

Individual Feedback from Olympic Nomination Consultation

(Please note - item references in bold relate to v0.4, Policy v0.3 item references other than section 2) are one less. So Policy v0.3 has section 4, in Policy v0.4 this is now section 5)

2.1.3 c) *Athletes being put forward for selection: Would it not be fairer for the athletes put forward to the nomination panel, come directly off the adjusted international rankings?*

Section 2.1.3 is about clarity on who is responsible for what and the governance, not the criteria. The Nomination Panel will be provided with the Adjusted Ranking Lists, where relevant - ie team selection.

2.1.5 *If changes are made will the changes be put out for consultation again?*

That would be the intention if there is sufficient opportunity - noting that nomination and selection deadlines are not set by BF.

5 (Previously 4) *Please confirm if the adjusted ranking that will be used for Olympic nomination only takes into account FIE World Cups, FIE Grand Prixes, FIE European Championships and FIE World Championships. Therefore excluding FIE satellites, U23 events, commonwealth championships and all domestic events?*

The Adjusted Ranking List is defined in the Policy. As it is created by adding the FIE Official Ranking points gained in FIE Official Ranking events, excluding FIE Satellites by definition it does not include EFC Senior/U23, Commonwealth Championships and domestic ranking events.

5 b) (Previously 4 b)) *Why is the period 1st October 2023 to 1st April 2024 used rather than 3rd April 2023 to 1st April 2024 so that it would then cover the full Olympic qualification period?*

To give weighting to most recent performances.

6.3.1 *.. it would seem fairer if it were the top 3 fencers of the adjusted international ranking that are automatically selected. They will be competing individually. The 4th fencer is reserve, therefore makes sense that the 4th member of the team is selected based on the best member for the team.*

If the top 3 fencers have 30 or more FIE World Ranking points (on the Adjusted Ranking List so excluding FIE Satellite points) then they are automatically nominated. If they have fewer than 30 world ranking points it is very unlikely (based on current athlete trajectories) they are going to win an individual medal. Therefore team contribution of the 3rd athlete is a significant factor, in consideration of the likely opposition at the Olympics.

6.4.2 (b) *Junior European and Junior World Championship results should have no impact for the 2024 Olympic Games British team selections. There is no indication that results at these events contribute to an Olympic medal.*

Why would any junior event be taken into consideration for a senior tournament? The said athlete (Junior fencer) should be considered solely on their results in the senior international events. I.e. Olympic qualification period. Their result at a junior world Championships does not indicate that they will replicate that result at the Olympic Games.

There is statistical data that shows a correlation between medalling at Olympic and World Championships and medalling at major events at Junior level.

It is not the intention to use this factor to replace another fencer that has demonstrated they can contribute to a 2024 medal winning performance, but where no 2024 team medal winning indicators exists, consideration will be given to indicators of future (2028) medal winning potential.

The policy has been updated to reflect this and also state that the factor will only be considered for the Team reserve position.

6.4.2 (c) *what defines contribution to a positive team dynamic? Is this determined from input by the #1 & #2 ranked athletes, coaches, ADP? This is too subjective in my opinion and Olympic selection should be as objective as possible.*

How would this be evaluated? Who would make this decision? Surely only the coach of the team and the athletes in that team would be qualified to speak on this?

There is a recognition that this is a team event and a positive team dynamic is vital if athletes are to perform at their best. Every athlete that competes in a team match for GBR) any level has the facility to feedback about their performance and other factors including team dynamic to the ADP team [International Performances - Team Results Form](#). Input is and will be taken from team coaches.

7.1.2 *what are the necessary medical standards for selection. This should be stated before qualification has started*

A reasonable time frame would need to be given to athletes to book with a NGB doctor. This would have detrimental effects to athlete abroad if they need to travel back to the UK for

medical testing, if not given a reasonable booking window. I would suggest a 2 month window.

Medical reviews would only be necessary in the case of illness and injury, we would not want to nominate an ill or injured athlete who would then not meet 7.1.5 a). Medical standards that indicate fitness to compete will be dependent on the illness/injury concern and led by medical professionals. There is no intention to perform full body comprehensive testing. Timescales will necessarily be led by the timeframes set out by the FIE, the BOA and the Paris Games. Note that according to the published FIE document NOCs must give the selected athlete names by 25th June.

8.1.3 athlete appeal costs: *Why is there a cost for appeal? Surely this should be every athlete's right to appeal and should not be hindered by cost? How would BF spend this £250 considering it would be returned to the athlete if the appeal is won?*

All appeals and appeal responses will be reviewed by a lawyer on behalf of BF and the minimum cost of that to BF is around £250 per appeal. There is no account taken of the staff time that is involved in managing appeals.

The £250 payment would be held by British Fencing until the outcome of the appeal becomes clear. In the event of a failed appeal, the payment would contribute to legal costs incurred by British Fencing. In the event of a successful appeal, the payment would be returned to the athlete, and all costs would be borne by BF.

Other comments made that do not relate to the Olympic Nomination Policy:

The Senior British Ranking should not include U23 events (separate to nominated satellites events) that are not open to any athletes over the age of 23

This is the current situation.

There are no Senior BF ranking points awarded for the U23 National Championships or the U23 European Championships.

However the EFC U23 circuit events are currently international Senior events nominated by the EFC for U23 EFC ranking points. Therefore seniors of any age can enter and Senior BF ranking points can be awarded.

If there are changes and there are new EFC U23 competitions restricted only to U23s, Senior BF ranking points would not be awarded.

Senior British Ranking should not include commonwealth games.

The Commonwealth Fencing Championships is an international fencing tournament. There are no FIE ranking points awarded. There are BF ranking points awarded. There will no longer appear in the rankings from 1st September 2023 as they expire in accordance with the standard ranking rules.

As we do for other international competitions, BF will continue to monitor ranking point multipliers for future to ensure these reflect the strength of the competition.

Disclaimer – This document is not a Policy document and is not intended as a replacement for those documents. Athletes who wish to represent Great Britain, along with their coaches and parents are expected to read the final approved policies rather than rely on summaries and news post contents. No appeals will be permitted on the basis of the contents/interpretation of this document.