

Feedback received on CC Road criteria through online form, with responses

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

Feb. 13, 2026 – The following responses have been prepared by Cycling Canada Coach Panel, CSO, and DHPS and are without prejudice.

Le 13 février 2026 – 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
Pourquoi considérer les résultats des 12 derniers mois dans les critères de sélections plutôt que la saison en cours (année de calendrier). Ce critère fait du sens pour les projets de printemps, comme la saison commence tout juste, mais pour les projets d'été ou de fin de saison, suffisamment de courses ont eu lieu pour faire une sélection dans l'année en cours. Le risque est qu'un.e athlète ayant changé.e ses objectifs sportif ou son engagement dans la discipline lors de l'entre saison soit sélectionné automatiquement dans un projet, mais n'a pas plus le niveau requis pour y participer.	Les critères de sélection sont toujours un compromis. Dans le cas présent, nous essayons de trouver un équilibre entre le fait d'obliger les athlètes à rechercher continuellement des résultats pour être sélectionnés et la reconnaissance des résultats obtenus sur une plus longue période. L'utilisation des résultats obtenus au cours des 12 derniers mois est un compromis raisonnable et est souvent utilisé dans nos critères de sélection. Il y a toujours un risque qu'un athlète ne soit plus performant au niveau requis pour réussir dans l'épreuve ciblée, mais nous avons une clause de préparation à la performance dans les critères généraux de sélection qui peut être utilisée si un athlète n'est manifestement pas prêt pour la sélection.
Pour les critères de sélection aux Championnats du monde juniors à Montréal, je crois sincèrement que vous devriez revoir les critères basés uniquement sur des résultats dans des courses UCI Top 5. Il serait important de fixer une date limite avant le Tour de l'Abitibi, par exemple autour du 12 juillet, pour atteindre ces critères. Autrement, plusieurs jeunes risquent de ne pas participer au Tour de l'Abitibi, ce qui serait vraiment dommage pour une organisation de ce calibre de ne pas pouvoir compter sur les meilleurs coureurs canadiens. En exigeant que les résultats soient obtenus avant le 12 juillet, cela inciterait automatiquement les athlètes à prendre part au Tour de l'Abitibi, ce qui renforcerait à la fois l'événement et la sélection canadienne.	Nous avons inclus le Tour de l'Abitibi dans les critères de sélection des Championnats du monde en priorité 4 afin d'inciter les athlètes à participer à cette épreuve en raison de sa valeur en tant qu'épreuve de cyclisme sur route junior de premier plan dans les Amériques. Mais nous ne pouvons pas mettre le Tour de l'Abitibi au même niveau que les épreuves en Europe parce que la qualité des participants est typiquement plus bas; c'est pour ça que nous reconnaissons que les victoires d'étape ou un top 3 au classement général.
My comment relates to the date selection of the Canadian Road Championships. Year after year, high school graduates are confronted with the difficult choice to participate in the championship, or attend their graduation. Student athletes have worked particularly hard to be successful in their sport while balancing training demands. They will need their brain long after they are finished with their bike. It is unfortunate and sad that some will miss out on this once in a lifetime milestone because THE competition of the year is at the same time.	Cycling Canada cannot choose its own dates for the National Road Championships: the UCI mandates all national road championships must take place in the last full week of June (UCI rule 1.2.029).

<p>All results must be top half of the field unless otherwise specified. Field size is calculated based on the number of entrants in the official results on the UCI website, including athletes listed as DNS, DNF and DSQ. So this means for example I finish 1st in stage 3 of a .1 or .2 race but finish 70/85 started in all other stages and Gc. So my result won't count? This criteria is vague</p>	<p>As noted under "Events Considered for Selection," results can be from a one-day race, the general classification of a stage race, or a stage – each is considered a distinct result. Winning a stage would count as an eligible result regardless of how the athlete does in the other stages or on the GC.</p>
<p>The current criteria for both the Men's Spring European Project and Tour de l'Abitibi essentially exclude any rider that did not race at Coupe de l'Avenir in 2025, regardless of their results at the 2026 Road Nationals road race or time trial (unless they are the top finisher). This strongly biases against cyclists from smaller jurisdictions like the Yukon that were not able to enter teams into Coupe de l'Avenir in 2025. The 2024 selection guidelines, which allowed for placements at Hayman to be considered, was much more equitable and inclusive, as riders can race at Hayman Classic as independents/without a formal team. Hayman Future Champions Camp is the largest junior cycling event in Western Canada, and the most accessible. Please reconsider the Priority 5 Selection Criteria for both the European Spring Project and the Tour de l'Abitibi to be more inclusive for riders from Western Canada and small jurisdictions. Thank you!</p>	<p>Unfortunately, there are not many high-level junior and U17 events in Canada that can be used for selection. The Hayman Classic was great when it included multiple days of racing as it gave an opportunity for athletes in the west to gain experience and get noticed, but it is not being run as a competition this year. We would consider including an event in Western Canada if one at the appropriate level were to be organized in the future. It's important to note that Cycling Canada does not organize the events on the national calendar: we depend on local organizers to host races. We do of course recognize how hard it is to organize road events and we, along with the provincial and territorial associations, are actively looking for ways to make it easier, but it is a very complex challenge that has no simple solution.</p>
<p>why are only top 5 results among fully professional UCI .1 races considered when a top 10 would more than prove an athlete is capable to compete among the best u23s in the world?</p>	<p>Choosing the cutoff for eligible results is inevitably a compromise. The higher the finish, the more likely it is a strong indication that an athlete was in the hunt for a win. Lower finishes are more likely to be influenced by other factors, such as team tactics, that are less of a reflection of the athlete's abilities. We have chosen top 5 as a reasonable compromise that has the highest likelihood of being a true reflection of the athlete's potential.</p>
<p>The amount of emphasis on Road Nationals for selection creates an unreasonable amount of pressure on U17 and U19 athletes. They're teenagers, not small pros. It's already a high stress event and expecting athletes to nail down the best performance to such a small window with pressure and expectation assailing them on multiple fronts is unrealistic. It creates a breeding ground for poor mental health and will contribute to burnout. This is exacerbated by the fact that most youth athletes are just finishing their schooling and exam periods days before Nationals takes place. It privileges the kids who have the bandwidth and flexibility to mitigate those factors. And it demonstrates that Cycling Canada doesn't view these young athletes as well rounded human beings who exist and need to function beyond their sport and instead only as sport performers. The health and wellbeing of young people (not just as young athletes)</p>	<p>High-performance sport is built around the ability to rise to the occasion at key moments. To support this, we've based our selection process on a set of important events that most athletes already target, creating the fairest and most consistent environment for comparison. Canadian Championships remain a significant element of the junior criteria, but we've intentionally included additional data points—such as the Tour de l'Abitibi, the Coupe de l'Avenir, and various UCI events in Europe—to ensure that no single competition carries all the weight. At the same time, we want to avoid a system that encourages athletes to travel nonstop in pursuit of selection. By clearly identifying several key events in advance, we hope to give athletes the clarity they need to plan their training and competition schedules with confidence. It's also important to remind aspiring athletes that while high-performance sport can be incredibly rewarding, there</p>

need to be considered and prioritised above what they can achieve for you, under your banner. There needs to be more data points from different points in the season to allow athletes to demonstrate ability and spread mental load of performance expectation across the season. Relying on what is essentially a single data point to make a complex decision would make you the laziest (at best) and worst data scientist in the world.	is much more to life than results, and much more to sport than national team selection. The high-performance pathway is, by its nature, selective, and not every environment will be the right fit for every athlete—and that's okay. Our goal is to support athletes in finding the path that helps them grow, thrive, and enjoy the journey.
All selection criteria for Junior projects that use ITT as a criteria (pages 4-8) - Using ITT is comparing apples to oranges -- not all youth wear TT helmets or other equipment that provide an advantage -- if TT bikes are not allowed then why allow all the other gear -- which can be cost prohibitive for youth. Some families have to make a choice between equipment and being able to compete at all (meaning that when all key selection races are in Eastern Canada only -- that adds significant costs to youth travelling from the north / west) at national events -- and gear like TT helmets make a difference in time -- that is why they are used, resulting in skewed results.	Yes, it is true that the regulations vary from one time trial event to another, but we are not comparing average speeds between events. Rather, selection is based on finishing position, so that athletes are directly compared to competitors racing under the same regulations. The decision to not allow time trial bikes or disc wheels for juniors at Canadian championships was made precisely to help limit the equipment cost required to compete at that event. As you point out, that doesn't stop athletes from spending money on marginal gains elsewhere – helmets, skinsuits, ceramic bearings, nutrition, etc. – but the performance effect of those items is lower than complete time trial bikes and aero wheels.
On the selection criteria for the Junior spring European projects (both men and women), more specifically criteria #6, it appears there would be more equity between the 2008 and 2009 athletes if the criteria considered the best two placings rather than the best three placings considering athletes born in 2009 couldn't participate in the Tour de l'Abitibi in 2025 and therefore are required to have participated in all three remaining events listed in the criteria whereas the athletes born in 2008 had access to four events and are consequently allowed to have missed one. Another option from going to two best placings instead of three would be to add another event to the list where both 2008 and 2009 athletes could participate in 2025, for example GP Charlevoix, which has both a selective course and is well attended by most top athletes, at least from Eastern Canada.	Thank you; we may incorporate some of these suggestions in future criteria.
I believe that under criteria for Tour de l'Avenir, the 4th priority should be based on UCI points solely on Europe. A .1 ranked in the US is easier than Europe however points are awarded the same.	That's something we could incorporate in future criteria. However, realistically there are not many opportunities to earn points in North America (there are only a handful of UCI events, and the .1 and higher events tend to be well attended by European teams), so points earned in North American events are unlikely to be a major factor. It's also important to note there can be significant variation in quality of field between .1 events in Europe.
For the world championships road race / junior men and junior women criteria #5, bullet 4 refers to "Tour de l'Abitibi femmes" when it should refer to just "Tour de l'Abitibi"	Thank you – we've corrected that.

For the junior road selection criteria it would be more appropriate to have before criteria #5, a single spot for the top average finished in the road / TT. This would mimic the spring project criteria. In addition (or instead) criteria #5 needs more specificity and should not allow a rider to qualify based on just one event. As currently written a rider could be selected to the worlds based on 3 good finishes (including a short prologue) at the Coupe de L'Avenir. That event is not as high quality as the other three events, has short stages compared to the worlds race, attracts mostly Canadians and is not a UCI event. A rider selected under criteria #5 should need results from 3 of the 4 events. Or at least 2 of the events or some other way to de-emphasize the possibility of just using Coupe De L'Avenir.	Our perspective is that a single good result is a stronger indication of performance potential than an average of multiple results. That said, average results are a useful indicator, which is why they have been included in the criteria, but at a lower priority. The worlds criteria are more focused on peak performance than the spring criteria because the spring criteria is more focused on athlete development than performance; and there are more opportunities for athletes to meet worlds criteria in 2026, closer to the targeted event. The Coupe de l'Avenir prologue will not be counted (see "Events Considered for Selection," which specifically excludes prologues).
The criteria for Tour de Gatineau and Chrono Gatineau should include at least one residual selection criteria that allows for non U23 athletes to be selected based on merit. Currently, only Elite athletes who are selected for World Championships may be selected for Gatineau. Such additional selection criteria could be added after criteria 5 for Tour de Gatineau, and include similar qualifying criteria as current criterion 3 & 5 including results in Canadian Championships. Therefore, both Elite & U23 athletes would have the opportunity to qualify, while still giving priority to U23 athletes. Alternatively, criteria 6 & 7 for Tour de Gatineau could be modified to also include Elite athletes.	Gatineau is still primarily a development project, which we would like to focus on U23 athletes. While we have reserved spots for elite athletes selected to worlds, the reality is most of those would not be allowed to race with the national team because their trade teams will be present (UCI rule 2.2.001). Nevertheless, other elite athletes can still be selected through Priority 7.
U23 Worlds: Some changes from previous years are welcome. 1. Athletes with a top-5 result in a UCI .1 or higher event in Europe* in the 12 months prior to the selection date. The bar is set to high, graduated steps to get there would foster better development It's great to signal a high standard (i.e.: top-5 in a European *.1) No Canadian U23 has ever done this, therefore the likelihood is improbable De-motivating, rather than motivating athletes to progress "A mission that seems impossible to imagine, becomes impossible in practice." Athletes cannot figure out the steps to get there - abandoning the mission. The selection criteria influence how athletes train and which events they participate. Some guidance would be appreciated.	It's not true that this has not been done before: last year, Isabella Holmgren had three top-5 results in UCI .1 or higher events, and Mara Roldan won a stage of the UCI 2.WWT Tour of Britain. Looking farther back, Guillaume Boivin would have met this criterion in 2010. But for athletes unable to achieve Priority 1, Priority 3 of the criteria clearly considers results in UCI events other than Class 1. An athlete with good results at the UCI level has a strong chance of being selected.
UCI Road World Championships - U23. The criteria create a void or contradiction between European emphasis to national championships. Criteria clearly establish: European results matter most. Standards set in a high/rigid band: top-5. Then fallback to a low performance standard: nationals. Having more European results bands would make more sense, before introducing Nationals	It's true there is a big performance jump from Priority 1 to Priority 2, which is why we limited Priority 2 to selecting a single athlete, leaving four spots for the women and three spots for the men to be chosen using other results. We also want to encourage our U23 athletes to make a strong showing at Canadian Championships, which is one of the only opportunities to see them race head-to-head.

<p>Every project starts with European top-5. The criteria stress one-off results over performance consistency. Single result criteria can actually end up being a development disincentive. Could you introduce a criteria 1.2 that includes multiple top 10s, similar to what Cyclocross has done. E.g. Crit 5. Two top-10 results at junior UCI Cyclo-cross events.</p>	<p>We chose to go with a single result because a high peak result is a better indicator of performance potential than a lower average result. Also, athletes playing a team role may only have a handful of opportunities a season to chase their own results; in our view it makes sense to highlight those opportunities.</p>
---	---