Class Rules Sub-committee Minutes

The Class Rules Sub-committee met at 9:30 – 15:21 hours on Sunday 8th November 2009 at the Paradise Hotel, Busan, Korea

Please refer to the ISAF website www.sailing.org for the details of the submissions and supporting papers on this agenda
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Present:
William ABBOTT (CAN) - Vice-Chairman
Jan DEJMO (SWE)
Janet GROSVENOR (GBR) - Oceanic and Offshore Representative
Dina KOWALYSHYN (USA) - Equipment Control Representative
Renee MEHL (USA) - Special Regulations Representative
David ANTONCIC (SLO)
Sebastian EDMONDS (GBR)
Georg TALLBERG (FIN) - Chairman
Michael GRANDFIELD - IC Representative
Henri SAMUEL (FRA) - Racing Rules Representative
Antonio CARDONA ESPIN (ESP)
Fred KATS (NED)
Ana Maria SANCHEZ DEL CAMPO FERRER (ESP) - Racing Rules Representative

Apologies:
Alberto PREDIERE – ISAF Vice President
Henry THORPE - ISAF Technical Co-ordinator

Other Present
Jason SMITHWICK – Head of the ISAF Technical and Offshore Department

Please refer to the ISAF Council minutes of 12 - 14 November 2009 for the final Council 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 Committee meeting opened with an apology from the chairman as he was unable to attend the meeting due to health reasons. The meeting was therefore chaired by the vice chairman of the Sub-committee, Bill Abbott, who welcomed everyone and those present introduced themselves as this was the first meeting of the new 4 year cycle of committee members.

2. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

   (a) Minutes

   The minutes of the Class Rules Sub-committee meeting of 9th November 2008 were noted and there were no matters arising not otherwise covered on the agenda. The minutes can be downloaded at www.sailing.org/meetings
3. Submissions

(a) Advertising Code

Submission 011-09 was noted from the Executive Committee regarding the removal of redundant definitions and a proposed amended regulation 20, advertising code. Sebastian Edmonds raised a point regarding the incorrect use of the term measurement which in reality was referring to equipment inspection at an event. The committee agreed this point and unanimously supported the following proposal.

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve with the following amendment.**

Change the reference in 20.2.1. from “measurement” to “equipment inspection”

(b) Advertising Code – Classes and Rating Systems

Submission 013-09 was noted from the Executive Committee regarding the addition of regulation 20.5.8 to include the responsibilities of a National Class Association when entering into a sponsorship contract. On a proposal by the Bill Abbott the committee unanimously approved this submission viewing the amendment as positive.

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve**

(c) Advertising Code – Advertising Code – Supplementary Entry Fee

Submission 015-09 was noted from the Executive Committee regarding the addition of regulation 20.8.3 to permit variable entry fees for boats carrying advertising. Bill Abbott spoke against the additional fees in general and the effects it would have in terms of justifying and obtaining sponsorship. Janet Grosvenor spoke specifically about examples of racing in yachts mainly under handicap rules where additional entry fee on those boats with high level / high value sponsorship was used to successfully subsidize entry fees. On a proposal by Bill Abbott, the committee unanimously accepted the following proposal not to make a recommendation but to make a statement questioning the charging of additional race entry fees outside of offshore racing.

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee:**

The regulation may be appropriate for Offshore Racing boats but the Committee believe additional entry fees should not be charged for others events. The regulation should be redrafted to consider this opinion.

(d) Class Rules Changes and Interpretations

Submission 075-09 was noted from the Chairman of the Equipment Committee regarding an amendment to Regulation 26.11 to reinforce the Class Rule change procedure with the requirement of ISAF classes to get ISAF approval. In addition it addresses building specification changes. On a proposal Bill Abbott the committee unanimously agreed the following recommendation to address concerns raised by the classes committee.

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve with the following amendment.**

Change the proposed regulation 26.11.9 to read as follows:

26.11.9 Changes to manufacturing/building specification shall be made handled as per Class Rule changes except that for equipment with a confidential building specification the change shall be processed handled by the ISAF Secretariat in consultation with the Chairman of the Class Rules Sub-committee
(if he is conflicted, another committee member) instead of the Class Rules Sub-committee.

(e) RRS 87 Changes to Class Rules

Submission 142-09 was noted from the Royal Netherlands Yachting Union regarding RRS 87, changes of the Class Rules within the notice of race and sailing instructions. Bill Abbott raised the point that the Notice of Race was effectively the condition for entry so could understand the reason for such a submission. A class rule change affects who and with what equipment a competitor can enter a regatta and it would be ideal for such a change to be in the Notice of Race. However the reduction in flexibility was felt to be too much of a hindrance to race organisers. On a proposal by the Bill Abbott, the committee unanimously rejected the submission with the following recommendation:

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Reject**

Reject as it removes flexibility of the organising authority to change class rules in terms of the timing of the notice of race and sailing instructions being published.

(f) RRS 87 Changes to Class Rules

Submission 143-09 was noted from the Royal Netherlands Yachting Union regarding RRS 87, changes of the Class Rules within the sailing instructions by a national class association.

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Reject**

The reason for this is that it is felt Submission 144-09 inadvertently covers this issue in a better way.

(g) RRS 87 Changes to Class Rules

Submission 144-09 was noted from the Royal Netherlands Yachting Union regarding RRS 87, changes of the Class Rules within the sailing instructions with permission of the class rules authority as opposed to the class association.

The committee discussed the fact that the RRS use of the term class association was confusing in particular, for example, ISAF classes need additional approval from ISAF for class rule changes at events. The committee felt that the ERS term class rules authority covers every eventuality. Concerns where raised that by using the term “class rules authority” the class association isn’t formally recognised in the process, but it was felt that any class rules authority would consult interested parties and the wording copes for classes without a class association.

On a proposal to approve this submission and reject submission 143-09 by Jan Dejmo and seconded by Sebastian Edmonds the Sub-committee voted 5 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Approve**

(h) RRS G1.2 Specification Identification on Sails

Submission 151-09 was noted from the Royal Netherlands Yachting Union regarding RRS G1.2 to include the requirement for sail numbers to be contrasting to the colour of the sail.

On a proposal by Dina Kowalyshyn seconded by Jan Dejmo the committee voted unanimously against the submission with the following recommendation:

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee: Reject**
This point is already covered in the existing rule by the phrase “clearly legible” to add an additional subjective phrase would not add any further clarity to the rule.

4. **Class Rules of New Classes Applying for ISAF Status**

The class rules were reviewed to make a recommendation to the equipment committee on the suitability of the class rules for ISAF status. It was also intended to cover minor editorial issues for the Secretariat to raise with the class via these minutes.

(a) One Metre

It was noted that the application by the International One Metre class had been withdrawn and the class rules therefore were not discussed.

(b) Laser Vago

The post-adoption version of the class rules in the standard class rules format were received. There was a general feeling that the rules were a little light on content particularly in the handling of permitted competitor modification, design control and rigging. It was felt best to work with the class to develop the rules further particularly after feedback from their first international event.

The following editorial amendments should be made:

+ Correct advertising code reference C.2.1.
+ Refer to ISO buoyancy aid and other buoyancy aid standards

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee:**

The class rules are to an acceptable standard for adoption although the committee felt they were minimal and would like to carry on developing the rules content after receiving input on class rule compliance at the first world championships.

(c) RS 500

The post-adoption version of the class rules in the standard class rules format were received. The following editorial amendments should be made:

+ Correct advertising code reference C.2.1.

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee:**

The class rules are to an acceptable standard for adoption, although the committee felt they were minimal and would like to carry on developing the rules content after receiving input on class rule compliance at their first world championships.

(d) Kona One Design

The proposed post-ISAF-adoption version of the class rules were received

**Recommendation to the Equipment Committee:**

The class rules are to an acceptable standard

(e) RC44

The post-adoption version of the class rules in the standard class rules format were received. The following editorial amendments should be made:

+ Correct advertising code reference C.2.1.

+ Sailor classification code reference changed
+ Concerns over number of “not allowed” statements within closed class rules
+ Use of the term “official measurer” and “certification authority” seems unclear in what is with the exception of sails a manufacturer controlled class
+ Use of certified section C boat weights
+ Use of sail measurement diagrams in Appendix A and the possibility of conflict with the ERS

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee:
The class rules are to acceptable standard however the committee recommends that a condition of acceptance is a change to class rule A.8.1. for an independent ISAF based interpretation arrangement rather than the class association, as per the ISAF regulations.

(f) Class 40
The Secretariat highlighted the issues with converting a class rules in the standard class rules format. While the open nature of the class doesn’t create a problem for closed class rules the use of global certified boat measurements does. The current SCR template is designed for certification of parts of the boat whereas the class have overall measurements linked to the complete boat. The Secretariat has been working with members of the EQSC and this committee to develop the SCR to handle this type of certification and type of boats.

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee:
A report from the secretariat confirmed that the class are not in standard class rules format. However there are technical problems with using the SCR for overall boat measurements. It is recommended that with the assistance of the EQSC on the structure of the rules is resolved and a number of solutions have been worked on. The rules also should be changed to be closed class rules. For this reason and based on the equipment committee decision in mid-year 2009 it is recommended the class continues to maintain provisional status.

(g) Maxi Class
No rules have been submitted and at present the class rules are part of the classes constitution (by-laws) However a framework of non standard class rules has been produced by the Secretariat and the class are working towards adopting this.

Recommendation to the Equipment Committee:
As no class rules were presented but a written commitment to work with the CRSC was received, based on the equipment committee decision in mid-year 2009 the recommendation of the committee is to recommend the class remains with provisional status.

5. Class & Championship Rules

(a) Championship Rules Working Party Report
Bill Abbott gave a brief verbal report on the developments of the Championship Rules Working Party during the year. It was noted that although work on producing a template for Championship rules within the Standard Class Rules format was progressing well, there was still some work to be done on the details of the proposal to move Championship rules in some instance out of class rules and in other equipment related issues to a separate appendix.
6. **Equipment Control Sub-committee**

The Equipment Control Sub-committee is responsible for producing a number of the ‘tools’ used by the Class Rules Sub-committee.

(a) Dina Kowalyshyn reported that the ERS Working Party and the Standard Class Rules Working Party are both in a transition period and were re-examining their goals and objective. The ERS was well established and its future development would be discussed by the EQSC. In regards to the standard class rules working party Dina stressed her desire for this committee to remain heavily involved in the document development, as the initial framework is well established and input from its main user group is key.

(b) **Certification and Certification Control**

Ken Kershaw (observer) reported his surprise that this was on the agenda but as chairman of the working party for the last committee cycle responsible for this he gave the following update. On the original goals of certification to provide documentary proof that the equipment had been checked and pointed towards the extensive work done to get the ISAF In-House certification program running. He felt that sails were well under control and that the focus on other areas was required. Highlighting on-line certification systems as demonstrated Michael Grandfield of the Tornado class as a way of moving this area forward.

7. **Reports & Opinions from Committees Members with Cross Representation**

As most other committees hadn’t met for the first time of the new cycle it was difficult for representatives from other committees to report on their activities. However, Renee Mehl was able to report on the submissions in front of the Special Regulations Sub-committee for consideration for adoption this year.

8. **Class Rule Change Procedure and Working Process**

The committee noted the original procedure document and agreed that it needed to look at developing this document further. The committee encourage dialog between the vice chairman and chairman on moving this forwards.

9. **Class Rule Changes**

(a) **49er Class**

Barry Johnson presented a diagram to the committee explaining some ideas of media friendly branding for the 49er. The Class Rules Sub-committee agreed that if the proposal were to be developed, suitable changes to parts defined by the class rules could be adopted such as issues related to RRS Appendix G. However as parts of the proposal were outside the advertising code the approval of such designs should be put to the ISAF Executive.

10. **Any other Business**

(a) **Philosophy of class rules**

Bill Abbott described a need for producing standard working and best practice to aid classes in developing class rules.

(b) **Submission 023-09 regarding the ISAF Sailor Classification code involved a number of changes that sought bringing classification race management deadlines into class**
rules. While this may not present a problem for ISAF classes where the wording of such rules could be controlled, general concerns were raised. Janet Grosvenor agreed to take these concerns to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee.