

Class Rules Sub-committee Minutes



The Class Rules Sub-committee met at 9:30 – 17:30 hours on Sunday 6th November 2011 at the Caribe Hilton Hotel, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

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

Present:

Georg TALLBERG (FIN) - Chairman
David ANTONCIC (SLO)
Sebastian EDMONDS (GBR)

William ABBOTT (CAN) - Vice-Chairman
Jan DEJMO (SWE)
Janet GROSVENOR (GBR) - Oceanic and Offshore Representative
Ana Maria SANCHEZ DEL CAMPO FERRER (ESP) - Racing Rules Representative

Renee MEHL (USA) - Special Regulations Representative

Apologies:

Antonio CARDONA ESPIN (ESP)
Dina KOWALYSHYN (USA) - Equipment Control Representative

Fred KATS (NED)
Henri SAMUEL (FRA)

Not Attending:

Michael GRANDFIELD - IC Representative

Other Present

Henry THORPE - ISAF Technical Co-ordinator

Jason SMITHWICK – Head of ISAF Technical and Offshore Department

*Please refer to the ISAF Council minutes of 11 - 13 November 2011 for the **Final Council** 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

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

(a) Minutes

The minutes of the Class Rules Sub-Committee meeting of 7th November 2010 (circulated and approved after the meeting) were signed as a true record by Chairman. The minutes can be downloaded at www.sailing.org/meetings

(b) Minutes Matters Arising

There were no matters arising not covered elsewhere on this agenda.

3. Submissions

(a) Equipment Rules Interpretations

Submission 055-11 regarding Regulations 29.3.5 and 29.3.6 on Equipment Rules interpretations was noted from the International IRC Owners

Association and was introduced by James Dadd from the RORC Rating Office (Observer). Bill Abbott questioned the need for such a system, in response James suggested that the lack of an ability to get a prompt formal answer discouraged questions from being asked. The Secretariat reported that the ability to provide an authoritative rather than an informal written statement to questions asked could be beneficial. But there were also concerns about the number of potential requests.

Renee Mehl discussed the need for any interpretation to be limited in validity to that edition cycle of the ERS and then incorporated within the ERS. Jan Dejmo acknowledged that this was the intent as he felt it important that the interpretation/casebook didn't become a supplementary document to the ERS. Georg Tallberg expressed some concerns having looked at the RRS Interpretation, casebook and Q&A decision potential changing or introducing rules. Jan Dejmo stated that the majority of informal questions raised regarding the ERS should be dealt with by Class Rules changes rather than an ERS interpretation this meant it would be much less likely new parts of definitions would be accidentally introduced.

The following recommendation was passed unanimously.

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve

(b) The Equipment Rules of Sailing: C.2.3 Open Class Rules

Submission 058-11 was noted from the International 12 Metre Class Association regarding a recent 2.4 metre class rules interpretation concerning "open class rules" and its effect on In-house certification. Georg Tallberg introduced the 2.4 metre interpretation and it was recognised that while this was not ideal it was done in the best interest of the class. It also raised the need for the class executive committee to be in a position to do urgent rule changes.

A discussion was also had as to how applicable open class rules were, noting that in many ways the 12 metre class did not fit the ERS definition of Open or Closed Class rules.

Jan Dejmo made it clear that the SCR template as per the guide should not be used for open class rules. He reiterated a preference for only closed class rules to be written as these could quickly, and most importantly, knowingly be open to allow development.

The exact intent of the submission was hard to ascertain and therefore the committee felt it best to simply answer the questions raised rather than make a formal recommendation. On a proposal by Bill Abbott seconded by Jan Dejmo the following was approved 7 in favour and 1 abstain

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: No Recommendation

Comment in response to the submission questions:

1. Does "specifically prohibited" mean that the item must be directly mentioned within the **class rules** as a prohibited item?

Yes
2. If an **open class rule** uses the ISAF Standard Class Rules format of listing mandatory and optional equipment, if an item of equipment is

not listed in either of these lists, is that considered to be "specifically prohibited" by omission?

No

3. If the answer to Q2 is "Yes", would that not meet the definition of **closed class rules**? and if not what would be the reason?

Not Applicable

Additional comment: The ERS Interpretative process contained within Regulation 29.3 should be addressed.

- (c) ISAF Advertising Code – Regulation 20.7.1

Submission 011-11 from the Executive Committee was noted regarding the ISAF Advertising Code.

Georg Tallberg raised concerns about when manufacturers were displayed not as a manufacturers mark but as competitor advertising.

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve

- (d) ISAF Advertising Code – Regulation 20: Table 1, Events Advertising

Submission 012-11 from the Executive Committee was noted regarding the ISAF Advertising Code.

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve

- (e) ISAF Advertising Code – Regulation 20: Table 2

Submission 013-11 from the Executive Committee was noted regarding the ISAF Advertising Code.

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve

- (f) Regulation 10.5(h)

Submission 054-11 was noted from Royal Yachting Association regarding a class' requirements for maintaining ISAF Class status with regards to the ISAF In-house Certification programme.

Bas Edmonds introduced the submission explaining the background and issues created by a sailmaker who was approached by an ISAF Class to operate a class based system.

The committee felt that by restricting the scope of the submission to sails then they were better able to support the submission. On a vote 7 in favour 1 abstain

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve with amendment

Comment: Add an effective date and make the regulation specific to sails. Modify as follows:

10.5 To maintain its ISAF designation an International or Recognized Class shall:

- (h) **From the 1 January 2013** not prescribe within their class rules or promote any form of manufacturer **sail self-certification** scheme not approved by ISAF or that is seen to be in contradiction to the ISAF In-House Certification Programme

4. Class Rules of New Classes Applying for ISAF Status

This section is regarding recommendation to the Equipment Committee on new ISAF classes' compliance with ISAF regulations 26 in regards to the class rules suitability.

(a) RS100

The post ISAF-adoption version of the class rules in the standard class rules format were review by Bas Edmonds and David Antoncic prior to the meeting. Bas Edmond introduced the rules as satisfactory apart from a few reference to advertising and lifejacket standards.

In addition Bas Edmonds raised the issue that the boat had 2 sail size options. He asked whether this effectively implied the boat was more than one class . The class rules specifically talk about the 10.2m and 8.4m rig and the builder has recently launched additional 7.4m option. The Chairman replied that this did not affect the standard of the rules but he would raise it as a discussion topic for the Equipment Committee.

In addition to those documents circulated the following Rigging Manual is provided with the boat which answers some of Georg's concerns of the default configuration <http://rs100sailing.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/rs100-owners-manual-v2.pdf>

Recommendation on the Class Rule Suitability to the Equipment Committee

The RS100 rules are generally in good order apart from a few points. The Class Rules Sub-committee recommends that a comprehensive building specification should be submitted.

(b) RS:One

The post ISAF-adoption version of the class rules in the standard class rules format were review by Bill Abbott and Antonio Cardona Espin prior to the meeting. Bill reported to the committee that the rules were general up to standard.

The Secretariat reported that no construction manual had been supplied but that Neil Pryde from the RS:X knows what is required.

Recommendation on the Class Rule Suitability to the Equipment Committee

The RS:One rules are generally good apart from a few points. The Class Rules Sub-committee recommends that a comprehensive building specification should be submitted.

(c) Elliott 6m

The class rules were developed by the ISAF Secretariat in standard class rules format. Georg Tallberg and Dina Kowalyshyn had reviewed the draft and apart from some references needed updating and the mention builder declarations needed distributing to the owners. In addition Ana requested that the Rule 42 reference be updated to the latest wording.

Recommendation on the Class Rule Suitability to the Equipment Committee

The Elliott 6m rules are generally good apart from a few points with regards

to the referenced documentation in the class rules.

(d) Soto 40

The committee reviewed version of the class rules in the standard class rules format that the class were open to develop and adopt to replace the current class rules. Rene Mehl and Janet Grosvenor had been tasked by the Chairman to review the class rules. Renee provided a short review together with provided the Secretariat with an extensive document detailing wording and typographical errors. In addition comments were provided from:

- Antony Matush - Chairman of the Sailor Classification Commission on the wording of the rules related to classification that should be adopted. He also questioned whether such high percentage of professional sailors aboard undermined the usage of the code to some degree and urged the class to discuss this issue.
- Ana Sanchez – Highlighted some racing rule issues and a number of event rules that shouldn't be within the class rules.

Recommendation on the Class Rule Suitability to the Equipment Committee

The Soto 40 rules have a number of significant issues that needs to be addressed concerning; event rules, the amount of measurement in a manufacturer controlled class and unnecessary notes. The Class Rules Sub-committee will recommend that the class agree to work with the CRSC on the rules as a condition of ISAF status; in addition a comprehensive building specification should be submitted.

5. Class & Championship Rules

(a) Championship Rules Working Party Report – Bill Abbott

Bill Abbott Chairman of the Working Party looking into Championship Rules in Class Rules. He pointed out that negotiation with the Classes was now limited in purpose and that the following recommendation

Recommendation not based on Submission to the Equipment Committee

1) Olympic Classes Contract

The CRSC recommends that the 2016 Olympic Classes Contract includes the requirement for Event rules to be separated from their Class Rules.

2) Timeline for removing event rules

To comply with the decision of Council the CRSC requests that the ISAF secretariat write to classes and request that Event rules of all ISAF classes are to be separated from their Class Rules by 1 January 2013 and the ISAF secretariat work with classes to complete this task.

6. Class Rule Change Procedure and Working Process

(a) General Discussion

The discussion focused on how the committee should be engaged with the class rules change process. Bas Edmonds commented on the low level of

committee input on the current forum based system and asked about alternative. Georg Tallberg reiterated the amount of work done by the staff and the ability to negotiate on rules issues was helpful to achieving a satisfactory solution to the class.

(b) Class Rules Sub-committee – Terms of Reference

Submission 002-11 was noted from the Chairman of the Equipment Committee regarding the operating procedure of the Class Rules Sub-committee. On a vote 7 in favour 1 abstain

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee Approve with the following amendment

10.11.4 The ~~sub-committee~~ **Secretary General** may, **in consultation with the Class Rules Sub-committee**, approve or reject the changes **using processes policies determined by the Class Rules Sub-committee** or return them to the Class/Owners Association with comments for revision. However before rejecting them the ~~Chairman of the Class Rules Sub-committee~~ **Secretary General** shall report ~~the views of his committee~~ **back** to the Class/Owners Association, who shall be entitled to comment on such views within thirty days of such report. Any such comments shall be ~~submitted to the members of the Class Rules Sub-committee~~ **considered** before a final decision is made.

7. Equipment Control Sub-committee

Jan Dejmo made a verbal report of the Equipment Control Sub-committee work, highlighting in particular the work of ERS working party.

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

(a) In addition the following submissions was discussed

i) Submission No 069-11 ERS - F.1.6(a)(i) and (iii) Forestay and Shrouds

Bill Abbot and Georg Tallberg spoke about the importance of the default being that the shroud and forestay remain attached while racing in terms. The positive effects on the stability of the rig was a major issue. The Chairman suggested the wording be slightly amended so on a vote 7 in favour 1 abstain

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve with the following amendment

(i) SHROUD

Permanently attached Rigging providing transverse support for a mast **spar** or hull **spar** which may also provide longitudinal support **and it shall not be detached when racing.**

(iii) FORESTAY

~~Permanently attached~~ Rigging providing forward support for a mast spar and it shall not be detached when racing.

ii) Submission No 070-11 ERS - F.1.6(a) Standing Rigging

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Reject

Prefer wording of amended 069-11

iii) Submission No 076-11

A solution to aid the Equipment Control Sub-committee was discussed on this submission however a general agreement wasn't found, Jan Dejmo stated that he would use the input in developing further submissions.

(b) 2.4 Metre

Jason Smithwick gave an update on the 2.4 metre class. Reporting on a meeting at the Secretariat with International Class Secretary Steve Bullmore and President Pal Kragset. He reiterated the feeling expressed by the Class Rules Sub-committee and Equipment Committee.

There being no further business the committee members thanked the chairman and the meeting closed at 17:30.