

Technical Committee Deputy Chairman's Report to the General Assembly, May 2001

The following is a resumé of the TC's activities since the last General Assembly:

1999

- June TC consulted regarding M draft limit
- July Second draft One Metre class rules sent to TC for comment
- August Notice given to Chairman RRC that One Metre class rules (and others) will not specify sail marks and that this will be required in the RRS
- October Notice of change to M and 10 Rater class rules sent to DMs.
Notice that One Metre class rules will be delayed to 2001 sent to DMs
Third draft One Metre class rules sent to TC for comment

2000

- January PC Meeting ratifies Marblehead and Ten Rater draught limits
- March Draft Marblehead and Ten Rater class rules to SCR format ready sent to PC for approval of exemption from formal consultation with DMs
- April Draft One Metre class rules go to DMs + timetable + questionnaire
Draft Marblehead class rules circulated to TC
Draft 10R class rules circulated to TC
10R transom interpretation material to TC
A Class weight tolerance issue queried with TC and RRC
Single digit sail number issue material to TC
- June 10R transom interpretation finalised
TC asked to provide declarations re commercial interest
- July Resign as Chairman of the TC
- August Appointed Deputy Chairman of the TC
TC asked to comment on 2nd draft One Metre class rules draft
DMs circulated with M 10R advertising cat questionnaire
- October DMs circulated with 10R transom rule change questionnaire
- December Drafts of 1M, M and 10R class rules prepared for PC
Draft of revised ICAR prepared for PC
- 2001
- January Concept of length gauge introduced for Marblehead
PC Meeting ratifies 1M, M and 10R class rules (and revised ICAR for A Class)
- February Measurement forms and certificates prepared to mesh with class rules
Necessary amendments to class rules identified to PC
Work on diagrams started by various helpers
PC agree that class rules will be delayed until further revision
- March New draft class rules sent to TC for comment
- April New draft of 1M, M and 10R class rules prepared for PC
Measurement forms and certificates amended as required
All sent to PC for ratification

TC member with a commercial interest queries 1M class rules

Request for 1M interpretation from GBR delegated to PC VC

My report to the 1999 General Assembly noted that the One Metre class rules would shortly be revised and brought into line with the ISAF's Standard Class Rules (SCR) and the Equipment Rules of Sailing (ERS).

The need to revise the class rules stems from the work that has been undertaken by the ISAF Measurement Committee to produce the ERS which will serve a very important function in regulating our sport for the benefit of the sailors. The value of the ERS is not fully appreciated at present but will become clearer as people begin to understand how the sport can be better regulated in the future than it has been in the past.

The purpose of the ERS is threefold:

- to contain the rules which relate to how equipment is used during a race
- to contain a fairly comprehensive set of definitions which can be used by any class which chooses to use them
- to set out how measurers shall proceed

The first of these means that the Racing Rules of Sailing can concentrate on right of way and race administration rules which apply equally to all classes. The second means class rules can be more precisely expressed by using well understood definitions which are common to many classes. Higher visibility of the third will help remove 'local practices' - always desirable in a truly international sport.

The rule re-drafting work was delayed for a year but came to fruition during late 2000 by which time the ERS had been fully adopted by ISAF as part of the rules framework.

It is worth pointing out that since 1999 it has been necessary to issue one interpretation (there is another being decided at the moment) and that the current class rules have all served for relatively long periods i.e. since 1994, 1995 and 1996 (amended 2000).

There remains an element in our sport which thinks that interpretations should be decided by a popular vote and which fails to understand that, if an interpretation is not liked, the way forward is to propose a change to the class rules. The message is - do not expect interpretations to change class rules to mean what you (or even a majority) might want.

The Marblehead and Ten Rater class rules were also re-drafted in the SCR format so that the RSD might have an almost complete 'new' set of rules. The need to consult Division Members was waived by the PC because of the nature of the rule changes i.e. essentially re-formatting.

However Division Members were consulted regarding the category of advertising to be permitted (because advertising on boats would become a class rules issue rather than a RRS matter) and at the same time a survey of other areas of interest, including two proposals to change the technical content of the One Metre class rules, was also made.

The water free draught limitation method tacked on to the Marblehead rules in 2000 had been well received and has been extended in the new draft to deal with hull length, appendage and rig overhangs.

The current draft rules contain some significant changes which will have a beneficial impact on the sailors and the sport but little or no impact on the boats. These are:

- The administrative section of the class rules will be in the same document as the class specific rules
- Sail marks will be governed by the Racing Rules of Sailing alone
- Advertising permitted on the boats in a class will be determined by their class rules and not by the RRS
- It will be possible for sailmakers to sell certified sails i.e. which need no further measurement (One Metre only)

After the PC had ratified the draft class rules in January 2001 it became apparent that there were some technical shortcomings in the rules themselves, that the SCR would need some amendment, and that the planned effective date could not be met. Thus more time has been taken further to revise the class rules. I am confident the time has been well spent.

The current position is that the draft class rules, measurement forms and certificates are with the PC for their approval. Diagrams, for which scanned drawings are not apparently suitable, have yet to be prepared and may remain a stumbling block for some time to come.

The PC has decided that the A Class does not warrant the same level of support as its numbers and geographical spread indicate it will probably lose its full international status in the near future. It seems likely that the Ten Rater class will lose its full international status in the next decade unless more fleets aspire to meeting the standards required for support from ISAF-RSD. However the class is showing feint signs of growth whereas the Marblehead continues to decline albeit from a higher level.

Members of all the RSD Committees were asked to declare any commercial interests they might have. Inevitably members of a technical committee will probably have a greater incidence of commercial activity but it is felt that, where it is conspicuous, there is less danger of it having any unwelcome influence.

I anticipate some clarification work for the incoming TC chairman as people become familiar with the new class rules. It is possible that a One Metre ICA will wish to address issues in the class rules which it feels better able to tackle than the RSD has done in the past. If this happens it should be welcomed and looked upon correctly as 'the owners being in control of their own class'. In principle the presence of an active ICA will make the task of the RSD TC easier by removing the need to read the minds of the owners - always a fruitless task.

This can also be taken as a strong suggestion that owners who are concerned about the One Metre class should take an active part in the ICA or they may find that the future path of the class is as much out of their control as they feel it has been in the past. 'Sign up' or 'put up' is the clear message.

In conclusion I would like to express my thanks to the members of the Technical Committee and Permanent Committee with whom I have had the pleasure to work as well as the many others who have been able make a positive contribution to the work carried out by the TC. I hope the RSD will be able to move forward from its current difficult position

of attempting to act as a multi class association when it really needs to be a committee of ISAF and I wish the next chairman of the TC a safe passage.

Graham Bantock, Technical Committee Deputy Chairman, 20010507