

Feedback received on CC Track Endurance criteria through online form, with responses

Commentaires reçus sur les critères endurance piste par le biais de la formulaire en ligne, avec réponses

Dec. 18, 2025 – The following responses have been prepared by Cycling Canada Coach Panel, CSO, and DHPS and are without prejudice.

Le 18 décembre 2025 – Les réponses suivantes ont été préparées par le comité d'entraîneurs de Cyclisme Canada, le CSO et le DSHP, et sont sans préjudice.

Feedback received / Commentaires reçus	CC response / Réponse de CC
Given the performances at the World Championships (known at the time of criteria feedback) there are no quantitative metrics for any of the elite endurance program selections. With no riders in the top-8 at Worlds or at the only relevant Nations Cup all of the criteria for selection to bunch races (and team pursuit) is entirely subjective. Criteria should meet the realities of the Athletes Canada currently has, not speculative ones. As such it is necessary to consider other metrics like ranking of time standards, UCI points or performances at National Championships.	<p>The selection criteria were developed and released in draft form before the World Championships.</p> <p>Because of the variability in depth and quality of field in other competitions, World Championships and World Cups are the only performances that demonstrate international competitiveness to warrant automatic priority selection.</p> <p>UCI rankings and Canadian championship performances are not an accurate reflection of an athlete's performance potential at the Olympic level. Time standards are a minimum performance benchmark to be part of the program, rather than a direct selection tool</p> <p>Other metrics that may be considered are listed under priority 3.</p>
With regards to World cup's 2 and three for bunch racing, selection should also include results from the Pan Am track championships as it would be a good indicator on the form of a given athlete leading into the world cup season. For World Championship selection, it is imperative to include both 2026 AND 2025 results as to not solely factor in the current season, but also consider results from the past 12 months as athletes may have other commitments are other issues such as crashes, injuries, etc	<p>CC considered making the selections for World Cups II and III after Pan American Championships. However, athletes also need time to plan with their trade teams and training plans to be available and in peak form for these competitions, so we opted to go with the earlier selection date.</p> <p>For the World Championships selection, the policy already states "results must be achieved 12 months prior to the applicable selection date." This includes 2025 World Championships.</p>
A. General Comments on 2026 Proposed Events: If the road to LA2028 is going to prepare athletes well and develop a medal contention team, having only 1 team pursuit opportunity in a World Cup in 2026 doesn't seem to support development of a team for this event. Also, fewer opportunities don't adequately prepare athletes for being a competitive team for 2026 world	At this time, Cycling Canada's available resources do not allow for participation in multiple Team Pursuit World Cup events in 2026.

<p>championships, yet each selection criteria section begins with... ‘overarching strategy to support medal winning performances.’</p> <p>1. Given team pursuit athletes will be in Hong Kong for World Cup II, and that team pursuit experience and practice against other top athletes is paramount for development and necessary for road to LA2028:</p> <p>a. why not have team pursuit in Nilai as well? Team pursuing requires practice.</p> <p>b. If WC II and III are having different riders, why not have this as a ‘development and broadening pool of athletes’ project, bunch and team pursuit?</p> <p>c. Having same riders in both WC II and III would save money and that money could be used toward Perth and having a team pursuit team.</p>	<p>Additionally, racing is not the ideal way to develop a team in closed events like the Team Pursuit. The work needs to be done before the event in training.</p> <p>A. 1c. The same riders are being selected to WC 2 and WC 3, though the bunch race allocations vary.</p>
<p>2. Perth World Cup I – no team pursuit. Why not have full squad for World Cup I and hold a training camp, before or after. Poll athletes for interest in having it a fee-based project for training camp.</p>	<p>At this time, Cycling Canada’s available resources do not allow for participation in multiple Team Pursuit World Cup events in 2026.</p>
<p>3. Commonwealth Games selection policy – why is there no team pursuit event listed? If budgetary issue, have it fee/partial fee based, engage athletes in fundraising. Can CC/athletes at least try to go?</p>	<p>3. We did not include a Team Pursuit for Commonwealth Games because it does not support our high-performance priorities for the year. Our focus must remain on qualifying bunch events for the World Championships and performing in the Team Pursuit at World Championships, which directly impacts Olympic qualification. Without a dedicated preparation camp, a Team Pursuit project at CWG would divert money, time, staffing, and performance focus from those primary goals. For this reason, CWG is being treated as a developmental bunch-race opportunity, not a TP target.</p>
<p>A clear commitment to fairness, transparency, and accountability in the selection criteria is paramount whether it be for bunch, individual or team pursuit. Athletes should be evaluated equally, with well-defined selection criteria and benchmarks communicated well in advance, so that everyone understands not only what is expected, but also how those expectations translate into actual rankings and decisions. In this way, athletes can prepare with purpose, knowing precisely what they need to do, when it must be done, and how their performance will be assessed, and to track progression of athletes.</p>	<p>The current criteria were developed with fairness, transparency, and accountability in mind using well-defined selection criteria and benchmarks, and by communicating these well in advance.</p>

In this context, feedback would be:	
<p>Generally, defining or providing some objective guidance on ‘factors’ that the panel is assessing would assist in understanding what is being assessed, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Overarching strategy to support medal winning performances’ – can you show what this strategy is/map it out? – what are the medal winning performances, what do they look like, for the 3 levels of events, i.e., World Championships, World Cups, Pan Am Championships, and ultimately LA2028? With so few team pursuit opportunities in 2026 what would this strategy look like and how does it fit with strategy for building road to LA2028? 	<p>The overarching strategy aligns with Cycling Canada’s high-performance plan, which outlines the performance benchmarks required at World Championships, World Cups, Pan Am Championships, and ultimately LA2028. This plan has been developed internally but will be communicated now we can validate it against the Olympic qualification criteria, which were published on Dec. 12.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitability to specific positions in the team pursuit – How is suitability to a position objectively measured/described? Quantifying this ‘factor’ allows for training targets and progression tracking. 	<p>Team Pursuit evaluations are determined by the coaching panel, informed by both training and competition data collected for each athlete, including (but not limited to) power data, timing reports, and video analysis. Due to the interaction-dependent, role-specific, and contextual nature of the Team Pursuit, it is not possible to objectively quantify all factors that contribute to overall team performance. As such, qualitative evaluation by expert coaches is both valid and necessary in selection process. Selection decisions are therefore based on an integrated assessment of quantitative data and qualitative performance factors that reflect how athletes contribute to overall team performance.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to deliver team strategy at target pace in the team pursuit – How is “ability to deliver team strategy at target pace” measured/described? Who/what defines the “target pace,” and does it change per competition/composition of riders? 	<p>Target pace can vary between training sessions, between lineups, and between rides at a competition. The target pace is determined by the coach in collaboration with the data science team and the athletes at the event or training session. Athletes are always aware of the target pace. The target pace is recorded and kept for the record on timing reports.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tactical and technical ability in the team pursuit - What counts as tactical ability in team pursuit? What are the main technical skills being assessed, e.g., smooth exchanges? How much weight do tactics and technical execution have compared to raw speed/power? 	<p>The key technical components for team pursuit are: Exchanges, Standing Start, Drafting, Line, Stability in position, Power Predictability.</p> <p>The key tactical components for team pursuit are: Ability to Execute Strategy, Processing External information, Race adaptability, and Competitive Savviness</p>

	<p>Not all factors are weighted equally and each rider's strengths or weaknesses needs to be balanced in the context of each given lineup. The coaching panel applies expert judgment to determine the relative importance of each factor in each given context. In some cases, a significant deficiency in a critical area may be considered sufficiently impactful to render an athlete unsafe or ineffective within a Team Pursuit context. Ultimately, evaluations are guided by whether an athlete contributes to making the team go faster.</p>
<p>• Madison/Bunch: Tactical and technical ability – what factors are being considered?</p>	<p>The key technical components for Madison are: Efficiency of Exchanges and Pack Skills.</p> <p>The key tactical components for Madison are: Ability to Execute Strategy, Processing External information, Race adaptability, and Competitive savviness</p>
<p>Performance camp dates for events: If a goal for CC is to develop athletes and broaden pool of athletes, why not have these as open camps so that athletes can train together, have opportunities to demonstrate 'factors' for consideration in real time CC training sessions, so that past performances are not the only events being considered given there are so few opportunities for athletes. If not considered a 'selection' camp (as they were before), at least provide all athletes with an opportunity to be on track so that months don't go by without being in a line up/CC eyes on an athlete testing/benchmarking, technical coaching, immediate feedback etc.)</p>	<p>This is being considered for the first week of the World Championships camp and will be published in the Training Camps & Talent ID section of the CC website.</p>

<p>New Application Process: Now that an application process is in place for projects, having open camps for all projects, ie: if you apply, you attend and then are potentially considered for a project based on performance at camp. This would allow riders to prepare with purpose – knowing what they need to do, when it must be done, and then how the performance would be evaluated or considered in the evaluation process. If an athlete is not chosen for an event, and thus an opportunity to attend a performance camp: How is an athlete supposed to ‘break in’ to the top 5 or 6 athletes who are chosen for events? It becomes cyclical, athletes get chosen, have performance camp opportunities and ‘past results’ for consideration. However, any athlete not selected does not have the opportunity to ‘demonstrate’ the 4 ‘factors’ being assessed, in either a CC training session/performance camp or an actual event. Opening performance camps to all athletes or having targeted training camps throughout the year could be strategies for athlete development and progression and broadening the pool of athletes, by allowing more athletes to be seen, coached and assessed by CC coaches.</p>	<p>This is being considered for 2027, keeping in mind budget and entry deadline constraints for each competition, and the need to have some camps purely for preparation and others that can incorporate selection.</p>
<p>Selection Dates for All Projects – Athlete Notification: Given athlete application process is now being used for projects, when athletes are informed of their selection:</p> <p>a) will every athlete who applies be given notice of selection or not, and</p> <p>b) for those who apply and are not selected, will feedback and rationale be provided as to why they were not selected? This type of process would benefit athlete and team development by helping all athletes understand the selection process including what data specifically was used to support selection or not. Will this be part of the new ‘application’ process? Thank you for opportunity to provide feedback.</p>	<p>a) Yes, every athlete who applied will be notified of selection or non-selection.</p> <p>b) The coaches are available to debrief with each athlete if requested.</p>
<p>If an elite rider has not been able to attend World Cups/World Championships but stands a good chance of medalling at Commonwealth Games, I think this should take priority over U23 rider selection, if coaches and the panel agree.</p>	<p>World Cups and World Championships are of greatest priority and importance in 2026, especially with Olympic qualification starting at worlds. Commonwealth Games is a development opportunity (equivalent to C1 points) and has been prioritized as such.</p>
<p>The following comments focus specifically on the team pursuit selection criteria. The four stated criteria which are to be considered by the panel are lacking sufficient insight into what specific performance indicators are valued, or how athletes can steer their development</p>	<p>1. Please see responses to similar question above.</p>

<p>with these expectations. While subjective evaluation is a necessary component of selection, the current framework relies too heavily on undefined discretion, leaving athletes unable to interpret or act on feedback meaningfully. There is no reference to Cycling Canada's time standards or to any internal benchmarks in the Team Pursuit Criteria. Further, the four subjective factors being considered are so general that they do not meaningfully inform athletes of the panel's actual decision-making considerations or how to align their preparation to achieve a satisfactory standard. The outcome is a process that appears opaque, limits athlete development, and risks undermining confidence in the fairness and accountability of selections.</p> <p>1. Lack of Defined Evaluation Parameters: The four stated selection factors are qualitative and nonspecific. The policy should provide accompanying definitions, measurable indicators, or examples of what constitutes a satisfactory standard, and provide a usable framework for athletes to assess their readiness or progress. This would be beneficial to help riders understand how to improve or where to direct their focus in training and competition.</p>	
<p>2. Insufficient Transparency for Athlete Feedback: It would be beneficial if the policy offers a description of how evaluations of performances are documented and intended to be communicated to athletes. Without a clear feedback mechanism or an ongoing and accessible evaluation record, athletes cannot verify the reasoning behind their selection outcomes and coaches cannot make data-informed adjustments to their training plans. An ongoing feedback system where athletes can understand their current ability compared to the panel's evaluation (in advance of selection decisions!) would allow the athlete to interpret feedback more meaningfully for better development and performance at future competitions.</p> <p>3. Potential for Inconsistent and Biased Application: When selection criteria are broad and undefined as they are here, a panel may apply them inconsistently or unconsciously rely on familiarity, reputation, or historical preference. This creates the perception—or reality—of selection bias. Documented evaluation rubrics, shared benchmarks, and a feedback protocol would help mitigate these risks and reinforce procedural fairness. These are currently not included in the selection criteria.</p>	<p>2, 3. After selection has been published, Cycling Canada coaching and sport science staff are available to speak with athletes and their personal coaches to explain gaps the athletes need to address. Cycling Canada is updating its Team Pursuit Gold Medal Profile to provide athletes and coaches specific performance indicators and help clarify what the gaps are for athletes. However, the GMP is a performance feedback tool and is not used for selection: it is important for athletes and coaches to be as open as possible in their GMP assessments without fearing that this may cost them a spot on the team.</p> <p>3. The selection process is designed to be robust and to control for bias through multiple layers of accountability. Selection recommendations are made by a coaching panel of at least three expert coaches and are reviewed and approved by the CSO and DHPS. Where required, selections are further reviewed by the High Performance Committee, consisting of 13 cycling and sport experts.</p>

<p>4. Absence of Objective Reference Standards: Although Cycling Canada may internally use their time standards or other evaluations as consideration for selection, these are not included in the published criteria and therefore cannot serve as justification for the current lack of clarity. If time-based or power-based benchmarks/considerations are in fact used in the team pursuit selection, they should be explicitly referenced in the published policy. If they are not currently used as a consideration, then these easily measurable and projectable data should be include in the consideration process.</p>	<p>4. Time standards are referenced in the selection document as a minimum standard to be considered for selection. They are not a direct selection tool, and nor is power data.</p>
<p>1. "Suitability to Specific Positions in the Team Pursuit":</p> <p>a) The suitability of an athlete for a specific position depends on race strategy, pacing, distribution, and the technical demands of the role—all of which can vary significantly across competitions.</p> <p>b) The criterion, as written, does not specify what physical, technical, or tactical markers define "suitability." This leaves athletes unable to understand what attributes or performances would demonstrate readiness for a given position and how to achieve them.</p> <p>c) For developing or newly integrated riders, there is no stated process for how they can demonstrate potential suitability without prior opportunities in the lineup.</p> <p>Recommendation: Provide objective descriptors or observable indicators for each position (pull power, expected pull distribution, etc.) and communicate these expectations during and prior to the selection cycle.</p> <p>2. "Ability to Deliver Team Strategy at Target Pace in the Team Pursuit":</p> <p>a) This criterion presumes that a team strategy and pace are known in advance of the selection decision. Will these parameters be shared with athletes prior to selection?</p> <p>b) Without clear definition of what the target pace or strategy is, this factor cannot be meaningfully measured or demonstrated.</p> <p>c) Because team compositions and strategies vary, past performances are not a consistent benchmark. A rider's form and ability to deliver at pace may evolve between</p>	<p>1, 2, 3 – We feel these comments are already addressed in responses above.</p>

<p>competitions. This should be accounted for through transparent and current evaluation.</p> <p>Recommendation: If a target pace or plan is part of the evaluation, this information should be communicated to athletes in advance of selection. Alternatively, define and communicate how an athlete's "ability to deliver strategy" is measured and ranked (e.g., through simulation testing, timed training sessions, or performance data analysis) and provide an avenue for new riders to demonstrate their readiness.</p> <p>3. "Tactical and Technical Ability in the Team Pursuit":</p> <p>a) The policy does not specify which tactical and technical elements are evaluated. These could include factors such as line, exchanges, ability to hold pace, or communication—but without clarification, athletes cannot identify areas for improvement or demonstrate progress.</p> <p>b) There is also no explanation of what standards constitute proficiency, nor how such assessments are documented or how riders are ranked.</p> <p>Recommendation: Outline the specific tactical and technical competencies that are evaluated, provide a consistent assessment framework and share the internal thinking of the panel with athletes. This would enable athletes to understand expectations, self-assess, and receive actionable feedback.</p>	
<p>4. "Past Performances and/or Results in International and/or Domestic Competition and in Cycling Canada Training Sessions":</p> <p>a) Historical performance is important, but as currently written, this criterion does not describe how recent or relevant performances are weighed relative to current form. Greater clarity is needed to understand how Cycling Canada is considering past standout performances, an athlete's ability to reach top-form for critical events and data-based projections.</p> <p>b) Given the limited number of team pursuit projects each year, reliance on results from the prior 12 months risks overlooking athletes who have had prior standout performances, have since improved or those whose earlier results occurred under materially different circumstances.</p>	<p>4 - The policy states "results must be achieved in the 12 months prior to the applicable selection date." This ensures performances are current, relevant, and reflective of an athlete's competitive readiness at the time of selection.</p>

<p>c) There is no indication of which elements of past performances are reviewed or how contextual factors are incorporated.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clarify the timeframe within which past performances are considered valid, and detail how current form (e.g., recent testing data or monitored training) is factored into evaluation. Explicitly define the key performance elements assessed within competitions or camps so athletes have a clear understanding of how and when they are being assessed</p>	
<p>Why did Cycling Canada remove the rule about 2nd year U17 riders at Apeldoorn next gen? It gives U17 riders a chance to race internationally and prepare themselves for the junior ranks.</p>	<p>The Apeldoorn organizers have restricted eligibility to U19s, thus the CC criteria reflected that change.</p>