Chronology of Events:

At the 2023 SCCA Solo Nationals, after the successful completion of two days of competition (Tu/Wd) and impound process, Hillary Anderson (CAMS #145) appeared in the posted and online results in the 10th (of 35) and final trophy position, was announced as the final trophy holder, and received the said trophy during the onsite trophy presentation.

Shortly thereafter, Anderson was approached by the Chief Steward who informed her there was an error and she finished one out of the trophies in 11th at which point she returned the trophy. The error in question was an erroneous cone call on Richard King (CAMS #14) that the Chief Steward corrected after reviewing grid sheets, interviewing course workers on the course, and finally reviewing an in-car video from the competitor. By the time the investigation concluded, the trophy presentation had already started.

Anderson subsequently filed a protest which was withdrawn after being asked to do so by the Director of Rally/Solo.

The Chief Steward, Chief of timing, and Director of Solo further discussed the issue and determined the Timing software had made an error and that there should be 11 Trophies. The Results were modified, Anderson was informed by the Director of this and was called on stage to receive a trophy for 11th Place at the evening banquet.

Post nationals, the Final results were again revised to show only 10 Trophy positions with no further communication or explanation to Anderson.

Root Causes and Recommendations:

Incorrect results and awards distribution:

1) There is no official mechanism to inform other event officials that the Chief Steward (or by extension, the Chief of Course or Chief of Timing) is investigating an issue that may have an impact on the results. Similarly, there is no documented mechanism for notifying competitors in class that something in the results is being investigated. There also is no documented process for indicating issues during the hand-off of results from event officials to SCCA officials who handle the awards portion of the event.

    It is recommended that:

    a. Before results are presented to competitors for review in impound or to event officials for awards distribution, The Chief Steward or whatever officials can permute the results in response to the competitor or official action should have to sign off or initial that there are no active actions that could change the results.
    b. T&S must be promptly notified by any event official "taking a case." Preliminary and provisional results should include an indication that a run or a competitor's results are under review when an investigation has been initiated and said notation be changed to indicate when the review has been completed ideally with a notation indicating it has

been revised or upheld. This will serve to alert other officials, announcers, and competitors as to what is going on.

    c.   After completion of any Event Official investigation, the final results as intended to be used for the awards presentation must be provided to competitors in impound for review and to allow them to raise any new issues to event officials and file a protest before the awards presentation begins if applicable. A release from impound or start of awards at nationals should only begin once the competitors have indicated they have no issues with either compliance or timing. (This used to happen regularly, but seems to have fallen by the wayside in recent years.)

Erroneous addition of trophy position:

1) The decision to add an 11th trophy was based upon a multiparty discussion and recollection of Section 11 of the rule book specifics rather than consulting the text which indicates 10 awards for 35 entrants. (3 for the first 9 plus one for every 4 additional entrants or a fraction thereof = 3+6.5 = 10 trophies).
It is recommended that:

    a.   Protest policies and flow are well documented as is the appeal chain. This is not the case for Chief Steward or SCCA officials taking action outside the protest dynamic. What can or can't happen, who can revise things and when, as well as the escalation path and end of it relative to turning into a protest all should be documented.

    b.   Much as a Protest Committee member should recuse themselves when a protest involves them or their decisions, event and SCCA officials should recuse themselves from subsequent decisions that require a review of previous actions that involved them as competitors or officials. This will both remove concerns of conflict of interest and also help ensure an objective and thorough review is conducted. This should be documented somewhere, or the existing "conflict of interest" section (4.9) should be clarified to include these cases.

Changes to official results:

1) There is no mechanism in place to inform competitors of changes to the official or final results after the event resulting from certain types of changes.

It is recommended that:

    a.   Any change to the results should include a notation as to why the change was made (Similar to what is called for in section 7.9 for protests)

    b.   Such changes should also be communicated to the affected competitors before they appear online or in print. Beyond being a courtesy, it will allow them the ability to take any other actions afforded to them before said publication.

Other Findings and Recommendations:

Lack of Operational clarity:

Unlike road racing which has many operations manuals that document mechanisms, processes, and responsibilities for running events or runoffs, the SCCA Solo program and Nationals do not. Some of this information is captured in the SCCA rules and some in the National sups but much of it is tribal knowledge. This is even more important when part of the event is handled by members as officials and part is handled by paid SCCA staff.

As relates to this case, the following should be captured in some manner.

1) There is currently no *complete* documented process for how results proceed from captured, audited, preliminary, final, and "official" and what "signoffs" are required to proceed from one step to the next. In turn, there is no documentation of when and under what conditions and authority the results may be changed after reaching a particular milestone. 1.5.f defers ". The manner of determining results" to the event supplemental regulations yet the sups only cover the posting of "Final" results to Sololive and publication of "Official results" on scca.com. This seems like a great place for a flow chart.

Similarly, awards mechanisms and processes are spread between multiple sections of the rule book and as relates to nationals, the supps. (8.6, 11.0 Supps 13.0)

1) Whether in a section relating to event flow or as a standalone relating to awards, all rules and processes for awards should be combined in one section with appropriate callouts as to how they impact other rules if superseding. As example, 8.6 specifies that awards may only commence after the period for protests elapses, yet the Nationals supps say that trophies will be awarded approximately 20 minutes after day 2 competitions. It does not clarify how this would impact protests…arguably at the event where protests are most meaningful.
   a. Replace or augment the language "Approximately 20 minutes after" to instead include the conditions under which the awards presentation will commence.

Lack of clarity around Chief Steward's role, responsibilities, and powers as well as the complete flow of T&S problems:

Road racing has reams of language on the Steward's roles and responsibilities and powers. We have one paragraph that is very light on what the Chief Steward does. Specifically:

"After the start of the event, the authority of the Chief Steward shall supersede that of the Event Chairman regarding the effectiveness of event administration procedures in achieving the intent of all applicable rule"

This seems to limit the Chief Steward to making changes to the process in the interest of aligning them with the rules. Nowhere does it grant him the power to modify results based upon a protest committee-like review, such as occurred in this case (reviewing video).

Much of the Steward's role seems to be passed down verbally via tribal knowledge.

Furthermore, the current rules indicate a complaint of incorrect results posting (wrong cone) should be handled by the chief of course and timing Appendix F, yet this is not listed in the Chief of course's responsibilities. It also is the only place in the current rules that protesting a posting discrepancy is addressed.

1) Add to the rule book or supplemental documentation further language around roles and responsibilities of event officials with actual examples or prescriptive lists of actions they can take.
2) Move language regarding complaints about incorrect posting into the event flow section and chief of course responsibilities
3) Add language to the protests section of the rule book on how T&S-related results should be protested. Ideally, cover what can be covered by the chief of course, and what needs to progress to protests.

New onsite rewards format:

There still seem to be small inconsistencies between the rules and the new "Faster' awards format.
1) A scrub should be made to find and remove such inconsistencies and perhaps move the relevant section to the supps and operations manual to provide greater flexibility in awards formats without having to revise the rule book.
2) Assuming an operations manual is created, it should be revised anytime the awards process is changed to ensure everyone is following the correct process.

11. Awards Numbers is confusing and very hard to remember

1) Simplify: make it just one award for every three competitors rounded up, or simply 33%
2) 11.B should be moved to the nats supps.
3) Section 11 currently bases all of its math on "Entrants" yet current operational policies seem to base it on competitors. This needs to be normalized. I'm aware of at least one case - where a meaningful trophy was lost due to some entrants not taking runs and thus being removed from the final results, and as the rules currently read, this was an error. 1.2.4 defines an entrant as someone who has met the requirements to enter the event. It does not specify they must actually attend or compete. A "Competitor" is defined in 1.2.5 as "a driver who has completed at least one run". I would go further to recommend a quick scrub of the book and likely replacing most instances of "entrant" with a "competitor".