

ISSUES & OBJECTIONS RAISED

In compiling this I have arrived at the following key thoughts:

- There are numerous requests made in the list below for evidence, proof and/or justification and in almost every instance no such material has been provided. I have referred occasionally below to the old adage “if it ain’t broke, don’t try to fix it” and yet the intent to do so persists. In business I always had to justify a business case for change was better than the ‘do nothing’ option, never the reverse and yet seemingly that is what we are being asked to do.
- There seems to be an overwhelming view from around regions that the proposed changes will have a serious impact on numbers participating – these views are based on reactions from existing competitive members and those on coaching and judging pathways and yet no response has been made on any of these points.
- Well-reasoned arguments have been made (capable of being evidenced academically) to justify abandoning the intent to mark arm-set as an aesthetic skill and yet this has been ignored.
- Well-reasoned arguments have been made (capable of being evidenced academically) to justify abandoning the intent for a mandatory six-bounce start and yet this has been ignored.
- Well-reasoned arguments have been made (capable of being evidenced academically) to justify abandoning the damaging age-based difficulty requirements and yet these have been ignored.
- Arguments have been put forward to suggest that the process of introduction of the new structure is in breach of BG’s rules and this has simply been ignored, not disputed or proven otherwise.
- Several have suggested that the objectives could easily be achieved with minor change, not radical, and yet no attempt appears to have been made to consider this.
- Several have raised issues about the structure being supportive of FIG and yet the evidence of our eyes suggests many deviations without evidenced justification.
- It is noted that the proposed structure increases costs hugely; given (i) comparison with MAG & WAG paying similar fees for 6/4 competitions to the proposed trampoline fees and (ii) BAGA has delivered financial surpluses averaging around £1m per year for the past several years why should trampoline members have to bear the full cost for what seems to be an unjustified (evidence) vanity project.
- The one year abatement of difficulty for 15+ year old performers may help current performers to transition but the proposed reinstatement in 2015 simply defers the problem – children just coming through then will still see the almost insurmountable challenge current performers see today.

NO.	PRIORITY	REGION	ISSUE / OBJECTION	HAS THIS BEEN RESOLVED/ADDRESSED?
1	Info	SE	No evidence existing system would fail to deliver objectives. Given that, why is it necessary to undergo such wholesale change?	No evidence provided. Old adage applies – “if it ain’t broke, don’t try to fix it”.
2	Info	SE	Why do the NTTC appear to be being bypassed with proposals coming from unseen/unknown others?	No response.
3	Info	SE	Proposed scheme will provide disincentive for competitors, coaches & judges and result in reduced levels of participation.	It seems to be a distributed opinion throughout the sport that this will cause numbers to diminish, this has not been addressed at all.
4	Info	SE	BG has been controlling the Olympic system since 2000. During that time there have been eight different systems put in place. By your own admission those have all been failures. Now you want to introduce plan 9. Why should we believe this plan will be any better than the previous attempts when your track record is so poor?	No response.

5	Info	SE	Experience delivers medals (Steve Cram & Beth Tweddle quoted as examples) these proposals will reduce experience.	No comment.
6	Info	SE	Adaptation & improvement is more likely to create benefit than constant change.	No comment.
7	Info	SE	You quote a 2012 report highlighting deficiencies in the current structure – it will be useful to see that report (and its conclusions) to understand the call for drastic change. May we have a copy please?	No response.
8	Info	SE	<p>You call for change without explaining how the change will produce medals. Please explain how medals will now be more certain?</p> <p>If you are sure that this system will produce medals at Olympic level (the way funding is determined) are you prepared to promise medal delivery? If you are not, is your system better than any other that has been tried and has no certain outcome worth supporting?</p>	No response.
9	Info	SE	A statement is made that our World Age results are worsening. In reality we should remember that there are many more countries participating and our contingents have been reducing which impacts the chances of medalling and prevents our competitors from a great learning experience. Can you share your figures supporting this claim?	No response.
10	Info	SE	You mention funding as an issue several times. You even quote a £4 million investment since 2006 – but it is not apparent where this money went and thus hard to understand how this benefitted the sport. Can you divulge how much are you proposing to invest in Trampoline between now and Rio 2016?	No response.
11	Info	SE	You state that our best performers cannot complete basic moves - which is ridiculous, else their results for set routines would always be below 9.0 which is clearly not the case. Can you share the figures you use to draw this conclusion so we may correct your error?	No response.
12	Info	SE	You state that the Regional programme is linked to the NDP programme when in fact there is only the NDP programme – can you explain how the two arrangements are different?	No response.
13	Comps	SE	You state that reducing the number of qualification opportunities (for Nationals) will bring more consistent performance when common sense, our own experience, and all empirical evidence has shown that competition experience is essential to success and cannot be replicated during day to day training. Without competition experience (read 'pressure') it is ridiculous to say that reducing the competition opportunities will raise	No comment.

			performance levels – in fact it is bound to have exactly the opposite effect. We suggest that the number of competitions is raised (say doubled) if the aim is to raise performance.	
14	Comps	SE	Following on from above, suggesting that making Nationals more elite will raise levels is similarly unrealistic. Indeed, with the inevitable reduction in time required for the competition, number of participants, spectator attendance, reduced revenue and media interest, the whole viability is called into question. This will also lead to a dramatic reduction in the standing of the championships which will become just a Saturday afternoon event. Please explain how this idea will lead to “higher level” as suggested.	No response.
15	Comps	SE	Giving “other levels a National Finals” has no apparent benefit to performance levels (given that this arrangement was abandoned years ago for the current arrangement for a myriad of good reasons). Knowing that the current scheme was borne of over a years worth of expert meetings and development which included advice from Government advisors, can you indicate what material and research was carried out to suggest this change of approach would be more successful than any other and also if alternative methods were reviewed?	No response, no evidence provided.
16	Info	SE	You talk about resistance to change – this is something you have helped create by forcing 8 programme changes in the last 12 years (see earlier comments). Change does not automatically mean improvement. Can you explain why in you opening document you state you are expecting resistance to change over these proposals, is this a lack of confidence in the underpinning ideals of the proposals?	No response.
17	LTAD	SE	Many of the changes you propose already exist in the current structure (albeit using different terminology) but how can a young person of 10 get to elite level at this age by only competing for one year at NDP age level 9-10?	No response.
18	LTAD	SE	The suggestion of creating two pathways – one leading to Elite status and the other a dead-end if you are over 17 - does not, in itself, improve performance in any way. It will deter competitors from striving to achieve excellence (“there’s no point”) and creates a two class system which will only divide the community – and fail to deliver better performance as a result. It may also create a legal situation where BG may be discriminating on age. Can you explain how this system will provide a clear benefit for all ages?	Some concession has been made to current performers affected by the tariff jump but it will only delay the problem by 12 months as the next crop of 17 year-olds suffer the same massive jump.
19	Comps	SE	It is difficult to understand why a Regional Team event is being introduced – without any clarification or format information and funding process. Can	No explanation is forthcoming although the format will be as for a regional comp but with only one entry per region in each grade/age

			you explain your thinking on this?	group.
20	LTAD	SE	Mention is made of the 'BG Performance Pathway Development Programme' that infers a degree of coach education – again without any further detail. Does this mean there are plans for coach education under this proposed system?	Not addressed.
21	Detail	SE	No (regional) qualification scores are included which is a major omission if this programme has been properly thought through. When will these be available for scrutiny?	Whilst 'qualifying' competitions (to Regionals) are restricted to 3 between January & March, regions are allowed to run more. This latest version also has some 'guidance' about indicative minimum scores between NDP grades but these are not expected to be enforced, rather they are intended only as guidance.
22	Detail	SE	There is no mention of how people progress from (regional) grade to grade (or demotions). Can explain how grade movements will be affected?	It is answered implicitly in the form of 'Recommended Execution Scores before progression'. No downgrade within a season.
23	Detail	SE	Are NDP 1/2 Regional grades – as no competition information is included?	It appears that they are not since the routines still refer to 'Club' although with the introduction of new CDP this might be omission.
24	Detail	SE	The advancement from NDP 7/8 to Elite is vague and infers you cannot progress from NDP 7/8 to Elite. Is this correct?	This is answered by the response 6 – Pathway – the only time a competitor can change <u>during a year</u> is in the first regional competition. It is implicit that the following year is a clean sheet.
25	Comps	SE	Why are NDP Grade 6 participants excluded from the Regional Team final?	Not answered, particularly an issue given number 52..
26	Detail	SE	Will ToF be an integral component of Regional NDP scoring?	No reference has been made to this so, presumably, we must assume not?
27	Detail	SE	There are only 4 (zonal) events mentioned – can you confirm where these events will take place?	Based on email issued after the latest updates, no, they are looking for host venues.
28	Detail	SE	As ToF is an integral component in 7/8 & FIG levels scoring, are you assuming all clubs will purchase ToF equipment now and how will this be funded?	Not addressed.
29	Comps	SE	It seems odd that tumbling is limited to two events – why do we not offer more competitive opportunities to this discipline?	No answer
30	Comps	SE	Why are the TRA Elite/FIG competitors limited to 3 out of 4 competitions?	Not answered.
31	Comps	SE	Surely the 4th Zonal will become meaningless as the competitors will naturally compete at the first three events?	Not addressed.
32	Comps	SE	It is disappointing to see a reduction in the number of National Galas as it will not be possible to ensure everyone around the country has a 'local' competition let alone provide sufficient competitions to allow people to try	Not addressed

			new things, assess their progress, have an end result to months of training, aspire to emulate their role models and generally add the whole competition experience to their knowledge – all the things you cannot recreate in a training environment. Over the years this has reduced from 10 Open opportunities, now to 4. Can you share the information supporting your view that fewer competitions improves performance?	
33	Comps	SE	There is no reasoning offered as to why the Regional competition structure should be cut down to 3 events. This makes no sense if you wish to identify and make provision for talented competitors to be able to progress quickly (even though the document does not explain how competitors qualify to progress). Fewer competitions will also reduce the Regions ability to enhance the sport and deliver support to its members. If anything, it is our opinion that Regional competition, which is the birthplace of future talent, should have more competitions to promote/develop our next generations. Can you explain why you feel it necessary to limit the number Regional competitions?	Whilst 'qualifying' competitions (to Regionals) are restricted to 3 between January & March, regions are allowed to run more. This latest version also has some 'guidance' about indicative minimum scores between NDP grades but these are not expected to be enforced, rather they are intended only as guidance.
34	Comps	SE	The fact that a twin pathway is proposed would suggest that you have too many competitors for one system. To restrict the regional pathway events to three competitions reduces opportunity by 25% minimum. Can you confirm it is your intention to restrict competition opportunities to prevent progression?	No direct response on this challenge although they maintain the same number of comps in this revision.
35	LTAD	SE	There is a disturbing issue in this scheme – it appears that if you are over 17 but not on an Elite pathway that you have no progression potential and are dead-ended in NDP 7&8. This is unacceptable. Looking at Olympic qualifiers since 2000 shows that both men and women do not realise medal performances until at least mid 20s. Writing-off someone at 17+ as having no potential is foolhardy. Can you confirm that NDP 7&8 competitors will be able to progress to Elite level?	The specific question has been addressed implicitly in the suggestion that decisions are only made in respect of the current year, the difficulty gap is still very large though. Some concession has been made to current performers affected by the tariff jump but it will only delay the problem by 12 months as the next crop of 17 year-olds suffer the same massive jump.
36	Comps	SE	We do not believe any culture change is required – all our competitors fully appreciate what it means to be a British Champion. However, we do feel you need a culture change in that you suggest that Nationals become just a trial event for Worlds or, even worse, include some random foreign competitors, a trial for worlds and part of a World Cup event. The British National, if you truly believe they are important, should be only for National Championships. Can you explain why you wish to prevent GB competitors from competing at Nationals but are prepared to allow foreigners to compete instead?	The idea of GBR only at nationals appears to be covered by 40 but going further, as suggested by London (see 188), to create a true showcase has not been taken on board.
37	Comps	SE	With such a drastic reduction in entrants for Senior Nationals, can you	Not answered.

			explain how the event will be funded?	
38	Comps	SE	With such a drastic reduction in entrants for Senior Nationals do you think you will be able to continue the interest (and thus promotion of the sport) from outside media (Sky, BBC etc)?	Not answered.
39	Comps	SE	With Nationals being so drastically reduced in numbers, are you planning to merge TRA Nationals with other BG disciplines in a 'super event'?	Not answered.
40	Comps	SE	<p>Noting the 'Automatic Entry' statement we are keen to support this providing the eligibility criteria are more clearly defined. Under this suggestion it would be possible for:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a foreign gymnast • someone who competed many years ago • someone from a completely different sport (say ACRO) • a Youth competitor (to compete at Senior level) <p>...to have automatic right to compete. Clearly, this provision needs a much more precise definition to be fit for purpose. Can you please confirm these points will be addressed in any proposed criteria?</p>	This appears to have been addressed in respect of foreign nationals by the clarification "xxx will qualify <u>after</u> the HNC has allocated automatic places for GBR gymnasts"
41	Comps	SE	You state that for NDP a pair must come from the same club. This will disadvantage small clubs and give the larger clubs an unfair advantage. Can you confirm that this restriction will be removed on the basis of fair play?	Position has shifted to being somewhat more acceptable but still awkward.
42	LTAD	East	Why are the new proposed Club & Regional routines considered preferable to the current ones?	Not addressed. Adage – "if it ain't broke, don't try to fix it."
43	LTAD	East	Why does the proposed grade 1 routine not have a forward somersault option given that this rotation is usually taught first?	Addressed.
44	Info	East	Considering the absence of detail about where the previous £4m was spent it is interesting to note that it is intended to link this new approach in to the coach education process "through targeted interventions". Will these be at all levels, only at Elite or some other permutation? What format will these interventions take? Are we able to see a plan?	No response.
45	Arm6	East	What code of points are intended to be applied to arm set? And why was the decision taken to introduce this as a counting 'element' in a routine?	No code of points provided, no reason given for making it a judged move although now removed from proposed levels 5 & 6
46	Info	East	Are ages intended to be age as at 31 st December in the current year?	Implicitly yes.
47	LTAD	East	We notice that there were certain criteria which were either excluded from the document or stated as TBA, such as:	Minimum execution now available, haven't seen minimum ToF, seems that no penalty applied other than scores not eligible for Nationals

			<p>a) minimum execution scores at NDP 7 & 8 and Elite</p> <p>b) minimum TOF scores at NDP 7 & 8 and Elite</p> <p>c) required qualification score from Grade 6 up to NDP 7&8 or Elite (as appropriate).</p> <p>When would we have been told what these criteria were to be? What penalties, if any, would be applied by failing to achieve (a) and (b), other than denial of a place at British Championships/NDP National Finals?</p>	qualification if minima are not satisfied.
48	Info	East	Who would comprise the 'Technical Panel' deciding in "exceptional circumstances" who can move between NDP grades 6 & 7 within a season?	The exceptional circumstances provision does not appear in the latest document although there is the option to attempt to qualify for national competition in the first regional competition.
49	Info	East	Other than the need to meet qualification requirements to progress to National level was it intended that decisions about what grade to enter is entirely down to coach/performer discretion at the beginning of each year (even to Elite)? If so, how does this compare with the requirement to 'grade' in other gymnastics disciplines?	It is answered implicitly in the form of ' <i>Recommended Execution Scores before progression</i> ' that whilst there are guidelines it is entirely down to discretion. No response on question about mapping to other disciplines.
50	Info	East	Would coaches/performers be allowed to downgrade at will at any level?	Partial response in that no downgrade is permitted during a season, presumably, therefore, they are able to do so in next season.
51	Comps	East	What consideration has been given to the effect of reduced numbers of competitions on judge development?	Not addressed although this is very much a regional issue only since National Judges will be appointed by BG and not 'offered' by clubs. Good for those clubs who have no judges.
52	Comps	East	Why is it proposed NDP 1-8 tumblers attend Zonals and nationals but only NDP 7-8 trampoline & DMT?	Not answered (links with 25)
53	Comps	East	For the sake of clarity, are we to understand that "NDP Regionals Finals", "Inter-Regional Team Finals" & "Regional Team Event" referred to at various points in the documentation are in fact all one and the same event?	Not addressed specifically but it seems to be so.
54	LTAD	East	What are the criteria for moving up grades during a season, if the performer/coach desires?	We now have some <u>recommended</u> (i.e. not enforced) minimum execution scores but no statement as to whether progress during a year is permitted or not.
55	LTAD	East	We notice that the requirements at NDP 8 & Elite levels are in fact more stringent than those required internationally (e.g. WAG requirements). Given that one objective is to align with international competition requirements, can you explain why it is felt adopting this approach will be beneficial? Was a simple, direct replication of WAG competition structure considered as an alternative format at these levels? If so, on what basis was the replication approach rejected?	Not addressed.

56	Comps	East	We notice that the finals would be run on a cumulative basis at Zonal/Qualifying events at the Senior Elite level. As FIG only operate zero finals, what is the justification for dissenting from this approach?	Not addressed.
57	Comps	East	Why is there no 'Final' during Zonal/Qualifying events, other than for Seniors?	NDP 7 now have a final. It has not been addressed specifically for NDP8 but is, presumably, because they are already competing 3-routines.
58	Info	East	We can see how removing tariff from most levels of regional competition, but rewarding those competing the next grade routine in the second round, makes sense in terms of focussing on form but not why the routines need to be changed so radically.	Not addressed.
59	Arm6	East	There are many different techniques available for arm-set as advanced technical analysts of trampolining like Jack Kelly could describe at length; how could judges possibly accommodate this variation without forcing competitors to treat it as an aesthetic skill without a technical purpose? [See 226 & 227]	This has not been addressed for CDP 1&2 & NDP 1-4.
60	Arm6	East	We can see how extensive in-bouncing should be discouraged but, considering Olympic & World Champions like He Wenna & Dong Dong can take 6 or 7 bounces to achieve full height and about 14 before they have sufficient stability to start, not enforcing a draconian rule.	This has not been addressed – there is a change from penalty to bonus but this is same animal dressed in different clothes and will still disadvantage higher bouncers which is surely not a desired outcome.
61	LTAD	East	At the Regional Level the routines proposed do not reflect normal coaching priorities (i.e. Grade 1 routine Back S/S not Front S/S) and do not provide a suitable (and equitable) progressive structure. Some inter-grade moves involve a significant jump in difficulty (e.g. 3-4 & 6-7 for 13+ ages) and others involve almost none at all (e.g. 2-3, 4-5 & 6-7 for under 13). We believe that the current grade structure offers a much smoother transition between grades as difficulty is increased more steadily and progressively.	Partially addressed in that first regional grade now has Front S/S but there are still some large tariff jumps, e.g. a 17+ y/old having to increase tariff by 50% to go from NP7-NDP8. Again, though, 'if it ain't broke, don't try to fix it' and nobody has convinced us the current routines are broken.
62	Motivate	East	We are disappointed to see the need to achieve a standard qualification score has been removed at regional events. We believe this was an effective motivator for competitors by providing a rewarding and objective goal. Performers were given a clear target and were rightfully proud once they achieved this. With de facto 'free movement' up the grades, we have to question the incentive for participants to compete regularly at a regional level. We fear reduced participation in region, with inevitable implications on funding of these events through decreased entry fee income.	The introduction of suggested minimum form scores is welcome but it still falls short of actually conferring on the individual a sense of achievement that they have 'qualified' since those who did not achieve the score are just as likely to be competing against them in the next grade.
63	LTAD	East	At the National level, the emphasis of the new structure appears to have been put on difficulty. Execution should be the main focus of any structure. With increased form it is much easier to build up technical content and	Not addressed. Whilst there is some small degree of easing for 15+ in NDP7&8, the age discrimination is introduced earlier now in NDP6 and the respite for 15+ is only for a 1-year period after which higher

			difficulty. Stating a minimum tariff will have people chasing moves they are not fully prepared for and performance in terms of execution will suffer. People can only learn at a certain rate and putting in minimums will not speed up the process or improve performance. This will also have the potential to increase the problem of lost move syndrome as people are pushing too hard and too fast to fully learn the skills in the early stages. This will look good to begin with but may cause severe problems later on degrading the overall outcome. Noting also that World Class trampolinists can compete effectively well into their 3 rd decade, we do not need to rush things as much as may be necessary in artistic gymnastics where few make it very far into their 2 nd decade.	demands will be reinstated.
64	Motivate	East	Rather than encouraging wider involvement in trampolining <i>across performers, parents, coaches and judges</i> , we can see that this has the potential to cause significant frustrations and unhappiness within our community and could result in a unforeseen reduction in membership, causing our sport lasting damage.	Not addressed.
65	LTAD	South	Competitors need to learn how to compete. The restriction of opportunities at each level means that new international performers may well be relatively inexperienced in competition performance. European Championships and World Championships (used for Olympic selection) usually involve a large number of large groups. The new scheme will result in small numbers. How will this make for more successful results? Each performer's needs are different, why are they all are bundled into the straight jacket of a restricted diet. There are too few opportunities for competitors to hone routines under competition conditions.	Not answered, no justification.
66	LTAD	South	Improved performance is usually the result of good coaching. There is a need for the perceived weaknesses of the coaching award scheme to be identified and addressed. The Regional Performance Pathway project should not result in coaches feeling that the BG scheme did not prepare them for quality coaching. No approach has been made to the Coach education Panel regarding this issue.	No information on this at all.
67	LTAD	South	(LTAD) There is a lack of obvious flexibility to allow for normal skill learning and physical development.	The current system facilitates different approaches to learning & development that continue to be missing from the proposed one.
68	LTAD	South	There is a reduction of opportunity for coming to the sport as early teenagers and staying in the sport. Research has shown that the dropout rate in gymnastics as a whole is 9 yrs old. Trampolining has always been proud of its ability to retain performers and late developers have had a route through to high level competition. Many retired gymnasts have had a	This has most definitely not been addressed.

			second career in Trampolining. The new scheme is likely to bring trampoline into the early dropout category.	
69	Comps	South	Reduction of qualifiers and opportunities to qualify for National finals may increase the travel and costs for competitors.	Not addressed
70	Arm6	South	The imposition of penalties in regard to number of jumps prior to a routine, whole routines, minimum difficulty levels and the performer restricted to the same level for a whole season (despite injury, loss of confidence, and effects of puberty) does not afford any protection from the reckless coach. This may result in an increase in litigation.	This has not been addressed for CDP 1&2 & NDP 1-4, certainly safety has not been addressed – there is a change from penalty to bonus but this is same animal dressed in different clothes and will still disadvantage higher bouncers which is surely not a desired outcome.
71	Comps	South	Revalidation is already required for domestic judges to understand the new international rules. Judges now need to be instructed in the implementation of the domestic rules. The regions have a year to introduce them but the Level 7+ judges will need instruction very quickly.	Not addressed
72	Arm6	South	The published rules and regulations are not comprehensive and may well lead to regions implementing the scheme in different ways. The clarity of the arm set requirements, lack of qualification scores etc	No response on this nor guidance issued. No code of points provided, no reason given for making it a judged move although now removed from proposed levels 5 & 6
73	Info	South	What research has been undertaken prior to the construction of the new scheme?	None provided.
74	Info	South	Will Silver membership still apply when there is a reduction of opportunities to compete?.	No response.
75	LTAD	South	Why has LTAD been so comprehensively discarded?	No statement given on this.
76	LTAD	South	Have the National Technical Priorities been discarded?	No mention has been made of them anywhere.
77	Info	South	Why, when there are less than 8 competitors will a cumulative score be used?	No response.
78	Info	South	A penalty of 1.0 occurs if a minimum difficulty is not executed. Is there a limit below which a bigger penalty will be implemented?	Points penalty has been removed in favour of routines failing to complete or meet minimum criteria will not be allowed to be used in qualifying to nationals.
79	Arm6	South	Why has a limit been imposed on the number of jumps prior to a routine?	The reason given is based on assumptions rather than any study and it is hoped that it will encourage better technical and mental preparation. This does not take account of other negative implications though already covered here.

80	Arm6	South	If a performer jumps 3 times and stops are another jumps allowed or only 3, are restarts allowed?	Yes, up to 1 minute allowed.
81	Arm6	South	If the limit in preparatory jumps is important, why does it not apply to all levels?	No response.
82	Arm6	South	What are the criteria for judging an arm set?	No code of points provided, no reason given for making it a judged move although now removed from proposed levels 5 & 6
83	Detail	South	Is a voluntary at lower levels an arm set and 9 skills or 10 skills?	Only NDP6 has a voluntary and it is implicit that NDP6 is not subject to judged arm-set for compulsory.
84	Info	South	Why is there such a limit on what can be used as a voluntary routine, at lower levels?	No response.
85	Synchro	South	Why is it mandatory that Synchro pairs are from the same club? This disenfranchises small clubs who may not have appropriate pairings	The constraint on NDP7 pairs being from the same club has been modified to make it from same region. This could force clubs near regional boundaries to travel further than necessary if the closest suitable partner just happened to be in an adjacent region.
86	Info	Scotland	We do not believe that the proposed changes will achieve the desired outcomes, these specific goals only being attainable through further developed coaching and coach development/CPD structures;	Not answered (or disputed, simply ignored).
87	Info	Scotland	We have been given no details of the purported "underlying deficiencies" in the current competition structure, which we are told were highlighted following a BG "high level review" of all disciplines: without this information we are not being fully informed and cannot be expected to accept such radical changes without any justification;	Absent evidence to support the changes how can we be assured that change is needed – as I have said a few times now “if it ain’t broke, don’t try to fix it”.
88	LTAD	Scotland	The supposed underlying principles of the structure do not correspond with (and in some cases are completely contradictory to) the proposed changes. For example, it is stated that <i>"the long -term development of all of our athletes (LTAD) will be at the centre of all of our thinking"</i> ... yet the proposed age categories, minimum difficulty scores and routine structure all completely disregard the principles of LTAD;	No material change so appears unaddressed.
89	Info	Scotland	We have been given no explanation as to why abandoning FIG rules for lower levels will be of any benefit to our gymnasts, particularly when common sense suggests that this will disadvantage our gymnasts. Again, one of the underlying principles of the proposed structure is for it to be "fully aligned with the competitive structure promoted by FIG" yet this is	Not addressed.

			not reflected in the details, with FIG rules being almost completely disregarded at Levels 1-6;	
90	Info	Scotland	We do not believe that any competition or development structure which aims to prepare gymnasts for "international success" will be successful unless FIG rules are followed at all competition levels.	Not addressed.
91	Motivate	Scotland	The proposed structure will in no way create an "enjoyable and fulfilling experience within the sport" but rather will lead to high stress and increased pressure on our gymnasts;	Not addressed.
92	LTAD	Scotland	The proposed structure is not progressive and does not provide any continuity for our gymnasts, particularly in relation to skill development;	No material change so appears unaddressed.
93	Info	Scotland	The proposed routines, minimum difficulty scores and the introduction of a deduction for performing more or less than 6 'in-bounces' are major safety concerns and will likely dramatically increase the number of serious accidents both at training and competitions;	Not addressed
94	Comps	Scotland	The proposed structure is very much weighted in favour of large clubs and will disadvantage smaller clubs who generally have less training time and resources, which will create a significant divide between the regional and elite levels;	This has not been specifically addressed although they have appointed a 'small clubs rep' (Lindsay Hedmann) to the implementation panel. It will be interesting to see what he has to say on this.
95	Motivate	Scotland	By separating the regional, NDP and National levels, we are depriving younger/less experienced gymnasts of the opportunity to observe, compete alongside and aspire to those gymnasts competing at higher levels, which is one of the many advantages of the current competition set-up;	Not addressed.
96	Info	Scotland	No consultation with the member regions has taken place and we have been given no opportunity to provide input or comments in relation to these changes;	Remains true, no reference made.
97	Info	Scotland	In terms of the published BG Code of Points 2013, any changes to the competition routines require to be published by the Trampoline Technical Committee "at least one year ahead of the next National Championships and will be valid from the 1st of January of the year of these championships". Given that the information released prior to this year's national championships was at best a skeletal overview of a new structure, did not include any routines and is substantially different from the subsequently circulated proposals, the NTTC have not complied with this regulation and therefore the proposed implementation timeline is invalid.	It still seems that the whole process is invalid and yet being pushed forward regardless of mass objection and unanswered issues
98	Info	Scotland	Why are the proposals being released and implemented in such a short	Not addressed.

			time-frame? If the competition structure is as important as suggested, why were the changes not announced last year to ensure successful implementation in 2014?	
99	Info	Scotland	Why have the NTTC made no attempt to involve regions/clubs in the decision making process, thereby creating a general feeling of discontent within the trampoline community?	No response.
100	Info	Scotland	Why are such radical changes being proposed without justification rather than lessons being learned from other nations who have performed successfully at World Championships/Olympic Games?	Not addressed.
101	LTAD	Scotland	Canadian trampolinists have won medals at every Olympic Games since trampolining was introduced in 2000. The Canadian national structure is based on achieving high execution and time of flight scores: why are we therefore not following their example by focusing on execution and time of flight scores but instead targeting increased difficulty scores, when this represents only a small percentage of a gymnast's overall score?	No response.
102	Info	Scotland	The proposed competition routines all include somersaults: why is there no non -somersaulting routines for beginners? What is the justification for this?	Have now introduced Club Development Grades which start with front s/s. All regional grades need back s/s.
103	Info	Scotland	If the aim of this structure is to produce future champions, why reduce the number of skills at the foundation NDP levels to 9, only to then change it back to a 10 skill routine further on in the structure? Won't this create confusion for our gymnasts? What is the proposed benefit of this?	No comment.
104	Info	Scotland	What is the benefit of having a competition structure where the first 6 levels do not follow FIG rules? How can that be justified as providing gymnasts with an optimum foundation for progressing to the higher levels, where they will then be required to compete under different rules?	Not addressed.
105	Info	Scotland	In NDP Grade 6, what is meant by a "10 skill" voluntary routine? Does this include the arm set?	Not answered although implicitly unlikely since set is a 10-bounce the voluntary would be expected to be but, since arm-set is now considered to be a skill, there is nothing stated to stop it being used as one of 10 skills.
106	Arm6	Scotland	What is the benefit of gymnasts in NPD 1-5 only being permitted to perform 6 'in-bounces'? Has any consideration been given to the possibility that this will encourage gymnasts to begin routines before they are ready or on 'bad bounces', therefore increasing the risk of injury?	This has not been fully addressed for CDP1&2 and NDP 1-5 – there is a change from penalty to bonus but this is same animal dressed in different clothes and will still disadvantage higher bouncers which is surely not a desired outcome.
107	Arm6	Scotland	Will execution judged be required to mark the 6 in-bounces and arm set? If	No code of points provided for arm-set, the 6-bounces appear not to

			so, how is this going to be implemented?	be judged though, no reason given for making it a judged move although now removed from proposed levels 5 & 6
108	Arm6	Scotland	What happens if a gymnast takes 6 bounces, stops before performing an arm set, recomposes him/herself, takes another 6 bounces then performs the prescribed routine? Is the rule allowing gymnast up to 60 seconds to begin their routine without penalty being completely disregarded?	6-bounce can be restarted for up to one minute.
109	Detail	Scotland	In NDP Grades 7 & Elite Pathway: If minimum difficulty is not met there will be a penalty of 1.0 per judge. Is this rule definitive, i.e. in the case of an interrupted or terminated routine will the penalty still apply?	No longer a penalty but all minima must be met in order for a score to count towards ranking.
110	LTAD	Scotland	In NDP 8, why are the compulsory routines in most cases more difficult than the WAGC requirements, which are supposed to represent the next stage in development?	Not addressed, still the same.
111	LTAD	Scotland	Why is there no linear progression in relation to the routines? NDP Level 8 routine for 15-16 yrs includes a ½in ½out with no previous mention of double backs/half outs, which are pre-requisites for this skill. Why is this the first double somersault to feature in any routines, particularly when a double somersault is not part of the WAGC requirements for this age-group?	Whilst ½ in ½ has been addressed the underlying sentiment, particularly in respect of WAGC, remains unaddressed.
112	LTAD	Scotland	Under the present structure gymnasts can perform ¾ front somersaults at Level F, under the new structure the move does not appear until NDP Grade 7, why is a fundamental skill appearing so late in the structure?	Marginally addressed by adding in a new age split in NDP6 in which the older age group now compete ¾ front somersault.
113	Info	Scotland	Why are voluntary routines not encouraged until NDP Grade 6?	No response.
114	Detail	Scotland	Will there be a tariff limit for NDP 7?	No maximum has been specified for NDP 7
115	Detail	Scotland	How will the age categories be classified, by age at the end of that year or age on the day of competition?	Not answered but, given the link to WAG etc..., it is unlikely to be unchanged from current practice – age on 31 st December.,
116	Info	Scotland	There seems to be a 7-8yrs category for NDP Grades 3-6, but no such category for NDP Grades 1-2. Why?	Remains the case although at 1-2 additional age groups can be added in at regions discretion. It does show a lack of consideration of real life at a regional level though, since there is more likelihood of younger members at lower grades!
117	Info	Scotland	Will there be a matrix created to advise coaches/clubs how the current tiers transfer across?	No response.
118	Detail	Scotland	When will the qualification scores for NDP 7, 8 and the Elite Pathway be released?	Are now available in the routines publication.

119	Motivate	Scotland	Why is there a zero score if less 10 moves are completed? How does this fulfil the underlying principle of ensuring all gymnasts have an "enjoyable and fulfilling experience within the sport"?	The zero score no longer applies although routines failing to meet minimum criteria will not be eligible for consideration in qualification to nationals so the effect remains similar.
120	Info	Scotland	Why is there no promotion/demotion within a season?	No response.
121	LTAD	Scotland	What happens if a gymnast has Lost Move Syndrome? The current structure has two different compulsory routine for a gymnast to choose from. Why has this not been continued in the proposed new structure?	No response, not addressed.
122	Comps	Scotland	Why only 3 competitions a year, in such a short space of time? What is the perceived benefit of this?	Not answered directly although they have made clear this is to make it 'convenient' to planning towards international events – i.e. for the Elite.
123	Comps	Scotland	Why has the competition schedule been designed around the English school year, with no regard to the Scottish or Irish holiday/exam dates?	It is equally inconvenient for English (& Welsh/Irish?) school year with all those doing O & A levels having to be competing in peak exam time.
124	Comps	Scotland	Why are all regional competitions being proposed for the first 3 months of the year, during a time when many regions will experience bad weather? This could make getting to competition venues very difficult, and in some instances impossible.	For 2014 only BG are allowing some flexibility on when exactly the comps occur but still before the end of March, as a sop additional comps can be organised but they will not form part of the process for qualifying to regional finals.
125	Comps	Scotland	What will the format for Regional Team Finals be?	Same as a regional comp but with pan-regional entries.
126	Info	Scotland	One of BG's strategic aims is for gymnastics as a whole to be one of the top 3 mass participation sports in the UK: why does the proposed structure not correlate with this aim? Why are you trying to implement a structure which will reduce the number of gymnasts able to take part?	It seems to be a distributed opinion throughout the sport that this will cause numbers to diminish, this has not been addressed at all.
127	Detail	Pat D	Can you please confirm that regional performers currently qualified for C grade can be entered for NDP 7 next year if coaches feel they can meet the requirements (or need they prove that at this October's regional competition?)	It seems implicit that you can enter where you want provided you are prepared to suffer the consequences.
128	Arm6	Pat D	Marking the arm set - the purpose of this is very appropriate but it will of course require careful education for coaches and judges as to what constitutes a good arm set (going forwards vs going backwards.)	This has not been addressed for CDP 1&2 & NDP 1-4. No code of points provided, no reason given for making it a judged move although now removed from proposed levels 5 & 6
129	Arm6	Pat D	Arm set on the 7th jump, however worries me a little re ensuring stability, height and safety and I would suggest a little more flexibility would still achieve your aim. How about incurring the 0.2 penalty if the arm set has not been completed on or before the 10th jump?	This has not been addressed – there is a change from penalty to bonus but this is same animal dressed in different clothes and will still disadvantage higher bouncers which is surely not a desired outcome.

130	Comps	Pat D	Qualifying for Regional Final - the worry here is that fields will be tiny and so the Regional Finals will be tiny and poorly supported with no atmosphere. How about allowing first, second and third at the regional events to qualify provided they have met the 22.5 criterion?	Not addressed.
131	Synchro	Pat D	Synchronised at Regional Level - very much welcomed. More detail re suggested age groups and progressive routines would be welcomed please.	The statement about regions being free to include synchro appears to have been removed.
132	LTAD	Pat D	The (zonal) routines seem fine though I am a little concerned from a safety point of view for a few, otherwise able, performers about double back straight at the end of NDP 8 compulsory for the oldest age group. Might half in half tucked (following the half out) be ample and safer?	Double BSSS replaced with double BSSP which eases this issue without introducing need for Level 5 coach.
133	Motivate	Pat D	<p>Zero for an incomplete routine and a 1.0 per judge deduction for not achieving minimum tariff. The intentions behind these proposals are admirable but risk concerns about unfairness in not distinguishing between failure on move 1 and the brushing of the frame pads on move 10; the risk that some jumpers in trouble will recklessly hurl big tariff so as not to incur the penalty (I think there is a skill to substituting safely that needs to be encouraged;) and the ironic risk that other jumpers will stop half way through the routine because they realise they cannot achieve minimum tariff.</p> <p>I think your proposals for qualifying for NDP 7 and 8 Finals and for British Championships actually make these penalties unnecessary. If you have to achieve a minimum form score on each routine and the minimum tariff then that will deal with your concerns. In practice no one who only does 8 moves or fewer can possibly achieve these requirements so there is already considerable incentive to complete routines. When you do the maths it can be seen that it will only be a very exceptional gymnast who can achieve these scores from 9 moves, arguably someone who should be considered to qualify for Finals. I think you could safely drop these two penalties with no detriment to your purposes (and a much happier population of gymnasts, coaches and supporters.)</p>	The zero score no longer applies although routines failing to meet minimum criteria will not be eligible for consideration in qualification to nationals so the effect remains similar.
134	Comps	Pat D	Putting the Elite competitions on Day 2 - Checking this year's competition results suggests that Elite group entries will be very small (only 6 gymnasts across all ten groups achieved the tariff requirements at the first gala and still only 29 at the last.) The worry is that these tiny fields and the relatively few supporters who will stay for them will detract from the status of the competition and from the financial viability of Day 2. Given that your proposals should see some national competitors return to the regions, it could be that it would be quite possible to put the Elite events on at the end	Not addressed

			<p>of Day 1 (pulling two or three age groups together in the same flight and spreading the events across 3 or 4 panels.) That would see a good audience cheering their local heroes. Alternatively you could look carefully at what else goes into Day 2 so as to ensure a good turnout from gymnasts and supporters.</p> <p>(Incidentally, checking this year's results suggests that NDP 8 groups could also be very small.)</p>	
135	Synchro	Pat D	<p>Synchro - Your proposals replace the current 6 groups with 34 and so the fields are bound to be small. Indeed given how small individual NDP 8 and Elite groups may be the synchro entries at these levels could be non-existent in some age groups. Clearly you will run some of these groups in the same flights but the sense of competition may be diminished if you are the only pair (or one of just 2 or 3 pairs) in your event. I wonder if it sensible to rethink the synchro structure at Zonal Level so as to reduce the number of groups?</p>	Unchanged other than in respect of NDP7 now being able to draw on partners from within region other than club.
136	Comps	Pat D	<p>Having an Elite only British Championships - the worry here is how to ensure a good audience of supporters and of up-and-coming gymnasts attending to witness and cheer these performers. Given the possibly tiny fields this could be a rather flat (and financially worrying) event. Having the Elite groups on at the end of the NDP 7 and 8 Finals (" Incorporating the British Championships") would ensure the audience and the excitement. Alternatively I think you will need to think very carefully about how you package a separate British Championships.</p>	No response, not done
137	Comps	Pat D	<p>As competing trampoline is not very physically demanding, I think gymnasts could cope with more competitions (compare tennis or athletics) and there would be benefit (in skills, dependability and in competition psychology) in their doing so. REGIONALLY - I would suggest a 4th event around October/November. ZONALLY - I would suggest letting gymnasts enter all the Zonal events and put synchro on at them all.</p>	No rationale put forward why fewer comps are better, only assertions without proof.
138	Arm6	Craig C	<p>FIG does not recognise an arm set as a one of the counting 10 skills in a routine. Competing 9 skills is a step backwards.</p>	Not answered. This has not been addressed for CDP 1&2 & NDP 1-4.
139	Arm6	Craig C	<p>The arm set is an important 'skill' which should be trained and perfected. As should straight jumping be a perfected 'skill', though this is not a judged.</p>	No comment
140	Arm6	Craig C	<p>Moving forwards with this all NDP 7-8 and elite routines that have an arm set will be an 11 skill routine and should receive a penalty. The structure needs to remain consistent throughout all grades.</p>	Not addressed.

141	Arm6	Craig C	FIG does not stipulate how many in-jumps are taken to start a routine. I fail to see how any progression or improvement is being implemented with this rule and really don't know what to say other than it is complete rubbish. I would very much like to hear the explanation behind it.	This has not been addressed – there is a change from penalty to bonus but this is same animal dressed in different clothes and will still disadvantage higher bouncers which is surely not a desired outcome.
142	Comps	Craig C	FIG does not have cumulative finals. How does this improve performance if it does not follow the FIG format? How do gymnasts prepare at a national level if the national level does not follow the international standard.	Not addressed
143	Detail	Craig C	The structure is still missing key points. What is the tariff limit for NDP 6? What is the qualifying score to move from NDP 6 to 7 if wanting to change in the same year? If this still needs more thought the new structure has not been fully thought through and has been rushed out.	<i>"The voluntary routine must meet the minimum tariff required to compete at NDP Level 7 per relevant age group. (This is the maximum tariff allowed at NDP Level 6)" - So tariff MUST equal exactly the NDP7 minimum? Minimum form scores are also provided now.</i>
144	Info	Craig C	Zonal events are mentioned throughout the document. There are no zones unless this is another change that has not been mentioned in any of the documentation. It is either a regional event or a national event in the old and new structure.	Not addressed although it's a fair guess that the zones will be similar to the schools championships zones.
145	Info	Craig C	What venue are the British championships to be held in? If this is to be a premier event it should be held in a premier venue. How is this going to be achieved financially with greatly reduced numbers?	Venues now on BG site, no explanation provided about cost other than inflating entry fees by massive percentage!
146	Info	Craig C	The change is to improve our performance across the sport. The old structure has produced 5 world class women who do win medals at world class events. In the Olympics the finals place was missed by 0.01 of a mark. The artistic disciplines won a hand full of medals though there was many more on offer. Had synchro or a team event been included within trampolining then there would have been a very good chance to walk away with a medal. With these results in the women's how can you say the sport is under performing? The Men's is a different story though if the women have been successful it is not the structure at fault. As said it has created world class ladies. Therefore is a radical restructure really needed or more a refinement of the current system.	No evidence provided. Old adage applies – "if it ain't broke, don't try to fix it".
147	Motivate	Craig C	<i>"The goal of the TRA Programme will be to ensure all trampolinists have an enjoyable and fulfilling experience within the sport, and those who aspire to achieve Olympic success are fully supported in doing so."</i> The small number of top end elite performers which this is supposed to be	Not addressed.

			improving will not be affected in any way. It will have a massive effect on vast majority of performers below this level and the feeling is far from enjoyable.	
148	LTAD	Craig C	The emphasis of the new structure appears to have been put on difficulty. Execution should be the main focus of any structure. With increased form it is much easier to build up technical content and difficulty. Stating a minimum tariff will have people chasing moves they are not fully prepared for and performance in terms of execution will suffer. People can only learn at a certain rate and putting in minimums will not speed up the process or improve performance. This will also have the potential to increase the problem of lost move syndrome as people are pushing too hard and too fast to fully learn the skills in the early stages. This will look good to begin with but may cause severe problems later on degrading the overall outcome.	This remains the case from a National perspective, less so from a Regional perspective where there are different issues.
149	Arm6	East Mids	Armset as 1st move in routines – bad for form scoring (what does the ‘perfect’ armset look like?), reduces the number of real skills in a routine. What’s wrong with the existing full 10 move routine with a deduction if no armset?	This has not been addressed for CDP 1&2 & NDP 1-4.
150	Arm6	East Mids	Fixed number of in-bounces – maybe dangerous, doesn’t get the best performance, uncertainty over how to count the bounces (what is first bounce etc). Will cause dissent. What is the benefit? If there is a benefit then why not apply it to all grades? We already have a time limit.	This has not been fully addressed for CDP 1&2 and NDP 1-4 – there is a change from penalty to bonus but this is same animal dressed in different clothes and will still disadvantage higher bouncers which is surely not a desired outcome. The only ‘out’ is that performers can restart within the one-minute allowed.
151	Info	East Mids	NDP1 and 2 need to start lower – most clubs teach front S/S first. We must get to see the club pack and routines.	Have now introduced Club Development Grades which start with front s/s. All regional grades need back s/s.
152	LTAD	East Mids	Increments between NDP1 to 6 are too fine – especially NDP5 to NDP6.	This is partially addressed by removal of arm-set requirement from NDP5 up and using that ‘spare’ move to create slightly more differential in difficulty, and easing NDP2 by 0.3..
153	Info	East Mids	The use of 9 skill routines for NDP 1-6 is contrary to FIG rules and further exacerbates the lack of depth in the routines.	Not addressed although now only applies to NDP1-4 with 3 & 4 both starting with back s/s.
154	LTAD	East Mids	No choice of routines for anyone suffering ‘lost move syndrome’.	This remains the case.
155	LTAD	East Mids	Increment from NDP6 to NDP7 is far too extreme, especially for older age groups. This penalises late developers and will lead to large number of Nat C to NDP6 reversions. NDP6 will become bottlenecked as an estimated 2/3 of existing Nat C will have to ‘downgrade’.	There has been a partial solution but only by introducing age bias at a grade earlier, 15+ now have a harder NDP6 routine, the pressure is then eased slightly from NDP6 – 7 but resumed with greater impact in NDP7-8. #fail
156	LTAD	East Mids	The high minimum tariff proposed for 7 will see NDP 6 becoming a huge tier	Minimum tariff remains the same for all 9-10 and NDP8 19+ age groups

			with a massive ability range.	but have been reduced slightly for others for 2014 only after which they will be reviewed.
157	Info	East Mids	Changes should be phased in over 1-2 years.	Some elements have been phased but with main objections about large tariff increments still in place from year 2.
158	Comps	East Mids	The only source of income for regions is now through competitions. We therefore need to keep entry numbers high to fund regional squads, judge training etc. We need 'novice' participation to boost numbers.	Not specifically addressed but then this is probably not of particular interest to them.
159	LTAD	East Mids	NDP 8 age 15-16 includes ½ in ½ out, which requires a higher coaching qualification than any move in the other NDP 8 age groups.	Now replaced by double back, I think all moves are now within Level 4 syllabus.
160	LTAD	East Mids	No 1½ but directly into ½ out? Risk of progressions being missed.	This remains the case.
161	Comps	East Mids	Could NDP8 and Elite finals be combined to make the event financially viable?	No response, not done
162	Comps	East Mids	More heavily populated age groups should have more qualifiers to finals.	Not addressed, numbers slightly larger in 2014 but still same for each age/grade, and will be reviewed for 2015.
163	Info	East Mids	Poor alignment with FIG standards for judging and competition structure through the NDP.	Appears to remain the case.
164	LTAD	East Mids	The inflexibility in NDP 7 set routines limits scope for alternative progressions favoured by some coaches. For example, ½ twist to crash is often used to teach full, yet it precedes it in the set routines (full for 15-16, ½ to crash for 17+). There should be a choice of moves to allow for differing rates of learning different types of moves.	Whilst there are some minor routine changes the inflexibility remains an issue.
165	Comps	East Mids	The massive increase in entry fees for gala events is a barrier to participation.	Justified by reference to costs but those are inflated by 'Elite participation' being restricted numbers and high profile venues. As far as I know they are also <u>not comparable</u> with Artistic who compete in multiple disciplines (MAG 6 & WAG 4) for similar, or lower fees.
166	Comps	East Mids	Elite and level 8 (at least) should be at the same national finals. Elite on their own may become just that and there may not be enough spectator support for two national finals.	No response, not done
167	LTAD	East Mids	Concentrating regional events within 3 months gives reduced opportunity for steady progression through the year. This will further devalue the regional event for NDP1-5.	Not addressed.
168	Comps	East Mids	Concentrating regional events within 3 months fits some clubs training timetable better (cf 19) [167 here].	As would almost any other changes made – doesn't make it a reason to change unless it benefits an overwhelming number of clubs.

169	Motivate	East Mids	The new scheme offers little to novices, late starters and non-elite competitors. It may significantly reduce grass-roots participation.	Other than introduction of CDP 1&2 no real change made to reflect this.
170	Info	East Mids	There seems to be very little evidence presented in the proposals to justify the changes.	Remains so, old adage applies – “if it ain’t broke, don’t try to fix it”.
171	Info	London	We are in favour of evolution not revolution and feel that there is insufficient (if any) evidence to explain why the system which has evolved over the past 20 years needs to be destroyed and replaced with a new system which seems to be based upon spurious claims and shaky foundations at best.	Not addressed.
172	Motivate	London	The proposals undermine the confidence of coaches and performers in those who are responsible for future proofing our sport and are dismissive of, and place no value on, the vast majority of competitive trampolinists in GB who no longer feel that they have opportunities to achieve national level competition.	Not acknowledged at any point.
173	Info	London	We are extremely concerned about due process regarding how our interests as members and shareholders are represented by our NTTC. The NTC terms of reference document is very clear about where responsibility for competitions lies and we reiterate Southern Region’s comments concerning the bypassing of the NTTC in proposing these changes. We share concerns that documents do not detail who has put the proposals together and we also request an explanation of this action undermining as it does the need for a National Technical Committee. Please can you explain how BG has not acted in ultra vires by not enabling the NTTC to have full and unfettered discussions concerning new competition proposals? In addition, Clause 42.2 of BG’s Memorandum and Articles of Association require BG to remove Affiliated Associations (which would be the Region) if they fail to follow FIG rules. If the FIG code of points falls under the definition of FIG rules then BG have a problem (see below)	It still seems that the whole process is invalid and yet being pushed forward regardless of mass objection and unanswered issues
174	Info	London	BG claim to have invested £4m into Trampoline since 2006. Please can you provide a detailed breakdown of exactly where these funds have been spent?	Not addressed.
175	Info	London	£4m in 6.5 years equates to just £615k per annum. Can we properly list the notable achievements at World and European Championships, World Cup, WAG etc in that time to assess properly?	Not provided.
176	Info	London	Until recently, WA and more spectacularly MA were failing to win much let alone qualify for major finals. Those wilderness years were measurable in decades rather than a matter of a few years. Trampoline has been an	Not addressed.

			Olympic sport for a short number of years and is already being criticised for lack of Olympic medals. How many years of Olympic competition has it taken to win Olympic medals at WA and MA? How much was BG investing in those disciplines during those 'wilderness' years?	
177	Info	London	If the best trampolinists in the country aren't able to perform zero deductions on basic somersaults then the issue lies with coaching at the early stages and gymnast progress through the club session structure NOT the competition structure. Changing the competition structure will not address deficiencies in coaching; merely reduce the number of people who are taking part.	No comment.
178	Info	London	In addition, and we acknowledge this is a contentious point; those people who are coaching our international performers must take significant responsibility for our perceived failure at international level. These coaches have significant (24/7?) access to our high-level performers and yet the 'blame' for our failure to achieve international success is being thrown back at the clubs! Can we therefore expect mass resignations of our paid BG coaches?	No comment.
179	Info	London	Can you explain in detail how the current competition structure fails to support its underlying principles (listed in section 3), as it would appear that the current competition structure provides a better support to those principles than the new proposals.	No response.
180	Motivate	London	<p><i>"British Gymnastics will be synonymous with international success in Trampolining."</i></p> <p>Currently on the overall World Championship medal count GB is eighth with 8 Golds and a total of 54 medals (out of 28 countries)! It is stated that the goal of the TRA Programme will be to ensure "all trampolinists have an enjoyable and fulfilling experience within the sport, and those who aspire to achieve Olympic success are fully supported in doing so." It is noteworthy, that many trampoline clubs receive significant numbers of ex men's and women's artistic gymnasts, who have already 'failed' in those disciplines, possibly due to restrictive competition practices and being relegated to lower-level membership status in their clubs. By imposing the same structures on trampolining, we are removing this exit route from their options. How is it proposed that by replicating existing structures which do not cater for mass participation, and given the fact that the average age at which children give up gymnastics is nine years nine months, we can retain our attraction for young people and our mass participation status? BG have already acknowledged that Trampolinists peak later than participants of its</p>	No acknowledgement of this made, nor are the issues addressed.

			<p>other disciplines, and that they have a longer career at the top level of the sport (Anna Dogodnaze is a prime example of this, well into her 40s and still competing at the level BG is aspiring to). Current trampolinists who are relegated to the status as “also rans” and all those next generation potential performers who aren’t the exception are effectively being discriminated against and will be given what as a result of this restructure? A chance to take part in three competitions in three months and then nothing for nine months and be the only regional representative at the “big end of season event”? We do not see this as “an enjoyable and fulfilling experience within the sport”.</p>	
181	LTAD	London	<p><i>“The long-term development of all of our athletes (LTAD) will be at the centre of all of our thinking. “</i></p> <p>As far as we can see there is no LTAD anywhere within this proposed structure. The BG LTAD model is based on Dr Istvan Balyi’s work. Although this work needs to be mitigated in the light of the differing age band related requirements of different gymnastics disciplines the existing competition structures are based upon a LTAD model which fits trampolining and ameliorates issues such as physical development, burn out, loss of confidence and early drop out from our sport.</p>	Not addressed.
182	LTAD	London	<p><i>“An appropriate Domestic Competition structure should fully support and be in synergy with our high performance aspirations. “</i></p> <p>The proposed “progression” by the new proposed set routines seems illogical and doesn’t link them into a progressive whole to provide the above stated aim of LTAD. Please can a detailed explanation be given for the new routines and please can you explain how they fit into a progressive developmental model.</p> <p>We can see the following issues as pertinent to this discourse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relationship between chronological age and developmental age and the further relationship between age and stage seems to have been ignored. The current system is ability based whereas the 2014 proposals ignore long-term development and are clearly age-based. • The lack of “development” as a significant component in the proposed “national Development plans” and its (lack of a) relationship to LTAD. We can see no logic in describing many progressions as “developmental”. For example, at 17/18 a competitor competes a 9 move compulsory at NDP 6 with six somersaults separated by non-rotational moves into 3 sets of back somersault/barani pairs. Developmentally (!) if they then choose the Elite pathway, they are 	Information not provided. Whilst there is some small degree of easing for 15+ in NDP7&8, the age discrimination is introduced earlier now in NDP6.

			<p>then required to compete a compulsory of 10 somersaults including 3 doubles and a twister. Please can you explain how, under the guise of a National Development Plan, there is any semblance of development from NDP 6 to the Elite 17/18 pathway. This situation is replicated more than once and is indicative of the fact that unless a performer is in the Elite pathway very early in their career they are for all intents and purposed worthless.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is common knowledge in many sports that the dominant performers are those born within the first 4 months of the age group band and have 'accumulative advantage'. A detailed analysis from the Football Association has shown this has a significant effect with the number of 'early birthday' footballers dominant in the upper reaches of the sport. In Trampolining those born later are disadvantaged. In the 13/14 age group in 2014, a gymnast born between January and April 2000 will be competing against a gymnast born between October and December 2001 (potentially 24 months older). In developmental terms this means that the youngest in the age group is expected to match the maturity of the oldest without ever having the chance to 'catch up'. This effect has a profound effect upon older age groups where, in order to be competitive, gymnasts will have to 'force' tariff and take short cuts to difficultly before they are physically, physiologically or psychologically prepared. 	
183	Info	London	<p>"The National Programme will be fully aligned with the competitive structure promoted by the International Federation (in our case the FIG). "</p> <p>This is directly contradicted by the published routines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nine moves, No difficulty No finals Zero scores for a failed routine, Specific six bounce pre-bounce routine start, Compulsory arm set. <p>Please explain how this is "fully aligned"?</p>	No explanation provided.
184	LTAD	London	<p><i>"A National Development Programme with Compulsory Routines will be in place that determines and then quality controls the skills being taught to and then produced by our junior gymnasts, and fully supports the LTAD of all participants."</i></p> <p>How will this happen, given that there is no logical development of the proposed compulsory routines and where is the logic of "quality control the</p>	Looking at this from a regional perspective first, since this is where quality first needs to be grounded, the single biggest initiative that will help is the abandonment of voluntary routines and tariff for levels up to LDP6. The same could be achieved with the existing grade routines at a regional level and we know them to be based on solid LTAD principles offering support to those whose skill development might

			<p>skills being taught” given the statement in ‘The catalyst for change?’</p> <p><i>“At the most fundamental level, the best trampolinists in our country are still not being able to perform zero deductions on the most basic somersaults. We need to ensure our trampolinists are outstanding physical specimens, comparable with the very best examples within the Olympic family.”</i></p> <p>(See earlier comments regarding LTAD).</p>	<p>take a slightly different path to others.</p> <p>Not really addressed at all despite some changes to routines.</p>
185	Motivate	London	<p><i>“A Regional Programme will be implicitly linked to and underpinning the National Development Programme, with its own culmination event, providing a credible and sustainable pathway in the development of our junior gymnasts. “</i></p> <p>A chance to take part in three competitions in three months and then nothing for nine months and be the only regional representative at the “big end of season event”? This is neither a credible and sustainable pathway in the development of our junior gymnasts nor is it very motivating and “an enjoyable and fulfilling experience within the sport” (see earlier comments).</p>	Not addressed.
186	Motivate	London	<p><i>“The TRA Performance Pathway will be progressive in producing high quality young athletes who, by following a prescribed journey, can produce significant senior international results. This Pathway will assist our associated clubs in retaining their memberships by providing an appropriate and progressive set of competitive experiences, commensurate with their performance level. “</i></p> <p>This proposed structure will actually have the total opposite effect. Initially it will cause all/most of the senior performers who will be unable to meet the new requirements to compete in the new “elite pathway” to leave the sport. Secondly, it will make it much harder for new generation of potential performers to progress in the sport beyond the age of fourteen with the current proposed compulsory requirements. Thirdly, the one performer to qualify to the proposed “big” event really isn’t going to motivate people as to the importance or relevance of the NDP Pathway and neither will the “choose your own entry level” and with no qualification scores needed to move up the grades it gives no meaningful satisfaction to prove ones worth as either a performer or a coach.</p>	No acknowledgement of this made, nor are the issues addressed other than, perhaps, progression through regional grades although this is still unclear(i.e. whether permitted during the (very short) season).
187	Comps	London	<p><i>“The British Championships will be a true high performance experience positioned at an appropriate time of the year to complement the international calendar. This will support British Gymnastics’ wider strategic aim of delivering spectacular events in major cities across the UK. “</i> This will,</p>	Showboating at the expense of the majority of participants. As a one-off sop more competitors will be allowed in 2014 which simply postpones the negative impact of those who do not make it in future years.

			<p>make a mockery of, and totally devalue the very essence of the event. Currently it is the pinnacle for everybody in the sport to aim at and a fitting season finale. If it is deemed too large an event – and we are not convinced that 400 performers is too many,– then simply make the qualifying criteria more stringent (The US Nationals this year had over 2000 performers in attendance.) One “spectacular” event will not do this. To meet the aims and objectives set out as the reason for this restructure there needs to be a level of competition over and above British Nationals to narrow the gap between them and major internationals. This will also take the place of needing to have a number of selection trials and make the selection process far more meaningful.</p>	
188	Comps	London	<p>A three round competition, on the lines of the athletics Golden League, in the last part of the year, with meaningful prize money for the medallists, and with a Grand Final to finish the year. If a series of international squads are also invited, one country per competition, to further raise the standard it will give the competition more kudos and if BG’S marketing department does its job and gets a competition sponsor and TV coverage it will really do what the aim is, by bringing spectacular events to major cities with the additional benefit if raising the profile of the sport and BG.</p>	Not addressed.
189	Comps	London	<p>Selection for these competitions [on the lines of the athletics Golden League] will be dependent on results at the British Championships and to have met higher criteria for TOF, DD and Set DD with a maximum number of fifteen places available for individual events and ten for synchro to meet the requirements needed to be a top international performer.</p>	Not addressed as an option.
190	Motivate	London	<p>BG acknowledges that resistance to change has the potential to send the sport into a black hole. Will you also acknowledge that those with closest involvement in the sport are passionate about their sport, who want it to develop and want to see medal success for our country and that those people are the ones best able to see flaws in the current system, and be best placed to assess whether proposed changes will be of long term benefit to their sport? Beneficial change is welcome, detrimental change is resisted and if imposed is the more likely cause of the sport’s demise.</p>	No response.
191	Info	London	<p>Artistic disciplines need a fast track performance pathway because their competitors peak at a much younger age and have a shorter career. Forcing a model from a discipline (that until recently was a spectacular failure in terms of winning international medals) on to a discipline that has had reasonable successes with little funding is a recipe for disaster.</p>	No comment.
192	Motivate	London	<p>Regional events are squashed into a couple of months at the beginning of</p>	Not addressed.

			the year and will clash with school exams. The first one is disadvantaged by the Christmas break so competitors will have had reduced or no training. Zonal events are similarly disadvantaged, clashing with GCSE and A level exams and commencing after the Easter holidays when some clubs have reduced or no training. This does NOT in any way optimise preparation to perform. The only people for whom calendar planning is optimised are those who participate at international level and everyone else has to be sacrificed in order to benefit these (less than 30??) individuals.	
193	Info	London	NDP Finals venue requirement – “mid size venue to be sought.....in keeping with the size of the venue used for the British Championships”. It would appear that the current venue fits this requirement so can you explain the need to seek a new venue.	Not addressed.
194	Motivate	London	British Championships are British Championships. Please explain and justify your plans to open them to foreign competitors and judges and how this will happen without disrespecting our judges by saying that a global judging panel will provide an indication of likely scores at any future international competition. This displays a blatant lack of respect for all competition officials who willingly officiate for free at many events each year and without whom competitions would not take place.	No response.
195	Synchro	London	If Clubs, Counties and Regions can choose whether or not to include Synchro in their competition structure for development purposes it would appear that synchro competitions at these levels are of little interest to BG. Therefore please explain and justify why you require all pairings to come from the same club, particularly when this is not a requirement for national circuit competitions.	The statement about regions being free to include synchro appears to have been removed and the NDP7 constraint of club been changed to region.
196	Info	London	Anecdotal evidence and considerable personal project management experience proves that “managed change at speed” is a misnomer and there is a high rate of failure for projects with this description. Training plans for top level competitors will already be written and in place for the 2014 season (and presumably as far as Rio). The sudden and large scale changes mean that the majority of these will be consigned to the dustbin, causing additional work for coaches in clubs across the country on top of the mammoth task of adjusting and resourcing the large scale changes being imposed. The lack of acknowledgement of this by BG is arrogant and disrespectful to those at the heart of the sport.	No comment.
197	Motivate	London	If regional D maps to grade 6 then National C maps to grade 7. Currently there is a tariff limit of 8.4 for National C competitors. Under the new structure in the NDP (“second division” category) the minimum tariff for	Some concession has been made to current performers affected by the tariff jump but it will only delay the problem by 12 months as the next crop of 17 year-olds suffer the same massive jump.

			male competitors aged 15-16 is 8.5 and for older boys a minimum tariff of 9.0 is needed, i.e. MINIMUM tariffs now higher than the supposed equivalent grade maximum. Given tariffs competed in recent galas this will either push the vast majority of National C competitors back to regional competitions plus significant numbers of B competitors and possibly even some A competitors (complete with a large dose of demotivation and/or retirements) or it will push competitors into competing high tariffs before they are ready resulting in loss of form, lost moves, injuries and a higher accident rate.	
198	Arm6	London	How is the arm set going to be judged? There is nothing in the FIG code of points about how to judge an arm set. Skill 1 is currently defined as 6 bounces and an arm set. How can that be judged as part of a routine?	<p>This has not been addressed for CDP 1&2 & NDP 1-4.</p> <p>No code of points provided, no reason given for making it a judged move although now removed from proposed levels 5 & 6.</p> <p>The 6-bounce element has not really been addressed – there is a change from penalty to bonus but this is same animal dressed in different clothes and will still disadvantage higher bouncers which is surely not a desired outcome.</p>
199	Arm6	London	The routine is essential a 9 bounce routine which isn't consistent with the FIG code of points.	This has not been addressed for CDP 1&2 & NDP 1-4.
200	Arm6	London	Dictating when a routine that begins with a back somersault should start is downright dangerous and it is reckless for BG to implement these new routines. Children in a competition environment may, no matter how many times their coach has told them not to take off for a somersault if they're not ready, do just that regardless of whether they are ready. Is British gymnastics aware of the increased risk of gymnasts taking off for their first rotational move when they are not fully prepared and/or are not ready and the potential for an increased number of accidents resulting from this new demand?	<p>This has not been fully addressed – there is a change from penalty to bonus but this is same animal dressed in different clothes and will still disadvantage higher bouncers which is surely not a desired outcome.</p> <p>The only 'out' is that performers can restart within the one-minute allowed.</p>
201	LTAD	London	There is a lack of structured progressive increase in tariff between grades 1 to 6 G1 (1.2), G2 (1.9) G3 (2.0 –just 0.1 difference), G4 (3.0), G5 (3.5) and G6 (3.6 again just 0.1 more) then a massive hike to G7 (5.4 for age 15+) and a further massive hike to G8 (7.6 for age 17+)	Tariff gaps remain erratic with some even reducing as progressing through grades/ages, some concession has been made to current performers affected by very large tariff jumps but it will only delay the problem by 12 months as the next crop of 17 year-olds suffer the same massive jump.
202	Motivate	London	Grade 7 and above is a retrospective step with easier grades for younger children putting emphasis on skill acquisition rather than form and the demotivating prospect of downgrading because they have moved into a new age category.	Not addressed.

203	LTAD	London	It is our view that routines are more difficult at entry level and lack consistent graduated progression through the grades with some grades being almost identical to each other and others having overwhelmingly large increases in requirements from one grade to the next.	There have been some changes in this but oftentimes just moving the problem to a different place in development.
204	Motivate	London	There is a strongly felt feeling that the new structure will significantly benefit larger/full-time clubs at the expense of all others who have become at best only feeder clubs and at worst will fold. This reduces the number of opportunities for young people to begin trampolining and therefore reduces the potential pool for our future Olympic performance. Whilst the current structure is by no means perfect, the integration of the national circuit at gala weekends and national finals was a positive move as it gave every Nat C/FIG B competitor the chance to see what they were aiming for and feel that it was an achievable personal goal.	Not addressed.
205	Motivate	London	The new structure disregards or replaces the FIG code of points in places. Judging courses follow the FIG code of points and should continue to do so as that is the international judging standard and home nation amendments will add time and confusion to future judges. It downgrades the County qualification and ensures that judging will be prescriptive and boring as there's no scope for voluntary routines at regional level.	Not addressed.
206	Motivate	London	Competitive trampolining remains very successful mass participation sport with an enviable record of retention and high standards, and committed gymnasts, coaches and judges. Overall we see this structure as only there for the very few, the small handful of exceptional athletes that come along once in a generation with all the required attributes to actually win medals and the very talented performers who may, if properly coached, actually make finals of major championships. We believe that these proposals cannot proceed in this format if Trampoline as a discipline, is to survive and thrive.	Not addressed.
207	LTAD	Andrew A	<p>My first confusion arises from the use of progressive minimum difficulty values for the newly introduced age groups. What rationale supports these new figures as beneficial for athlete development, and why is age a relevant factor for stage or progression?</p> <p>Other than obvious factors such as strength, physicality and the expectation that gymnasts develop from a young age, the new structure instantly gives competitors such as myself, who started at the sport later in life, the impression that we are beyond the point of ever being successful. I am under no disillusion that I will ever bring international success to the sport, but at the same time, the current structure at least gives me a clear</p>	Nothing has been proposed to address this.

pathway to follow and is progressive enough to provide clear goals for the next grade up.

To provide some context, the new NDP Level 7 grade replaces the previous National C grade and requires me to compete a second routine with a difficulty of 9.0. Having just qualified to National C and only just improving twisting skills and developing double somersaults, this new requirement instantly forces me to move back to regional level. I should stress that I fully appreciate that our sport should not be top heavy, and having judged at national events several times, I can appreciate that there is too much low quality performance at this level. Unfortunately, moving down to grade 6 in the new structure feels like a much larger step backwards; I was previously in the mind-set of now needing to achieve a 9-somersault routine with a twisting skill and/or double somersault. Grade 6 does not appear to require anything near this, with the first routine being much easier than the current Regional D requirements.

As such, in my position I find myself stripped of the sense of achievement that I had worked intensely hard for three years towards, and now with little sense of direction. Aiming for a 9.0 difficulty at my level is far beyond contemplation, yet I have little incentive to compete a non-challenging first routine and use my second routine as a practise for NDP 7 which I have little chance of (perhaps ever) achieving. I may also find myself up against a great number of current high-level National C and FIG B performers who have also had to move down, which provides even less incentive for me to compete.

To further emphasise, I realise that I may be in the minority with this issue, but I do know that I am not the only individual in this position, and it isn't just affecting people over the age of 17. I am perfectly willing to accept the need to remove low-level national performers like myself from the national competition structure, but I have to ask clarification from you – where do I fit? And what am I now aiming for? The gulf between the two grades I am between seems too great and I understand this has also been observed between 7 and 8. The current structure provides really clear direction for me, and I am quite apprehensive about feeling lost and pushed out under the new system.

This is the first, albeit probably more selfish question, I have regarding my place (and indeed those similar to me) in the new structure. I refuse to accept that by virtue of age and not having the opportunity to begin the sport at a younger age, that I should be considered to have any less potential than those lucky enough to start young. I only need to name other late starters such as Pete Cracknell to prove that age need not be a barrier, but from first impressions, the proposed structure puts these barriers in

			place by assuming a higher level of ability at older ages.	
208	Motivate	Andrew A	<p>My next question is quite simply – how does the new structure encourage participation in the sport and competition? Looking at the new routines, the lowest level requires a somersault. Does this mean that if gymnasts cannot achieve this benchmark they do not deserve the opportunity to compete in a BG competition?</p> <p>Without having any background in the financial matters of the regional committees, I know that regional competitions are largely filled with current grade H and I competitors (who can enter with routines at a much lower and more accessible level), and, regardless of the opportunities this provides, the regions depend upon these for the competitions to be financially successful.</p> <p>More concerning is the suggestion that, from this starting point, those than do not and may never somersault, are not afforded the opportunity to compete and experience success and improvement. From a welfare perspective I find this to be totally lacking in equal opportunity and access to the sport. Competitors of all ages who progress more slowly prior to achieving the somersault are now denied entry to the BG competition structure. I would like to understand how this betrayal to the grass roots and financiers of our sport is justified, and why we are forcing regions to provide something substandard and ‘separate’ to allow these individuals to acquire any success or participation early on. It seems completely illogical to discourage experience of the competition environment and format as early as possible.</p> <p>I also believe my point above about pushing a large proportion out of national level applies here. Moving people down into the regions can only really be justified if the gymnasts affected are in a position to understand and be motivated by the next step up so as to prevent dropout. I can see this quite clearly at the lower age bands, but less so in older competitors who are suddenly expected to have acquired a great number of double somersaults and links.</p> <p>The Elite cannot exist and will not be supplied unless those lower in the system are made to feel included and with a very clear development plan. In its current form I feel more clarification is required to demonstrate how this is the case in the proposed structure.</p>	Have now introduced Club Development Grades
209	Arm6	Andrew A	<p>Six-bounce start</p> <p>My first thought when I read this rule was that it had been put in place to force competitors, from an early stage, to be able to start under pressure</p>	This has not been addressed for CDP 1&2 & NDP 1-4, certainly safety has not been addressed – there is a change from penalty to bonus but this is same animal dressed in different clothes and will still

			and without the 'perfect' bounce so as to develop the ability to adapt to different situations within competition. If this is the case, I completely understand the logic, but after contemplation, putting this into a competition structure deeply troubles me. Especially at lower levels, and with the pressure of competition, I can only imagine this causing competitors to start under unnecessary pressure when they are not in a safe position to begin a routine. Is there evidence to suggest that this works and will not cause an increase in accidents and anxiety? Further, given that it does not apply at the higher level (and certainly isn't seen at the top international level), should we be enforcing this (something I view as a coaching priority) into a competition structure lower down?	disadvantage higher bouncers which is surely not a desired outcome.
210	Info	Andrew A	<p>Matting Provisions</p> <p>Forcing National C and FIG B performers back down into the regions by virtue of minimum tariffs means that many individuals performing multiple double somersaults in a routine will now be competing on equipment not as safe as that provided by Gymaid and Continental currently at Gala competitions. Again I am deeply disturbed by the thought of gymnasts of a high level competing without the international matting provision standards, as will be the case in the majority of regional competitions. BG has already 'relaxed' the matting requirements for regional level – can you justify and happily allow complex skills to be performed in venues with equipment not suitable for this level? Indeed it can be argued that many top level gymnasts train in these environments and so there is little difference – however I believe that the pressure and atmosphere of a competition is different enough to increase the likelihood of error and so this falls straight away. Having seen competitors fall off the trampoline and come down heavily onto the continental biscuit mats and be able to walk away unharmed, it deeply worries me that within regions we will see an increase in very serious injuries. Matting may have been less of a priority historically, but with the power and instability present in modern trampolines there is undoubted evidence for a need at the higher levels of competition. 2cm thick judo mats will do very little for a fall from 6 meters.</p> <p>How does the new structure handle this serious concern?</p>	Not addressed.
211	Motivate	Andrew A	<p>Inclusivity</p> <p>What does the new structure do to ensure participants at all levels have a place and a clear goal in mind?</p> <p>I invite you to watch the following article filmed at the 2013 British Championships: http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/0/get-inspired/23394751</p>	Not addressed.

			<p>Throughout there is the overwhelming feel of the ‘support’ of the crowd and the ability for younger and less experienced gymnasts to compete alongside and aspire to reach the level of the elite. Particularly at 1.16mins I feel the reporter sums it up really well – ‘they get to see what they could become’. How will separating the Elite from NDP, particularly at the finals stage allow this to continue? Why is there a need to remove this aspiration of the lower levels?</p> <p>These events are already extremely expensive to attend, and having spoken to many people in the sport about this, those competing at NDP will not be able to fund a second visit to the Elite British Championships later in the year. Can we justify funding an empty arena without anywhere near the volume of support as in previous years? I fear that this separation is a further psychological cue to make the ‘non-elite’ feel sub-standard and separate from what they are aiming for. Whether this is the intention or indeed the outcome, I feel that it is so important for this panel to appreciate that regardless of the intention, this is how participants are currently being made to feel by the way the proposed changes have been presented.</p> <p>From this observation, I want to understand why these changes are being made and how the damage that has already been done to the confidence of gymnasts will be undone. Again, from my perspective within welfare and the obvious psychological association of NDP to ‘not good enough’, I hope you are able to explain why this will not be the case.</p> <p>My opinion is that we should absolutely make changes to encourage international success – but does this really come from a competition structure? Is there any evidence for this? My instinct is that great coaches, determined individuals and indeed talent make success, and not competitions (did our 2013 Men’s British Champion enter a single gala event in 2013?). Saying that, competitions are a necessary part of this development, and just as it can be a vessel for progression and success, it can also become a black hole for failure if the end goals seem too far out of sight.</p> <p>I think more than anything it really saddens me that the 2013 British Championships could have been only my second and indeed last opportunity to be together, in the same place as the thousands of others within the community of the sport that I love.</p>	
212	Motivate	Andrew A	<p>Coach and Judge Progression</p> <p>The higher-level requirements at national level will effectively prevent County and Regional judges from experiencing national competitions (if the</p>	Nothing has been changed in reflection of this.

			<p>current requirements are upheld). Will anything be done to support judge development? It worries me that separating the Elite further will remove the opportunity for National judges to get the required experience for Brevet, and more importantly, access for County judges and higher will be completely removed. The current system is extremely supportive of new judges (I can vouch for this). Partly this is due to the exceptional work Mike Phillipson and Peter Heames have done in helping the younger generation get the required experience, but also because the competition structure allows it.</p> <p>Based on my observations above, I also fear that reduced participation at the lower levels will discourage the new generations of coaches coming through. A point not yet mentioned is that the proposed structure is incredibly complex - I feel it is overwhelmingly so for some newly qualified or less experienced coaches and could wipe out a whole generation of coaching talent if dropout (as many expect) does occur.</p>	
213	Info	Sue L	<p>[Too lengthy, in order to be well-reasoned, to repeat here in detail but main points are presented in précis form – apologies if I have missed or misconstrued a point].</p> <p>Assertion that since focus is on Rio it is inevitable that any GB athlete capable of reaching Rio is already in the system and probably at an Elite level. Any changes outside that area will have no effect on Rio aspirations and so rushing in such far-reaching changes without thorough debate and analysis seems unnecessary..</p>	No response to this point.
214	LTAD	Sue L	<p>Whilst talent will succeed in any system, the vast majority need a considered system based on LTAD and thorough research and understanding. The principles used to develop the current system could be applied to adapt the proposed system.</p>	Seemingly ignored.
215	Motivate	Sue L	<p>By introducing age as well as ability as a key determinant for competition structure and, in particular, difficulty to be achieved, up to ¾ of competitors are ‘cumulatively disadvantaged’ – this may well have the effect of excluding them from future potential thereby reducing the talent pool significantly.</p>	No acknowledgement made of the point nor addressed in any way.
216	LTAD	Sue L	<p>BG’s advice is that a 13-year-old ought, all else being equal, be at the training to train stage of LTAD under a level 3 coach, the difficulty requirements put forward though require a level 5 coach.</p>	Some of the difficulty requirements for 13-year old have actually increased in the latest routines, albeit as a consequence of removing arm set and adding another SS/.
217	LTAD	Sue L	<p>The adoption of minimum tariff creates conflict for those whose learning style is more towards form and height leading to higher tariff over time with</p>	Not addressed.

			a potential for fall-out & accidents thereby reducing the talent pool at NDP7 and above.	
218	LTAD	Sue L	The proposed routines miss out significant development steps and if viewed litigiously in future could leave BG very exposed if somebody has a serious accident as a consequence of bypassing progressions not part of the NDP. Any NDP needs to be written in such detail as to ensure that litigation is not likely to succeed since all stages of development are documented thoroughly.	This appears to still be the case.
219	Motivate	Sue L	At a national level the new system totally abandons the potential for 'unconscious learning' afforded by competitors of lesser ability to be exposed to those of higher ability. The current system more closely reflects current international competition where a very wide range of talent competes in the same arena.	Not addressed.
220	Motivate	Sue L	Moving to a minimum score system for qualifications at national level abandons decisions made on well-founded research that suggests that whilst judges generally get the ranking order approximately right, they often give scores that are variant and could result in a score difference of up to 2.0 without actually being incorrect.	Not addressed.
221	Motivate	Sue L	Modelling trampolining on other gymnastics' disciplines may well be erroneous given that the average Olympic trampolinist is about a decade older than the average artistic gymnast. Indeed many 'retired' gymnasts are able to find a second career in trampolining but, with an age-biased system, may find this harder to do in future. It can also be predicted that there will be a higher drop-out rate adversely affecting long term source of coaches and judges.	Not addressed.
222	LTAD	Sue L	The proposed regional structure is not challenging enough with NDP 3 – 6 being capable of being achieved in months.	Other than removing arm-set from 5 & 6 this remains much the case although, if interpretation is correct, that progress can't be made because of limited competition opportunities and the need to select where you are for the season.
223	LTAD	Sue L	Without the application of current LTAD principles ultimately there could be:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a reduction of the medal potential of future trampolinists. • an increase in early 'drop out' from the sport. • an increase of stress and loss of confidence as trampolinists have to develop the next level or drop back to the lower level (as a child who is almost two years younger than the oldest in the age group is expected to match performance). 	No response.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a prevention of some promising older competitors having a pathway to elite and international competition due to the imposition of tariffs they need longer to develop. • a promotion of much earlier specialisation in the discipline (contrary to LTAD advice) • less consistent performance as the 'learning to compete' aspect of LTAD has been removed by allowing entry at any point. • an increase in 'burn out' for the reasons given above. • a reduction in coaches and judges developing in our sport. <p>The current system allows all those younger in the age group to develop at the rate that suits them, and progress as and when they are ready. Anecdotally the incidence of 'burn out' and stress appears to have been massively reduced through the current system whilst tariffs have increased.</p>	
224	Info	Jack K	<p>About Money:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I totally understand the explanation put forward to justify a need for change. No results.....no money! 2. How much of the money was seen by the lower echelons of the sport? Why should the regions care if funding is lost? 3. Did funding do anything to raise the international standing?.....maybe, but hard to evaluate. Perhaps GBR would have achieved the same results without it. 4. No question that money spent on medical, analysis, rehab and conditioning gave added value to the top few and it's doubtful the old unfunded BTF couldn't have supplied these benefits. 5. Did the payment to national coaching staff make a difference to international results? Highly questionable! 	None of these questions/points addressed.
225	Info	Jack K	<p>Every single world ranked performer we've had since the first Worlds in 1963, up to and including the overrated 'Olympic' achievements of Lee and Gary, were achieved by the work of individual club coaches NOT the national system.</p> <p>This is still the case and only the athlete awards and support services have given added value. Our silver medal winning women were produced in the clubs by Jay, Sue B, Sue L, Paul G (after Nigel Blundell).</p> <p>It is naive to think that a 'structure' will produce the goods because this is simply a form of social engineering designed to change peoples behaviour. This will only work IF people engage with it or are forced into compliance by some means. However, we know that compulsion doesn't lead to engagement and so the process is likely to fail in its objective.</p>	No response.

226	Arm6	Jack K	<p>I know the idea of making the armset compulsory is well-meaning but sadly misguided showing a lack of true technical understanding. I have identified at least three different timings of the armset and there will be intermediate timing and methods between the ones I have categorised. Which one is 'right'? Several people have already asked "how do you judge and arm set?" ABSOLUTELY!!!</p>	<p>This has not been addressed for CDP 1&2 & NDP 1-4.</p> <p>No code of points provided, no reason given for making it a judged move although now removed from proposed levels 5 & 6</p>
227	Arm6	Jack K	<p>Now here is a sinister implication:- Because it is to be 'judged' AND be part of the routine it will be treated as a 'cosmetic' aerial exercise instead of an effective technical platform from which to deliver the routine. There is far too much 'cosmetic coaching' already!!</p> <p>One simply has to look at the World's best to realise that there is a whole range of idiosyncratic arm setting but the common factor is upright posture and arms in line with the body on the descent. BUT how long that lasts on the descent varies enormously and a world star like Ueyama (JPN) allows his arms to swing behind his body line as he descends. This is for a sound TECHNICAL reason which I won't bore you with. (writing too much already.)</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>
228	Arm6	Jack K	<p>The restriction to 6 jumps in the lower groups is again, well-meaning but misguided. Of course we want balance and control at this development level, but to plant the idea of low jumping (which will be the likely outcome) when the prime requirement is height with control leading to air time and the opportunity to display good form and DD. It is outrageous to propose a judges deduction for ANYTHING other than 6 jumps followed by a statutory arm set on 7. If a limit to the number of jumps is to be imposed it should allow for up to 12 with no lower limit.</p> <p>The number of performers already 'bouncing' not 'jumping' and failing to bend their knees to work the bed is like an epidemic and needs to be 'stamped out.' (pun intended!) The proposal will make this even harder to change. We should be planting the idea of Time of Flight as early as possible, commensurate with balance and control of course!</p>	<p>This has not been addressed – there is a change from penalty to bonus but this is same animal dressed in different clothes and will still disadvantage higher bouncers which is surely not a desired outcome.</p>
229	Motivate	Jack K	<p>As a nation and as a region we have a vast 'talent pool' from which we should be developing a higher level of achievement but without knowledgeable coaches prepared to dedicate themselves to raising the standard, no amount of tinkering with the structure will make much difference. Indeed it may act as a disincentive to many. I hope there is a chance to change some of the technical proposals at least.</p>	<p>It appears not.</p>