

## Class Rules Sub-committee Minutes



The Class Rules Sub-committee met at 9:30 – 16:30 hours on Sunday  
4 November 2012 at the Royal Marine Hotel, Dun Laoghaire, Dublin, Ireland.

**Please refer to the ISAF website [www.sailing.org](http://www.sailing.org) for the details of the submissions and supporting papers on this agenda**

1. Opening of the Meeting	1	7. Class Rule Change Procedure and Working	
2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting	1	Process	6
3. Kiteboarding Submissions	2	8. Reports & Opinions from Committees Members	
4. Other Submissions	3	with Cross Representation	6
5. Class Rules of New Classes Applying for ISAF		9. Any Other Business	6
Status	4		
6. Class & Championship Rules Working Party	5		

### Present:

Georg TALLBERG (FIN) - Chairman

David ANTONCIC (SLO)

Antonio CARDONA ESPIN (ESP)

Janet GROSVENOR (GBR)

- Oceanic and Offshore Representative

Dina KOWALYSHYN (USA)

- Equipment Control Representative

Ana Maria SANCHEZ DEL CAMPO FERRER (ESP)

- Racing Rules Representative

William ABBOTT (CAN) - Vice-Chairman

Jan DEJMO (SWE)

Sebastian EDMONDS (GBR)

Fred KATS (NED)

Renee MEHL (USA)

- Special Regulations Representative

### Apologies:

Henri SAMUEL (FRA)

### Not Attending:

Michael GRANDFIELD - IC Representative

### Other Present

Alberto PREDIERI - ISAF Vice President (In Part)

Jason SMITHWICK – Head of ISAF Technical and Offshore Department

Henry THORPE - ISAF Technical Co-ordinator

*Please refer to the ISAF Council Minutes and where applicable the Annual General Meeting Minutes of November 2012 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 6<sup>th</sup> November 2011 (circulated and approved after the meeting) were signed as a true record by Chairman. The minutes can be downloaded at [www.sailing.org/meetings](http://www.sailing.org/meetings)

### (b) Minutes Matters Arising

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

### 3. Kiteboarding Submissions

- (a) The Chairman introduced the Kiteboarding Equipment Evaluation Report of which he was member of the group that produced the report. This led on to a combined discussion about Submission 048-12 which propose the same recommendation as the report which is a measurement controlled Box Rule combined with a production register similar to the approach used by Formula Windsurfing. This is what the draft International Kiteboard Association rules had developed to following Olympic selection.

The other option although not favoured by the report was manufacture controlled “One Design” as per Submission 049-12. Bas Edmonds introduced this explaining the concerns on cost, potential for a development race and most importantly making sure that the best sailor not the best equipment won.

Supporting the registered series production rule Georg Tallberg responded that this was the approach of most other Olympic Sports sighting skiing, rowing and canoeing as an example. He went to explain how limitation often made things more expensive. He thought that a more open approach could decrease entry costs to the class, improve the quality of equipment and increase the range of optimum weights for sailors.

Dina Kowalyszyn citing snowboarding explained how allowing development the equipment had become more refined and easier to use and warned of the danger of freezing equipment development when the equipment is not fully evolved. Also the ability to have equipment that could be checked by simple measurement at events would be more transparent to the sailors. Bearing in mind the rumour associated with perceived “one design” of manufacture classes.

Bill Abbott support the open concept although had some concerns both equipment and optimum weights could become venue specific. He also expressed concerns that there are very few controls on the foils which may be needed in the future.

Jason Smithwick pointed out how allowing different manufacturers would significantly increase the potential of competitors getting equipment sponsorship deals. It would also answer concerns about being able to produce boats locally, which has been cited by some parties as an area of concern, particularly where luxury good import tax make importing equipment cost prohibitive. Fred Kats supported this and added that the box rule could be closed as far as a manufacturer controlled if required but this would avoid the confidential building specification and the monopolies issues.

Other discussion topics were more issue for event organisers in terms of legalistic and race management. It was stated that the topic of equipment limitation would need to be reviewed in the near future to potentially stop equipment highly optimised to one conditioned from being developed. It was felt likely a competitor would need at least one board and 3 kites of varying sizes for an event.

When discussion moved on to delaying the decision and seeing how the IKA kite developed over the coming season Alberto Predieri noted the urgency for a decision based on ISAF need to confirm equipment with the IOC by the end of the year.

A motion was put forward to accept the report, this was approved 6 in favour, 5 abstain and 0 against. This lead onto the following votes for the two submissions.

- (b) Selection of Equipment - IKA Formula Kite

Submission 048-12 from the International Kiteboarding Association regarding 2016 Olympic events and equipment was noted.

Some concerns were raised over how open the rules were but those people also agreed that the rules could react and potentially tighten should it be needed. The fact that the rules were at presently written as open not closed class rules was raised as an area of concern.

On a proposal by Sebastian Edmonds to reject the submission the following vote happened 4 favour, 5 Against and 2 Abstain this led onto the agreeing the following recommendation.

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve**

But that a review of the Class Rules continues to narrow if necessary the formula box rule.

(c) Olympic Kiteboard Equipment

Submission 049-12 from the Royal Yachting Association regarding Cost Control – New Regulation 23.1.9 was noted and introduced by the Sebastian Edmonds.

On a proposal by the Chairman to reject the submission was rejected as followed 7 in favour, 0 Against and 4 Abstain.

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Reject**

Prefer the proposal in 048-12

#### **4. Other Submissions**

(a) Reduce Costs for Olympic Sailing Campaigns

Submission 085-12 from the Swedish Sailing Federation regarding Reduce Costs for Olympic Sailing Campaigns was noted and introduced by Jan Dejmo. Committee members talked favourably of the submission and thought that there was plenty of potential to reduce costs and hoped that some definite proposals could be developed by the Events and Equipment Committee.

Discussion focused on making sure the campaign costs as a whole were looked at not areas in isolation. Example of transportation and the cost of support boats providing advanced wind information where more than any equipment specification based cost saving that are possible. It was noted that some classes like the TP52 class had already tackled issued like support boat via there event rules if this proved to be an issue for Olympic sailing. Equipment issues such as durability of equipment and workable equipment limitation rules should be considered amongst any review.

On a proposal by the Chairman the following was approved 9 In Favour, 0 Against and 2 Abstain

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve**

(b) Nation Flags Boat Branding at ISAF Events

Submission 086-12 from the Chairman of the Events Committee regarding the mandatory use of National Flags at ISAF Events of Olympic Classes was noted.

While no one was against the concept Bill Abbott highlighted that the flags would probably reduce the area for competitor advertising on the sail. Richard Hart (Observer) raised concerns that the flags would reduce resale potential of the sails as removing the flags can prove problematic. Jan Dejmo also noted that the specification of this type of branding can affect the sails performance and cost considerably. He mentioned that it had been indicated to him for example a painted option would be

40% lighter and 60% of the cost of a vinyl solution for a simple flag design. The Chairman acknowledged all these points and suggested the Olympic Classes should work towards standardising their approach which should include a clearly defined specification and potentially consider limiting suppliers.

On a proposal by the Chairman the following was approved 10 In Favour, 0 Against and 1 Abstain

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve**

## **5. Class Rules of New Classes Applying for ISAF Status**

The class rules of the new classes applying for status were reviewed with the aim to make a recommendation to the equipment committee on new ISAF classes compliance with ISAF regulation 10.

### **(a) RS100**

The RS100 class rules had been reviewed at the 2011 meeting and the Committee discussed the class but the general feeling was the same. The Committee chose to reiterate it minute of the previous meeting as follows:

*"The post ISAF-adoption version of the class rules in the standard class rules format were reviewed 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 (he forgot to do it).*

*In addition to those documents circulated the following Rigging Manual is provided with the boat which answers some of the Chairman'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) SKUD 18**

The post ISAF-adoption version of the class rules in the standard class rules format were reviewed by Bill Abbott and Dina Kowalyshyn prior to the meeting.

The Secretariat reported that no construction manual had been supplied and that there were some known construction control issues that needed to be addressed.

### **Recommendation on the Class Rule Suitability to the Equipment Committee**

The rules are to a satisfactory standard with the exception that some of the authority references need to be updated for post ISAF adoptions. Questions should be asked of the class if they correctly apply their Class Rules in some areas.

(c) Melges 20

The post ISAF-adoption version of the class rules in the standard class rules format were reviewed by Sebastian Edmonds and Bill Abbott prior to the meeting. Bill reported to the committee that the rules were general up to standard with Sebastian adding that the structure of the rules are in order. However he provided the Secretariat with a list of a number of minor editorial amendments to resolve.

The Secretariat reported that no construction manual had been supplied.

**Recommendation on the Class Rule Suitability to the Equipment Committee**

These rules are to a satisfactory standard pending the supply of a satisfactory building manual.

(d) J/111

The post ISAF-adoption version of the class rules in the standard class rules format were reviewed by Renee Mehl and Janet Grosvenor prior to the meeting. A list of editorial amendments was also supplied by Bas Edmonds.

The Sailor Classification rules were discussed as these introduced a non-subjective rule regarding not requiring classification for sailors over 65 years of age. This was felt by the Committee to be acceptable provided the sailor classification commission was happy as similar age criteria applied to younger sailors amongst the code. The Sailor Classification Commission Chairman had thought this to be acceptable to trial and looked forward to Classes feedback on its experiences.

The Secretariat reported that no construction manual had been supplied.

**Recommendation on the Class Rule Suitability to the Equipment Committee**

These rules are to a satisfactory standard pending the supply of a satisfactory building manual.

(e) Swan 60

The post ISAF-adoption version of the class rules in the standard class rules format were reviewed by Janet Grosvenor and Georg Tallberg prior to the meeting. Georg reported to the committee that the rules were general up to standard and that Andrew Yates (observer) representing the class had agreed to take on board a number of small concerns.

The Secretariat reported that no construction manual had been supplied.

**Recommendation on the Class Rule Suitability to the Equipment Committee**

These rules are to a satisfactory standard pending the supply of a satisfactory building manual.

## 6. Class & Championship Rules Working Party

Bill Abbott Chairman of the Working Party considered his task had been completed and a framework and policy for the Class Rules Sub-committee had been established. Championship Rules should be kept out of Class Rules unless they specifically affect the equipment or the way it should be used. Any such rule included should be workable at every level of event.

Having briefly reviewed every ISAF Classes set of class rules he considered the only class that had major changes to do was the Dart 18 class and requested the Secretariat contact them to look into updating their class rules.

## **7. Class Rule Change Procedure and Working Process**

A paper showing the number Class Rules changes done during the year was presented. No comments on the operation of the more staff orientated procedure were given and the Chairman reported how pleased he was with the system and that he had been approached repeatedly throughout the year for guidance. When it was a matter of policy it was still very much the intention that the Class Rules Sub-committee would remain consulted. All changes involving the Racing Rules of Sailing are sent for consultance to the Racing Rules representative in the committee.

## **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.

Although most items were covered were linked to on-going developments within their respective committee. Jan Dejmo highlighted that there was little need for emergency rule changes caused by upcoming new edition of the Equipment Rules of Sailing. There are a number of new definitions classes may considered using and Jan Dejmo specifically highlighted the two definitions for Sail Windows that would allow classes to choose the definition that best suits their requirement.

## **9. Any Other Business**

- (a) Before the meeting the Chairman had agreed to discuss Submission 013-12 – Maintaining ISAF Class Status – Classification Code Administration - Regulation 10.5(f) after Sebastian Edmonds highlighted it's relevance to this committee. David Irish noted the reason for the submission and the fact that a number of classes had implemented the codes primarily as a presumable way to market the boat, but were neither enforcing or properly administering the code and therefore undermining it integrity. Bas Edmonds felt that a number of regulations and rules already required the classes to administer there affairs correctly and that such a reiteration of these values specifically for the code was not needed. On a proposal by the Chairman to reject the submission was rejected 11 in favour, 0 Against and 0 Abstain.

### **Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Reject**

Although the intent is agreed with the Committee feels this is already covered by 10.5(b).

- (b) Tower Trapezing

A video of a recent 49er regatta in Lake Garda showed the crew trapezing from the helm's shoulders rather than the gunnel to increase their righting moment. A jury decision was made at the time that allowed this practice, but it was unanimously agreed by those present that this practice should be prohibited. As the Racing Rules are fixed for four years and that trapezing is not permitted by the Racing Rules unless an exemption is included it was thought the best short term solution was to address the issues in the class rules. A group consisting of Ana Maria Sanchez Del Campo and Georg Tallberg, together with Barry Johnson (49er) and Dimitris Dimou (470) to develop suitable wording. This wording this group came up with is contained within Appendix 1 of these minutes.

(c) 2.4 Metre Class Association Developments involving the Norlin Mk3

Georg Tallberg, Bill Abbott and Jan Dejmo reported on a meeting they had with the class following the development of the One Design within the Development Class. Georg reported that the International 2.4 Metre Class Association administers 2 classes, The International 2.4 Metre Class and a one-design class. The one-design class will be a separate class that probably will apply for ISAF status when the rules are ready and there are enough certificates to fulfill the ISAF class criteria. The International 2.4 Metre Class will continue to be a development class. There will be discussions between ISAF and the class if the class rules shall be changed to closed class rules. These are at the moment open, but written in the format like Closed Standard Class Rules.

There being no further business the committee members thanked the Chairman and the meeting closed at 16:30.

## **Appendix 1 – Class Rules Text Regarding Trapezes**

### **Applicable Terms**

*Racing Rules of Sailing 2009-2012 & 2013-2016*

49.1 Competitors shall use no device designed to position their bodies outboard, other than hiking straps and stiffeners worn under the thighs.

*The RRS only mention “trapeze” in 43.1(b) and there in connection with weighing of a “trapeze harnesses”.*

*Equipment Rules of Sailing 2013-2016*

*The ERS 2013-2016 define “trapeze”:*

#### **F.1.7 Rigging Types**

(c) OTHER RIGGING

(i) TRAPEZE

**Rigging** attached to a mast **spar** used to support a single **crew** member.

### ***Class Rules***

*These proposals are intended for class rules coming in force after 2012-12-31.*

***Proposed Closed Class Rules when using ERS 2013-2016 definitions:***

#### **Section C – Conditions for Racing**

C.X.X RRS 49.1 is changed to: ‘A **crew** member shall use no device designed to position his body outboard other than a **trapeze**, hiking straps and stiffeners worn under the thighs.’

C.X.X A **crew** member using a **trapeze** shall be in contact with the **hull** at all times except in the situation of accidental movement and or a manoeuvre.

*Optional rules:*

C.X.X Only one **trapeze** shall be used at any time.  
*Change the number as as appropriate.*

C.X.X The **crew** member helming shall not use a **trapeze**.

#### **Section F – Rig**

##### **F.X Other Rigging**

F.X.X CONSTRUCTION

(x) OPTIONAL / MANDATORY  
*Delete one.*

(x) 1 **trapeze** on each side of the boat.  
*Change the number as appropriate.*



***Proposed Closed Class Rules when not using ERS 2013-2016 definitions:***

- X.X.X A trapeze is defined as: Rigging attached to a mast spar used to support a single crew member.
- X.X.X RRS 49.1 is changed to: 'A crew member shall use no device designed to position his body outboard other than a trapeze, hiking straps and stiffeners worn under the thighs.'
- X.X.X 1 trapeze is optional / mandatory on each side of the boat.  
*Change the number of trapezes on each side as appropriate.*
- X.X.X A crew member using a trapeze shall be in contact with the hull at all times except in the situation of accidental movement and or a manoeuvre.

***Optional rules:***

- X.X.X Only one trapeze shall used at any time.  
*Change the number as as appropriate.*
- X.X.X The crew member helming shall not use a trapeze.