Event Equipment Inspection Policy

A. Background:

The control of equipment in an event environment relies on a number of interdependent elements: the class rules, measurement or manufacture control, certification and inspection.

The perspectives are changing: Common class rule formats are the accepted norm, as are common definitions; there is a growing need for cross-class equipment control; there is increasing pressure on budgets; multi-class measurement is now feasible, as is multi-class equipment control, etc etc

It is time to take stock of the situation.

This paper doesn’t seek to provide answers to these questions, but to form a framework for discussion.

B. Certification.

1. The SCR and ERS provide common formats for class rules and equipment definitions, they are accepted as key elements within ISAF policy.

However, this principle has not carried through into the documentation and records required to check compliance at events.

Would the checking at events of boat certification be more effective if the certificates of some or all International Classes were a common format?

What benefits would a central certification database provide to classes, sailors and event organisers?

C. Inspection

1. There is increasingly a need to address the requirement for across-class equipment inspection. This can help reduce costs and administration at events such as the Sailing World Cup. This need is currently being met from within the existing IM structure.

Is there a need for ISAF-trained Race Officials who can be responsible for the inspection of equipment ‘across classes’ at multi-class ISAF events?

This person would be trained to measure and inspect equipment in accordance with the Equipment Rules of Sailing and understand the Standard Class Rule template.

2. Many International Classes provide an excellent level of equipment control at their own major Class events. Some, often less prominent classes struggle to maintain standards.

Would smaller ISAF classes be helped by the availability of multi-class equipment controllers?

3. There is no barrier of principle to the notion of ISAF-trained, ERS-qualified multi-class certification measurers (this is already a fact in the IHC scheme).

Should the same principles apply to event equipment inspectors, recognised and identified by ISAF as qualified ERS equipment inspectors, with no specific Class allegiance?
D. Training

1. The ERS is becoming increasingly widely applied in International classes, in some national classes and even in rating systems.

At a class level the measurement skills are currently taught on a class-specific basis, even where the class invokes the ERS. Standards inevitably vary.

*Is there a case for requiring all those involved in the equipment control of International classes to qualify to an ISAF standard of measurement skills and principles, based on the ERS?*

This would therefore apply to certification measurers, IHC IOM’s and to IMs.

IM’s would go on to be trained more specifically, as now, in event inspection techniques, event organisation skills and Race Official responsibilities.

E. Roles/Titles.

1. Clearly, titles do not matter as much as the task. However, this has been historically a subject of keen discussion and strong opinion.

It is commonly argued that a person with the title “Measurer” would be clearly recognized as someone whose primary function is fundamental measurement and certification. A person with the title “Inspector” would be recognized as a race official whose sole responsibility is to the event. This separation is particularly important at large, multi-class events like the World Cup of Sailing, Regional Games etc. It is assumed that no fundamental measurement would be available through the event organizer at such events.

*Would the roles of 1) the inspectors of equipment at events and 2) those who measure equipment for its certification, be better understood in the regulations and by ‘the customers’ if their titles were reviewed?*
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Note. The concept of the ISAF Equipment Inspector, as outlined above, was approved by the Executive Committee on 11 November 2006. Item 12 of their minutes refers.