



FAQ on UKAC Scoring Vote 2017

1. Who was on the expert group?

- Nick Henwood, G3RWF (Chair, President RSGB)
- Ian Pawson, G0FCT (Chair Contest Support Committee)
- Ian White, GM3SEK
- Stewart Bryant, G3YSX (RSGB Board Representative for Contesting)
- Andy Cook, G4PIQ (Chair VHF Contest Committee)
- Keith Le Boutillier, GU6EFB
- Richard Baker, GD8EXI (VHFCC Member)
- Martin Hall, GM8IEM (VHFCC Member)
- David Dix, G8LZE
- Mike Tubby, G8TIC
- Carl Ratcliffe, M0ICR

2. Wasn't this dominated by voting from IO91?

IO91 did attract the highest number of votes at 26% of the overall votes cast, but it was not dominant. In general voting levels were in line with the distribution of activity. IO93 and IO92 were the squares with next highest votes cast.

3. What was the distribution of votes by area?

In general, Scottish stations tended to vote for B3, and other areas tended to vote for Nordic. But, if we remove the predominantly Scottish squares from the analysis, the vote was 83/17 in favour of Nordic. In the Scottish squares, the vote was 80/20 in favour of B3. Even if all the votes in the South East of England were discounted, the result returned would still have been for Nordic.

4. Why were there only two options?

This was discussed extensively within the group. These two options, and only these two options were proposed because

- The B3 option has the feature of geographic variability within the UK&CD and the Nordic option doesn't, so this offers a clear choice
- Both provide a strong incentive to look for new squares, making the event require more strategy and skill, and providing an incentive for stations to beam in all directions and to spend additional time and effort trying to work rare bonuses
- Having analysed the behaviour of other reasonable bonus or multiplier based scoring systems, they all behave in similar ways to one of these two
- There is not enough variation in the behaviours of the alternatives to justify making the decision more complex and risk ending with a poor compromise which works badly for everyone.



5. Why did you not offer a handicapping system?

To the best of our knowledge, a handicap system is not applied anywhere in the world for contesting and our initial analysis of such systems suggest that terrain is the major factor impacting contest scores and the public domain sources of terrain data are not sufficiently granular to allow us to handicap a site with a high degree of confidence. It would be a complete change to the way that VHF contest progress is rewarded. Given the UKAC contests are attracting a level of success and activity way beyond anything seen in the past – even at ‘Peak VHF’ in the 1980s – this would seem an inappropriate place to try such an experiment.

6. Will this scoring system stay stable for more than 1 year?

It is our clear intention that we retain the Nordic scoring system for an extended period