



## 2022 LE CASTELLET EVENT

21 to 24 July 2022

---

<b>From</b>	The Stewards	<b>Document</b>	18
<b>To</b>	All Teams, All Officials	<b>Date</b>	22 July 2022
		<b>Time</b>	19:40

---

**Title** DECISION - Car 15 - Right of Review Hearing on Spielberg Decision  
**Description** DECISION - Car 15 - Right of Review Hearing on Spielberg Decision  
**Enclosed** Doc 18 - DECISION - Car 15 - Right of Review Hearing on Spielberg Decision.pdf

**Dennis Dean**

**Steve Pence**

**Chris Geffroy**

**The Stewards**

## LE CASTELLET EVENT

21 TO 24 JULY 2022

---

<b>From</b>	The Stewards	<b>Document</b>	18 (3 pages)
<b>To</b>	The Team Manager, Campos Racing	<b>Date</b>	22 July 2022
		<b>Time</b>	19:38

---

**Procedure** The Stewards received a Petition for a Right of Review from Campos Racing (the “Competitor”) regarding the Decision (document 62) for Car 15 from the Feature Race at the Spielberg Event under Art 14 of the FIA International Sporting Code (the “ISC”) on 21 July 2022. This was within the 14 calendar days specified by Art 14.4.1 of the ISC and was, therefore, admissible.

This Petition was forwarded to the Stewards’ Panel from the Spielberg Event, who issued the decision in question.

Subsequently, because of the logistical challenges in reconstituting their panel, the Spielberg Panel communicated with the FIA and requested that the hearing be conducted by the Le Castellet Panel, who fully supported that request.

The FIA then designated the Le Castellet Panel as the hearing authority under the provisions of Article 14.1.1 of the International Sporting Code.

Subsequent to its designation as the hearing panel, the Le Castellet Panel sought input from EM Motorsport, the supplier of the GPS device used in the F2 cars, termed the Positioning Data Module (the “PDM”), as to the accuracy of a PDM and also as to its viability in arriving at the positioning information of an F2 car on a circuit with accuracy sufficient to judge whether such a car could be judged to be in breach of the track limits of the circuit or not. An EM Motorsport representative provided the requested input.

The Le Castellet Panel also sought input on the same subject from the Permanent F2 Technical Delegate, Mr. Florian Bartsch. He also provided the requested input.

A summons was issued (document 16) and a Hearing was held at 16:30 hours local French time on 22 July 2022, with the Team Manager, Enrique Colomina and the Team Principal, Adrian Campos, Jr. in attendance.

The Stewards then deliberated and rendered this decision.

**Decision** The Stewards deny the Competitor’s Petition for a Review under Article 14 of the ISC.

**Reasons** The Competitor provided the Stewards with an analysis of the GPS data downloaded from the car after the Spielberg event, accompanied by an analysis which purported to show that one of the breaches of track limits counted by Race Control and the Stewards in assessing the five second penalty to Car 15 (at Turn 10 on Lap 20) was not a breach of track limits.

*Cont.../*

Pursuant to Art 14 of the ISC, a petition for review must be filed against a Stewards' decision and can only be granted if a Competitor successfully demonstrates that *"a significant and relevant new element is discovered which was unavailable to the parties seeking the review at the time of the decision concerned."*

The four key points that the Competitor must demonstrate are that the new element must be (i) Significant, (ii) Relevant, (iii) New; and (iv) Unavailable to the parties seeking the review at the time of the decision concerned.

Here, the Competitor points to the GPS data from the car which had to be downloaded after the race and subsequently analysed as the element supporting the request for a Right to Review hearing.

In the analysis the Competitor postulates that such data can accurately place the car on a track map within an accuracy of 30 cm, based on a statement found on the supplier's (EM Motorsport's) website regarding the accuracy of its PDM.

It is important to note that the following is not an affirmation or review of the Stewards determination made during the race, but rather is an assessment regarding whether the Right of Review exists.

Taking the four above-mentioned key points of the Right of Review in reverse order, the Stewards hereby make the following assessment:

### **Unavailable**

It is undeniable that the data was unavailable to the Competitor at the time of the Decision (document 62) as it had to be downloaded after the race and subsequently analysed. This test is therefore met.

### **New**

The Competitor provided as an exhibit an analysis of Car 15's positioning data on the laps in question at the corner in question derived from the GPS data which was unavailable to both the team and the Stewards at the time of the initial decision (document 62). This test is therefore met.

### **Relevant**

The Competitor proposed that the data was relevant because it purported to show that based on GPS positional data obtained from its installed PDM, Car 15 did not breach track limits at Turn 10 on Lap 20.

In his input, the EM Motorsport representative states unequivocally, "The purpose of the PDM is not to define track limits, but to provide accurate positioning for race control and driver trajectories. The exact deviation of an F2 car [with] respect to a white line cannot be determined by using the PDM."

The permanent F2 Technical Delegate, in his input, noted that while the accuracy of the PDM can approach 30 cm, that is a best case solution under highly specialized circumstances, none of which are met with the F2 car installation. He also noted that the suspension setup on any particular F2 car could change the dimensional values used by the Competitor in the analysis of the trajectory of Car 15 at Spielberg.

The Stewards also take note that the Competitor's analysis is based on the position of the wheel rim with respect to any given track limit line. In fact, the test to be met when judging whether a car has gone beyond the track limits, per Appendix L, Chapter IV, Article 2.c is " . . . if no part of the car remains in contact with the track." The relevant test, therefore, is not whether the "plan form" of the wheel and tyre as viewed from above is over the white line at the edge of the track or not; but whether the contact patch of the tyre, which is measurably inboard of the wheel face used

by the Competitor in establishing the car's position with respect to the track's limits, remains in contact with the line that defines the track edge. Therefore, even if the GPS data was deemed sufficiently accurate for this use, significant changes would have to be made to the Competitor's model before making any such calculations, which would render its conclusions moot.

The Stewards, therefore, judge that the presented GPS data is not relevant and this test is not met.

### **Significant**

Because the data submitted is not relevant, the Stewards determine that it is also not "Significant".

### **Conclusion**

The Stewards therefore find, in their sole discretion:

- That the decision is subject to the Right of Review;
- That the data is New;
- That the data was Unavailable to the Competitor at the time of the decision subject to the petition for review;
- That the data is not Relevant; and
- That the data is not Significant.

The four key points required under Art 14.1.1 are not met and the Stewards, therefore, deny the Competitor's Right of Review.

Competitors are reminded that, in accordance with Art 14.3 of the ISC, this decision is not subject to appeal.

**Dennis Dean**  
**The Stewards**

**Steve Pence**

**Chris Geffroy**