

Category	Question
Reason for change	1 Where is the info, data or evidence that Chief Marshals are struggling to get enough marshals of a specific skill, to run an event? How many events have been unable to run, due to this? Is this a specific circuit? Is this a specific skill set? How will this proposal solve the above, when we are volunteers, and choose what we would like to do?
	2 Why change something that is not broken?
	3 Why exactly do we need to change the grading scheme - the old one is fine but could easily be tweaked to improve?
	4 If the reason for change is to "help cover low numbers" then I think the actual cause of low numbers is long days, lack of proper breaks, lack of welfare, late finishes, and costs. These we have said a dozen times to MSUK and yet it seems reluctant even to attempt to address them. Why?
	5 It is implied in Nadine's write up within the original email that the old grading scheme is somehow to blame for low numbers - please can she qualify this, because as far as I am concerned that is NOT what most of us think?
Proposal process	1 During the development stage, did you seek any input from Senior specialist marshals, such as, but not limited to, those who are chief for British Championships, such as BTCC or BGT and/or International race meetings and/or the British GP? Senior Clerks of the Course Senior MSUK Stewards FIA Race Directors Has it been established that the proposed grading pathway allows sufficient training for marshals to be considered as sufficiently competent in a role for a meeting held at National level or above by any/all of the groups mentioned?
	2 How many of the people involved in the pathway project have experience of specialist marshalling at a senior level? How many undertake specialist duties on a regular basis?
	3 Has anyone asked the track marshals if they want to undertake specialist roles? When this was tried before (When Chris Hobson was chairman), this idea was tried and dropped due to marshal opposition.
Consultation	1 Is MSUK going to hold meetings for the consultation so we can hear from all the discipline representatives?
	2 I note that a quote from Nadine as MAG Chair was included in the initial "consultation email". Both clubs and individuals are being consulted, including BMMC, and so BMMC must represent its members views. However, as Nadine is also Chair of the BMMC, this is a potential conflict of interest. How does BMMC intend to deal with this?
	3 Given the above – what is the BMMC's stance on the new proposals – or is it yet to consult members?
	4 How much of this consultation is a "done deal" and how much will general marshals views influence the outcome?
New marshals	1 it is a good idea for newer people to see both Specialism and Track as they are currently. Perhaps reduce the number of days in the opposite discipline to 2 (after all this should be enough since according to the proposal you can upgrade to L1 with 2 days in each off track area). Do this at Registered level. That way the person gets to see the other side and can make a choice then. The split should come at L1 and then there should be no further requirement to do the "other side".
	2 I agree with trainees (and ONLY trainees) spending a day each in Pits, Startline and Paddock. This gives them a much better overview of the disciplines and provides them with some knowledge to make an informed choice as to whether they want to primarily stay "Off-Track" or "On-Track". Indeed some circuits already do this. There is nothing to stop a marshal working in both disciplines as is the case currently. This is simply two pathways which can be followed independently. As is currently the case.
	3 As a new marshal with an interest in Race, Speed and Rally, I welcome the introduction of the Registered Marshal (Accredited) grade which allows me to volunteer at Race, Speed and Rally events. However, I would like very much to attain Level 1 Marshal in all three disciplines if at all possible and maintain these grades. However, given time constraints and the cost of travel this is a challenge, hence my questions. Are any of the training modules (courses) and event attendances counted as being cross discipline? Please note this is in respect of both maintaining grades and for assessment? How is cross training recorded in the PRC and are the MSUK records updated across all disciplines?
Future upgrade	1 Why are we being forced to mix On-Track with Off-Track?
	2 Why are marshals who wish to upgrade being forced in to undertaking roles they would otherwise not be interested in.
	3 If it has previously been agreed that at least 15 days experience/knowledge in a role is required for an upgrade, how can this now be dropped to 6 days?
	4 How do you plan to retain current marshals who wish to upgrade but don't want to do both on track and off track duties?
	5 As a dual grader I am fully aware that the skills, mindset, KASE and awareness are wholly different across the two disciplines - so very different. The analogy I would give is like a Lorry Driver and a Train Driver. Both are "Drivers" but need wholly differing skills. Yet here we are suggesting that a lorry driver can learn to drive a train competently in 6 days. Are you aware of how ridiculous this is?
	6 I believe the danger you face is having a large number of people refusing to grade because they do not want to do the other side and are unwilling to "waste" their valuable volunteering days being forced to do something they do not wish to do. I think that this will lead to worse stagnation - probably at both Registered and L1. How do you propose to get over this issue? I believe you will fast find yourselves running short of L2's and L3's as time goes on.
	7 Question of Upgrade Days - you have put 6 sig days in as minimum for someone to ask for an upgrade on the offtrack part of their L1 grade. As an Examining Spec do you SERIOUSLY expect me to sign off that someone has sufficient experience and expertise to work without close supervision in any of the 3 "offtrack" areas you have mentioned - and it would need to be without close supervision because we will be busy with the next influx of "ontrackers" on the list. Honestly - if someone has 2 days experience on start-line and I leave them alone to grid (because that is what MSUK have said is sufficient knowledge and experience) and they get presented with two cars coming at them which they are not expecting - honestly what is going to happen - it will turn into a mess because they will not have the experience to pick up on the various cues around to actually work out what is wrong in a very short space of time. This will waste both timetable time and knock their confidence - wholly unfair. So, six days or not, as an Examining Spec I will only recommend and upgrade when I feel that person has sufficient experience and knowledge which will be probably 12 to 15 days. This will both annoy those who just do not want to be there - and also compound point 12 above. What do the MSUK intend to do about this issue?
	8 There is a now a minimum time on a grade. Can you confirm that this is a calendar year? But this now means that an Experienced Marshal must have been on the bank for at least 3 years. And IO or Post chief for at least 6. I completely agree with this increase. In fact I would go further and increase the trainee requirement to 2 years (from one)
	9 The minimum amount of days required to upgrade has gone down across both "On-Track" and "Off-Track" compared to the current scheme.
	10 A minimum number of years on a grade is a welcome change.
Transfer	1 In the future, how will you know which marshals have on and off track experience - those who transfer over to the new system and do not upgrade will not necessarily have the knowledge to perform both roles, but their grade would suggest they have that knowledge?

Inclusion & Diversity	1	The question of inclusiveness, diversity and Equality Act - as volunteers we ARE covered by the Equality Act, as I have stated before Specialism and Track are too vastly different fields, each requiring different skills, and also personal abilities. Track can be more physical in short spurts - we can find many roles in Specialism for those not willing or able to go sprinting 200 yards down a track. many people are uncomfortable trackside and many people do not have the mindset for specialism. So a lot of people gravitate to Specialism because of a degree of physical infirmity, or just being older. The point is, to stay within the law MSUK will HAVE TO make reasonable adjustments in these cases. I have found more recently less of a willingness within MSUK to do this. However, I believe that the new proposal will attract a plethora of requests for exceptions to say go trackside, but MSUK will still need to find a way of making reasonable adjustment and allow them to upgrade - this is potentially an administrative minefield as I think the requests will be many. How does the MSUK intend to deal with this aspect of the scheme.
Training	1	The suggestion to drop the requirement for duplicate training requirements for the same thing, such as Fire theory etc is a strong positive move.
	2	Have you considered the fact that specialist marshals have to write reports from day one, unlike there track side colleagues? To make the report writing module a requirement for level 3 upgrade only indicates that this has not been considered.
	3	How will training days work? They are already crowded, how will you fit in more modules?
	4	What is "Advanced First Marshal On Scene"? Careful reading of the proposals for "Level 2" reveals a requirement for "Advanced First Marshal on Scene"? What is "Advanced First Marshal On Scene"? What exactly does MUK propose to move to the "Advanced" part? What does MUK expect a "Level 1" marshals _not_ to do, and what will be the implications for an injured driver if those actions are _not_ taken? Is moving the head to open an airway considered advanced? Or is it essential to know and practice for any first marshal on scene? Very clearly whoever is first on scene should have all the skills and knowledge necessary to keep a driver alive and free from disability (if at all possible) until medical and rescue support arrives. As someone who runs FMOS at training days, I teach every marshal, regardless of discipline or grade exactly the same material and techniques. We cannot have - and do not need - an "Advanced First Marshal On Scene".
Volunteering	1	It seems that you are saying that people will volunteer for roles as they do now - but it appears to me that these roles are no longer formalised - or is it intended those roles such as IO, or PC, or Flag remain written in and formalised? If the above is the case, and these roles still exist (formally or not) and that is what we volunteer for, then what is the reason to introduce this ridiculous proposal?
	2	We are now forcing volunteers to have given up their time freely to do something they enjoy, into disciplines they have no interest in or intention following. As a result we will lose marshals, or marshals will stick at their current grade or future marshals will not join.
	1	Why has Flag Marshal been downgraded to Level 2? It was previously a upgrade from Experienced
	2	I currently hold two Race grades, Flag Marshal (Level 2) and Specialist (Level 1). What will my grade be under the new proposal?
	3	Within Race people will naturally gravitate to either Specialist or Track (current) for very good personal reasons. How does the MSUK believe that forcing people to do something they do not wish to do (via forcing the issue to allow an upgrade) will improve matters, and not actually lose volunteers? For sure you will lose me as a volunteer because I cannot work under a scheme that is so unpopular and I believe unsafe.
	4	Deskilling - it is clear the new proposal deskills both on and off track - but affects off track more. This is similar to the point above. It is clear the MSUK have been concerned recently about people upgrading too quickly - a valid argument perhaps. Indeed, I was involved in an upgrade to Exp Track recently where the person had double the amount of needed sigs, all the relevant training and had passed an assessment properly. However, the grade was sat on at MSUK with the accusation that the person was "rushing through" the grading scheme. Yet, here you are proposing that to get to L1 which you claim is equivalent to Specialist or Track, that you need only 6 days in offtrack, and I think only 10 ontrack plus flags. So, from the very organisation that complains people upgrade too quickly comes a proposal to actually reduce the number of days - it makes no sense. Whatever you say, reducing the days and attempting to spread KASE across a broader spectrum will end up in deskilling on both disciplines (I don't care what you say you have disguised Specialism as "offtrack" then pretended it doesn't exist) and potentially made us Jack of All Trades and more importantly Master of None - and this is dangerous.
	5	A few years back and in response to lack of Flaggie numbers the MSUK introduced into the grading scheme the requirement to do a minimum number of Flag days to upgrade. This was to cross skill and hopefully have a marshal base that can carry out both Track, but be asked to flag if needed. This has led to an interesting pair of issues - mostly if we ask a Track or Exp Track to flag - in 90% or more of cases they will simply refuse because they simply do not want to do it, and we have a bit of a stagnation at Track with a number of marshals who clearly should be Exp Track not grading because they simply do not want to do the flag days. How then does this proposal intend to get over this issue of people refusing to do what they do not wish to do?
	6	The loss of some positions - it seems that all the PC's and Flaggies who have worked hard for their grades are just about to have all their hard work wiped out? Do you think this is good for morale and retention?
	7	These changes endanger my incident teams, myself and are fundamentally unsafe and therefore dangerous.
	8	The loss of the flag grade as a separate discipline is not acceptable. This change has also dropped the 4 required flag assessments at Trainee, Track, Experienced, Flag grade upgrade points.
	9	Why is MUK forcing volunteers into roles they have no interest in. On track we already have problems persuading trainees, track and experienced marshals to complete the required flag days to upgrade. Indeed many marshals have delayed and or refused to upgrade on the basis of being forced to flag - a discipline which they have no interest in, and see as "boring" and less "involved" than the incident discipline. I profoundly disagree with this point of view, but that is the view of a large number of marshals. To now force marshals to spend 10 days a year (possibly 50% of their time) into a the "Off-Track" disciplines which "On-track" marshals have no interest in, will simply cause marshals to leave the sport, or refuse to upgrade. The same is true in reverse. "Off-Track" marshals similarly have no interest in "On-Track" activities. The two disciplines are required to run an event. But the personalities and interests of the two groups are very different. As a result, I can see no marshal wanting to upgrade between Level 1 and Level 2 in the future. Marshals will upgrade from trainee as that opens the Grand Prix. I know of marshals who do a limited number of days each year due to both work and family commitments. It is entirely possible in these cases that even if they wanted to take the "Off-Track" days as part of an upgrade it could take several years to accrue the required 6 days (between Level 1 and Level 2) to the point that the oldest "Off-Track" day would be more than 2 years old - and so potentially would not count to any upgrade due to its age. In these cases marshals the new system is actively preventing these marshals from upgrading. There should be no forcing of volunteer marshals to move between "On-track" and "Off-Track", for upgrade, grade maintenance or any other reason. If an individual marshal wishes to do this (and I can personally think of only 2 who do) then they should be supported in this decision and have to clear but separate pathways - as is currently the case. As I understand it the average number of days per season of a marshal is something between 15-20 days a year. Or roughly one weekend for 7 months of the year. Given this I do not feel that it is correct that a marshal who has taken the time to volunteer should be forced into a discipline - "Off-Track" or "On-Track" - that they have no interest in.

Race	<p>10</p> <p>Why has MUK removed the flag specific grade? While I believe that all "On-Track" marshals should be able to flag to some degree so that they can cover or fill in for a flag marshal as required, the removal of the flag grade is both short sighted and wrong. A flag marshal is my and my incident teams last line of defence. To belittle the role by removing the separate grade, or reduce the current experience requirements - as this proposal does - for this critical role for both drivers and "On-Track" marshals is short sighted. There is skill in knowing what flag to wave or light to trigger. There is much more skill in knowing when not to display a flag or trigger a light. Marshals should be rewarded for knowing this, not penalised. This change drops the 4 required flag assessments at Trainee, Track, Experienced, Flag grade upgrade points. Without these what "standard" should I as an IO am I to expect from flag marshals in the future? Under the current system I can at least be assured that the marshal has taken a specific flag assessment. Under the new system I have no such reassurance. I know many excellent flag marshals, who have no interest in returning to an incident team. They have chosen to flag as they is there preferred way to be involved. I know of many who would be physically incapable of jumping over barriers or tyre walls. But are perfectly able to flag and get out of the way of an accident if necessary. Are these marshals now to be turned away, or forced into incident roles on occasion? By the same token I know of many trainees who came into the sport to become flag marshals, as they see that as having more involvement that either incident or "Off-Track". In may ways I agree with them. What are these new marshals now to do? By forcing these marshals to work with an incident team (or with an "Off-Track" team) we are again putting volunteers in a position where they are not performing the role that they prefer and not making use of the skills they have. And let me remind MUK, that flagging is the one and only discipline that translates across countries. MUK marshals who are lucky enough to go to events overseas are predominately working as Flag marshals. If MUK is prepared to let flagging standards slip nationally - by the removal of the flag grade - then UK marshals excellent reputation overseas will certainly slip. What does MUK expect to happen in the future, if we have less experienced flag marshals? Will fewer penalties for "overtaking under double waved yellows" be issued. Is an would a experienced flag marshal more likely to be questioned as to what he saw? Will clerks only rely on onboard video of an incident going forward? Will more marshals or drivers be injured because yellow lights or flags where late or non existent?</p>
	<p>11</p> <p>Why has MUK decided that the minimum time of a grade has gone up - but both the "On-Track" and "Off-Track" experience required has gone DOWN? Currently from Trainee -> Track requires 15 days (all "On-Track") of which 2 are Flag. Or 100% of the days are "On-Track". Under the new system its 15 days, split between 3 incident, 3 flag, 6 specialist. If I am generous, and say that the remaining 3 days are as Incident that works out to be 6 incident, 6 specialist, 3 flag, Only 9 days (or only 60%) of the days "On-Track" to upgrade from trainee. This is a 40% reduction. So under the new scheme a trainee can upgrade to track with just 6 incident days. This is plainly unsafe. Track->Experienced was 20 days (5 Flag) so all 20 "On-Track". Under the new system it would be 20 days split as 5 Incident, 5 flag, 10 specialist. This means that only 50% of the days are "On-Track". This is a 50% reduction compared to the current system. Only 25% or 5 days as incident! So it's now OK to upgrade am marshal from Track to Experienced after 5 days as a track marshal over 2 years. That is plainly unsafe. Specialists have been similarly impacted by this change. Trainee to Specialist was 15 days all "Off-Track" it is now 9 (including the free 3 days are all "Off-Track".) This is a 40% reduction. Specialist -> Experience specialist used to be 20 days, its now 10 days. A 50% reduction. The flag grade appears to be abolished completely. So am I now to assume that a marshal is considered a competent flag marshal - and my and my teams last line of defence - after 2 days which - the minimum between trainee and level 1 or 8 days (the minimum between trainee- level 2). As opposed to the 15 days (from race experienced). Or from trainee that would be 15 + 5 + 2 = 22 days. Even on the best (8 days) case this is a 64% reduction! So, as an IO (of 15+ years, and an marshal of 22+ years) I can look forward in the future to having my incident teams made up of marshals that have (according to the new grading system) 50% less experience (or 75% if you could only incident days) "On-Track" than they have to have at the minute. This is fundamentally unsafe change in my opinion. Marshals with this lower level of experience are nothing more than trainees with at best half a season under their belt. I as an IO I will therefore treat these Level 1 and Level 2 marshals as trainees. That both increases my connotative load, as I will now have to train these new "marshals/trainees" as well as the actual trainees I have on post. So this will comfortably double the number of people I have to train on a day. I now cannot balance a team. If I have a Level 1 grade marshal who has only 9 days incident, I cannot pair them with a trainee. Where as at the minute I will often pair them with a most experienced trainee. I do this because track marshals are often very good an helping trainees simply because they still remember what it was like to be a trainee. I can't really pair the trainee with an level 2 grade marshal either - as my Level 2 marshal could only have 14 days incident experience. I am therefore forced to keep the trainees with me, and pair the Level 1 and Level 2 marshals up as best as I can to cover the corner. This is likely to led to groups of 3 marshals rather than pairs, which reduces the number of points that can be covered. All assuming of course that I have the marshals to be able to cover more than one point. To be absolutely blunt about this. "On-Track" marshals are the one who are "putting their neck on the line" every time we are track side. The dangers inherent in the "On-Track" roles far out weight those on the "Off-Track" roles. Every serious injury or death to a marshal in the UK over the last 25+ years have involved "On-Track" marshals and not "Off-Track" marshals. Unfortunately these statistics speak for themselves. To weaken, or reduce the "On-Track" experience requirements for the on-track roles, as this new proposal does, makes the "On-track" disciplines more dangerous - to both the individual marshals and to the incident teams they work within. This is a serious failing of the proposed pathway and it must be rejected on this basis alone.</p>
1	<p>Do you realise how insulting it is to specialist marshals to decree that they, as a group, are no longer worth their own grade?</p>
2	<p>Loss of Specialist "Pathway" if you wish to call it that. In fact, it isn't entirely missing but de-formalised and disguised as "offtrack". If you have references to this throughout the documentation and indeed at L3 you ask someone to choose - then you are admitting there is a clear need - so why lose it, this is oxymoronic?</p>
3	<p>Do the authors of the proposal have any idea how complex Specialism is? I am both an IO and Ex Specialist so I believe I am in a very strong position to comment on both roles (or a Level 3 "ontrack" and Level 2 "offtrack" if you wish to use your new codes). Clearly not - because Specialism is a lot harder than the authors of this proposal appear to think. In the current grading scheme we have a minimum number of 15 days to upgrade from Registered to Specialist. In fact as an Exam Specialist I normally look for more (unless the person is exceptional) because I have to be sure that person is competent to both understand the basics, cope with minor issues (hopefully before they happen) be safe, and perhaps have a new Registered with them. This is only at Specialists level. Expecting someone to have any idea what is going on in any Specialist area with 2 days practice (6 days in total 2x Ass, 2x S/L and 2x Pits) is utter nonsense and plain dangerous and as an Ex Spec I will have none of it. I would like to see how MSUK represent themselves with this in court if someone is injured or killed. The same would apply with Track. So where was the Specialist representation when this proposal was cobbled together?</p>

Specialist	4	Capacity - if the scheme goes ahead then it is clear to gain any grade above registered, a marshal will need to do both ontrack and offtrack activities. On track we have a fairly good capacity for soaking up numbers. However, in Specialism we most certainly only have a very finite capacity. The issue is we will suddenly find that if 80% of "ontrack" marshals wish to upgrade then we will need to syphon them ALL through Specialist Areas. We do not have the capacity. We are both limited by what is a sensible limit on numbers in and area, and having enough substantive marshals to actually look after very inexperienced people. For instance, in Assembly a good number is 3 or 4, plus perhaps a couple of trainees at most. Anymore; than this gets difficult to manage tbh (and I know this having run assembly a good many days). Pits is similar, a sensible number might be say 15 or 20 for a club meeting, but if we have only 6 or 7 substantive marshals, the number of new inexperienced people is limited to probably 3 or 4 at most, and that will even then be difficult to manage. The problem is sensibly we need a ratio of about 3:1 substantive against new (3 substantive for every one new) or thereabouts. I think there will be long waiting lists to get into Spec areas, and you will have to prioritise those that are already Spec marshals for their experience and know how - or risk aggravating them. I believe you could easily start to see upgrades taking 3 to 4 years or more as people await their offtrack days. So how does the MSUK intend to manage the huge numbers of ontrack marshals seeking their offtrack days to upgrade and manage the restricted capacity in offtrack areas?
	5	Danger - this proposal is nefarious - due to the deskilling on both track and off track, this can only lead to a more dangerous environment. For instance - it is quite possible to have an unsupervised L1 running around on a startline with only 2 days experience. Utter nuts - how do the MSUK ensure the safety of both that marshal and mine with minimal training? Please do not insult my intelligence say we have to supervise closely - because you have already stated in your proposal that after 2x days on S/L that marshal should be proficient!
	6	Also the addition of a "grade" within Specialism is also a good idea - we have been missing it for years.
Rally	1	I am currently gaining experience as a Rally Timekeeper with the aim of following a timekeeper pathway in both Rally and Speed but I'm not sure how this is covered in the new structure. From what I can see the specialist disciplines such as timekeeper are not individually identified as pathways.
Speed	1	I am a Speed Marshal but also work in the Speed Paddock and on Startline. What will my grade be under the new proposal?
Assessors	1	By limiting the marshals able to upgrade to only those Experienced Post Chiefs who wish to be assessors, are we getting into the same situation we have had for a significant number of years, i.e. the lack of marshals of this grade? After all, how does an examining post chief assess a trainee Incident Officer when he/she cannot hear the radio messages being passed to Race Control from the IO ?
	2	Totally agree with making the Examining a more formal Assessor role that has training, a course and is monitored. Excellent idea