Racing Rules of Sailing

Rule 62

A submission from the Chairman of Race Officials Committee

Purpose or Objective

To remove or reduce the possibility of giving redress.

Proposal 1

1. Delete rules 62.1, 62.2 and 64.2
2. Make any other consequential changes in the Racing Rules which are considered necessary by the Racing Rules Committee to delete all references to redress.

Current Position 1

See rule 62.

Reasons 1

1. The idea behind redress is commendable, but in practice it very often creates more problems than it solves. It is sometimes difficult to decide if a boat is entitled to redress, and if it is decided that the boat is, then it is even more difficult to define a proper redress, and the redress tends to become artificial.

2. The Case Book includes 20 cases about redress. Some of these may also cover other rules, but it illustrates the complexity of the rules for redress.

3. Several high-level sports besides sailing do not have redress, and this also includes sports that are performed outside a closed area. Within sailing, several disciplines have already deleted redress.

4. Addendum Q for Medal races deletes redress in all cases except giving help. This avoids artificial and impossible adjustments of the results that in many cases do not please anyone and often is experienced as very controversial. This has worked very well since 2006 when the first version of Addendum Q was published, on all levels from the Olympic Games to national events.

5. It has been argued that at lower level sailing events the race committee may be less competent, and then it must be necessary to give redress. However, at that level of events the protest committee may also be less competent, and therefore they are likely to make improper redress arrangements. Many appeals cases on national level demonstrate this very clearly.
6. For many years, there has been discussion whether or not the sport should retain redress. A decision should be made now whether or not it will be retained until 2024.

Proposal 2

This proposal is an alternative to Proposal 1.

62.1 A request for redress or a protest committee’s decision to consider redress shall be based on a claim or possibility that a boat’s score or place in a race or series has been or may be, through no fault of her own, made significantly worse by

(a) an improper action or omission of the race committee, protest committee, organizing authority or technical committee for the event, but not by a protest committee decision when the boat was a party to the hearing;

(ba) injury or physical damage because of the action of a boat that was breaking a rule of Part 2 or of a vessel not racing that was required to keep clear;

(bb) giving help (except to herself or her crew) in compliance with rule 1.1; or

(bc) an action of a boat, or a member of her crew, that resulted in a penalty under rule 2 or a penalty or warning under rule 69.2(h).

Current Position 2

As above.

Reasons 2

1. The reasons for Proposal 1 also apply to this proposal.

2. Redress under rule 62.1(a) is usually the most difficult in terms of making a fair arrangement for all boats affected.

Proposal 3

This proposal is an alternative to Proposal 1.

62.1 A request for redress or a protest committee’s decision to consider redress shall be based on a claim or possibility that a boat’s score or place in a race or series has been or may be, through no fault of her own, made significantly worse by

(a) an improper action or omission of the race committee, protest committee, organizing authority or technical committee for the event, but not by a protest committee decision when the boat was a party to the hearing;
(b) injury or physical damage because of the action of a boat that was breaking a rule of Part 2 or of a vessel not racing that was required to keep clear;

(eb) giving help (except to herself or her crew) in compliance with rule 1.1; or

(dc) an action of a boat, or a member of her crew, that resulted in a penalty under rule 2 or a penalty or warning under rule 69.2(h).

Current Position 3

As above.

Reasons 3

1. The reasons for Proposal 1 also apply to this proposal.

2. Redress under rule 62.1(b) is often controversial, because it is difficult to assess how much a boat was harmed. It is also challenging to include enough races, because the series in many events get shorter.

3. World Sailing cases already place a limit of on how many races can be eligible for redress. It is further challenging to include enough races, because the series in many events get shorter (and may even be further divided into qualifying and final series, for example).

Proposal 4

This proposal is an alternative to Proposal 1.

62.1 A request for redress or a protest committee’s decision to consider redress shall be based on a claim or possibility that a boat’s score or place in a race or series has been or may be, through no fault of her own, made significantly worse by

(a) an improper action or omission of the race committee, protest committee, organizing authority or technical committee for the event, but not by a protest committee decision when the boat was a party to the hearing;

(b) injury or physical damage because of the action of a boat that was breaking a rule of Part 2 or of a vessel not racing that was required to keep clear; or

(e) giving help (except to herself or her crew) in compliance with rule 1.1; or

(dc) an action of a boat, or a member of her crew, that resulted in a penalty under rule 2 or a penalty or warning under rule 69.2(h).

Current Position 4

As above.
Reasons 4

1. The reasons for Proposal 1 also apply to this proposal.

2. This part of the rule is probably the most controversial to delete. It may seem logical that a boat that complies with the requirement of rule 1.1 should be given redress, but the consequence is unfortunately, that artificial redress arrangements are often made.

Proposal 5

This proposal is an alternative to Proposal 1.

62.1 A request for redress or a protest committee’s decision to consider redress shall be based on a claim or possibility that a boat’s score or place in a race or series has been or may be, through no fault of her own, made significantly worse by

(a) an improper action or omission of the race committee, protest committee, organizing authority or technical committee for the event, but not by a protest committee decision when the boat was a party to the hearing;

(b) injury or physical damage because of the action of a boat that was breaking a rule of Part 2 or of a vessel not racing that was required to keep clear; or

(c) giving help (except to herself or her crew) in compliance with rule 1.1.2;

(d) an action of a boat, or a member of her crew, that resulted in a penalty under rule 2 or a penalty or warning under rule 69.2(h).

Current Position 5

As above.

Reasons 5

1. The reasons for Proposal 1 also apply to this proposal.

2. In other sports, disciplinary penalties may be issued, but there is no redress to any competitors affected. This provides a simple solution even though it may be unfortunate for those affected. The alternative with artificial scoring arrangements is more undesirable.