

## Equipment Committee Minutes



The Equipment Committee met at 09:30 – 18:00 hours on Tuesday 6 November 2012 at the Royal Marine Hotel, Dun Laoghaire, Ireland.

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. In-House Certification	13
2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting	1	12. Championship Rules	13
3. World Sailing Speed Record Council	1	13. Reports & Opinions of Equipment Committee Sub-committees	13
4. Applications for ISAF Class Status	2	14. Reports & Opinions of Committees with Cross Representation	14
5. Review of ISAF Class Associations	3	15. Annual Report	14
6. Submissions	4	16. Any other Business	14
7. 2016 Kiteboard Event Equipment Evaluation	12		
8. Evolution of Olympic Equipment	12		
9. Review of Equipment Evaluation Processes	13		
10. Equipment Rules of Sailing	13		

**SP = Supporting Paper**

**CM = Paper circulated to Committee Members only**

Please refer to the ISAF Council minutes of 8-10 November 2012 for the Final Council decision on all recommendations and opinions contained within these minutes

<b>Present:</b>	
Dick Batt (Chairman)	Jan Dejmo (Class Rules SC Rep)
Dina Kowalyshyn (Vice Chairman)	Dimitris Dimou (Equipment Control SC Rep)
Alberto Predieri (ISAF Vice President)	Stan Honey
David Brookes (ISAF Classes Rep)	Riccardo Simoneschi
Bruno de Wannemaeker (Windsurfing Rep)	George Fundak
Kim Anderson	Caroliijn Brouwer
Barry Johnson	Bill Abbott
Georg Tallberg	Boris Hepp
	Patrick Lindqvist (Special Regs SC Rep)
<b>Apologies:</b>	
Marta Weöres	
Ali Hulki Oruz	Henri Samuel
Dick Rose (Racing Rules Rep)	
<b>Also Present:</b>	
Jason Smithwick (ISAF Head of Technical & Offshore)	Rob Taylor (ISAF Technical Co-ordinator)
Norbert Marin (ISAF Technical Co-ordinator)	Henry Thorpe (ISAF Technical Co-ordinator)

### 1. Opening of the Meeting

Dick Batt opened by welcoming all committee members and observers to the meeting and reminded committee members of their requirement to declare any conflict of interest when discussing any of the agenda items.

### 2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the Equipment Committee meeting of 28 April 2012 were circulated and approved. There were no matters arising not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

### 3. World Sailing Speed Record Council

Stan Honey reported on a relatively quiet year for the World Sailing Speed Record Council with few record attempts taking place. He described the use of 'black box' technology for recording record attempts, in particular start and finish times and how this had made the data recorded from record attempts more reliable and quicker for the WSSRC to ratify.

#### 4. Applications for ISAF Class Status

(a) RS 100

The application from the RS100 Class for ISAF Class status was considered by the committee. Martin Wadhams from RS Sailing was invited to speak on the application and confirmed to the committee that the worldwide distribution met the requirements of Regulation 10 for International status.

On a proposal from Georg Tallberg, seconded by Bill Abbott and with a vote of 15 in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, the RS100 application was recommended for approval.

**Opinion: Approve**

*Approve subject to the class signing the ISAF Class agreement.*

(b) SKUD 18

The application from the RS100 Class for ISAF Class status was considered by the committee. David Staley from Access Boats was invited to speak on the application. The class is aware they do not meet the requirements of ISAF Regulation 10, but are seeking special dispensation as they believe the SKUD18 fulfils a special need of allowing severely disabled sailors to sail a high performance skiff type boat. IFDS have selected this boat as the equipment for the 2016 and 2020 Paralympic Games and as the only non-ISAF class competing at the Games, the class is seeking to change this by gaining ISAF Class status.

There were a number of issues highlighted with the class in terms of changes to the moulds and the design of the gunwale and also the problems encountered at the 2012 Paralympics with sail measurement. Georg Tallberg commented that the class rules were in reasonable form with only some minor amendments required to be fully suitable, notably requiring a measurement form for a manufacturer supplied one design and sail measurements in the rules which are from a single supplier. David Staley explained that the change to the gunwale shape is non-performance enhancing and makes the boat more watertight and of a stronger construction and that the issues with the sailmaker has been addressed by using a different supplier going forwards.

Dina Kowalyshyn asked why the Regulations should be put aside in order to allow the SKUD18 to become an ISAF Class. David Staley replied stating that this boat allows quite highly disabled people to compete, not only against other disabled people, but also in open and club level competition by being able to use the boat in a number of different configurations including centreline seating and the use of trapeze.

**Opinion: Reject**

*Recommend rejection of the application but recognise the need of the class for ISAF assistance in the technical aspects of the class and recommend that the ISAF, IFDS and the Skud18 Class enter into an appropriate Paralympic Class Agreement with ISAF control of the Class Rules and Building Specification.*

(c) Melges 20

The application from the Melges 20 Class for ISAF Class status was considered by the committee. There was no one present from Melges Performance Sailboats or the Melges 20 Class Association; however the Secretariat confirmed to the committee that the worldwide distribution met the requirements of Regulation 10 for ISAF Class status and the class rules were in SCR format and to a satisfactory standard.

On a proposal from Dina Kowalyshyn, seconded by Riccardo Simoneschi and with a vote of 16 in favour, 0 against and 0 abstention, the Melges 20 application was recommended for approval.

**Opinion: Approve**

*Approve subject to the class signing the ISAF Class agreement and supplying a satisfactory building specification*

(d) J-111

The application from the J-111 Class for ISAF Class status was considered by the committee. There was no one present from J-Boats or the J-111 Class Association; however the Secretariat confirmed to the committee that the worldwide distribution met the requirements of Regulation 10 for ISAF Class status and the class rules were in SCR format and to a satisfactory standard. Bill Abbott noted that the class rules invoked the use of the ISAF Sailor Classification Code and then broke that within the class rules by changing aspects not permitted by the code with regards age allowance of the crew. This would be discussed with the class prior to acceptance as an ISAF Class.

On a proposal from Kim Anderson, seconded by Barry Johnson and with a vote of 14 in favour, 0 against and 0 abstention, the J-111 application was recommended for approval.

**Opinion: Approve**

*Approve subject to the class signing the ISAF Class agreement and supplying a satisfactory building specification*

(e) Swan 60

The application from the Swan 60 Class for ISAF Class status was considered by the committee. Andrew Yates from the Swan 60 Class was invited to speak on the application and confirmed to the committee that the worldwide distribution met the requirements of Regulation 10 for ISAF Class status.

It was noted by the committee that although the Swan 60 class met the requirements of 2 boats in 3 countries on 2 continents, a class consisting of just 8 boats was not setting a very good example of a truly international class and the Regulations in this area should be reviewed. Concern was also raised that a number of the boats were owned by the same owner yet represented different countries and the nationality requirements should also be reviewed when it comes to larger boats such as these.

On a proposal from Bill Abbott, seconded by Kim Anderson and with a vote of 10 in favour, 0 against and 5 abstentions, the Swan 60 application was recommended for approval.

**Opinion: Approve**

*Approve subject to the class signing the ISAF Class agreement and supplying a satisfactory building specification*

**5. Review of ISAF Class Associations**

(a) Melges 32 Class

Tom Rinda was invited to speak to the Committee regarding the Melges 32 Class and their failure to comply with aspects of the ISAF Sailor Classification code. It was noted that whilst the class have previously breached the classification code within their class rules, and failed to work with the Classification Commission in trying to resolve the outstanding issues, there has been a change in the management of the class association with a new President who is keen to improve the relationship and will work towards resolving these problems. It was recommended the Classification Commission continue to work with the new Class administration and review the situation at the next meeting of the Equipment Committee.

(b) Platu 25 Class

The Platu 25 Class was under review for not having a signed agreement in accordance

with ISAF Regulation 10.3. It was noted the class obtained status in 2005; however an agreement had only been received by the class in 2010 due to problems ascertaining the copyright holder and on-going questions over the design rights. The ISAF Secretariat had written to class on numerous occasions to try and resolve the lack of agreement.

Dimitris Dimou represented the class as Technical Committee Chairman and class Chief Measurer, noted that the first agreement received by the class in 2010 contained errors which made it difficult to get Farr Yacht Design to sign. The class had questioned when they should pay for plaques, from 2005 when status was granted or from 2010 when agreement was first received by the class? The response was from gaining ISAF status as per the regulations. The committee were informed that the class have paid all fees requested by ISAF since 2010 and the class had tried to resolve the problems and had returned the final agreement to the ISAF Secretariat just prior to this meeting.

Bill Abbott queried when classes become ISAF Classes is usually subject to signing the class agreement and questioned if ISAF should be more rigid in requiring this is done before accepting any class application for ISAF Class status.

Dick Batt proposed this be deferred for further consideration and consultation between parties to resolve the outstanding issues without taking any further action regarding the Platu 25 Class status.

(c) Access 2.3S, Breeze 2.3 & Breeze 303

The applications from the International Access Class Association for inclusion of the Access 2.3S and Breeze 2.3 models within the Access 2.3 Class and the inclusion of the Breeze 303 model within the Access 303 Class was discussed. David Staley from Access Boats was invited to inform the Committee the reasons behind the request and why the proposals should be approved. It was noted that the differences between models was mainly for cost reduction purposes and not performance enhancing and as such they can compete with the existing fleet.

When asked if there was any intention of allowing a separate World Championship for the different variations, David Staley replied that this had not even been considered and was certainly not the intention of the proposal. It was simply to allow less expensive variations of the existing boats to compete with the main fleet. On this basis, it was agreed that the class should change the class rules to permit the different variations and be permitted to compete with the main fleet of Access boats.

(d) It was noted that a summary of the ISAF Class reports was given at the mid-year meeting of the Equipment Committee and all class reports can be found on the ISAF website.

## 6. Submissions

### ISAF Regulations

(a) Nomination and Appointments Process - Regulation 5

Submission 008-12 from the Canadian Yachting Association regarding the Nomination and Appointments Process – Regulation 5 was discussed by the committee. David Brookes reported the view of the ISAF Classes Committee was to reject this submission, as was the opinion of the Windsurfing and Kiteboarding Committee. Whilst they appreciated the idea behind the submission they did not feel the proposal was a suitable solution. Alberto Predieri informed the committee that the Executive Committee had recommended rejecting the submission as they believed governance issues such as this should be covered in a more comprehensive review of procedures. On a proposal by David Brookes, seconded by Bruno de Wannemaeker and a vote of 11 in favour, none against and with 5 abstentions the submission was recommended for rejection.

### Opinion: Reject

### **Advertising Code**

#### (b) Bibs at ISAF Events - Regulation 20.3

The committee noted submission 015-12 from The Chairman of the Events Committee regarding the ISAF Advertising Code. Dina Kowalyshyn informed the committee of the views of the EQSC and the concerns raised regarding the specification and that it should be consistent across all ISAF events and visually enforceable from the water and not by measurement. Bruno de Wannemaeker noted the Windsurfing and Kiteboarding committee had voted to approve this submission in favour of 016-12 with the note that kiteboarders also use their bibs as the primary means of identification and so any specification should take this into account. The ISAF Classes committee also voted to approve 015-12 in favour of 016-12 with the comment that sailors should be advised of the specification as soon as possible. Alberto Predieri noted the Executive Committee supported 015-12 over 016-12 and that a working party be set up to work through any of the details. Dina Kowalyshyn asked that any working party also include a member of the Equipment Committee to give technical input to the specification. Dick Batt proposed this submission be approved instead of 016-12, this was seconded by Riccardo Simoneschi and on a unanimous vote in favour the submission was recommended for rejection.

#### **Opinion: Approve**

*Subject to a subsequent working party working on the detail*

#### (c) Advertising on Rear of Competitor Supplied Bibs at ISAF Events - Regulation 20.3

Submission 016-12 from US SAILING regarding the ISAF Advertising Code was discussed. Alberto Predieri gave some background information on the Sailing World Cup and reasons for requiring such a submission; however it was noted that National Authorities had been allowed to use space on the bibs for sponsorship when requested and that the wording in this submission was not required at this time. It was agreed to recommend rejecting this submission in favour of submission 015-12.

#### **Opinion: Reject**

#### (d) Regulation 20 Table 1- Events Advertising

The committee discussed submission 017-12 from the Executive Committee regarding the ISAF Advertising Code. Whilst the intentions of the submission were thought to be acceptable in principle, there were a number of problems highlighted including that of larger yachts which may have overlapping headsails on one day, but a smaller non-overlapping headsail the following day, depending on the conditions. It was also noted that because the position of event advertising on the boom was to become optional, sailors would not know if an event would require the forward or aft part of the boom in advance and as a result, the space reserved for event advertising was effectively 40% of boom length, limiting competitor advertising to the middle 60% which was considered an unacceptable consequence of how the regulation was drafted. A unanimous vote to reject the submission was recorded.

#### **Opinion: Reject**

*Subject to further consideration*

### **2016 Olympic Events and Equipment**

#### (e) Regulation 23.1.4

The Equipment Committee noted submissions 020-12, 025-12, 026-12 and 027-12 from the Executive Committee regarding 2016 Olympic events and equipment. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with any of the proposed equipment in any of these submissions and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

### **Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

- (f) Selection of Equipment - IKA Formula Kite

The Equipment Committee considered submission 048-12 from the International Kiteboarding Association regarding 2016 Olympic events and equipment along with submission 049-12 from the Royal Yachting Association as they covered two aspects of the same issue. After some discussion on the merits of both submissions and hearing the opinions of the Equipment Sub-committees it was agreed to support the work of the Kiteboarding Evaluation Panel and to recommend that the Formula Kite option presented in submission 048-12 was the preferred solution.

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

- (g) Cost Control – New Regulation 23.1.9

The Equipment Committee considered submission 049-12 from the Royal Yachting Association regarding the Olympic Kiteboarding equipment and were unanimous in recommending this submission be rejected in favour of supporting submission 048-12 and the work of the Kiteboarding Evaluation Panel's recommendation on equipment.

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

*The Equipment Committee supports the work of the Kiteboarding Evaluation Panel and recommends the licensed kiteboard equipment proposed in the Kiteboarding Evaluation reports.*

- (h) Regulation 23.1.4

The Equipment Committee noted submissions 050-12, 051-12, 052-12, 053-12, 054-12, 055-12, 056-12, 057-12, 058-12, 059-12, 060-12, 062-12, 063-12, 064-12, 065-12 and 094-12 relating to 2016 Olympic events and equipment. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with any of the proposed equipment in any of these submissions and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

### **Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

## **Olympic Sailing Competition – Core Events & Equipment**

- (i) Men's One Person Dinghy

The Equipment Committee noted submission 076-12 and 077-12 from the International Laser Class Association regarding the 2020 Olympic Sailing Competition core events but did not consider it appropriate to make a recommendation on the core events at the Olympic Sailing Competition.

### **Opinion: No Recommendation**

- (j) Laser Dinghy

The Equipment Committee noted submission 078-12 and 082-12 from the International Laser Class Association regarding the 2020 Olympic Sailing Competition core equipment but did not consider it appropriate to make a recommendation on the core equipment to be used at the Olympic Sailing Competition until such time that the full slate of events is known.

### **Opinion: Reject**

*It is only appropriate to select equipment for core events if the complete Olympic slate and the number of medals is known*

- (k) Men's One Person Dinghy and Men's 2nd One Person Dinghy - Regulation 23.1.5

The Equipment Committee noted submission 079-12 from the International Finn Association, Bulgarian Sailing Federation, Czech Sailing Association, Danish Sailing Association, Finnish Sailing and Boating Federation and the Serbian Sailing Association regarding the Olympic Sailing Competition core events but did not consider it appropriate to make a recommendation on the core events at the Olympic Sailing Competition.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

- (l) Finn - Regulation 23.1.5

The Equipment Committee noted submission 080-12 from the Czech Sailing Association, Danish Sailing Association, Finnish Sailing and Boating Federation, Hungarian Yachting Association, Russian Yachting Federation and South Africa Sailing regarding the Olympic Sailing Competition core events but did not consider it appropriate to make a recommendation on the core equipment to be used at the Olympic Sailing Competition until such time that the full slate of events is known.

**Opinion: Reject**

*It is only appropriate to select equipment for core events if the complete Olympic slate and the number of medals is known*

- (m) Men's 2nd One Person Dinghy as Core Event - Regulation 23.1.5

The Equipment Committee noted submission 081-12 from the Czech Sailing Association, Danish Sailing Association and Finnish Sailing and Boating Federation, Hungarian Yachting Association and the Russian Yachting Federation regarding the Olympic Sailing Competition core events but did not consider it appropriate to make a recommendation on the core events at the Olympic Sailing Competition.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

- (n) 470 for Men's Two Person Dinghy and Women's Two Person Dinghy - Regulations 23.1.4 and 23.5

The Equipment Committee noted submission 083-12 from the Italian Sailing Federation, Japan Sailing Federation, Romanian Yachting Association, Russian Yachting Federation and South Africa Sailing regarding the 2016 Olympic Sailing Competition core events and core equipment but did not consider it appropriate to make a recommendation on the core equipment to be used at the Olympic Sailing Competition until such time that the full slate of events is known.

**Opinion: Reject**

*It is only appropriate to select equipment for core events if the complete Olympic slate and the number of medals is known*

- (o) Men's Board [Windsurfing] and Women's Board [Windsurfing] - Regulation 23.1.5

The Equipment Committee noted submission 084-12 from the International RS:X Class Association regarding the Olympic Sailing Competition core events but did not consider it appropriate to approve the submission when the men's board and women's board events are not currently part of the current Olympic slate of events.

**Opinion: Reject**

*The men's board and women's board events are not currently on the Olympic slate*

- (p) Reduce Costs for Olympic Sailing Campaigns

The Equipment Committee discussed submission 085-12 from the Swedish Sailing Federation in some detail. Dina Kowalyshyn gave the views of the EQSC which were that costs should always look to be reduced wherever possible, but also consider the nature of the sport and how deeply we want technology to control the game as it is the

technology associated with sailing and coaching that pushes up costs more than the equipment used.

Kim Andersen was very supportive of the idea of a working party to investigate cost control for Olympic sailing and was in favour of approving the submission.

David Brookes gave the opinion of the ISAF Classes which was to reject the submission. They agreed with the principles, but recommend that ISAF look at reducing costs throughout the sport and not only for Olympic sailing.

Georg Fundak was in favour of the submission not only would it give the option to reduce costs but also control them better in the future which would be better for all MNAs and sailors.

Riccardo Simoneschi was also in favour of the submission but felt it should be given more detail and that the working party should identify all streams of cost to an Olympic campaign and that information should then be given to Council.

Georg Tallberg informed the committee that the CRSC were in favour of the submission and that the working party should be formed to look into costs of Olympic sailing.

On a vote of 13 in favour, 1 reject, the submission was recommended for approval.

**Opinion: Approve**

*A working party should be formed to examine and identify all streams of cost of an Olympic campaign*

### **Olympic Sailing Competition - Regulations**

(q) Regulation 23.1.7

The committee noted submission 070-12 from the International Funboard Class Association regarding Olympic equipment regulations. Bruno de Wannemaeker spoke to the submission explaining why the Funboard Class considered permitting equipment to be changed without changing the event to be a good idea. He gave the example that it allowed the possibility of different equipment to be used if a single manufacturer class got into difficulties and were unable to continue producing the equipment that had been selected.

Bill Abbott was generally in favour of the ideas behind the submission and liked the option to change equipment without changing the event, but wanted to see more work put into the detail of the submission.

Dina Kowalyshyn agrees there is merit in separating out the selection of equipment from the events but notes that equipment evaluation takes time and so supports the idea of the submission but is not convinced this is the best solution to the issues and so would like to see the submission deferred and the details investigated further.

On a proposal from Dick Batt, seconded by Riccardo Simoneschi and on a vote of 13 in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention the submission was recommended for deferral.

**Opinion: Defer**

*The committee approve the principle but would like to see the detail better considered.*

(r) Change the Men's 2nd One Person Dinghy Event Name - Regulation 23.1.4

The committee noted submission 071-12 from the International Finn Association regarding Olympic events and equipment but did not consider it appropriate to make a recommendation on the event titles used at the Olympic Sailing Competition as this should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**



## Equipment Committee Minutes (cont.)

- (s) Definition of Sailing Discipline - New Regulation 23.1.2

The committee noted submission 072-12 from the International Kiteboarding Association regarding the Olympic Sailing Competition. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with the proposed equipment in this submission and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

- (t) Make Men's 2nd One Person Dinghy (Men's One Person Dinghy Heavyweight) Priority Event for Unused Quota

The committee noted submission 075-12 from the International Finn Association regarding the Olympic Sailing Competition. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with the proposed equipment in this submission and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

### **ISAF Sailing World Cup & ISAF Sailing World Championships**

- (u) Add Windsurfing as an ISAF SWC Event - Regulation 24.3.1

The Committee noted submission 066-12 from the Norwegian Sailing Federation regarding ISAF Sailing World Cup events. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with the proposed equipment in this submission and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

- (v) Retain Windsurfing RS:X as Events/ Equipment - Regulation 24.3.1

The Committee noted submission 067-12 from the International RS:X Class Association regarding the ISAF Sailing World Cup and 2014 ISAF World Championships. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with the proposed equipment in this submission and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

- (w) Selection of Kiteboarding and Windsurfing Events and Equipment - Regulations 24.2.2 and 24.3.1

The Committee noted submission 068-12 from the Chairman of the Windsurfing and Kiteboarding Committee regarding the 2013-2016 ISAF Sailing World Championships and ISAF Sailing World Cup. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with the proposed equipment in this submission and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

- (x) Nation Flags at ISAF Events

The committee discussed submission 086-12 from the Chairman of the Events Committee regarding nation flags at ISAF events and class rules of Olympic classes in some detail. David Brookes informed the committee of the ISAF Classes committee

opinion that this submission be approved.

Dina Kowalyshyn gave the opinion of the EQSC which was also to approve the submission but that consideration is given in any specification as to how the flag may be removed from the sail for re-sale purposes.

Barry Johnson expressed support for the submission but was of the opinion they should be sourced from a single manufacturer as this minimises any differences between material weights used in the flags and noted that the flags used in the 49er class are all sourced through one manufacturer and are not easy to remove.

Dimitris Dimou asked if these requirements for flags should be included as part of the class rules, or if they could be written into the Notice of Race for any particular event. Dick Batt highlighted that the submission was aimed at putting the requirements into the class rules and that this was the more acceptable solution and any recommendation should be made on that basis.

On a proposal from Barry Johnson, seconded by Dina Kowalyshyn and a vote of 12 in favour, 1 against and with 1 abstention the submission was recommended for approval.

**Opinion: Approve**

*Providing satisfactory safeguards for the technical aspects of performance and cost are addressed.*

### **ISAF Youth Sailing World Championships**

(y) Regulation 24.4.3

Submission 088-12 from the International 29er Class Association and the Danish Sailing Federation regarding events for the ISAF Youth Sailing World Championships was noted by the Committee. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with the proposed equipment in this submission and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

(z) Regulation 24.4.9

Submission 089-12 from the International 29er Class Association and the Danish Sailing Federation regarding events for the ISAF Youth Sailing World Championships was noted by the Committee. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with the proposed equipment in this submission and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

(aa) Delete Hobie 16 - Regulation 24.4.9

Submission 090-12 from the SL16 Class Association regarding the ISAF Youth Sailing World Championship was noted. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with the proposed equipment in this submission and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

(bb) Techno 293 Class to be Added to list of Equipment Regulation 24.4.9

Submission 092-12 from the Techno 293 Class Association regarding classes for the ISAF Youth Sailing World Championships was noted. It was agreed that there were no

equipment related problems with the proposed equipment in this submission and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

**ISAF Regional Games**

- (cc) Retain Windsurfing RS:X as Events / Equipment - Regulation 25.13.5

Submission 061-12 from the International RS:X Class Association regarding selected equipment for Regional Games was noted. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with the proposed equipment in this submission and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

- (dd) Regulation 25.13.5

Submission 093-12 from the Chairman of the Regional Games Committee regarding equipment for the Regional Games was noted. It was agreed that there were no equipment related problems with the proposed equipment in this submission and the final selection of events should be recommended by the Events Committee.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

*There are no equipment related issues with the proposals.*

**Racing Rules of Sailing**

- (ee) New Appendix SY – Superyacht Racing Rules

Submission 117-12 from the Chairman of the Racing Rules Committee regarding addition of a new Appendix SY specifically for Super Yachts was discussed in some detail by the Committee. Concern was raised over the term 'superyacht' and how the restriction of 30.5m inadvertently defined a Class which was now seemingly recognised by ISAF, without meeting the requirements of Regulation 10. The inclusion of length requirements and a definition of 'superyacht' was felt was unnecessarily restrictive and the rules could still be applied to all large yachts wishing to race under the Racing Rules of Sailing without the definition.

**Opinion: Approve with the following amendment**

*The term 'superyacht' and the dimensions given are unnecessarily restrictive.*

**APPENDIX SY**

**LARGE YACHT ~~SUPERYACHT~~**  
**RACING RULES**

*Under rule 86.2 and Regulation 28.1.3, the ISAF has approved the use of The Racing Rules of Sailing as changed by this appendix ~~for races for a superyacht class~~, but only if the notice of race so states.*

**~~SY1~~ TERMINOLOGY**

~~'Superyacht' means a boat with a hull length greater than 30.5 metres. 'Superyacht class' means a racing fleet in which a majority of the fleet are superyachts.~~

## 7. 2016 Kiteboard Event Equipment Evaluation

- (a) The committee received the report on the Kiteboard Equipment Evaluation from the chairman of the evaluation group. Georg Tallberg reported on the evaluation event that took place in Santander in March. It was noted there was only one Kiteboarding class which was a 'formula' kite class with licensed builders to produce a range of different equipment to a set of class rules, as opposed to a one design set of equipment. This has been proven to work well over the past 3 world championships and the class rules were well established and worked well. The format of the events was as yet undecided, but this was a work in progress and further work on this was on-going.

Carolijn Brouwer highlighted some concern over the development of the fins in the future. Whilst this is not currently a problem, it should be addressed to make sure the rules are sufficient to avoid expensive developments in the future. This concern was also noted by Bruno de Wannemaeker who also noted that having multiple licensed manufacturers would keep costs down which should also reduce any undesirable developments in fin design going forward.

Dick Batt thanked the evaluation panel for the excellent work done in a very short space of time.

- (b) The recommendations of the evaluation panel were to adopt the formula kite equipment produced by licensed manufacturers. This allows some controlled development year on year and will keep the top sailors in the sport for longer and was not considered to be any more expensive than a one design class, which would become outdated very quickly. This recommendation was unanimously agreed by the committee.

### **Recommendation:**

*The Equipment Committee supports the work of the Kiteboarding Evaluation Panel and recommends the licensed kiteboard equipment proposed in the Kiteboarding Evaluation reports.*

## 8. Evolution of Olympic Equipment

The committee were presented with a document on the evolution of Olympic equipment which was compiled of responses from the Olympic Classes to an email from the Secretariat on the subject and which outlined the plans of each class, if any, for future developments within the class.

The production of new templates for the 470 was noted which has led to better equipment inspection and control of the build of 470s.

Barry Johnson noted some of the breakages that had occurred in the 49er fleet had seen equipment redeveloped and the replacement parts working much better and a change to the building specification was imminent. There were no plans to change anything related to the sails until at least 2016 when the contract next comes up for tender.

Jason Smithwick reported that there had been a specification change proposals received from the Laser Class relating to a new radial cut sail and composite top mast. Whilst the sail change proposal was complete, it was noted the mast specification was far from complete and there were a number of reservations on production control of the new top mast section which have been relayed back to the class association.

The Nacra 17 and 49erFX distribution, class rules and building specification have been discussed at length with the builders and the Secretariat Staff and all is progressing well with the first boats already being distributed around the world.

### 9. Review of Equipment Evaluation Processes

The committee reviewed the Women's Skiff and Mixed Multihull Evaluation processes. It was noted that this has been an incredibly busy year for equipment evaluations and that it was important that the lessons learned during the processes were taken forward for the future.

Dina Kowalyshyn added thanks to all the volunteers without who the process couldn't have happened so easily, especially the sailors who trialled the boats. It was also noted that the core team who organised the evaluations had been preparing for the eventuality for a year or more before the trials were required and this timescale is certainly required in order to get everything in place to make the trials run smoothly. The idea of a committee based working party to be set up at the beginning of every 4 year cycle to look at evolutions and evaluation processes was suggested. This would result in a prepared group in place should the case of equipment evaluations arise in the future. This is to be included in the planning document to go forward into the next 4 year cycle for the future committee.

### 10. Equipment Rules of Sailing

The committee were given a brief verbal update on the 2013-2016 ISAF Equipment Rules of Sailing. The new edition of the book is available to purchase through the ISAF website in addition to the downloadable .pdf version. The committee were also shown the new iOS app for iPad and iPhone which has been developed and is available in the iTunes Store.

It was noted that the new edition of the ERS had five new advertisers and thanks were extended to Nautivela, Zaoli Sails, Dimension Polyant, Ullman Sails GZ(Italy) and North Sails One Design for their contribution to the Equipment Rules of Sailing.

### 11. In-House Certification

The ISAF In-House Certification scheme continues to be administered by the Secretariat with sales of certification stickers now exceeding 25,000 and has shown consistent growth since 2008. Work is on-going with MNAs including GER, NED and SWE to further involve them in the scheme.

The ISAF In-House Certification Seminar was held on Friday 2 November. The large majority of attendees were very familiar with the details of the scheme already and the format of the seminar was changed to reflect this and a good discussion was had with ideas and plans to further develop the scheme in ways that would make it easier for sail makers and MNAs to get involved in the scheme without compromising its integrity.

### 12. Championship Rules

The Chairman of the Championship Rules Working Party updated the committee on the progress of removing championship rules from the class rules. With the exception of the Dart 18 Class, with which work on this task is continuing, the ISAF Classes now have separate documents outlining the championship rules and class rules. It was agreed that this working party have now finished their work.

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

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

The Chairman of the Equipment Control Sub-committee noted that for several consecutive years the Equipment Control Sub-committee had had excellent attendance. There are a number of key action points to take forward into the next 4 year period including continuing the work of the Equipment Rules of Sailing Working Party and current members were urged to continue the good work to date, and also the documenting of procedures for event equipment inspection which has made good progress in recent years.

(b) Class Rules Sub-committee

The Chairman of the Class Rules Sub-committee noted last year's submission enabling the Secretariat Staff to administer and approve class rule changes in line with policies agreed by the Class Rules Sub-committee has been working well this year. The Chairman informed the committee he would not be standing again in the next 4 year cycle and thanked the committee for the good work and the staff for their on-going work.

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

(a) Special Regulations Sub-committee

Stan Honey reported on the Special Regulations Sub-committee as Jacques Lehn was unable to attend the meeting, noting in particular the submissions to amend the Offshore Special Regulations which is an on-going process. There were a number of submissions regarding safety of capsized yachts as a result of the 100ft yacht 'Rambler' breaking the keel fin and capsizing in the 2011 Rolex Fastnet Race which included provision for additional lighting and means of escape for when a boat is inverted. After a lengthy discussion of the SRSC it was decided that focus should remain on making sure yachts do not capsize in the first place rather than trying to make them safe once they have, and that this being the case, the Offshore Special Regulations were in sufficiently good order to ensure the boats do not remain inverted.

(b) Oceanic & Offshore Committee

Stan Honey reported that the Oceanic & Offshore Committee would meet the following day and outlined the main topics for discussion. He highlighted reports from rating rule authorities and the evolution of a universal measurement system which would allow a measurement certificate to be calculated for any of the rating rules from the data recorded during measurement. Racing Rule 41, Outside Assistance was also highlighted as being an issue for offshore races around the world in that "*freely available*" is interpreted in different ways which is a constant problem for offshore navigators.

### 15. Annual Report

The Chairman informed the committee that the annual report covering the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012 would be distributed in due course.

### 16. Any other Business

Georg Tallberg raised the issue of 'tower trapezing' that occurred during the 49er European Championships earlier in the year. This was achieved by the Danish sailors with the crew standing on the shoulders of the helmsman. It was proposed that this practice be prohibited in class rules such that the trapezing crew shall be in contact with the hull. Further developments of this type of hiking should also be prohibited and work is taking place by the CRSC to draft class rules which classes may use to outlaw this practice. Barry Johnson highlighted the issue of youth sailors in the 29er and other local classes already using this technique. He highlighted the potential for medical problems with sailors standing or hiking off each other could be substantial and this practice should not be encouraged. It was considered important that that the class rules should prohibit this action and that suitable wording was available.

Dick Batt presented certificates to committee members in of recognition of their contribution over the past four years.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 1800.