FIA FORMULA 1 WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP

2026 MONACO GRAND PRIX

05 – 07 June 2026

From	The Stewards	**Document**	99
To	The Team Manager BWT Alpine F1 Team	**Date**	12 June 2026
		Time	11:30

1. The Stewards, having received two petitions for a Right of Review (Documents 73 and 75), having summoned (Documents 94, 95, 96 and 97) representatives of the following parties:

   BWT Alpine F1 Team ("Alpine") (Messrs Steve Nielsen, David Greenwood and Richard Lockwood)
   FIA (Messrs Nikolas Tombazis, Tim Malyon and Olivier Hulot)
   Formula One Management ("FOM") as Official Timekeeping Supplier (Messrs Arbi Karapetian and Bart Richardson)
   and having determined that there is a significant and relevant new element that was unavailable to the Stewards at the time of their decisions contained in Documents 73 and 75 (refer Part 1 of this hearing and Document 98) have reconvened as Part 2 of the hearing at 1320 hrs CEST Thursday June 11, 2026.
2. The other concerned parties listed as attending in Part 1 (Document 98) also were in attendance in Part 2.
3. With the agreement of all parties the Stewards determined that it was appropriate to hear both petitions concurrently.
4. Alpine made extensive written submissions in advance of the hearing. These submissions comprised:
   a. Formal Submission on Admissibility
   b. Proof of Deposit Payment
   c. Chronology of Events
   d. Memo of Electronics Meeting of June 5, 2026
   e. Presentation from the Official Timekeeper concerning discrepancies in the calculation of distance between timing loops in the first timing sector of pit lane, and Alpine's commentary thereon
   f. Alpine's telemetry review
   g. Mercedes and Ferrari telemetry data
   h. Written statement by Pierre Gasly (driver of Car 10)

BACKGROUND

5. Article B1.6.3a of the FIA F1 Regulations states:

   "Driving in the Pit Entry Road, Pit Lane and Pit Exit Road

   a. A speed limit of 80km/h will be imposed in the Pit Lane during the whole Competition. However, to ensure the safe and orderly conduct of the Competition this limit may be amended by the Race Director.

   i. Any Competitor whose driver exceeds the limit during any free practice session, qualifying session, or sprint qualifying session will be fined €100 for each km/h above the limit, up to a maximum of €1000.

   ii. In accordance with Article B1.9.3 the stewards may impose an additional penalty if they suspect a driver was speeding in order to gain any sort of advantage.

   iii. During a TTCS, the stewards may impose either a 5-Second Penalty, a 10-Second Penalty, a Drive-Through Penalty or a Stop-and-Go Penalty on any driver who exceeds the limit."

   Note: "TTCS" refers to a "Total Timed Classified Session" i.e. a Sprint or a Race

   The FIA Formula 1 Race Director's Competition Notes V3 dated 4 June 2026 issued in relation to the Monaco GP state:

   "Pit Lane Speed

   *The **Pit Lane Speed limit detailed in Article B1.6.3a of the FIA F1 Regulations is hereby amended to 60km/h** for the duration of the event."* (Stewards' emphasis)

6. For Formula 1 competitions, the speed in Pit Lane is, in fact, an average speed which is calculated using the distance between two consecutive loops and the time measured to pass between the loops using the Official timing systems. The distance measured between the consecutive loops is accurate to within 1 centimetre and the measured time between the car passing the first and second loops is accurate to within 1 millisecond.
7. The distance between loops is determined by GNSS (Global Navigation Satellite System) and verified through a survey on track.
8. In the Monaco pit lane, there were 9 sets of timing loop "zones" ranging in length from around 10 to 40 metres.
9. Because of the layout of the Monaco pit lane, multiple distances are available between each pair of loops. The shortest distance between the two loops in any one "zone" is selected to be used in the pit speed calculation.
10. It is noted that because an "Average Speed" is used, it is theoretically possible for a car to be over the speed limit for some portion of a "zone" and under it for another portion yet still meet the "average speed" requirement. However, because the zones are relatively short, the practicality of this makes it unlikely to have occurred, especially in view of the use of the speed limiting devices on the current Formula 1 cars, which assist in maintaining a car at a constant velocity when engaged.
11. Unbeknown to the Stewards, until the receipt of information from the Official Timekeeper on June 10, was the fact that **all** the alleged breaches of the pit lane speeding regulation in Monaco during the race, occurred in the first "zone" i.e. between the first pair of timing loops after the pit entry.

12. The barriers at the pit entry and at the pit loop 2 (the end point of the first timing “zone” in the pit lane) changed between 2025 and 2026 possibly enabling a significantly shorter trajectory feasible in 2026 than was possible in 2025.

FACTS

13. During the Race, the Stewards received 6 reports from the Official Timekeeper, in relation to pit lane speeding. These reports (driver/time of day/speed) were:
    a. HAM 15:39 – 60.1
    b. RUS 15:43 – 60.1
    c. COL 15:49 – 60.1
    d. GAS 16:02 – 60.1
    e. PIA 16:06 – 60.1
    f. GAS 16:22 – 60.4
14. Upon receipt of the third report (COL) the Stewards immediately queried Race Control, having found it unusual to receive so many reports of alleged breaches and all being 60.1 km/h at that stage.
15. As is standard practice, the reports contained no reference as to which particular part of the pit lane the alleged breach occurred in. Therefore, the Stewards had no knowledge that the alleged breaches were all occurring in the one same timing zone at the pit entry.
16. Race Control promptly came back to the Stewards stating it had made enquiries of the Official Timekeepers and was told that there was no issue and that the data was therefore accurate.
17. In its report, which formed part of the Alpine submission, the Official Timekeeper advised that for its setup of the pit lane speeding zones, it applied a measurement to the length of the first “zone” of 2692cm (accurate to within 1 cm)
18. However, the Official Timekeeper’s report then states that using LIDAR scans (Light Detection and Ranging), presumably post event, the shortest distance between the first and second loops of the zone was found to be only 2615cm, i.e. 77cm less than the setup distance used by them to calculate the speed of the car in that “zone” of the pit lane. However, that distance does not take into account the width of the car, which would increase the shortest distance that could be travelled, by a small amount.

THE HEARING PART 2 SUBMISSIONS

19. Alpine representatives Richard Lockwood and David Greenwood presented the case for the team and referred to the report from the Official Timekeeper plus measurements it took at the timing zone at the pit entrance, immediately post-race. They also referenced items referred to in point 4 above.
20. It was noted that the measurements of the pit entry “zone” taken by Alpine were taken with a trundle wheel. Although certified, the calibration resolution of this device was noted as 0.1 metres.
21. The Official Timekeeper’s representatives explained that they used the same procedure as in previous races and in previous Monaco Grands Prix. They explained that they always used the shortest distance between the loop endpoints to calculate speed, applying the simple formula: *Calculated Speed (average) = Measured minimum distance between loops, divided by Measured Time Between Loops*.

22. As stated in their written submission (refer 18 above) they stated that there was a “theoretical shortest distance of 2615 centimetres” that was identified, compared with the 2692 centimetre figure used in their calculation. This did not take into account the width of the car.
23. In relation to Alpine’s references, in its submission, to vCar and vSaS, Tim Malyon submitted the following:
    a. vCar is derived from wheel speeds. It is acknowledged that some elements of this calculation are FIA defined parameters but, as any tyre needs to be slipping to generate force, wheel speed is inherently not equal to car speed, certainly not to the level of accuracy needed for Pit Lane Speed Measurement. This is why it is widely understood that an off-car system for measurement of pit lane speed is required.
    b. vSaS is a team sensor, FIA had no knowledge of the calibration or accuracy of this sensor so could not comment but, in light of this, suggested that this means it cannot be used in this instance as reference measure of car speed.
    c. Position of loops in team data does not represent the same information used by the pit lane speed measurement system. What is displayed in team data is “first contact” between car and loop, which can vary based on many factors both on and off car. The pit lane speed measurement system uses post-processing to determine the centre of each loop which is then used to define the loop crossing time.
    d. The distance used was derived from application of a standard and established process. Furthermore, the distance derived from this process was correctly entered into the pit lane speed measurement system. However, for the geometry of the Monaco pit lane, and the line taken by drivers at pit entry in Monaco, this process does not provide the shortest distance thus could be viewed as not fit for purpose in this case.
24. Nikolas Tombazis explained that the source of the discrepancy between the reported speed and the actual speed of Car 10 was likely the result of the measurement referred to by the Official Timekeeper and that this method, which has been used constantly for many years, may have been insufficient for this particular Grand Prix pit lane layout.
25. Richard Lockwood, in summarising the position of Alpine, submitted that the Stewards should take the following decisions:
    a. To rescind the two 5-second penalties imposed on Car 10 (which were applied to the race time for Car 10 after the event.
    b. Restore Car 10 to third position (the position it finished in as it crossed the line at the end of the race)
    c. Allocate the points awarded for third position to the Driver Pierre Gasly and the Competitor BWT Alpine F1 Team
    d. Refund the two deposits paid to the FIA for the Right of Review
26. Stephen Knowles (Oracle Red Bull Racing) submitted the following points:
    a. That the timing was consistent all weekend
    b. That the normal process was followed
    c. That teams adjusted their systems according to the process in place

d. That teams know the method of calculating the pit lane speed is imperfect

27. William Courtenay (McLaren Mastercard F1 Team) submitted that:
    a. There is a well-known risk of discrepancies in the pit lane speed calculations
    b. Teams coach their drivers on how to manage this
    c. All teams adjust their processes accordingly
    d. There was conjecture on the issue of “shortest distance”
28. Marco Perroni (VISA Cash App Racing Bulls Formula One Team) commented on the calibration process and potential error of the trundle wheel.
29. In response, Richard Lockwood stated that Alpine’s main argument was based on the Official Timekeeper’s measurements and calculations which were based on GNSS and LIDAR measurements.

OTHER EVIDENCE

30. The Stewards noted that Alpine, on receiving notice of the penalty imposed on its team member Franco Colapinto at 15:49, warned the driver of Car 10 by radio at 16:02:15 “Cautious pit entry please. Cautious pit entry with speed”.
31. At 16:17:45 the driver was again warned by radio after receiving his first penalty for pit lane speeding: “If for any reason we need to pit again we need to under shoot speed at pit entry by a decent chunk”
32. On two more occasions at 16:22:03 and 16:22:40 the driver of Car 10 was again advised to exercise extra caution at pit entry and to undershoot speed.
33. The Official Timekeeper submission included a table which indicated that if the theoretical shortest distance between the loops had been used (2615cm) the two speeds for Car 10 would have been calculated as 58.7 km/h and 58.8 km/h.
34. It was noted that it would not be possible to follow the theoretical shortest distance because of the width of the car and the trajectory it would take on entering the pit lane (right curve followed by left curve, therefore not a straight line).

CONCLUSIONS

35. The calculations of distances done by Alpine post-race, whilst confirming the discrepancy referred to in the Official Timekeeper Report, have been largely disregarded by the Stewards due to the level of tolerance error present in a trundle wheel, as have the vCar and vSaS calculations. However, they do not in any way, even allowing for margins of error, contradict the evidence presented in the Official Timekeeper report.
36. Whilst Car 10 could not have been driven along the “theoretical shortest distance” between the two loops in question, there is still a significant delta in the distance used to calculate the speed and the distance which could be driven by Car 10, and which, from the evidence presented by Alpine, appears to have been driven.
37. The Stewards note in particular the Official Timekeeper’s calculation that in the recorded times of Car 10 between the two loops in question (1.604 seconds and 1.602 seconds respectively) if an assumption was made that Car 10 was averaging 60 km/h, the distance travelled would have been

2673 cm and 2670 cm respectively. When these distances are compared to the applied distance of 2692 cm and the theoretical shortest distance of 2615 cm, we conclude that Car 10 was not exceeding the 60 km/h speed limit between those two loops. This conclusion is reached even taking into account the car width and the likelihood that the car was not driven on the theoretical shortest route.

38. Critical to the background of the Stewards' conclusion is the wording of the formula referred to in the Official Timing Report, where reference is made (ref Point 21 above) to "the measured minimum distance between the loops". In this case, there is merit in Alpine's assertion that this should be the figure of 2615 cm as measured by the Official Timekeeper.
39. The Stewards also conclude that the revised barrier layout at the entry to the pit lane may have enabled drivers to take a different trajectory to that used in previous years.
40. The Stewards have sympathy for the argument that many other cars were not reported for exceeding the speed limit, however these two Right of Review petitions relate only to the two penalties that were imposed on the driver of Car 10 for allegedly exceeding the pit lane speed limit.
41. The Stewards note the wording of Article B1.6.3a of the F1 Regulations which specifically refers to a "speed limit" but contains no caveat that this limit is solely determined by the Official Timekeeping process. We contrast this to (for example) B5.11.1 where reference is made to a specific method of determining a false start breach. The pit lane speeding regulation does not say that the pit lane speed limit is 60 km/h "as determined by the Official Timekeeping System process". Therefore, the simple question to be answered by us is "did Car 10 exceed the speed limit of 60 km/h?"
42. The Stewards note that in relation to other cars that were penalised, some served their penalty and this regrettably, impacted their race strategies and therefore their race result. There will undoubtedly remain questions as to whether those breaches were genuine. There is no regulation that gives the Stewards the power to "undo" a served penalty. In any case, it is impossible to imagine how such power could be applied. Notably, no other party petitioned for a Right of Review within the allowable time frame.
43. In this case, following the acceptance of the petition, the finding of its admissibility and compliance with Article 14.1.1 of the ISC, the Stewards' sole task is to determine if Car 10 exceeded the speed limit of 60 km/h in the pit lane. **We determine that it did not**.
44. It is to be noted that within the FIA (based on the practices and findings of the FIA International Court of Appeal) there is a certain level of "proof" that is required to make a judicial determination. That level is referred to as "comfortable satisfaction" (which means "a strong and clear conviction"). Within most judicial systems, the lowest level of proof required is that of "balance of probability" which essentially means "more than likely" (greater than 50%). The highest level (usually required in criminal cases) is "Beyond reasonable doubt" (almost absolute certainty).
45. In this case, the Stewards unanimously make their determinations with the required level of comfortable satisfaction, however the evidence, in our view, approaches that of beyond reasonable doubt.

DECISION 1

46. In relation to the penalty applied to Car 10 in Document 73, we determine that:
    a. The penalty be rescinded.
    b. The 5 seconds added to the elapsed race time of Car 10 shall be removed.
    c. The classification shall be amended accordingly and determined as Final subject only to any appeal (see below).

DECISION 2

47. In relation to the penalty applied to Car 10 in Document 75 we determine that:
    a. The penalty be rescinded.
    b. The 5 seconds added to the elapsed race time of Car 10 shall be removed.
    c. The classification shall be amended accordingly and determined as Final subject only to any appeal (see below).

DECISION 3

48. That based on Decisions 1 and 2 above, the Drivers' and Constructors' Championship points shall be recalculated accordingly.

DECISION 4

49. As the Right of Review has been upheld and the original decisions have been revised, the deposits paid by the Competitor in relation to both petitions for review shall be returned pursuant to Article 14.4.3 of the FIA International Sporting Code

Competitors are reminded that they have the right to appeal certain decisions of the Stewards in accordance with Article 15 of the FIA International Sporting Code and Chapter 5 of the FIA Judicial and Disciplinary Rules, within the applicable time limits.

Decisions of the Stewards are taken independently of the FIA and are based solely on the relevant regulations, guidelines and evidence presented.

Garry Connelly **Tanja Geilhausen**

Derek Warwick **Jean-François Calmes**

The Stewards