

Class Rules Sub-committee Minutes



The Class Rules Sub-committee met at 14:30 – 17:30 hours on Saturday 1st November 2014 at the Melia Palas Atenea Hotel, Palma de Mallorca.

Please refer to the ISAF website www.sailing.org for the details of the submissions and supporting papers on this agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting	1	6. Class Rule Change Procedure and Developments	5
2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting	1	7. Equipment Control Sub-committee	5
3. ISAF Classes Development	2	8. Reports & Opinions from Committees Members with Cross Representation	6
4. Submissions	3	9. Any other Business	6
5. Class Rules of New Classes Applying for ISAF Status	4		

Present:

William ABBOTT (CAN) - Chairman

James DADD (GBR)

Janet GROSVENOR (GBR)

- Oceanic and Offshore Representative

Jim CAPRON (USA) - Racing Rules Representative

Agnes LIL (EST) - Vice-Chairman

Jan DEJMO (SWE)

- Equipment Control Representative

Renee MEHL (USA)

- Special Regulations Representative

Apologies:

David STALEY - IC Representative

Iulia FULICEA (ROU)

Cédric FRABOULET (FRA)

Other Present

Henry THORPE - ISAF Technical Co-ordinator

Norbert MARIN – ISAF Technical Co-ordinator

Jason SMITHWICK (In Part)

– Head of ISAF Technical and Offshore Department

Please refer to the ISAF Council Minutes and where applicable the Annual General Meeting Minutes of November 2014 for the decision on all recommendations and opinions contained within these minutes (other than class rule changes). For class rules submission the Class Rules Sub-committee is the ruling committee on behalf of Council except in the cases of appeals.

1. Opening of the Meeting

The Chairman opened the meeting and welcomed the Committee members.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

(a) Minutes

The minutes of the Class Rules Sub-committee meeting of 10 November 2013 (circulated and approved after the meeting) were signed as a true record by the Chairman. The minutes can be downloaded at www.sailing.org/meetings

(b) Minutes Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

However the Chairman requested an update from the Secretariat on new classes Class Rules issues. The Secretariat presented the following update:

- i) 49erFX – Being almost the same as the 49er Class rules and with the same building specification for the hull, no major issues have been raised.
- ii) Nacra 17 – As a new class, the rules are evolving in terms of permitted modifications, maintenance and repair. In regards to the building specification, Nacra and ISAF have a good relationship.
- iii) IKA Open – These rules are light in content and therefore no issues had been experienced so far.
- iv) IKA Twin Tip - Some issues were raised but the working relationship with the IKA mean that these rules are evolving.
- v) J/70 – The class rules structure is working well. However the class are having issues with items like hull fairing.
- vi) GP14 (former Classic Class) – The Secretariat is not aware of any progress in redrafting the Class Rules but the Class is aware of the requirement.
- vii) Shark (former Classic Class) – A good early draft had been presented to the Secretariat and communication with the class is good.

3. ISAF Classes Development

(a) Topcat K1 Proposed Changes

The Secretariat introduced a paper from the Topcat K1 Class showing how the class has updated its hull, sail plan and some control systems. The secretariat did not deem this an editorial or routine change and therefore requested the input of the Committee.

Bill Abbott explained to the committee that the policy decision and the specific response to the TopCat K1 Class were ideal to discuss together using the Topcat as an example. He expressed his regret that the TopCat K1 class were actually applying for retrospective ISAF approval.

The secretariat illustrated how changes like this had happened recently with other classes. For example the 49er continuing developments such as an updated rig and wings, and the Laser class with the introduction of the XD control system. In fact, Olympic classes are encouraged to consider evolution of equipment in consultation with ISAF.

This lead to the question about how much should a class be allowed to change the boat before it is more appropriate to treat it as a different class.

The changes of control systems were small systematic improvements rather than fundamental changes. The two major changes proposed by the TopCat Class, one to the hull shape and the other to the sail plan and sail cloth were discussed. Bill Abbott considered the changes to the sail plan and sail cloth to be more relevant to the performance of the boat than the changes in hull shape. And he also noted that sails are changed relatively frequently which would make the transition faster.

James Dadd expressed concern about the differences of the hull shape and questioned the class argument that there is not a notable difference in performance between new and old hulls. The simple profile outline given he feels mask the true change in hull lines with potential significantly increased volume in the bows. He also noted that having these two different hulls racing together would not look good in a class that is supposed to be One Design.

Jan Dejmo was also concerned about the validity of the voting process by the class that lead to these kind of changes. Noting that often the class Executive Committee voting process lead to a small group of people agreeing changes and that votes at Class AGM held at World Championships only have the small minority of higher level

class members present. He felt that the committee needed to know who exactly approved this change.

Henry Thorpe noted that the concerns should be linked to ensuring fairness of competition. He noted that in the 49er and Laser updates all the competitors moved to the latest specification equipment and therefore it was simply a task of managing the introduction. This may not be the case for the TopCat K1 hulls and that would lead to questions about perceived fairness.

The committee decided that before taking a decision, the staff should find out more about the voting process that led to the approval. In addition further investigation into the change in hull shape needs to be supplied to the committee.

(b) ISAF Class Review

The Secretariat gave a verbal report regarding the review of ISAF Classes and their compliance with ISAF Regulations which was an on-going project. It was noted that the interim report highlighted both event and technical issues. Event issues linked primarily to world championships included low participation, not seeking event approval and also having more subsidiary world championships than permitted by ISAF Regulations. The technical report highlighted other issues with non-compliance with the regulations such as contractual problems, class management issues, rules compliance etc.

The best way to deal with these problems was discussed. In the opinion of Jim Capron, ISAF does not have long enough arms to deal with these issues. However in the case of boats racing without an ISAF Plaques, they should be clearly not allowed to race or their results not count.

The Chairman asked how issues from classes were being reported. The Secretariat said that the paper had mainly come from its research and was continuing to be updated. A formal method of requiring ISAF stakeholders, such as race officials and certification authorities, to collect data and supply the verified information would improve the situation. This would allow staff time to be used to solve rather than collate the issues highlighted.

4. Submissions

ISAF Regulations

(a) Regulation 22

Submission 025-14 from the Executive Committee was noted as being withdrawn before the meeting. However the Committee decided to discuss some of the issues linked to Classification Code.

(b) Regulation 15

Submission 035-14 from the Executive Committee was noted regarding the ISAF Classification Code. The committee decided not to make a recommendation.

Equipment Rules of Sailing

(c) Introduction

Submission 059-14 from the Chairman of the Equipment Committee was noted regarding the Equipment Rules of Sailing.

Opinion to the Equipment Committee: Approve

(d) A.1 Class Rules

Submission 060-14 from the Chairman of the Equipment Committee was noted regarding the Equipment Rules of Sailing.

Opinion to the Equipment Committee: Approve

Racing Rules of Sailing

- (e) Terminology – Definition of Boat
- (f) RRS 69.1(a) and RRS C1 – Definition of Competitor
- (g) Terminology – Definition of Vessel

Submission 119-14, 120-14 & 125-14 from the Koninklijk Nederlands Watersport Verbond were noted together as these were linked to similar terms.

Bill Abbott cited two examples linked to apparent non-compliance with weight rules at ISAF events and stated that the inability of juries to hold competitors accountable for their equipment was disappointing. Bill is of the opinion that this issue should be considered and addressed. Jim Capron noted the concerns of the RRS working party regarding the exact phrasing.

Opinion to the Equipment Committee: Reject

Comment: We like the concept but the wording needs refining and possibly a new general definition used which should, where possible, either utilise or not conflict with similar ERS terms.

- (h) Rule 85

Submission 157-14 from the Koninklijk Nederlands Watersport Verbond was noted regarding the inclusion of equipment inspector and measurer in rule 85.

Opinion to the Equipment Committee: Approve with the following the amendment

85 GOVERNING RULES

The organizing authority, race committee, equipment inspector, ~~measurer for an event~~ and protest committee shall be governed by the rules in the conduct and judging of races.

Comment: This amendment to the submission means that the ERS terminology is used.

- (i) Rule 86.1(c)

Submission 159-14 from the Koninklijk Nederlands Watersport Verbond was noted regarding which Class Rules may change the Racing Rules of Sailing. Jim Capron gave the opinion of the RRS Working Party.

Opinion to the Equipment Committee: Reject

Comment: Appendix G already covers this issue and the repetition has unintended consequences particularly for non ISAF Classes

5. Class Rules of New Classes Applying for ISAF Status

The Equipment Committee is reviewing the application of the VX One to become an ISAF Class. The Class Rules Sub-committee looked at the class rules suitability for the purpose of ISAF Regulation 10. The class rules were at first glance in the standard class rules format; however on review, the amount of certification in a manufacturer controlled one design raised some concern. Agnes Lil provided a marked up version of the class rules with comments on a number of issues. Jim Capron, questioned some of the amendments made and Appendix 5; the Secretariat also pointed out the incorrect use of the sailor classification code.

The Secretariat was asked to provide feedback to the class so that they could review and amend the class rules in readiness for an application next year.

Recommendation on the Class Rules Suitability to the Equipment Committee

The VX-One Class Rules are in the standard format but there are significant issues that exist within the rules and they are not currently suitable for approval. The Class Rules Sub-committee therefore recommend that comments about the issues be sent to the class, so that a revised set of class rules together with a comprehensive building manual be submitted and approved, as a condition of ISAF class status approval.

6. Class Rule Change Procedure and Developments

(a) General Discussion

The operation of the class rules change procedure by the Sub-committee and developing a procedures document was discussed.

Jim Capron voiced concerns that beyond that contained within the ISAF regulations few guidelines existed on how the process worked. Bill Abbott agreed to work with the Secretariat to refine the way the Secretariat implement the process. It was also agreed to work with the classes to help them better understand the procedure.

Bill also explained to the Committee how the procedure has changed during the last few years from the Committee to Secretariat led process. The technical department had an internal process that meant that rules were reviewed by the team not just one person and in the majority of cases were able to utilise model wording. It was also noted that classes using the Standard Class Rules were easier for the office to deal with and got better technical support due to the common rule structure.

James Dadd noted that some classes do not want to get ISAF status because they want to avoid the bureaucracy involved in class rule changes that this would imply. In his opinion if a class wants to nominate an expert to approve class rule changes this should be allowed, like in the Volvo 65. Bill Abbott noted that this could be potentially dangerous but agreed with the fact that there is a perception that the process is slow.

(b) Development of Example Class Rules

Bill Abbott planned to make progress in the creation of various example class rules to aid rule writers to establish a consistent approach. Example of possible areas include: hiking / trapezing rules, outboard motors and modification, maintenance and repair.

7. Equipment Control Sub-committee

The Equipment Control Sub-committee is responsible for producing the 'tools' used by the Class Rules Sub-committee. A verbal report from the Chairman of the Equipment Control Sub-committee gave a verbal report highlighting the following working parties: Where present, the chairman of these working parties also spoke:

(a) Standard Class Rules

The Chairman of the working party Bas Edmonds (Observer) was present and explained how he planned to get further

Due to the importance of this document for this committee, Bas had asked, prior to the meeting, to Jan Dejmo to add members of the Class Rules Sub-committee to the working party. He agreed to this and the chairman has

asked Agnes Lil and James Dadd to join the working party.

Bill Abbott suggested that the working party should concentrate its initial work on modification, maintenance and repair. Of particular concern was hull fairing of manufacturer controlled classes. As an example classes like the J/70 were reporting issues with this. The use of expensive “speed shop” treatments within offshore classes was filtering into the J/70 despite these not be permitted by the class rules. Rob Weiland (observer) questioned how these rules could be enforced and it was agreed this was one of the biggest hurdles. It was agreed that the rules framework had to be in place and classes could do things to help siting the graphics on the RS:X.

(b) Guide to Measurement

Jan Dejmo explained how this document had developed into the ISAF Guide to Equipment Control leading to the development of different roles requiring different levels of training and knowledge and that may be carried out by different people:

- + ISAF Guide to Measurement (common document)
- + ISAF Guide to Certification Control (for measurers and manufacturers)
- + ISAF Guide to Certification (for measurers and certification authorities)
- + ISAF Guide to Equipment Inspection (for event equipment inspectors)

(c) ERS Working Party

Work is on-going for the ERS working party but the ERS submissions made this year in the conference showed most of the Committee work for this cycle. It was noted that a number of submission were also planned for next year and committee members were invited to come up with any suggestions.

8. Reports & Opinions from Committees Members with Cross Representation

The representatives from the Special Regulations Sub-committee, Equipment Control Sub-committee, Oceanic and Offshore Committee and Racing Rules Committee highlighted issues of interest to the committee on their agenda. The ISAF Classes Committee representative was not present at the meeting.

9. Any other Business

None