IYRU MYRD
Policy for Classes
and
Intent of the Class Rules

1 Introduction

1.1 When a problem of interpretation of class rules occurs people almost inevitably discuss the intention of those who wrote them. In practice this is unimportant as the class rules can only ever be interpreted, in the formal sense, according to their meaning. In any case the original rules were often written fifty or more years ago and it may be impossible to correctly gauge the original intent. Even if that was possible it may have been intended to change the rules subsequently. However it is useful to know something of the intent *and the reason for this intent* if only because it brings the nature of each class into clearer focus. Knowledge of the intent at those crucial times in a class's history i.e. when class rules are revised, may help to establish where the class rules are failing to work properly and may assist in bringing the rules back into line.

1.2 Until recently the classes given international status have been those popular enough to be sailed in relatively large numbers in a number of countries. In January 1992 the IYRU One Metre was granted international status even though it did not meet the minimum numerical criteria because it was considered there was *a need for the class* (see Rules and Recommendations for the Adoption and Control of International Classes). A policy decision was taken to establish the new class and it would seem logical to set out the rationale for this.

1.3 Establishing and recording any policy that exists may help guide future rule revisions which are not governed by the vote of owners - that is where no ICA exists. The Permanent Committee may then choose to continue an established policy where there is no clear reason to change the class rules.

2 Terminology

2.1 Where the terms One Design and Development are used here it is in the same context as currently used in IYRU class rules:

ONE DESIGN Anything in regard to design not specifically permitted by the rules is prohibited.

DEVELOPMENT Anything in regard to design not specifically prohibited by the rules is permitted.

3 Contents

International One Metre Class

1 Introduction

1.1 Origins

1.1.1 An International One Metre class was first adopted by the IMYRU in 1958 after application by France and Italy. The class rules limited length to 1000mm and sail area to 0.4m^2. There appears to have been much freedom over choice of rig design. No significant international competition appears to have taken place and it is assumed the class effectively died out some time in the 1960's.

1.1.2 In the 1980's there appeared a number of 'one metre' classes i.e. in the US, Japan, France and Germany (Naviga E class rule). The original reasons for interest in this new format are now unclear but it was almost certainly enhanced by the escalating cost of maintaining a Marblehead. This concept clearly appealed to model yachtsmen outside those countries and one metre long yachts to various designs and 'rules' appeared elsewhere.

1.1.3 The various classes had only the hull length in common. The US One Metre had no restrictions on materials or rig proportions; the French class used a One Design hull and rigs; the German class had many restrictions on the hull, foils and RC but permitted much freedom in choice of sail profile.

1.1.4 It was clear that a One Metre boat with tightly restricted rigs and equipment could produce an inexpensive class and close competition for experts and beginners alike. This class would complement the Marblehead class in nature and the lower cost might enable the popularity of the sport as a whole to be maintained or improved by providing a class which would permit mass manufacturers to produce a competitive boat

1.2 IYRU One Metre - 1988 Class Rules

1.2.1 During the development of the 1988 class rules a clear principal was established under the guidance of the Chairman of the MYRD Technical Committee, that is the boats permitted by the rule would be capable of being built by non-expert builders, either from a kit or from scratch, or inexpensively by a commercial builder, without being at a disadvantage in terms of performance when compared to yachts built using an unlimited amount of time and other resources. In order to achieve this the following policy and intent were employed:

i) Construction materials to be limited to certain inexpensive ones which are commonly available and capable of being used to produce yachts down to weight with no special building skills.
   Reasons a) to encourage simple building methods
   b) to limit cost

ii) Other materials would be permitted only in the foils
   Reason a) it would be difficult to test positively for their absence here and their speed enhancing effect is limited

iii) Fin and ballast would be removable
Reason a) to permit a minimum and maximum weight limit for this unit in order to limit the righting moment provided by the fin and ballast

iv) The range of permitted weight of fin and ballast was chosen large enough to permit yachts built to the Naviga rule to comply without modification
Reason a) to boost class numbers

v) Restrict nature and position of foils.
Reason a) for simplicity

vi) Minimum total weight was set quite high.
Reasons a) to permit relatively crude building quality so that there was minimal emphasis on or benefit from exotic techniques so that builder quality is relatively unimportant
b) to limit cost

vii) Draft minimum and maximum figures were chosen to accommodate certain existing yachts without modification.
Reason a) to boost class numbers

viii) Range of permitted draft kept small.
Reason a) to keep potential degree of tuning of yachts to specific conditions to a minimum thereby discouraging use of alternative fins/ballasts.

ix) Mast materials limited to wood or aluminium.
Reason a) to limit cost
b) to limit choice to materials commonly available everywhere

x) Generous minimum mast diameter.
Reason a) to ensure that one pair of shrouds and one set of spreaders would give an adequately stiff mast. This would tend to make each rig simpler to install in the boat and easier to tune thereby maximising similarity of performance between expert and novice.

xi) Mast section limited to round.
Reason a) to prevent shaping or tapering of masts thereby ensuring uniformity and simplicity
b) to limit cost

xii) In addition the following limitations/restrictions were considered essential:

Mast fittings limited to essential minimum
Booms treated in much the same way as the masts
Standing rigging and other rigging restricted to good 'minimal' current practice
Number of permitted suits of sails limited to three
Sail sizes and construction tightly restricted
RC equipment limited to two channels of control

Reasons a) to ensure simplicity and uniformity
b) to limit cost

1.3 1989 and 1992 Rule Revisions

1.3.1 Not unnaturally the first few years of use of the class rules uncovered some areas which needed more attention. Principally the changes were:

i) To permit mast heel and mast strut fittings.
Reason a) the former had been omitted in error
b) the latter enables deck-stepped masts to be used efficiently.

ii) Hull depth was limited to 60mm.
Reason a) to prevent stability gain by building very deep and light hulls with internal ballast placed low down.

iii) Draft was increased to 370-420mm.
Reasons a) to improve sailing qualities
b) few of the existing boats expected to join the class had done so.

iv) Permit non-woven sail material.
Reason a) this had been omitted in error.

v) It was made clear that vacuum formed plastic can be used if it is the only material in that part.
Reason a) in order to make it clear that the use of plastic foam sheet bonded under vacuum into GRP hulls is not permitted, a method currently considered to be not in keeping with the policy to keep boats simple.

vi) A plastic container would be permitted for the RC containment.
Reason a) this is a commonly used and simple method of keeping RC equipment dry and there was no need to prohibit it

vii) It was made clear that internal ballast in the hull may be used.
Reason a) to remove doubt

viii) Weight of the rudder limited to 75 grams.
Reason a) to prevent possible gain of stability by using ballasted and deep rudders

ix) It was made clear that the kicking strap shall be below the boom and shall work in tension only.
Reason a) to limit cost
b) for simplicity

x) Checkstays would be permitted.
Reason a) these permit deck stepped masts to be supported well and are to be used only when the mast is deck stepped. They are prevented from becoming lower shrouds by having their position restricted.

xi) Jib boom counterbalance weights would be permitted.
Reason a) these are seen as essential for good downwind sailing and in any case many builders were using very heavy jib tack fittings to achieve the same end result. Permitting their use enables all to achieve uniformity with the minimum of effort and cost

2 Current Nature of the Class

2.1 General

Development class with some One Design characteristics and with absolute limits to hull length, hull depth, displacement and draft and with One Design rigs.

2.2 Hull

Length, depth, draft and total displacement (of complete boat) only restricted.

2.3 Rig/Sails

Type of rig and rigging and size and construction of sails tightly restricted.

2.4 Materials

Tightly restricted

U = unrestricted development, R = restricted development, O = one design

Item	Materials	Size	Design
Sails	U	O	O
Spars	O	R	R
Rigging	U	-	O
Hull	O	R	R
RC	O	-	-
Appendages	R	R	R
Ballast	O	O	U
General	U/O	R/O	R/O

2.5 Sailing characteristics

The small size of these boats limits their ability to sail well in exposed waters but they are adequate in most current RC yachting venues. Nevertheless their large draft relative to their length and the small sail area of the smallest sails permits them to sail in winds up to 35 knots (20m/s).

2.6 Other

The class achieved virtually instant success in the UK and has very good support in New Zealand. Both these countries have also had good followings in the Marblehead class, large enough for the new class not to be a threat to existing fleets. In other countries where only small fleets of other yachts exist the One Metre is taking longer to appeal to new builders.

The class appeals to a good cross section of RC yachtsmen e.g. those with an interest in building their own yachts but who do not necessarily have the skills to build Marbleheads to a competitive standard; those who have no building skills but who are only interested in competition and who do not wish to commit the relatively large sums required for top level Marblehead competition; those who have severely restricted budgets.

The people who sail this class frequently cite the lack of expense and simplicity associated with the class as positive reasons for using it. In the UK in most cases there is clearly only the One Metre to recommend to a newcomer to the sport.

2.7 The Future

The tight class rules designed to produce uniformity in the yachts and equipment introduce the possibility of having international events where each boat is properly control measured before the event with the minimum of effort.

Likewise the uniformity, simplicity and low cost of the equipment makes this class the likely arena for the highest level of competition in the future.

An unforeseen and useful spin off from the small size and limited number of rigs is the possibility of having well attended international events which can only be reached by air.

3 Policy

3.1 The class is currently considered likely to become the most popular class in most countries and, before the end of the century, to become the most numerous international class. It provides a good alternative to the Marblehead in terms of cost and nature and is often the clear choice for a newcomer to the sport. It is intended that mass manufacturers shall be able to produce competition quality yachts in kit form by virtue of the relatively inexpensive materials which are permitted and the weight limitations which are imposed. Likewise it is intended that skilled technician builders shall not be able to achieve significant gains in performance by building very superior boats or equipment.

3.2 It is now considered essential for the health of the sport to keep one class where construction ability is not of paramount importance in obtaining first class results in major competition.

3.3 The effect on the existing fleet should always be considered of prime importance when considering proposed rule changes. Any change which would cause existing yachts to become less competitive in any condition without the expenditure of a significant amount of time or money should be avoided unless there are very clear benefits to the sport as a whole or a significant section of it. Any change which will help ensure uniformity, lower the maintenance cost to the majority of owners or lower the initial cost to new owners should be adopted providing it is not in conflict with the principal of not making the existing fleet less competitive.

3.4 The One Design nature of the rigs raises the possibility that a mass manufacturer could make a true One Design class boat within the IYRU One Metre class. The benefit for the sport as a whole could be large and this possibility should be encouraged.

January 1994

International Marblehead Class

1 Introduction

1.1 Origins

1.1.1 The original class rules were formulated by Roy L. Clough of the Marblehead, Massachusetts model yacht club in 1932. The intention then was to produce an inexpensive and comparatively simple boat which would fit inside a contemporary automobile. Thus overall length but little else on the hull was restricted. The total sail area was restricted and so was the mast diameter, maximum roach widths and batten lengths. There were no restrictions on the number of alternative rigs, rig height, or materials.

1.2 Early Development of Rules and Effect

1.2.1 A minimum garboard radius requirement was introduced at some stage which may have been intended to prevent the use of 'fin' keels. Nevertheless bulb keels were used and the garboard radius requirement was removed for the sake of simplicity.

1.2.2 During the 1960's the absence of any limit on rig height and number of rigs was exploited to the full. This was countered by introducing limits to the rule.

1.2.3 During the 1970's the swing rig first appeared and it is assumed by the writer either that the RC racing rules in use did not require the jib tack to be on or near the centreline or that it was felt this racing rule did not override the class rules. Thus this development was able to continue

1.2.4 The step towards the use of the bulb keel quickly lead to significantly lighter and more stable boats and thus improved performance. Likewise it can be seen that improvements in material performance have been the key to development of speed potential in this class. Major steps have been use of alloy spars (1960's), lightly moulded glass hulls and lighter RC equipment (1970's), carbon spars and carbon hulls (1980's).

1.3 Intention of 1988/92 Rule Revisions

1.3.1 During the mid 1980's it became apparent that large unmeasured sail area could be gained by having a mainsail cut with much luff round. The original lack of restriction on roach shape also tended to lead to sails with a poor life expectancy. The 1988 rule revision dealt with these matters successfully. The 1992 revision dealt with minor problems with wording but has changed the basic approach little.

1.3.2 Specifically the changes were:

i) use IYRU standard format and terms
   Reason a) to enable IYRU standard measurers to measure yachts
   b) to introduce a common format to all rules

ii) to prescribe a system where the measurer has no discretion over procedure

Reason a) to improve the accuracy and repeatability of the sail area measurement process

iii) remove 'loophole' in sail area measurement
Reason a) to promote uniformity and enable real choice of rig type

iv) improve quality of wording
Reason a) to aid non-native English readers
b) to remove reliance on 'intent' for understanding the meaning

vi) incorporate recent interpretations
Reason a) to locate all relevant material together

vii) prohibit ballast denser than lead
Reason a) to limit cost

viii) remove unnecessary material e.g. what is permitted
Reason a) for simplicity

ix) introduce new format sail identification marks
Reason a) to improve yacht recognition during racing

2 Current Nature of the Class

2.1 General

2.1.1 Development class with an absolute limit to the hull length and many restrictions to rig/sail profile.

2.1.2 The absence of restrictions on the hull permits a wide range of shapes, displacements and drafts. The basic concept of the class rule is shared with some dinghy classes.

2.2 Hull

Hull shape is totally unrestricted except that tunnel hulls are prohibited.

2.3 Rig/Sails

A sloop or una rig may be used. A maximum of three measured rigs of full area and different aspect ratios are permitted. In addition there may be a maximum of two reduced area rigs within the profile of each of the measured rigs. Measured sail area includes the basic triangles and any area gained by cross widths in excess of permitted figures. These excess areas are not taxed in any way so there is freedom to experiment with sail profiles in excess of the original 'maximum' profile. Boats may typically have five or more rigs.

2.4 Materials

2.4.1 Materials are un-restricted and yachts may be very expensive. The need to save weight in construction is paramount if top performance is aimed for.

2.4.2 The material and design technology in the class has generally lead the other

development classes.

U = unrestricted development, R = restricted development, O = one design.

Item	Materials	Size	Design
Sails	U	R	U
Spars	U	R	R
Rigging	U	-	U
Hull	U	R	R
RC	U	-	-
Appendages	U	U	R
Ballast	O	U	U
General	U	U/R	U/R

2.5 Sailing characteristics

The boats are usually capable of sailing well in exposed waters. Their high length/displacement and stability/sail area ratios means that reaching and down wind speed in high winds is high.

2.6 Other

This class has been the most popular for a long time. This is perhaps because of the very few restrictions imposed on the hull apart from length and also because the boat is big enough to sail well in all conditions and small enough to be easily transportable.

The class appeals to those with an interest in extracting improved performance by more appropriate choice of hull proportion and detail design and also to those with an interest in superior construction. Increases in the cost of the best materials and construction techniques will be reflected in increased cost associated with this class and possibly resultant reduced numbers. It is notable that the top places at the major international events are frequently taken by those who design and build their own craft.

2.7 The Future

Development in this class is restricted principally to refinement of hull and foil design. Often this is sparked off by improvements in the performance of the construction materials. As currently successful yachts are virtually 100% carbon fibre it is likely that the quest for improved performance will involve the use of higher quality carbon and refined building processes which produce lighter hulls and spars.

Thus the yachts will tend to become much more expensive and/or time consuming to build and maintain.

3 Policy

The class forms the backbone of international competition at present. It is important that a popular class exists which permits much freedom in construction and design. Although it may be useful if the overall costs of this class could be reduced or maintained at current levels as escalating construction costs are being blamed for reducing numbers in this class, such action is viewed as being contrary to the nature of the class i.e. to provide a tightly controlled class where high technology solutions are commonplace. It is probably impossible to justify limiting the use of materials as qualitative tests on these are impractical or prohibitively expensive.

January 1994

International 10 Rater Class

1 Introduction

1.1 Origins

1.1.1 The Length and Sail Area Rule was introduced by the Yacht Racing Association (national authority in the UK at the time) in 1887. The principle of multiplying the waterline length of the boat by its sail area was devised by Dixon Kemp and for the first time the potential propulsive power of the boat was included in its rating. However by the mid 1890's it was realised that the rating rule was responsible for producing boats which were not suitable for living on board and the Linear Rating Rule was soon devised as a replacement.

1.1.2 By that time the model class of Ten Raters was well established and, as the problems associated with full size yachts built to the rule were of no consequence to the model owners, the class retained its strength even when the full size class declined in popularity.

1.1.3 The original class rules did not require the actual sail area to be measured but rated the sail area based on the major dimensions only. Waterline length was already recognised as a limiting factor in speed potential when the rule was devised as a result of the early work by William Froude but nevertheless all the early designs, both full size and model had hollows in the stern profile in the region of the waterline ending. Some also had hollows in the bow profile. (see 100 years of the 10 rater Rule, Curved Air Press)

1.1.4 Not until 1969 did it become apparent that all the profile sail area needed to be measured and that mast area should also be included in this figure. By this time no hollows were permitted in the profile of the hull which would shorten the measured waterline length. The factor used in the rating calculation was amended from 6000 to 7500 so that boats would continue to rate at about 10 when their 'true' sail areas were measured.

1.2 Intention of 1994 Rule Revision

1.2.1 By the mid 1980's it became apparent that the existing class rules are weak in several areas. They do not stand up to scrutiny by non-English readers and a good deal of reliance is placed on 'traditional interpretation' of the class rules and the measurement process. The 'intent' of the class rule is relied on frequently and often this is entirely misleading - e.g. the very earliest 10 Raters had hollows in their profiles near the waterline ending!

1.2.2 The answers to the questions posed to the international group of 10 Rater cognoscenti who contributed to the 1994 rule revision indicated that it was felt certain new restrictions should be introduced. These include a prohibition on movable appendages and appendages joining the hull off the centreline. If adopted this would have the effect of prohibiting hydrofoil-borne machines which is considered un-desirable. This has the undesirable side effect of prohibiting much of

what is currently permitted but until such time as it becomes possible to determine when a 'lee-board' or 'bilgeboard' (current terminology) becomes a buoyant outrigger (and the boat becomes a multihull) this seems a precaution which is justified especially as it appears there are no boats using such devices.

1.2.3 Specifically the changes are to:

i) use IYRU standard format and terms
Reason a) to enable IYRU standard measurers to measure yachts
b) to introduce a common format to all rules

ii) prescribe a system where the measurer has little discretion over procedure
Reason a) to improve the accuracy and repeatability of the sail area measurement process

iii) remove 'loophole' in sail area measurement
Reason a) to promote uniformity and enable a true choice of sail plan

iv) improve quality of wording
Reason a) to aid non-native English readers
b) to remove reliance on 'intent' for understanding the meaning

v) remove existing grey areas e.g. all hulls have hollows in the profile caused by appendages
Reason a) to remove or minimise reliance on interpretation

vi) prohibit tunnel hulls, lee boards, bilgeboards and hyrofoil-borne machines
Reason a) consistent with the class remaining a monohull keel boat

vii) deal precisely with 'hollows' in the surface of the hull
Reason a) to improve consistency and standard of measurement

viii) incorporate recent interpretations
Reason a) to locate all relevant material together

ix) prohibit ballast denser than lead
Reason a) to limit cost

x) remove unnecessary material e.g. what is permitted
Reason a) for simplicity

xi) introduce M/1M format sail identification marks
Reason a) to improve yacht recognition during racing

1.2.4 It is intended now that end plates shall be included in the total sail area measurement although it is doubtful that this was previously intended.(they contribute little to the profile area).

2 Current Nature of the Class

2.1 General

2.1.1 Development class with certain absolute limits.

2.1.2 The rating formula is the simplest one in an international model class. It permits a wide range of hull shapes and rig choice. The rating rule has no parallel in the full

size classes.

2.2 Hull

Hull shape is totally unrestricted except that the profile may not be hollowed near the waterline endings.

2.3 Rig/Sails

The rig may be of any type. Sails may be of any construction method. The 'total' sail area, including spars etc, is measured.

2.4 Materials

2.4.1 Materials are un-restricted and yachts may be very expensive. There are no restrictions on the number of spars/sails and boats may typically have five alternative rigs. The need to save weight in construction is paramount if top performance is aimed for.

2.4.2 The material and design technology in the class is similar to that in the other development classes.

U = unrestricted development, R = restricted development, O = one design.

Item	Materials	Size	Design
Sails	U	R	U
Spars	U	U	U
Rigging	U	-	U
Hull	U	R	U
RC	U	-	-
Appendages	U	U	R
Ballast	O	U	U
General	U	U/R	U

2.5 Sailing Characteristics

Due to their physical attributes the boats are usually capable of sailing well in exposed waters. Their high length/displacement and stability/sail area ratios means that down wind speed in high winds is exceptional.

2.6 Other

This class has a reputation for being THE development class. This is perhaps because of the very few restrictions imposed on the normal limiting factors e.g. hull length, draft, displacement, mast height, maximum sail area. In practice the existing boats appear to be quite close in format and dimensions and the reputation may be

undeserved.

The class appeals to those with an interest in extracting improved performance by more appropriate choice of hull size and proportion and detail design and also to those with an interest in superior construction. This class alone provides the opportunity to experiment with radical rig designs. Increases in the cost of the best materials and construction techniques will be reflected in increased cost associated with this class and possibly resultant reduced numbers.

3 Policy

3.1 The proposed prohibitions on movable appendages and appendages off the centreline are a simple means of prohibiting hydrofoil craft and multihulls but which have the side effect of prohibiting genuine centre-boards and bilgeboards. It is possible that designers will find a means of tuning this aspect of the class rules to give more freedom in the future without permitting undesirable development. This should be welcomed if the class is to live up to its reputation as a development class.

3.2 The rating rule measures two parameters only; sail area and waterline length. The 'sail area' should therefore include anything which provides propulsive force and this will include fittings if they are suitably shaped i.e faired into spars. Likewise end plates, even with no visible profile area, should also be included. Rule amendments may be necessary in future to cope with currently unforeseen means of gaining additional sail area. Any rig which provides significantly more propulsive force for its area than others will tend to become the norm. For example it is possible that a propeller (windmill) device can provide more forward drive for the area of the foils than a normal rig (drive is related to the swept area of the propeller). However, as a development class any means NOT prohibited by the class rules or not rated 'fairly' would remain viable until the rules were amended. It would be up to the owners to decide whether such a rig should be handicapped or prohibited to enable true choice of rig to be exercised.

January 1994

International 'A' Class

1 Introduction

1.1 Origins

1.1.1 In 1922 the proprietors of the British magazine 'Yachting Monthly' offered a Challenge Cup for international competition with the object of encouraging the use of sailing models as a means of testing full scale design. The rating rule under which the yachts were to be built to race for the trophy was devised by Major Malden Heckstall-Smith, the editor of 'Yachting Monthly' at that time.

1.1.2 The class was originally known as the 'Yachting Monthly Six Metre' because the rule was intended to produce yachts similar to the International Six Metre Class at a 1:6 scale. The mainsail and foretriangle height and batten lengths were originally directly scaled from that rule. However the basic rating formula is similar to that used in the International Five Point Five Metre Class. The rating rule as a whole has very little in common with the 5.5 and 6 Metre classes.

1.1.3 The class was adopted by the Model Yachting Association (national authority for the sport in England, Wales and Northern Ireland at that time) and by the International Model Yacht Racing Union and was later re-named the International A Class.

1.2 Intention of 1994 Rule Revision

1.2.1 Specifically the changes are intended to:

i) use IYRU standard format and terms
   Reason a) to enable IYRU standard measurers to measure yachts
   b) to introduce a common format to all rules

ii) add maximum cross widths
   Reason a) to restrict unlimited gain of unmeasured sail area

iii) improve quality of wording
   Reason a) to aid non-native English readers
   b) to remove reliance on 'intent' for understanding the meaning

iv) remove existing grey areas e.g. extent of concave sheerline
   Reason a) to improve consistency of measurement

v) incorporate recent interpretations
   Reason a) to locate all relevant material together

vi) remove unrealistic measurement requirements e.g. weight to 0.001 kg
   Reason a) to limit cost
   b) to facilitate a common standard of measurement

vii) prohibit the 'swing rig', rotating masts, gaff sails, ballast denser than lead
   Reason a) to accord with wishes of ICA members

viii) remove undefined terms e.g. bilge-boards

Reason a) to minimise need for interpretations
b) for simplicity

ix) introduce M/1M format sail identification marks
Reason a) to improve yacht recognition during racing

x) deal precisely with 'hollows' near the forward waterline ending
Reason a) to accord with wishes of ICA members

xi) remove some existing scope for gaining un-measured sail area
Reason a) to promote uniformity and enable real choice of rig type
b) to limit cost

1.2.2 It has not been intended to return the rules to some earlier 'intent'. This would probably be unrealistic as many yachts which gained certificates in the last two decades may not have done so under earlier versions of the rules. In any case it is doubtful whether anyone can determine the intent of the originator.

2 Current Nature of the Class

2.1 General

2.1.1 Development class with certain absolute limits.

2.1.2 The rating formula is the only 'complex' one in an international model class. It permits a wide range of hull sizes to compete on relatively equal terms.

2.2 Hull

Hull shape is restricted by the inclusion of penalties in various forms whereas hull size and speed potential is limited by trading off the speed enhancing factors against measured sail area.

2.3 Rig/Sails

The rig in limited to one mainsail, one foresail.and one spinnaker. Certain sail construction details are tightly restricted.

2.4 Materials

Materials are generally un-restricted but ultra high cost to competitors in this class has been avoided by several features of the class rules e.g. limit to one mast and main boom, transverse stability of boats generally means few alternative smaller sails are required, high displacement/length ratio discourages super lightweight hull construction, independence of hull design from construction weight leads to long competitive life for successful designs.

U = unrestricted development, R = restricted development, O = one design

Item	Materials	Size	Design
Sails	U	R	R
Spars	U	R	U
Rigging	U	-	U
Hull	U	R	R
RC	U	-	-
Appendages	U	R	R
Ballast	O	R	U
General	U	R	U/R

2.5 Sailing Characteristics

Due to their physical attributes the boats are capable of sailing well in exposed waters.

2.6 Other

The class appeals to those with an interest in extracting improved performance by more appropriate choice of hull size and proportion and detail design rather than those with an interest in superior construction. It is assumed that greater competition in the class will cause a greater emphasis on this aspect in the future.

2.7 The Future

2.7.1 The class has traditionally relied on owner/builders but with a growing number of commercially available hulls the class has the opportunity to grow further.

2.7.2 Development in this class may see exotic building materials for hulls replacing the traditional wood and glass fibre of the current fleets.

3 Policy

3.1 The large size and complex rating method may restrict this class from being sailed in more countries. Those who sail the boats may be long time devotees who choose this class because of its longevity, low long term cost, low maximum relative speed. Thus these attributes should be retained.

3.2 The present lack of restriction on construction materials may impinge on the ability of the class to offer the desirable attributes mentioned above. If this occurs it might be necessary to amend the class rules to preserve its interest to those who currently sail the class.

January 1995
Previous issue: January 1994