

**CR-16**

**Date:** February 12, 2016

**To:** JCNA President and Board of Directors

**From:** Dick Cavicke, Chairman, JCNA Judge's Concours Rules Committee (JCRC).

**Subject:** Spring 2016 JCRC Report

**1. JCRC Membership:**

Region	Name	Club	Term Expiration
SW -	Dick Cavicke (Chair)	San Diego Jaguar Club	JCNA President Appoints
SE -	Mike Mueller	Jaguar Club of Austin	April 30, 2017
SC -	Rufus Coburn	Jaguar Club of Austin	April 30, 2017
NW -	Art Dickenson	Pacific Jaguar Enthusiasts Group	May 1, 2016
NE -	Hal Kritzman	Jaguar Club of Southern New England	May 1, 2016
NC -	Bob Stevenson	Jaguar Affiliates Group of Michigan	May 1, 2016

**2. JCRC Activity Summary:**

- Monitored the JCNA and Jag-lovers Forums concerning JCNA/AGM activity in general and concours in particular.
- Received one formal rules change proposal that clear bras be allowed in Driven Division. A copy of the request is attached and the JCRC comments are listed below as **Item #3**.
- Provided extensive input to the Concours Committee (CC) supporting their BoD directed task to propose a two-tiered awards program. JCRC does not agree with several of the suggestions offered in the CC report to the BoD. Specific concerns follow at Item #4.
- Requested all clubs to submit a listing of their model-expert Judges by class. A limited number of clubs responded. The information is being entered into a database.
- Miscellaneous administrative Rule Book edits have been proposed by the Rule Book Editor, Steve Kennedy. JCRC approves their incorporation.

**3. Formal Concours Rule Change Proposal:**

**a. The Request**

John and Kathy Schindler, members of the Jaguar Club of Ohio, submitted a comprehensive rules change request (attached separately) to allow clear bras on Driven Division Entries without deduction. Currently, because clear bras are not an official Jaguar Cars Ltd. or Jaguar USA option, all clear bras are considered non-authentic and, when detected, are given a 4.0 point deduction. The Schindler's justify their request based on the precedent of the many other authenticity exceptions, already made for Driven Division Entries, and on the "invisible" finish protection afforded by properly installed clear bras.

**b. JCRC Discussion and Split Vote:**

- 1) The 3 JCRC committee members in favor of the change agreed that the bras were very worthwhile on cars in regular use in areas where the finish was subject to sand abrasion and chip damage from other road debris.
- 2) The 3 JCRC members opposed to the change were highly reluctant to allow more non-safety, personal-preference exceptions to Driven Division's compromised authenticity standards.

**c. JCRC Discussion with the Schindlers:**

With the tie committee vote, there was further discussion as to how the clear bras should be judged, if the proposal were approved. It was agreed that the clear bras would be judged exactly as the original/existing paint finish. Any blemishes, discoloration, visible edges or seams, wrinkles, blisters, separation, etc. would be subject to deductions. Additional judging details, scoresheet changes and specific point deductions would be prepared and presented for approval at the 2017 AGM.

**d. Requested BoD-Associated Action:**

The JCRC directive does not address committee tie votes. It is suggested that the BoD decide whether or not this clear bra proposal should be presented to the AGM delegates for an “up” or “down” vote or returned to JCRC for additional consideration.

**4. JCRC Overview of the Concours Committee (CC) Proposed Revised Awards Program:**

**a.** *JCRC strongly supports the intentions of the Concours Committee to revise the method of determining the North American Championship Awards.*

**b.** *However, JCRC objects to those elements of the CC proposal which go beyond the basic concept of a “two-tier” awards program and suggest judging changes and details which are inappropriate for the CC and premature at this stage of planning.*

**c.** *JCRC repeatedly advised the CC that any suggested judging-related changes were beyond the scope of their authority and would be fully and properly addressed by JCRC, if the “two-tier” program were approved. The JCRC advice was not followed.*

**d.** *It is respectfully requested that the BoD vote its approval or disapproval of each item in the CC proposal.*

**5. Selected CC Proposals and JCRC Objection or Disagreement**

**a. CC – “The existing Concours program will proceed unchanged.** The scores will continue to be reported and displayed on the JCNA website. The existing program name will be revised to JCNA Local Club Concours to better distinguish the existing program from the Upper or Second Tier Program.”

**JCRC Disagreement:**

*The existing JCNA awards program has been widely acknowledged as “broken” and ridiculed for its inflated scores. JCRC disagrees with the continuation of the existing North American Championship awards program and recommends it be suspended until an alternative awards program is adopted.*

**b. CC – “The judging Standard at the JCNA Invitational Concours will be per the JCNA rules at the time of the Event along with the JCRC supplementary rules specifically designed for the JCNA Invitational Concours. The Concours Committee suggests that the JCRC consider ~~bolstering the current Concours Rules to include, but necessarily limited to, operation of all gauges, interior lighting, cigar lighter, glovebox & lighting, console, radio/sound system, air conditioning, heating, windscreen washers, window lifts (manual & electric), heated seats, keylocks, clock, and “tickover” of the engine.~~”**

**JCRC Objection:**

*The lined-out item does not belong in this CC proposal, the goal of which was “to establish a second tier competition and awards event”. Judging protocol is strictly JCRC business and, as*

*needed, new rules will be recommended for any new event. The CC suggestion, for judging all instruments, interior accessories, etc., has been previously examined, by JCRC, and rejected for reasons of time, safety, model differences and general impracticality. That portion of the CC suggestion is not supported.*

**c. CC – “The JCNA Invitational Concours will include Championship Classes C1/PRE through C13/JS and Driven Classes D1/PRE through D9/XJS.** This will be updated annually by the JCRC to include Championship and Driven Classes of approximately 20 years old or older.

The **JCNA Invitational Concours** awards will be presented up to 3 deep by JCNA to the Entrants receiving the highest scores with a minimum score being 99.00/9.90 for First Place, 98.00/9.80 for Second Place, and 97.00/9.70 for Third Place. No award is given should the score fall less than the minimum.”

**JCRC Disagreement:**

1) *JCRC disagrees with allowing Driven Division as part of the second tier event. Along with having only their exteriors and interiors judged, Driven Division Entry authenticity exceptions have allowed significant deviation from the original “as-delivered” JCNA concours standard. When introduced by JCNA, Driven Division was intended for Entries that would ultimately advance to Champion Division.*

2) *If Driven Division Entries are allowed to participate, the resulting Invitational awards and titles must clearly and formally distinguish between the Championship and Driven Division winners. Without this distinction, there will be a proliferation of Jaguar ads and auctions that carry claims of cars being “JCNA Invitational Concours Winners”.*

3) *Under any circumstance, with the theoretical possibility of three (3) winners invited from each class and each region (i.e. 3x6=18 cars per each fully-subscribed class), Driven or Champion Divisions, there has to be some acceptable criteria for limiting the number of Entries per class (to a maximum of 6-8) such that the class judging-time may be kept within reasonable limits.*

**d. CC – “Inadequate Number of Judges per Judging Team –** If the Board of Directors approves the Upper or Second Tier Concours Program, the Concours Committee has concerns regarding the adequacy of the number of Judges.”

**CC - Proposed Action**

“The Concours Committee suggests that the number of Judges per judging team and the time of judging of the Upper or Second Tier Concours Program utilize 3 Judges for the entire car as a Team for a time not to exceed 20 minutes including judging the addition of the proposed interior items.”

**JCRC Objection:**

*Similar to the objection in 5.b. , The number of Judges, judging time, Judge assignments, judging protocol, etc. is JCRC responsibility and does not belong in this CC preliminary awards-change proposal or any CC proposal. JCRC rejects this suggestion to alter the Judging Team composition, the judging protocol and the judging time.*

*Note: If some CC members wish to change the existing or future judging rules, they may submit a formal rule change proposal to JCRC.*

**e. CC – “Upon approval of the Concours Committee Upper or Second-tier proposal,** the JCRC in coordination with the Concours Committee, will present the detailed specifics for consideration by the Board of Directors at the 2017 Annual General Meeting, or at a time that is practicable.”

**JCRC disagreement:**

*Change to: “Upon approval of the Concours Committee Upper or Second-tier proposal, JCRC will explore all options and propose any judging rule changes it considers appropriate for the new level of competition. (The CC will be consulted as necessary).”*

**6. JCRC Membership Renewal:**

NE, NW and NC Regional Directors must reaffirm Hal Kritzman, Art Dickenson and Bob Stevenson, respectively, for an additional two years of JCRC membership, or recommend replacements.

Submitted:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Dick Cavicke".

Dick Cavicke, Chair, JCNA JCRC