



**The Equipment Committee met at 09:30 – 18:38 hours on Saturday 28 April 2012 at the ISAF Secretariat, Southampton, UK.**

*Please refer to the ISAF website [www.sailing.org](http://www.sailing.org) for the details of the submissions in these minutes.*

1. Opening of the Meeting	1	11. 2014 Youth Olympic Games	9
2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting	2	12. Equipment Rules of Sailing	9
3. Applications for ISAF Class Status	2	13. In-House Certification	9
4. Review of ISAF Class Associations	3	14. Championship Rules	9
5. Submissions Deferred from the November 2011 Council Meetings	3	15. Equipment and Event Equipment Inspection Policy	9
6. 2016 Women's Skiff Event Equipment Evaluation	4	16. Reports & Opinions of Equipment Committee Sub-committees	9
7. 2016 Mixed Multihull Event Equipment Evaluation	7	17. Reports & Opinions of Committees with Cross Representation	9
8. 2016 Kiteboard Event Format Evaluation	8	18. Any other Business	10
9. RS:X Equipment Evaluation Trials	8		
10. Evolution of Olympic Equipment	8		

<i>Present:</i>	
Dick Batt (Chairman)	George Fundak
Dina Kowalyshyn (Vice Chairman)	Barry Johnson (left meeting at 1733)
Bill Abbott	Georg Tallberg
Carolijn Brouwer (Not present for Item 7)	Bruno de Wannemaeker (Windsurfing & Kiteboarding Rep) (left meeting at 1733)
Jan Dejmo (Class Rules SC Rep)	
<i>Apologies:</i>	
Kim Anderson	Ali Hulki Oruz
David Brookes (ISAF Classes Rep)	Dick Rose (Racing Rules Rep)
Dimitris Dimou (Equipment Control SC Rep)	Henri Samuel
Boris Hepp	Riccardo Simoneschi
Stan Honey	Marta Weöres
Patrick Lindqvist (Special Regs SC Rep)	
<i>Also Present:</i>	
Alberto Predieri (ISAF Vice President)	Jeff Martin (ISAF Classes Committee Chairman)
Jason Smithwick (ISAF Head of Technical & Offshore)	Rob Taylor (ISAF Technical Co-ordinator)
Simon Forbes (ISAF Technical Manager)	Norbert Marin (ISAF Technical Co-ordinator)

Please refer to the ISAF Council minutes of 4 and 5 May 2012 on the ISAF website for the final Council decision on all recommendations and opinions contained within these minutes. The final decision on all submissions is the ISAF Council. Where an 'opinion' to 'reject' or 'approve' is shown against a submission in the minutes this is the opinion of the ISAF Equipment Committee. The final decision by the ISAF Council may be different after hearing the opinions of other committees.

## 1. Opening of the Meeting

Dick Batt opened the meeting by welcoming the members of the committee, Vice President Alberto Predieri and, as an observer, Jeff Martin (Chairman ISAF Classes Committee).

### (a) Committee Members attendance and Quorums

The Chairman noted the new regulation 7.6.4 which states that "The quorum for meetings of a Committee is one third of the number of members of that Committee..."

He also noted that some members appointed to the Equipment Committee in November

## Equipment Committee Agenda (cont.)

2008 had not attended any of the 6 meetings held since.

The Executive Committee were requested to keep in mind when appointing membership to committees, that a smaller committee, comprised of experts committed to the work of the committee, would have a more practical quorum requirement.

Jan Dejno requested that when allocating nominations to committees, (particularly those with committee cross-representation), that the Executive should verify with the nominee that he or she wishes, and is able, to attend those committees.

### (b) Declaration of Interest

Before proceeding to the business of the meeting, members were asked to declare any vested interests in any matters to be discussed. (ISAF Regulation 7.7)

Carolijn Brouwer advised that she would be leaving the meeting for Item 7 - Mixed Multihull Evaluation. This is due to her company 2B Sailing, which imports AHPC (Australian High Performance Catamarans) products into Europe. AHPC is the manufacturer for the Capricorn/C2 and Viper multihulls.

The Chairman accepted Carolijn Brouwer's declaration and agreed that she should leave the room for Item 7.

Noting the declarations made by the other committee members, the Chairman ruled that none of their declarations would preclude them from speaking or voting on the matters of business of this meeting.

## 2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

### (a) Minutes

The minutes were noted of the Equipment Committee meeting of 8 November 2011 (circulated and approved after the meeting).

Dina Kowalyszyn asked why there was no record in the minutes of the discussions held in the closed part of the meeting with no observers regarding the Evaluation Events.

The Chairman advised that the conclusion of the discussion, which was to approve the Equipment Selection Plans was minuted under Item 6. For the record, it was agreed to amend the minute to specifically reference the 'Request for Proposals' and 'Equipment Selection Plan' documents for both Women's Skiff and Mixed Multihull.

Georg Tallberg noted that the Soto 40 Class had recently submitted revised Class Rules.

It was agreed the minutes incorporating these changes could be signed.

### (b) Minutes Matters Arising

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

## 3. Applications for ISAF Class Status

### (a) RS 100

The deferred application was considered from the RS 100 Class regarding ISAF Class status. RS Sailing had advised that the international distribution of RS100s was progressing but did not yet meet the ISAF requirements. On a proposal by Bill Abbott, seconded by Bruno de Wannemaeker there was a unanimous vote to defer.

#### **Recommendation to Council: Defer**

**Defer until the November meetings pending further information on distribution.**

(b) Elliott 6m

The deferred application was considered from the Elliott 6m Class regarding ISAF Class status. Jason Smithwick advised there was no new information to report. Georg Tallberg felt that as there was little substance to the application, it should not be continually deferred and that it would be more appropriate to reject the application until such time as all the criteria had been met. On a proposal by Barry Johnson, seconded by Bill Abbott there was a unanimous vote to reject the application.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

**The class should be asked to re-apply for ISAF Class status once they meet the general requirements of Regulation 10.**

#### 4. Review of ISAF Class Associations

(a) A summary of ISAF Class reports was received.

It was noted that:

- i) the questionnaire regarding 2011 class activity had been circulated with the Regulation 10 criteria applicable in 2011.
- ii) The summary report of 2011 class activity had been analysed using the new Regulation 10 criteria applicable in 2012.

It was agreed that the Secretariat would re-contact the Classes, explaining the new criteria and highlighting any deficiencies in relation to the new criteria.

#### 5. Submissions Deferred from the November 2011 Council Meetings

(a) In-House Certification - Regulation 10.5(h)

To consider submission 054-11 from Royal Yachting Association regarding the requirements for maintaining ISAF Class status in respect of the ISAF In-House Certification programme and to make a recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

**No further information was received from the submitter. This issue can addressed through class rule changes approved by ISAF.**

(b) The Equipment Rules of Sailing: Introduction – Changes – 056-11

Deferred submission 056-11 was received from the Chairman of the Equipment Committee regarding proposed changes to the Equipment Rules of Sailing.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve**

**Approve the submission as amended by the Equipment Rules of Sailing Working Party below:**

**Changes**

The ERS may only be changed as follows:

- (a) Prescriptions of an MNA may change ~~on a rule in ERS rule, Part 1 for racing races~~ under its jurisdiction.

~~(b) Sailing instructions may change an ERS rule by referring specifically to it and stating the change, but may not change any portion of the ERS adopted in class rules.~~

~~(c) A rating authority may change an ERS for racing within its jurisdiction.~~

**(b) Class rules** may change ERS rules as permitted by rule A.1, B.7, and B.9, H1, H2, H3, H.4, H.5 and H.6.

These restrictions do not apply if Part 1 rules are changed to develop or test proposed rules in local races. The MNA may prescribe that its approval is required for such changes.

Marginal markings indicate substantial changes ~~and additions~~ to the ~~2005-2008~~ 2009-2012 edition.

### 6. 2016 Women's Skiff Event Equipment Evaluation

- (a) The Evaluation Processes Report was received on the Equipment Evaluation for the Women's Skiff and Mixed Multihull Events held in Santander, Spain 17-25 March 2012.

Dick Batt presented the Evaluation Processes Report and noted the excellent support received from Alejandro Abascal and the staff of the RFEV High Performance Sailing Centre in Santander, Spain.

The Evaluation Event had been longer than normal, held over nine days with a good variety of wind strength. He outlined the membership of the Evaluation Panels detailed in the report and their experience.

He noted that the processes of the evaluation have received criticism, some of which had been widely circulated. He felt the processes generally has received criticism because of vested interests and there are detractors from a political point of view.

Dina Kowalyshyn questioned what measurements were made of the boats. Georg Tallberg confirmed that only skiffs were weighed and that no sails were measured.

Dick Batt noted that all the evaluation sailors had been nominated through their MNA. All nominations had been accepted except in a couple of cases where the MNA had nominated more than two mixed multihull sailors or more than two women skiff sailors. The MNA sailors were of varying experience, some were World Champions. There were comments on how well some less experienced in sailing skiffs had got 'up to speed'. All MNA skiff sailors sailed all the skiffs, and all MNA multihull sailors sailed all the multihulls. During the nine day rotation through the allocation, some sailed the same boat on three occasions or more. The input on the MNA sailor questionnaire was not weighted, with all responses considered of the same value.

In managing the Evaluation, the Panel twice stepped out of the normal rotation of all sailors, the first was when racing was organised where the better MNA sailors were put in the first boat of a type and the manufacturers team in the second boat of that type. The second occasion was when a top 49er men's team weighing 155kg, sailed a Mackay FX against the second Mackay FX which was sailed by the NZL women skiff sailors. This was because the Evaluation Panel wished to investigate the effect on performance with crew weight greater than 130kg. Dina Kowalyshyn questioned whether the same exercise was conducted for the RS900. It was noted that weather conditions and time did not allow for RS900 to be evaluated in the same manner.

Caroliijn Brouwer felt that for future evaluation processes, MNAs should be encouraged to nominate a team of two sailors as this will enable them to better evaluate the boats, rather than pairing up with a sailor from a different nationality and language.

Thailand nominated a 16 year old female sailor, a recent Optimist World Champion she had helmed 29ers, but was not experienced at trapezing. She did not attend the whole evaluation event but was able to sail some of the boats, including on one occasion the third RS900 which was available as an exception to the policy of only two boats of each

type. As the Thai sailor was not available to sail all the skiffs her feedback forms were not included in the report.

Bill Abbott questioned whether the MNA sailors filled in the questionnaires as a group, or on an individual basis? It was noted that the questionnaires were completed individually.

As Evaluation Panel members Adrienne Cahalan, Nadine Stegenwalner and Sylvia Vogl conducted group discussions with the MNA-nominated skiff sailors. It was accepted that for future Evaluation Events it should be avoided that MNA-nominated sailors are also acting as the manufacturer's sailors for an entrant.

It was agreed that in future the report should document gear failures experienced during the Evaluation. It was noted that these were principally the breakage of a NACRA 17 carbon-fibre mast in a capsize and the bending of an Aura rudder stock.

Dina Kowalyshyn felt that not enough information was communicated to the MNAs. That the report needs to highlight areas of risk, such as the statements such as 'Builder A has built Olympic equipment for 20 years', which should be contrasted with 'Builder B has built recreational craft.'

Caroliijn Brouwer noted that the 'Request for Proposal' documents indicated that the Method of Evaluation would be by scoring all factors by a colour-coded system. Dina Kowalyshyn questioned whether the statistical percentages were used to make the colour coded system. It was noted that the total Evaluation Process Report, Skiff and Multihull report including appendices runs to 51 pages. Dick Batt concluded that he felt that some decisions could not be analysed on a mathematical basis.

On a proposal by Bill Abbott, seconded by Barry Johnson there was a vote of 7 in favour and 2 abstentions, that the processes followed allow the committee to make a recommendation to Council. (Dick Batt and Georg Tallberg abstain as Evaluation Panel members.)

### **Recommendation to Council:**

**The Equipment Committee recommend the processes and execution of the equipment evaluation event in Santander and recommend the evaluation processes report.**

**The Equipment Committee is satisfied that the processes followed for the evaluation event in Santander has arrived at results that allow the committee to make a recommendation to Council on the equipment evaluations.**

- (b) The Women's Skiff Evaluation Panel Report was received.

Dina Kowalyshyn felt that a paper, which had been circulated to the Committee, which explained the various trapezing terms wings/racks/gunwale with photos should have been incorporated in to the report.

Georg Fundak felt that the best boat for the future of the sport should be selected, however he had reservations about 'monopoly' manufacturers (minuted under Any Other Business).

The Committee reviewed the report on each boat in turn:

- i) ARUP Skiff

ARUP Skiff is based on a 12ft Cherub class and was significantly different in concept to the Men's Skiff with different control systems (T foil rudder etc). It was not seen as a strong contender and this was supported by the MNA sailor feedback. On a proposal by Bill Abbott it was unanimously agreed that the ARUP Skiff should not be recommended by the Equipment Committee.

- ii) Aura

## Equipment Committee Agenda (cont.)

The Aura was a very well presented new design, the performance of the boat was average, the MNA sailors found the boat sailed in a bow up attitude and they could not get their weight far enough forward in some conditions. The MNA sailors found difficulty when manoeuvring due to open-rack bars. On a proposal by Bill Abbott it was unanimously agreed that the Aura should not be recommended by the Equipment Committee.

### iii) 29erXX

Corrections were agreed to the report: that the sail areas presented in the report for the jib and gennaker should both be increased by  $0.5\text{m}^2$ . An error in the price had already been corrected in version 2 of the report on the ISAF Website.

It was noted that in an open forum of the MNA skiff sailors they all (except one person) said the 29erXX was not suitable to be the Women's Olympic Skiff.

Georg Fundak was in agreement with the MNA sailors opinion and felt that the 29er is a good boat for the ISAF Youth Worlds, but the priority here is to find a good boat for the Olympics.

On a proposal by Bill Abbott, seconded by Georg Fundak and a vote of 8 in favour and 1 abstention it was agreed that the 29erXX should not be recommended by the Equipment Committee. (Barry Johnson as the 29er International Measurer abstained).

### iv) Rebel

Georg Tallberg noted that the Rebel was a good high performance skiff, featuring racks with netting. The MNA Sailor feedback was that they felt the Rebel was less similar to the Men's Skiff than other boats with wings. The Rebel was not recommended as it is considered that other boats meet the criteria better.

On a proposal by Dick Batt, seconded by Bill Abbott it was unanimously agreed that the Rebel should not be recommended by the Equipment Committee.

### v) RS 900

Since the Evaluation Event, RS Sailing have decided to add shroud adjusters as part of the standard boat. The all-up weight of the production RS900 was quoted as 109kg, and the pre-production RS900 presented in Santander weighed 119kg. The details of this weight reduction were questioned, it was noted that no alteration to hull specification was planned, and that some weight would be saved when the non-slip deck surface is moulded.

On a proposal by Dick Batt, seconded by Bruno de Wannemaeker it was unanimously agreed that the RS900 should be recommended as one of two boats for further consideration by the Equipment Committee.

### vi) Mackay FX

The MNA Sailors favoured the Mackay FX, although they were concerned that they were less than the optimum combined crew weight.

It was noted that the 49er hull had been designed for a combined crew weight of 135-170kg, however the FX rig was considered to offer good de-powering options. Nevertheless the Evaluation Panel were concerned that combined crew weights over 130kg would be optimum.

On a proposal by Dick Batt, seconded by Carolijn Brouwer it was agreed (on a vote of 7 in favour, 1 abstention, 1 against) that the Mackay FX should be recommended as one of two boats for further consideration by the Equipment Committee.

## (c) The Equipment Committee decided to further consider the choice between the RS900

## Equipment Committee Agenda (cont.)

and Mackay FX as the equipment for the Women's Skiff event for the 2016 Olympic Sailing Competition and to make a recommendation to Council.

### **Recommendation to Council:**

**The Equipment Committee recommends that the RS900 is selected as the Women's Skiff as it better satisfies the evaluation criteria.**

**Vote on shortlist of Mackay FX and RS900 in accordance with the recommendation of the Evaluation Report:**

RS900	5
Mackay FX	1
Abstain	3

## **7. 2016 Mixed Multihull Event Equipment Evaluation**

- (a) The Evaluation Processes Report was received on the Equipment Evaluation for the Mixed Multihull Event held in Santander, Spain 17-25 March 2012

(Minuted under Item 6(a)).

Carolijn Brouwer chose to leave the room for Item 7(b) (as minuted under Item 1(b)).

- (b) The Mixed Multihull Evaluation Panel Report was received.

The Committee reviewed the reports on each boat.

- i) Hobie 16

The consensus was that the Hobie 16 should not be recommended by the Equipment Committee, as its merits did not qualify it above the Evaluation Panel's Recommendation of the Viper and NACRA 17.

- ii) Hobie Tiger

The consensus was that the Hobie Tiger should not be recommended by the Equipment Committee, as its merits did not qualify it above the Evaluation Panel's Recommendation of the Viper and NACRA 17.

- iii) Tornado

The consensus was that the Tornado should not be recommended by the Equipment Committee, as its merits did not qualify it above the Evaluation Panel's Recommendation of the Viper and NACRA 17.

- iv) NACRA F16

The consensus was that the NACRA F16 should not be recommended by the Equipment Committee, as its merits did not qualify it above the Evaluation Panel's Recommendation of the Viper and NACRA 17.

- v) Viper

The consensus was that the Viper should be recommended by the Equipment Committee, for further consideration.

- vi) NACRA 17

It was noted that the MNA Sailors favoured the NACRA 17 on a vote of 14 out 19.

It was noted that the curved daggerboards may raise equipment control issues and the need for more spares as they are not swappable port and starboard.

## Equipment Committee Agenda (cont.)

The consensus was that the NACRA 17 should be recommended by the Equipment Committee, for further consideration.

- (c) The Equipment Committee decided to further consider the choice between the Viper and the NACRA 17 as the equipment for the Mixed Multihull event for the 2016 Olympic Sailing Competition and make a recommendation to Council.

It was agreed that whichever boat is chosen, the one-piece carbon mast is the preferred option.

### **Recommendation to Council:**

**The Equipment Committee recommends that the Nacra 17 is selected as the Mixed Multihull as it better satisfies the evaluation criteria**

**Vote on shortlist of Nacra 17 and Viper in accordance with the recommendation of the Evaluation Report:**

Nacra 17	5
Viper	2
Abstain	1

Note: Carolijn Brouwer chose to leave the room for the mixed multihull discussions and voting.

## **8. 2016 Kiteboard Event Format Evaluation**

- (a) A report was received on the Kiteboarding Format Evaluation Event held in Santander, Spain 21-25 March 2012.

The Committee noted the report, in particular that equipment is readily available with worldwide distribution channels, and is production-controlled and that work continues on the Class Rules.

## **9. RS:X Equipment Evaluation Trials**

A report was received on the RS:X Equipment Evaluation Event Held in in Cadiz, Spain 8-12 March 2012.

The proposed evaluation of a lighter board was not made. The focus of testing was a 9m<sup>2</sup> sail proposed for men and women, and longer fins (64cm for women and 68cm for men).

It was noted that at the AGM on the 24 March, the Class Association voted to retain the existing equipment without change.

## **10. Evolution of Olympic Equipment**

Two papers were received from the Chairman of Equipment Control Sub-Committee titled: 'Configuration Management of ISAF Classes' and 'The Partnership for the Management of ISAF Classes'.

The papers outlined the way ISAF can interact with classes and their management teams to best insure one-design control and "evolution" within the one-design environment.

It was suggested that the role of the Copyright Holder should be incorporated in to the paper and that the paper be revised outside the meeting for future consideration.



### 11. 2014 Youth Olympic Games

The suitability was discussed of the Byte CII and Laser Radial as proposed equipment for the 2014 Youth Olympic Games.

On a proposal by Bruno de Wannemaeker, seconded by Dina Kowalyshyn there was a unanimous vote to support the Byte CII.

#### **Recommendation to Council:**

**The Equipment Committee support the recommendation of the Youth Olympic Games Working Party that the Byte CII is selected as equipment for the 2014 Youth Olympic Games.**

### 12. Equipment Rules of Sailing

A verbal report was received from the Chairman of the Equipment Control Sub-committee regarding the 2013-2016 ISAF Equipment Rules of Sailing.

### 13. In-House Certification

Rob Taylor, the ISAF IHC Co-ordinator gave a verbal update:

The 20,000 ISAF In House Certification sail sticker had recently been issued.

Hong Kong Sail Federation Council recently adopted ISAF IHC for IRC sail measurements in Hong Kong.

Work continues with Sweden regarding their existing scheme.

### 14. Championship Rules

Bill Abbott, the Chairman of the Championship Rules Working Party, gave a verbal update.

It was noted that some classes have moved their championship rules out of the class rules and into their standard Notice of Race. He particularly noted that the Dart 18 needs an update of its Class Rules, and that the Secretariat should write to them.

### 15. Equipment and Event Equipment Inspection Policy

The Chairman of the Equipment Control Sub-committee noted that Bengt Gustaffson's paper tabled at the EQSC meeting in November 2011 was the basis for future work.

### 16. Reports & Opinions of Equipment Committee Sub-committees

#### (a) Equipment Control Sub-committee

Dina Kowalyshyn gave a verbal report as Chairman of the Equipment Control Sub-committee, the specific items are covered under other agenda items.

#### (b) Class Rules Sub-committee

Georg Tallberg gave a verbal report as the Chairman of the Class Rules Sub-committee. He noted that the committees work is moving to towards setting standards through the Standard Class Rules solutions. To assist classes, it is planned to create a system, whereby a class creating a new class rule document would enter some basic criteria and then a tailored document would be generated.

### 17. Reports & Opinions of Committees with Cross Representation

## Equipment Committee Agenda (cont.)

- (a) Special Regulations Sub-committee

There were no matters raised.

- (b) Oceanic & Offshore Committee

There were no matters raised.

### 18. Any other Business

- (a) Equipment Control at Sailing World Cup Events

Georg Fundak noted that Team Leaders meetings at recent Palma and Hyeres Sailing World Cup events had raised concerns that lots of equipment was being used that was not in accordance with the class rules. He wished ISAF to ask Sailing World Cup Organising Authorities to help to have more Equipment Control at their events.

Jason Smithwick, noted that a working party had spent considerable time on the Equipment Inspection Regulations for the 2011 Test Event, 2011 Perth Worlds and Olympics 2012. A version of this document tailored to the Sailing World Cup may help.

Dick Batt felt that either the existing equipment inspection is ineffective or the Event Organisers are not making enough provision of man power. He felt that a Chief Equipment Inspector needs be appointed for each event.

Jeff Martin felt that class-dedicated measurers would be best able to control issues arising at an event.

Georg Fundak felt that the event organisers are looking to get their costs down, so there is no equipment control. Sailors don't make measurement protests. 470s - there were a lot of problems – but it is a technical sport. In Hyeres there was no equipment control stamp on Laser masts. Jeff Martin noted that this would normally be a matter which would need to be invoked by the Sailing Instructions.

Jan Dejmo would like to see an ISAF Syllabus for training Equipment inspectors. National Equipment inspectors ask if they can become International Equipment Inspectors.

Jason Smithwick noted that a discussion paper in the Equipment Control Sub-committee on this matter was rejected in November 2011.

Dick Batt felt that some good work had been made on the original discussion paper, it should be re-visited again by the interested parties so that elements can be taken forward before the November meeting.

- (b) Monopoly Manufacturer Classes

Georg Fundak felt very concerned at the monopoly position of so many current proposed Olympic manufacturer-controlled classes. How are the small nations like Bulgaria and Algeria expected to buy Olympic equipment? Would new class manufacturers be subject to any price control?

Jason Smithwick confirmed that new Olympic class manufacturers would be required to sign agreements on price control.

Dick Batt noted that customers want uniformity, not just Olympic Class customers.

Bill Abbott noted that the sailing equipment market place is not like it was 40 years ago.

- (c) 2012 Olympic supplied equipment

- i) RS:X Sailboards

It was noted that Norbert Marin (ISAF Technical Co-ordinator) had visited 'Cobra International' (THA) regarding the hulls, fin and centreboards and 'Neil Pryde-

## Equipment Committee Agenda (cont.)

Performance' (CHN) regarding the masts and sails. The Olympic supplied equipment had been inspected and selected.

ii) Laser

The Laser supplied dinghies are under construction and due for inspection in the UK in June.

There being no further business, the Chairman thanked members for attending and proposed a vote of thanks to the ISAF Staff. The meeting was closed at 1838.