

Open letter from the Southeast region regarding the Marshals Pathway consultation

Dear Nadine/MSUK,

We the BMMC SE committee have read and digested the current proposals regarding the new Marshals pathway and whilst we have only skimmed the surface of them they do appear a little complicated but our question is what is the new pathway trying to achieve? We have also consulted our regional members who have spoken openly and shared their views concisely with a supporting document attached and our conclusion is the following:

1. We cannot support the proposal as we feel that this is going to dilute the talent of marshals and the level of expertise of individuals which is going to increase safety concerns for those who are new to the role and for their more experienced colleagues. This is due to limited time learning the role to which they are undertaking IE 6 days off track, 3 days on track incident and 3 days flag. This marshal has now 3 additional days to be competent in a role and if this is "track" then compared to the current grading scheme the marshal has missed out on a further 13 days in the specific role of track marshal/level 1?
2. Given some marshals can only attend for a small number of days per year maybe 6 or less, would these marshals now not be disadvantaged as they would not be physically able to upgrade as the dates collected may become time expired before they has completed the required number of days attendance and training?
3. Our membership Poll agree that this is not a suitable way to change the grading scheme with the information provided and will cause disadvantage and discrimination to some of our Southeast members for a variety of reasons. Areas such as pits or other disciplines are "Specialist" and as such should be treated as Specific areas with lots to learn. Is 6 days "off track" going to allow a marshal to work safely in this area at a GT meeting for example?
4. With the cross level matching, we do not agree that this is a way to get more marshals to try something different. Marshals attend a particular meeting as that is the Genre they wish to attend. As a senior marshal with over 25 years experience across the world, if I was to go and complete a day's marshalling at a hill climb I would not expect or want to be signed on as my current grade having never attended a hill climb. I would request to start at the bottom to learn how the post runs and what each role each marshal has.
5. There has been no clear data published on who was involved (now published) and how the results of your findings have influenced the decision to change the grading scheme. Where is the data to show we need to make marshals more cross discipline? Currently most circuits the committee have visited have been well manned and my colleagues on committee have not reported any issues with low numbers at race meetings. We do agree some changes were required but not to this level. The Fundamental question is, what problem is this proposal trying to solve?
6. If a marshal has an utter disliking to completing "on/off Track" activities how will they ever be able to upgrade? Surely this marshal is forced to complete a role they do not feel is right for them and in

turn will disadvantage any progression by marshals across all grades. This may lead to a reduction of volunteers as they feel their time is better suited elsewhere.

7. The role of "Trainee" clearly defines a specific type of person and is used by industry today. If a person who becomes an "Accredited marshal" their thought process may be they can do all forms of marshalling which could lead to safety concerns for staffing posts if the "trainee" is not identified. This has happened on several occasions where an "Accredited" marshals have said they are a flag marshal and at the last minute they have been identified as a "trainee". This is a safety concern!

8. What is to happen if the "Accredited marshals" decides after a taster day no longer wishes to attend or take part in any form of motorsport? Who is responsible for informing MSUK or is this more admin work for the clubs who are run by volunteers most of the time?

9. If the new proposal is fundamentally the same as the existing grading scheme but with new titles, why change what already works. We should be educating the members with more clarity on what the process is and we as BMMC are very good at this. It appears that other clubs are not able to follow simple process or even MSUK don't know their own scheme and upgrade as they see fit. Again we agree that there needs to be a modernisation of current roles/grading but is this to the cost of losing marshals?

There are many other factors that need to be taken into account and there are not enough pages to write about them here. The fundamentals are simple, it's the same scheme with different titles which don't reflect each individual's abilities and will cause difficulties for chief marshals or coordinators if they don't know the individual and what grade/level they are at.

Add to this the cost to change branding, clothing, Badges, websites, volunteering systems and all the additional administration for all the volunteers who run regional committees. Is this change a viable option both financially and morally for clubs and organisers?

It is clear from the recent attitude of MSUK, BARC, TOCA with the issue of lights at BTCC meetings that MSUK have no grip on what marshals are capable of and how to treat the most valuable workforce they have. Without Marshals attending all forms of Motorsport there would be no Motorsport UK!

Yours in racing,

Andy Bumstead

Andy Bumstead

Chair BMMC Southeast region