

2011 Change Proposals - Data Aq(1 Items)

Posted by joepaluch - 27 Oct 2010 05:59

These are **PROPOSED** Changes only based on driver and director suggestions. These two items are variations on the same theme. Please comment on each of the poposals as written here.

2011-7a) Data Acquisition with limited data sharing

Proposal: Cars at time may be required to install a data acquisition device (supplied by the series) to monitor and log performance on track. Parameters measured will be speed, and lateral and longitudinal acceleration. The full data set will become property of the series. The full data set will be supplied to the competitor and data consist of ONLY a speed vs position plot will be shared with all drivers. If a driver already has a system installed, data may be extracted from this driver owned system to meet this requirement. Tapering with data or data acquisition equipment will be subject to penalty. Data will not be used in 2011 for pass/fail compliance, but maybe used as guide for compliance inspections.

Justification: Gathering data over multiple drivers on multiple tracks will establish a performance baseline for 944 spec power levels. This data can then be used to identify possible outliers for power levels and more precisely direct subsequent compliance inspections. It is believed that data acquisition can spot performance trends, but may not be accurate enough to generate compliance quality hp numbers. For that reason data alone cannot be used in 2011 for strict pass fail compliance. Compliance will be passed on the strictly defined rules as noted. The sharing of limited speed vs position plots will limit concerns of cars seeming to accelerate away from others by being able to visualize the acceleration curves.

2011-7b) Data Acquisition with no data sharing

Proposal: Cars at time may be required to install a data acquisition device (supplied by the series) to monitor and log performance on track. Parameters measured will be speed, and lateral and longitudinal acceleration. The full data set will become property of the series. The full data set will be supplied to the competitor, but NO data will be shared with drivers (regional 944-spec directors and regional NASA officials will have access to the entire data set). If a driver already has a system installed, data may be extracted from this driver owned system to meet this requirement. Tapering with data or data acquisition equipment will be subject to penalty. Data will not be used in 2011 for pass/fail compliance, but maybe used as guide for compliance inspections.

Justification: Gathering data over multiple drivers on multiple tracks will establish a performance baseline for 944 spec power levels. This data can then be used to identify possible outliers for power levels and more precisely direct subsequent compliance inspections. It is believed that data acquisition can spot performance trends, but may not be accurate enough to generate compliance quality hp numbers. For that reason data alone cannot be used in 2011 for strict pass fail compliance. Compliance will be passed on the strictly defined rules as noted.

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - Data Aq(1 Items)

Posted by 944Racer72 - 31 Oct 2010 10:41

I'm against DA as a rule enforcement tool - simply too much open to interpretation, error, etc here.

Charlie brings up a good point - is there a history of protests by competitors in 944 Spec? If not, then where is the issue that is spurring all of this discussion?

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - Data Aq(1 Items)

Posted by cbuzzetti - 01 Nov 2010 16:00

Oh yeah, I forgot to add "NO NEW RULES" we don't need either of these as rules for 944Spec.

So it should not be one or the other it should be neither.

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - Data Aq(1 Items)

Posted by Atteberry - 02 Nov 2010 20:16

I see no value to either idea. The data collected while somewhat accurate is not exact. It also suggests that every competitor should have data aquisition. If this is low cost racing some may not want to take on expense. It also smells of Formula 1 in the oversite of racers and cars. I say no to both ideas

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - Data Aq(1 Items)

Posted by bay924s - 03 Nov 2010 20:53

Too many variables in measuring HP...ambient temp, altitude, etc to use a DA for any meaningful data. Opposed to 2011-7a and 2001-7b.

=====

Re: 2011 Change Proposals - Data Aq(1 Items)

Posted by Big Dog - 16 Nov 2010 09:49

Version 1 - NO! This will address only the data sharing portion of this version. I will address general concerns with data sharing below.

I am absolutely opposed to forced data sharing with other competitors. I emphasize FORCED and COMPETITORS here. I have no problem sharing data if I choose to but, to the extent that I am competing with others and so not want to share information that cost me time, effort and money to get, that should be my choice and not the "rule". Please remember, we race because we like to compete against other racers.

Version 2 - NO! This version still gives my data to my competitors, the series directors, that will have FULL access to all data. The series directors are our competitors. Why should they have an unfair advantage.

The justifications for these proposed rules are to find "outliers" (read "cheaters"). This presumes that we have cheaters. Excuse me!

There seems to be general knowledge that data is NOT reliable to determine hp. There are sufficient rules in place to deal with suspected cheaters. Use them until they are shown to be inadequate for the job. As I understand it, there has never been anyone that has been found to have a cheater engine in the history of 944-Spec. Eric had one that he suspected but never got the chance to determine if, in fact, the competitor was cheating but the existing rules would have allowed him to determine if it was a cheater engine. The rules provide for protesting competitors if someone has a concern. NASA can do it's own compliance checks without a protest if it decides to.

Most regions do not believe that there are cheaters in their regions. If that changes, they can use the existing rules to verify and deal with any cheating that is found.

If it ain't broke, don't fix it. NO NEW RULES.

Big Dog

=====