USMS Convention — Greensboro, North Carolina. 2012

Committee Name:	Records & Tabulation	**Session #:** 1		**Report #:**11
Committee Chair:	Chris Stevenson	**Vice Chair:**	Greg Danner	
Minutes recorded by:	Greg Danner	**Date/time of meeting:**	9/14/12	

Actions Requiring Approval by the HOD:

1. None

Motions Passed:

1. MSA For the minutes from the July 29th, 2012 conference call meeting.

Number of committee members present: 7	**Absent: 4**	**Number of other delegates present: 12**

Committee members present (list all, including chair and vice chair): Chris Stevenson, Greg Danner, Mary Beth Windrath, Walt Reid, Ginger Pierson, Jeanne Seidler, Laszlo Eger

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 1:30pm

1. The Chair called the meeting to order.

2. The Committee **MSA** the minutes for the July 29th, 2012 meeting.

3. Review of rule proposals affecting Records and Tabulation. While there are many proposals that affect our business in some way, R71-R81 directly involve "our" Article 105 (Records, Top 10, All-American). Four of these were proposed by the Records & Tabulation (R74, R78, R79, R81); these were all recommended for approval by the Rules Committee, meaning that a simple majority of the HOD is needed to pass them. Of the remaining proposals, the most significant is R75 which states that, without more information, we will not accept the list of certified pools from USA-S. This proposal was discussed at our previous meeting and endorsed by the committee.

4. The Chair calls for a discussion of the four biggest issues from the year and encourages audience feedback (especially from Top Ten Recorders):

   a. The Chair outlines the purpose of the Event Results Database (ERDB) as it pertains to storing meet results. It is the intent that all official results from sanctioned or recognized will be uploaded. Committee members and audience members question the inclusion of "non-member" results and the visibility for search results. Jim Matysek indicates that results will only appear from the starting point of an individual's membership with USMS. Prior results from when they were a non-member are in the database, but not visible from an individual search perspective. Meet results are visible via the ERDB immediately upon uploading. Walt indicates that he may edit meet results weeks and or a month after the results have been initially uploaded, due to various related paper mailings (DQ cards). Chris reminds the room that the LMSC Standards now specify that results should be uploaded within two weeks of the meet. Ed Tsuzuki indicates that the lowest marks from respondents to the survey on LMSC Standards were with regard to the submission time for meet results to the ERDB.

   b. The GTO revision for Top Ten Recorders emphasizes the importance of results uploading and that their workload now occurs throughout the season, as opposed to historically when they would often prepare their Top Ten submission after the season, in the weeks leading up to the deadline.

   c. The Canadian SCM Nationals that resulted in a lack of Top Ten consideration led to various rule proposals and suggestions for policy changes. Previously, uploaded meets that were not associated with a LMSC were not on anyone's radar to be submitted for Top Ten inclusion. This meet, and others, shall be monitored by a new FINA related category of meets.

   d. The USMS pool measurement certification database is an evolving entity that should eventually be a part of E2EEM. Chris will contact all TTR's and ask them to review the database for pools that may be invalid or out of existence. The Sanctions process should eventually require pool certification in advance, as currently there is no

requirement that pool certification must be sent in. Laszlo inquires about the possibility of acquiring the list of Canadian measured pools and making it public. FINA may be unwilling to follow that approach, so Masters Swimming Canada should be approached first. Committee and audience members briefly discuss the process of using laser measuring devices in facilities with different wall configurations.

5. The Chair asks committee members to prioritize IT projects that are not already classified, on a scale of 1 (high priority) to 3 (low priority).

   a. The ability to import meet results in text format (custom formats) due to international meets. This is classified as 2.

   b. A Hy-Tek records file that is valid as of the date provided by the user. Jim Matysek notes that this tool is completed.

   c. A Top Ten Preview report that is public, but void of sensitive data. This is classified as 2.

   d. A Relay Check Tool. This is classified as 1.

   e. The ability to flag portions of a meet or an entire meet as ineligible for Top Ten consideration for a variety of reasons. This was classified as 3.

   f. A "notes" field in the meet information that is not visible to the public was not classified.

   g. A carry-through link for meet entry forms that is still available after a meet has concluded and only meet results are listed. This was not classified.

   h. The remaining items on the list of suggestions will be classified or removed in our next conference call.

6. The Chair asks the audience for any additional input or questions.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40pm