

I need to see a hand out the window before I initiate a pass. I don't want to have to interpret a mirror tap, or look for a right hand pointing inside the car.

Let's keep things simple and dependable.

~0~

Windows up for a point by? Windows need to be down. Driver awareness is increased. Rain at an event can happen, yet is unlikely.

~0~

What this proposal does not do is indicate how the driver will be able to make a point-by to allow cars to pass if his window is up.

Until we set up a new paradigm for pointing cars by, the windows need to be down (without a window net) on the driver's side.

~0~

I support allowing closed windows at DE and time trial events. I drive a 991, and in addition to rain considerations, there is severe buffeting in cross winds with the windows down. A while back, I drove the proval at the AAA track in Fontana. In the morning everything was fine with the windows down, but in the afternoon, the buffeting started in oval turns one and two. For me, the speeds are high with turn one entry north of 155 and turn two north of 130 with no run off. There is just a concrete wall for those who lose control. I was concerned I lost some feeling for what the car was doing because of the shaking, and I reduced my entry speeds out of safety concerns. Maybe it's my inexperience, but closed windows may offer increased safety in some conditions.

I also strongly support the use of head restraint devices at least for those cars with restraint systems such as five or six point harnesses. The use of window nets, arm restraints, or closed windows raises the issue of point by. Is the use of the car's turn signals allowed or under consideration for cases when arm signals are not possible?

Driving Events Proposal #3 – No Automatic Emergency Braking Systems and other Autonomous Systems in Track Events

Description of Issue or Problem:

Automatic Emergency Braking Systems, Collision Avoidance Systems and Lane Keeping Assistance Systems, etc. may unexpectedly and abruptly slow or stop a car when they encounter situations that would appear to be dangerous in normal street driving situations. If these systems were to kick in whenever a car enters traffic on the track, it might induce behaviors in the car that might surprise both the driver and the drivers of surrounding cars. In the track environment, safety depends on cars being somewhat predictable, and the unexpected changes may induce accidents which otherwise would not occur.

Proposed Solution:

Add additional wording to the rules that Automatic Emergency Braking Systems, Collision Avoidance Systems, Lane Keeping Assistance Systems and similar technologies are not allowed to run in DE or Time Trial events unless the system can be and is turned off.

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

Disabling the systems should avoid the issues, as would disallowing cars where the systems cannot be disabled. It should also be noted that at this point in time, these systems are prohibited by National and therefore we must also disallow them at least or until National reevaluates the situation. This proposal brings our rules into compliance with the current national rules.

Comments:

I agree with this proposal as it makes total sense unless it can be totally disabled or over ridden.

~0~

I agree with the basic idea of this change. It's easy to see how these types of autonomous systems could introduce unsafe conditions at the track. They should definitely not be permitted in DE or TT events.

However, cars with these types of systems should be allowed at autocross events, even if they can't be turned off. I don't see how they could cause safety issues, as long as only one car is on the course at any time. When these

systems become commonplace, we will discourage a large demographic group from joining our club, if they can't bring their street cars to AX events.

CONCOURS

Concours Proposal #1 – No Full Concours Winners in W&S

Description of Issue or Problem:

Last year a member dropped his car from Full Concours in 2015 to W&S in 2016. I believe it was unfair to all that entered in W&S in 2016. All those that entered W&S in 2016 had to compete against a car that is well known throughout Zone 8 as a perennial winner In Full Concours.

Proposed Solution:

I believe a rule change should be made that if you have won at Full Concours in any given year that the car should never be allowed to run in W&S.

ADDITIONAL WORDING for proposed rule change (Concours page 3 Paragraph 3)

"II DIVISIONS

.
.
.

The purpose of the Wash & Shine division is to help and assist new participants in preparing their Porsches for Zone 8 Concours competition. Any entrant may enter the Wash & Shine division ***except any Porsche that has won at the Full Concours level; these cars may not enter Wash & Shine at any future date.*** Written and verbal comments from judges will be encouraged."

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

This prevents a fully prepared car from competing in what is supposed to be an entry-level division for new participants.

Comments:

I fully disagree with this proposal because it goes against the basic principles of the Concours program at both the Zone 8 and National levels, by forever precluding a member from entering the Division of competition in which they feel comfortable &/or have the time, effort level and interest in which to

compete - as well as not recognizing that the use of a vehicle and it's overall condition (and thereby competitiveness) will change over time.

This rule change seems to imply that the Concours Judges judge the cars/vehicles in Full Concours differently, than for the same 2 judged Areas shared with Full in W&S (Exterior & Interior). The various Divisions are already well differentiated by the number of and which Areas are judged in each and the Judging of them is supposed to be consistent across ALL Divisions, as well as within a particular Division's Classes and cars/vehicles.

The only difference in the final scoring should be the maximum number of points allowed in each, based upon whether 2, 3, 4 or 6 Areas are judged (and any unique applicable criteria added for Unrestored and Special Categories Divisions). The level of competition differential between ANY of the Divisions from W&S to Full Concours only involves the number of areas to prepare - NOT how well they are prepared, nor the judging criteria for each Area, nor how they are judged.

Members must be allowed the latitude to participate at the level and within the Division(s) which meets their time, interest and car's/vehicle's needs; and to be able to eventually step down from the rigors demanded of preparing all 6 Areas on their car for Full Concours - especially where they are actually regularly driving their car/vehicle.

Concours Proposal #2 – Wash & Shine Division Clarification

Description of Issue or Problem:

Although Wash & Shine may be the logical place for beginners, they are not to be treated/judged any differently than experienced entrants. This should be stated more clearly. At this time, there is no "novice" division.

Proposed Solution:

Add language that makes it clear that Wash & Shine division is judged in the same manner as all other divisions.

ADDITIONAL WORDING for proposed rule change:

"II DIVISIONS

.
. .
.

The purpose of the Wash and Shine division is to help and assist new participants in preparing their Porsches for Zone 8 Concours competition. Any entrant may enter the Wash and Shine division. Written and verbal comments from the judges will be encouraged. ***This is not to imply that a lessor standard is applied to the Wash & Shine division. All judging is done to the same standards in all divisions.***"

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

This clarification explicitly states that Wash & Shine participants are not to be treated any differently than experienced entrants.

Comments:

I support this proposal. I suggest that we add the following clarifying language in bold/italics to the paragraph, as follows:

"The ***dual*** purpose of the Wash and Shine division is ***both to allow for members who drive their Porsches, &/or who have limited time &/or interest to prepare them in more judged areas, to compete in only two (2) judged areas, as well as*** to help and assist new participants in preparing their Porsches for Zone 8 Concours competition. Any entrant may enter the Wash and Shine division. Written and verbal comments from the judges will be encouraged."

This will eliminate the possible misconception, or redefinition, that the W&S Division is exclusively for new participants in our Zone 8 Concours. It is not nor should it be exclusive to only new participants.

Concours Proposal #3 – New Division Above Ubergang for Newer Cars

Description of Issue or Problem:

All 'newer' (since 2013) Porsche cars entering into a Z8 Concours can only compete in Wash & Shine or Ubergang Divisions. Some feel this is too limiting and there needs to be a loftier goal for the folks who have shown in W&S or Ubergang.

Ubergang is the only "advanced" division that is growing, as all current production models progress to this from Wash & Shine. Consequently, in some events this may be a bigger division than Street, Full or Unrestored. The advanced judging possibilities are very limited for newer models, compared to older cars.

Proposed Solution:

Add a new division, Ganz Ubergang, using the same classes as Ubergang has:

- GU-1 Boxster
- GU-2 Cayman
- GU-3 911 Carrera (991, 2012-On)
- GU-4 Cayenne
- GU-5 Panamera
- GU-6 Macan

The following areas would be judged:

- Exterior
- Interior
- Storage Compartment
- Chassis Half (without engine)
- Chassis Half (with engine)

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

Adding a new division for these cars with more judged areas makes sense. It splits up a potentially big division. This new division gives these entries a place to compete that is a step up from Ubergang. It adds a new place for these entrants to progress to, if they feel the need for a bigger challenge, with more areas judged which allows them a chance to compete at a higher level.

The engine compartment would still not be judged as this compartment is either not meant to be accessed by the owner, or just isn't accessible.

"Ganz" means "total" in German (Total Transition). Perhaps not quite accurate without the engine compartment, but it still sounds cool.

We might also want to consider a new name for these divisions. Since Ubergang is German for transitional, it was meant to be temporary while we figure out what to do with these cars. It appears things are no longer transitional....

Comments:

This proposal is proposing to add what is essentially a "Full Concours Ubergang" Division (named "GU" therein) - but without judging their now too hard to access engines, which makes perfect sense, and should be approved for the reasons stated by the proponent.

While it may add another judging team to staff for "GU" - in the long run and from an overall perspective, it will probably equal out not having to staff two teams in Ubergang for a split division, and then also further save on the third team to rejudge the two split division winners from all classes.

Concours Proposal #4 – Show Entry Requirement, Relative to Judge Competency

Description of Issue or Problem:

Currently the Zone 8 Concours Rules' requirements for Judges not only requires Judges to show an entered Porsche at least every two (2) years - in addition to other Judging School & Judging once a year requirements - in order to maintain the Judge's level, but it then goes on to sequentially and repetitively demote the Judge one level for each year from then on when a vehicle is not entered in a judged event. This effectively negates all of the other experience and educational aspects of judging competency by demoting otherwise active but non-showing judges every year in which they're not entering.

Not only does this run counter to the objective for Zone 8 to develop and maintain a cadre of experienced judges, but it is also severely punitive, and completely supercedes and negates all of the other Judging School and hands-on judging experience gained by individual judges - effectively making entering a car/vehicle paramount over all other factors in judging. Thereby, this actually taints the judging as a perceived "insiders club" of certain judge/entrant competitors judging each others' Porsches - to the detriment of the "outsiders" who only enter without judging (after all, service points can be attained in other ways for Zone 8 Awards).

In my review of the Concours Judging requirements for PCA National/Parade (PCRs), Zones' and Regions' nationwide - I found no others with such a requirement - not even for Parade Judges, ostensibly the pinnacle of judging prowess. Zone 8 is the only one which requires its judges to enter regularly, let alone goes on to repetitively punish it's judges for not doing so by successive demotions.

In reviewing the Judge requirements of other similar automotive organizations, such as AACA, CCCA, Corvette Club, Pebble Beach, Amelia Island, etc. - not only do they not require their judges to also enter their cars, but many frown on it or outright prohibit it, due to the obvious conflicts of interest &/or concerns over "mutual back-scratching" between judges (quid pro quo conflicts of interest), even when entered in different classes/divisions/groups than where judging. Many take the position that the ideal judges are those expert in judging, but who are not entered at all in the event(s) at which they are judging, drawing a sharp line between judges and competitors. Zone 8 currently requires no judging in the Division(s) entered, but there can still be cases of quid pro quo conflicts of interest. In my opinion, we would be better served by the sharp line division of no judges entering their vehicles, but I also recognize that we would never be able to staff the judging teams if that were the rule. So reality must prevail, but by the same token competing/entering in a Concours should not be a mandatory requirement to judge at any level attained by experience (point count and judges' schools), so long as they are maintaining their currency with regular attendance at least every 2 or 3 years, as per section IV.,M. Personally I would add to that, to either require or at the very least strongly encourage all judges to at least be required to review the new rules every year, as I do myself.

Perhaps this mandatory showing rule was instituted at a time when Zone 8 and its' Regions were struggling to have enough entrants to maintain a Concours program, but that is clearly no longer the case. Certainly knowing how to clean and detail one's

vehicle for our "preparation only" competition, is no indicator of judging competence, let alone the most important factor in preparing and maintaining a person's judging abilities.

In fact, anyone could just enter a completely unprepared Porsche in a show every other year, and still meet this requirement - so what is the point!? That most clearly shows the problem with having this requirement at all, as well as with it overriding all of the other education and experience of the judges - particularly for those with longer and more extensive experience..

Moreover, the repetitive and punitive demotions of the judges for not entering regularly gives the various event head judges and team head judges an inaccurate picture of which judges have what level of experience in judging at shows, and in attending Judging Schools over time. This can seriously impair the Concours events from being able to correctly and adequately staff the judging teams with judges at the appropriate required levels - let alone understand which judges have been judging at how many events for how long - if they're just demoted for not entering a vehicle, back down eventually to the level of a basic "Judge" fresh out of judging school (or perhaps not at some events), thereby reclassifying them "newbie judges" with less than 500 points or 5 judging events (or perhaps none). This just doesn't make any sense at all.

Additionally, it can discourage well trained long term judges from continuing to help the program as volunteer judges, if/when they are not able to, are no longer interested in, are between showable cars, or just want to cut back on their work load, but still stay active in the Concours program. In fact, it has already essentially run off several experienced judges no longer showing their Porsches, since they get demoted back to a basic level Judge; as well as some who had judged in earlier years, who would be excellent additions to the judging cadre.

In short, as it stands now with this rule, any judge who otherwise meets the educational (Judges' School) and experience levels (via Service Points from judging at 100 points per event judged) for "Zone 8 Judge" (500 points or 5 judgments & 1 Judges' Schools), "Senior Judge" (1000 points or 10 judgments & 2 Judges' Schools), and "Master Judge" (1500 points or 15 judgments & 3 Judges' Schools) - will be demoted one level after two (2) years of not entering a vehicle, then one additional level each year thereafter, until they are at the lowest level "Judge."

This lowest level "Judge" category is supposedly for those fresh out of judging school, with less than 500 points - i.e.: less than 5 judgments, and those points could be gained as Runners &/or Timers only; and presumably having attended at least one (1) Judges' School - but not necessarily, as I've judged at a couple of events where a completely untrained person was drafted into service to fill out a judging team. There really shouldn't be anybody with significantly more experience in this category, let alone very experienced judges sequentially demoted back to it. This is both counterproductive to a well run Concours judging program, as well as demeaning to more experienced judges, and confusing to participants and organizers when staffing events.

Proposed Solution:

Proposal to Eliminate Demotions & Make Entry a Recommendation:

"Any judge with a Zone 8 or higher classification who wishes to maintain that classification must judge at least one event each year ~~and show a car in a judged class at least once every two years~~. Any judge who fails to do so will have his or her classification reduced by one level each year these requirements have not been met. A Master Judge must complete at least one Zone 8 Judges School every two years or he/she will be reclassified as a Senior Judge. *It is also recommended that all judges show a car in a judged class at least once every two years.*"

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

This change brings Zone 8 in line with the National PCA Concours Rules (PCRs) and those of every other Zone and Region in North America, as well as following common sense and reasonableness, and get rid of this unfair and meaningless judges' entry requirement.

Concours Proposal #5 - New Judge Emeritus Status with Separate Requirements

Description of Issue or Problem:

There is a need for and justification of allowing very senior and long standing Concours Judges to remain in the program and available for judging, due to their long experience. Many other professional certification, licensing and other continuing education programs, as well as some of the other organizations' Concours programs, recognize the need for and allow an Emeritus designation for long time &/or very experienced practitioners.

Zone 8 has a number of very experienced judges within its membership, who are at a point in their lives where they may not want to continue taking classes, regularly judging, &/or for preparing and showing their Porsches, due to their own age, time availability, non-use or daily use &/or condition or location of their vehicle, etc. - but who may be willing to continue to help with judging. They often are not interested in continuous judges' schools, regular judging, etc., but whom would be willing to judge on an occasional basis. We all know some of them who are judges now, &/or were in past years.

Proposed Solution:

Zone 8 would benefit by providing for keeping these long time and well experienced judges to continue to participate in judging as they are able, without having to continue to meet the minimum judges' school annual judging requirements. This would be allowed based upon some minimum of time serving as judge and number of judged events threshold (not including other service points), which would be beyond that required for a "Master Judge" rating, and with a minimum time serving at "Master Judge" level.

This could be satisfied in aggregate from all of their time serving in PCA - regardless of whether such time &/or PCA membership was continuous. We wouldn't want to lose the expertise of long time judges from the old days, if they had stepped away from PCA &/or judging at some point(s) for any reason.

I suggest that this could be satisfied by a combination of a minimum of 10-20 years of judging and 40-50 times judging at events, and 5 years as Master Judge, all in aggregate of all of their time as a PCA member - whether or not concurrent. They would thereafter be exempted from the minimum ongoing continuing education and judging requirements of the other judge levels from "Judge" through "Master Judge" - but would need to bring themselves up to date on the current Concours Rules prior to serving as a judge thereafter.

Proposed New Section IV Judging: Sub-Section N: Judge Emeritus:

"IV Judging:

...

Section N: Judge Emeritus:

Judges who have a minimum of 20 years of judging experience, and have judged in at least 40 events - e.g.: 4000 judging points under current rules (not including other service categories), but the number of points assigned may have been different in the past - so the number of events judged controls in such cases; or alternatively, by judging a minimum of 10 years, and have judged at a minimum of 50 events - e.g.: 5000 judging points under current rules (not including other service categories), and again the number of events controls over point count. These would both be equivalent and alternative means of qualifying, but in any case for either, they must have also served as or have been qualified as a "Master Judge" for at least five (5) of those years, or as the most senior level at that time (waived if the time preceded judge levels).

Granting of Judge Emeritus is automatic upon reaching such qualifications, or upon satisfying them with the alternative verification process below. There shall be no other judgmental nor subjective requirements applied, except as required for the alternative verification of time noted below.

Judges so qualified would be exempted from the section L minimum of attending one Judges' School at least once every three (3) years, and of section M's requirement for Judging in at least one (1) event per year [and from entering a vehicle in a judged event every two years - if not repealed as per proposed rule change #2 above]. However, they would be required to review the current version of the Zone 8 Concours Rules annually prior to serving as a judge, if it has been more than 3 years since a Judging School; and the event's Head Judge would be responsible for supplying a copy of the current rules either in advance of or at the event for their review prior to judging at that event (waived if the rules had already been reviewed at a prior event in that same year).

Once granted Judge Emeritus status, it is effective for Life, and the member can exercise their judging privileges at any time thereafter, so long as they hold valid current PCA membership, and any lapse(s) in such membership for any reason shall not cancel their status, but only suspend judging privileges until membership is renewed. There will be no new requalifying for Judge Emeritus once earned, and granting of such shall be automatic upon reaching the minimum requirements for Judge Emeritus.

The Zone 8 &/or it's Regions' records shall serve as evidence for such experience and time in grade; while in some cases it may be hard to document due to the age of, loss of &/or differences in record keeping, and other factors about judges and the program(s) in the earlier years of Zone 8 and its Regions, an alternative procedure may be needed. In cases where the documentation is partially or completely unavailable, but the subject judge's reputation and experience is known to other member judges &/or officers who can offer written verification(s) to their past experience, then that would be presented to an impartial selection committee. A strict point count as currently used by Zone 8 is not required - other means of documentation such as judges lists or sign-in sheets, event programs or fliers which lists the judges, etc., and other means of documentation are acceptable; and only the points as converted to judging events &/or the number of events judged will be considered.

To determine eligibility for Judge Emeritus, on an as needed basis whenever there are judges meeting the qualifications, but no more than annually, there shall be convened a "Concours Judge Emeritus Selection Committee" - made up of the Zone 8 Representative, the Zone 8 Concours Chair(s), and at least 3 or 4 Master Judges randomly chosen (3 or 4 as needed to fill out an odd number). The committee can also review and verify the attainment of status for the other judging levels listed in subsection M at their meeting. The committee shall not deny such status where the documentation present, but will verify same; as well as to review the alternative verification statements from other judges &/or officers to verify if it confirms whatever records documentation is missing. This committee can meet in person, by teleconference, or electronically."

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

<not submitted>

Concours Proposal #6 - Waiver for Vehicle Damaged En Route to Concours

Description of Issue or Problem:

PCA's National Parade has had a longstanding rule that any Porsche damaged while enroute to Parade or other National Concours events or on-site, will have a onetime waiver of judging of the damaged area for that event only (it is not a recurring nor season long waiver). In this way, competitors are not eliminated from or disadvantaged by an act outside of their control, and they are consistent between such events.

After an entrant was hit by another driver on the way to the 2015 SDR Concours, it became clear that Zone 8 has no such standing rule, and the waiver is up to the discretion of the particular Head Judge at the event in question. While this approach may resolve the issue at a particular event - it does not provide consistency across all Zone 8 Concours events, and it opens up the possibility for unfairness with Zone-wide annual awards, where one entry may get the benefit of a waiver at one event - while another competitor at a different event may not, and they would suffer a lower overall score as a result of not having a damage waiver and suffer deductions for the damage.

Proposed Solution:

I believe that Zone 8 should implement something similar to the National Concours Rule on this matter (PCR or Supplemental Rules), as part of our regular Zone 8 Concours Rules, by making it standard procedure to waive the area(s) damaged from judging deductions if it happened en route or on site, in order to resolve the fairness of this waiver across the board.

Proposed New Rule for En Route/On-site Damage, Judging Waiver:

"V Scoring:

.
.
.

E. In the event an entered vehicle is damaged enroute &/or on-site prior to commencement of judging of the subject vehicle,

1. Any vehicle entered in a Zone 8 or Regions' Concours Event, which was damaged en route to the event, while entering or while parked at the event shall be exempted from the judging of and deductions for such damage at that event only, so long as the entrant informs the Event's Head Judge &/or Team Head Judge of such damage prior to the start of judging of that vehicle, and the Event Head Judge will inform the Team Head Judge of same to waive judging on the damaged area(s) if reported to them. This shall apply to both pre-registration and on-site registration for judged events.

2. Such waiver and judging accommodation shall be automatic and of right for that event only, and will not carry over to later events, since the entrant is expected to repair that damage, suffer future deductions if not repaired, or withdraw from competition. If such damage is unable or not desired to be repaired at the sole discretion of the vehicle's owner, but they have already pre-registered for subsequent events, then they shall be refunded any entry fees upon notification of the sponsor, regardless of any other refund deadlines or requirements."

How Proposal Solves the Problem:

<not submitted>