



EUROPEAN LE MANS SERIES
4 Hours of Le Castellet
28th April - 3rd May 2026

Decision no. 59

From:	The Stewards	Date:	1 June 2026
To:	AF CORSE	Time:	21:00

N° / Competitor: 83 / AF CORSE
Session: Post Race
Reference: Art. 14 of FIA International Sporting Code
Decision: The decision No 40 will be upheld

1. This Stewards Decision refers to the concluding part of the Right of Review regarding the petition for review received from A F Corse on 6th May 2026. The initial hearings are described in Stewards Decision No. 58 (Document No. 110).
2. Having previously determined that the petition for the Right of Review was admissible (Stewards Decision No. 58 refers), the Stewards summoned the Competitor's Representative and Driver (Summons No. 17, Document No. 112) to a hearing to be held on Friday 29th May 2026 at 19:00 CET.
3. The hearing was held on Friday 29th May 2026. The hearing was held using the Teams video conferencing facility. The Stewards present were the Stewards of the ELMS event held at Le Castellet (Michael Schwaegerl, Peter Roberts, Chris Geffroy and Marie Richard). The Competitor was represented by Ron Reichert and the driver, Matthieu Vaxiviere was also present. The ELMS Technical Delegate, Antoine Crevenat was also invited to be present and attended.
4. The Stewards invited the Competitor to summarise his submission. Mr Reichert stated that in their view the comparison of the data from the lap in question (lap 77) and the previous lap (76) was not meaningful due to the race conditions at the time.
5. Mr. Reichert separately but concurrently, referred to the FIA ISC Appendix H, Article 2.5.5.b) and the fact that a single yellow flag was being shown at the time, which then meant that the relevant part of the Code was that a driver must *"reduce ... speed, do not overtake, and be prepared to change direction. There is a hazard beside or partly on the track. It must be evident that a driver has reduced speed; this means a driver is expected to have braked earlier and/or noticeably reduced speed in that sector."*
6. Mr. Reichert specifically referred to differences in documentation from the ELMS event at Le Castellet and the WEC event at Spa, which was held a week later. Mr. Reichert referred to the Drivers' Briefing Notes issued at the ELMS event at Le Castellet and the similar, but not identical notes issued at the WEC event at Spa, together with the Notes issued to the Top Four Drivers from the WEC event at Spa.
7. As the Race Director for both the ELMS event and the WEC event was the same, Mr. Reichert argued that the notes issued at Spa were an extension of the ISC and were additional and more imposing controls to be applied to measure compliance with the Code. Mr. Reichert stated that, in his opinion, the Race Director had extended his notes due the vague nature of the FIA ISC regarding yellow flags and how the single yellow flag may be specifically respected.

8. Mr. Reichert did state that had the requirements imposed at the WEC event in Spa been in place for the ELMS event at Le Castellet then his driver may well have not been in full compliance.
9. The Chairman of the Stewards confirmed that he had spoken with the Race Director and was satisfied that whilst not relevant to the ELMS event, the WEC notes were, nonetheless, simply a further explanation of the yellow flag regulations and did not impose any stricter or additional restrictions on the drivers.
10. The Stewards referred to the Technical Analysis produced by Mr. Crevenat based upon the technical information submitted by the Competitor, accompanying the Right of Review request. The Stewards invited Mr Crevenat to summarise his findings.
11. Mr Crevenat explained that from the information submitted by the Competitor, the most accurate reference lap was 76, which was the previous lap to the incident (lap 77) and that this was in line with the data that the Technical Delegate had submitted immediately after the incident. He felt that the comparison between the analysis they had undertaken of the Competitor's data was very similar to the ACO's analysis on the day of the event and shows that the method of analysis was correct.
12. Mr Crevenat stated that the analysis indicated that on lap 77, the throttle of car 83 was only lifted for 0.76 seconds and was then applied more aggressively and was almost always higher than that on lap 76. It was noted that there was a minor speed reduction at a given point in time (132 kph on lap 76, 124 kph on lap 77), however the throttle trace was almost identical immediately after the incident and from there to the green flag, some distance later. He confirmed also that there was a change of the steering between the two laps 76 and 77.
13. At this point the Chairman of the Stewards asked Mr Vaxiviere if he had seen the green flag, which he confirmed. Mr Vaxiviere then stated that having seen the track, in his opinion, to be clear, he had accelerated immediately after the incident and some distance before the green flag.
14. Having heard the submission of Mr Reichert and Mr Vaxiviere, together with the analysis provided by Mr Crevenat, the Stewards closed the on-line hearing so that they may consider their decision.
15. **DECISION:** The Stewards determine that the Right of Review fails and that no further action will be taken.
16. In reaching their decision, the Stewards note the specific requirements of the FIA ISC Appendix H, Article 2.5.5.b). From the data provided, the Stewards do not see any evidence of the driver having braked earlier, therefore the focus of attention must shift to the actual speed of the car through the sector, not just turn 6 (the location of the stranded car that prompted the yellow flag).
17. The Stewards note that there was a nominal reduction in speed for a short period of time and specifically at the location of the incident, however the Stewards determine that there was not a noticeable reduction of speed before or at the location of the incident and certainly not after the incident to the end of the sector (the green flag).
18. The Stewards note the argument put forward by the driver (Mr. Vaxiviere) but do not consider that he acted sufficiently to satisfy the requirements of the FIA ISC Appendix H, Article 2.5.5.b).

The Competitors are reminded that they have the right to appeal certain decisions of the Stewards, in accordance with Art.15 of the FIA International Sporting Code, within the applicable time limits.



Michael Schwägerl
Chairman of the Panel



Peter Roberts
International Steward



Chris Geffroy
International Steward



Marie Richard
National Steward