



Model Yachting Association

IOM National Class Association for GBR

IOMICA Annual General Meeting 2006

NCA for GBR Voting Paper

Notes to be read in conjunction with the Voting Paper

Notes prepared by Richard Rowan on 20/08/2006

Use of personal information

Personal information given in the voting paper will be retained in the NCA for GBR and/or MYA membership databases. The information will be used only for the purposes of administering the NCA for GBR Class Association and/or the Model Yachting Association. At no time will any of the personal information be released to anyone other than officials of the NCA for GBR or MYA who have a requirement for such information.

Notes concerning the voting process

- (1) Only members of the NCA for GBR who are classed as either Certificated or Registered members may vote. If you wish to know what your current status is, then please send an email to me at iom-nca-sec@mya-uk.org.uk
- (2) This year there are 19 resolutions to vote on. The first 5 resolutions in the voting paper are concerned with changes to how boats, rigs and sails may be constructed. The next 3 are concerned with the running of Class Championships. The last 11 are concerned with the fine print within the class rules and how they relate to the Racing Rules of Sailing (RRS) and the Equipment Rules of Sailing (ERS). In particular, resolution 21 relates to the use of Texalium in hull mouldings. Note that resolution numbers 2.5, 2.10 and 2.19 are not being used.
- (3) Some of the resolutions may be voted on only by certificated members, other resolutions may be voted on by both certificated and registered members. If you are not sure of your exact status, then simply vote on all those resolutions on which you wish to have an influence and I will sort it out when I am tallying up the votes.
- (4) You don't have to vote on all the resolutions if you don't wish to. If you don't wish to vote on an individual resolution, then leave all 3 choice boxes empty. But please note that there is an Abstain choice. Please use this if you feel that you can't decide which way to vote for whatever reason.
- (5) Votes may be submitted by post or by email. In all cases, I would ask for the voting paper to be used.

Voting by Post : If you vote by post, then please print a copy of the voting form, complete it as appropriate and post it back to me. Please remember to return both sides of the paper.

Voting by Email : If you vote by email, then please download the Word document from the special AGM 2006 Voting arrangements web page on the NCA for GBR web site http://www.mya-uk.org.uk/iom-nca-gbr/2006/AGM/Voting_arrangements.htm type in the necessary information and email the doc file back to me as an attachment. Please make sure that you identify yourself clearly in the body of the email as I will be treating unclear messages as suspicious and may not open any accompanying attachments. Send to the email to iom-vote-2006@mya-uk.org.uk – you will receive an auto-response once the email reaches the MYA internet email server.

Notes relating to individual resolutions

These notes have been prepared from information supplied by IOMICA.

Resolution	Commentary
2.1	<p>Proposal: NCA for FRA</p> <p>Concerning sails building: Add G.3.1 (b)(14) Where the body of the sail consists of one part, slit(s) into the leech may be use to shape the sail. Add G.4.1 (b)(11) Where the body of the sail consists of one part, slit(s) into the leech may be use to shape the sail.</p> <p>Discussion: It's a very simple method to build sails, low cost, and "home made" and in the philosophy of the class. To increase number of IOM skippers, class need to propose low cost equipments.</p>
2.2	<p>Proposal: NCA for FRA</p> <p>Adding of lower shrouds on IOM. Change in class rules : F3.3b : add 14) lower shrouds fitting(s) F3.4 add : Height of lower shrouds fitting above deck level : min = 0 max = height of spreaders F5.2b : add 2) A pair of lower shrouds may be added.</p> <p>Discussion: Lower shrouds will increase the mast behaviour, so the importance of getting a high performance mast will be reduced. A boat with a low quality alloy could be as quick as a boat with a "top" mast. The lower shrouds shall be optional. They should be fixed on the same fitting on the hull than the current shrouds to avoid any modification of hulls. They are different of checkstays which control the forward movement of the lower part of the mast. These shrouds will improve lateral control of the mast.</p>
2.3	<p>Proposal: IOMICA Tech Sub-committee</p> <p>Change C 7.7(c) From: "(c) A headsail boom topping lift restraint line attached to, or passing around, the topping lift may be attached to and/or passed around any or all of the following: topping lift; headsail; headsail halyard; headsail stay." To: "(c) A headsail boom topping lift restraint line attached to, or passing around, the topping lift may be attached to and/or passed around any or all of the following: topping lift; headsail; headsail halyard; headsail stay; headsail boom." Discussion:</p>

	<p>Interpretation 2004-IOM-5 found that a rubber band used as a topping lift restraint line cannot be attached to the topping lift and then hooked around the boom. The proposed rule change would allow this simple and cheap use of a rubber band as a topping lift restraint line.</p>
2.4	<p>Proposal: NCA for USA Subject: Added Weights Rule C.7.3(a) Change to: “Weights may be positioned in or on a mast spar. If the weight is to be internal, it shall be installed at the lowest point possible.” Discussion: With a deck-stepped mast, you only have approximately 60 mm to insert lead weight internally. The #3 rig can require as much as 140 grams of corrector weight. Only about 60 grams of this will fit inside, and below the lower band. Eliminating this part of the rule would not enhance the performance capabilities of the boat. The only benefit gained would be a cleaner and simpler way to facilitate the installation of the weight and meet the minimum weight requirement while using the “c” rig on a deck-stepped boat.</p>
2.5	No resolution
2.6	<p>Proposal: NCA for USA Subject: Mainsail Construction Rule G.3 Add to G.3(a)(*): The luff must be attached to the mast. Add to G.3(b)(*): With the exception of a double luff, any method of attachment is allowed. Remove from G.3(b): Items 4,5,6,7,8. G.3.3 - Dimensions: Remove luff fitting dimension. Discussion: The current rule allows for a full length wire and an unlimited amount of wires 10mm or less. It seems senseless to disallow anything in-between.</p>
2.7	<p>Proposal: NCA for USA Class Championship Regulations Subject: Championships 4.2(i) Change “...may hold a Continental Championship” to “...may hold Continental Championships...” Discussion: The current wording suggests that only one Continental Championship is allowed biennially.</p>
2.8	<p>Proposal: NCA for USA Class Championship Regulations Subject: Obligations of the Organising Authority 6.4 Change entire paragraph to read: “For World and Continental Championships, the organizing authority shall submit their intended method of on the water rule enforcement before ICA approval of said regatta. Discussion: While International Juries have proven to be effective, they have also proven to be just as ineffective. They are also extremely costly. While this proposal may not be clear enough as submitted, this topic surely needs to be addressed.</p>

2.9	<p>Proposal: Class Championship Regulations Subject: Entries 8.61(ii) Add “and one place to each Member NCA.” 8.7.2 Remove “to a maximum of 12”.</p> <p>Discussion: This will guarantee that each Member NCA can send at least one skipper to represent their NCA. We are an International Class, and each NCA should be allowed to enter at least one boat to ensure a true international event. Bear in mind, although Europe is the only Continent to have held a Continental Championship regatta, this is expected to change. The Continental Regulations should be fair and unbiased to support a championship at any continent. The current regulation would not be sufficient for any Continental regatta other than the European Regatta.</p>	NCA for USA
2.10	No resolution	

Commentary concerning resolutions 2.11 to 2.22

Comentary written by Andy Stevenson (IOMICA Secretary) & Roy Langbord (IOMICA Vice Chairman Technical)

With the changes to RRS & ERS for 2005 - 2008 the IOM Class rules now must be heavily modified by individual event SSI to retain the original intention of the class. In order to rectify this problem a series of Class Rule modifications are being proposed by the current IOM Class Exec. Many similar changes were put forward at the Mooloolaba AGM and are being proposed again now due to our belief that many of these rule changes were rejected for procedural and other issues unrelated to their substance. Please note that the class will now be entitled to discuss, modify and vote on each of these proposed changes individually.

In addition, after extensive discussion, the IOM Class Exec is also proposing below a new rule change dealing with the issue of previously constructed texalium boats. Basically, this proposed rules provides for a special, one time only exemption that will make virtually all texalium boats legal for all purposes. However, it does not make any future use of this material legal in the IOM Class

Resolutions 2.11 to 2.22 are all proposed by the IOMICA Exec Committee

Resolution	Commentary
2.11	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 1: No Water Ballast Add to C.4: C.4.4 WATER Water shall not be used to trim the boat and it may be removed at any time.</p>
2.12	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 2: Spread Spectrum Technology Comment: With the advent of the spread spectrum radio systems, frequency information is being transmitted from the boat. The above change clearly permits the use of such radio systems. Proposal: Change C.5.3 From: C.5.3 REMOTE CONTROL EQUIPMENT (a) The rudder control unit shall control the rudder only.</p>

	<p>(b) The sheet control unit shall control the mainsail sheet and headsail sheet only.</p> <p>(c) Except for control unit positioning information, no radio transmissions from the boat shall be made.</p> <p>To:</p> <p>C.5.3 REMOTE CONTROL EQUIPMENT</p> <p>(a) The rudder control unit shall control the rudder only.</p> <p>(b) The sheet control unit shall control the mainsail sheet and headsail sheet only.</p> <p>(c) Except for control unit positioning and radio link information, no radio transmissions from the boat shall be made.</p>
2.13	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 3: Radio Gear Positioning</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Add to C.5.3:</p> <p>(d) Remote control and/or related equipment if temporarily removed and/or replaced:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) shall be refitted in the same position (2) shall be replaced by equipment of similar weight.
2.14	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 4: Fixed Keels</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Change C.6.3 From:</p> <p>USE</p> <p>(a) The keel shall not move or rotate relative to the hull, except by deformation under load.</p> <p>(b) The hull appendages shall not project outboard of the hull.</p> <p>To:</p> <p>USE</p> <p>(a) The keel shall not move or rotate relative to the hull, except by deformation under load.</p> <p>(b) The hull appendages shall not project outboard of the hull.</p> <p>(c) If removed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The keel shall be refitted in the same attitude and position in the hull. (2) Parts of the keel shall be refitted in the same attitude and position relative to the keel. (3) The rudder shall be refitted in the same attitude and position relative to the hull.
2.15	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 5: Wind Vanes</p> <p>Comment: The position of a wind vane should be unrestricted.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Change C.7.4 (b) USE from:</p> <p>The spar stepping position is optional.</p> <p>To:</p> <p>The spar stepping position and wind indicator position are optional.</p>
2.16	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 6: Sail Identification</p> <p>Comment: Due to changes in the RRS regarding the size and placement of sail identification, many already measured sails could be ruled out of compliance. To fix this problem, identification on sails should be permitted under a “grand-fathering” arrangement.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Change C.8.3 IDENTIFICATION From:</p> <p>Identification shall comply with the RRS.</p> <p>To:</p>

	Identification shall comply with the RRS. Sails certified before 1 st January 2005 shall comply with the sail identification rules in force at that time or at the time of initial certification.
2.17	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 7: Spreader Definition, Typo</p> <p>Comment: The term spreader is actually printed in “normal” print not in bold in F.3.3(b)(5) describing spreader as an optional fitting of mast. It should be printed in bold and used with the ERS meaning.</p> <p>Proposal: Change F.3.3(b)(5) from: Pair of spreaders and their fittings(s) and/or openings(s). To: Pair of spreaders and their fittings(s) and/or openings(s).</p>
2.18	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 8: Jib Swivel, Typo</p> <p>Comment: The omission of the "/or" after "Swivel and" in class rule F.4.4(a)(3) has been ruled as a typographical error in Edition 2003 v.2</p> <p>Proposal: Change F.4.4(a)(3) from: Swivel and its fitting(s). To: Swivel and/or its fitting(s).</p>
2.19	No resolution
2.20	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 9: Running Rigging Definition, Typo</p> <p>Comment: In F.6 the word rigging does not appear in that section in bold.</p> <p>Proposal: Change F.6.1 from: Materials of running rigging are unrestricted. To: Materials of running rigging are unrestricted.</p>
2.21	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 10: Texalium, Rule D.2.1(d)</p> <p>Comment: This rule change is designed to permit the use of hulls containing texalium that were measured prior to September 2004.</p> <p>Proposal: Add to rule D.2.1: D.2.1(d)(3): Notwithstanding anything otherwise contained herein, for hulls with a date of initial fundamental measurement prior to September 1, 2004, it is permissible to use the material “Texalium” in the hull molding.</p>

Commentary concerning resolution 2.22 - IOMICA Exec proposals for updated ERS

PROPOSED IOM CLASS RULE CHANGES TO COMPLY WITH THE 2005-2008 EQUIPMENT RULES OF SAILING

The Equipment Rules of Sailing (“ERS”) have been updated for 2005-2008. A few of these changes have unintentionally affected the International One Meter (“IOM”) Class Rules (“CR”) particularly those of our rules that refer directly to the ERS. Therefore in order to maintain the status quo, the following revisions of the CR are being proposed by the Exec. Please note that the intention of these revisions is not to change the nature or purpose of any current IOM Class Rule, on the contrary it is to

maintain our CR as presently understood.

Resolution 22 covers AGM Exec Proposals 16 to 19 as set out below

Resolution	Commentary
2.22	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 16: IOM CR Rule A.5.1 Comment: To be clear on which version of the ERS applies. Proposal: (IOM CR change suggestion) Change A.5.1 from: These class rules shall be read in conjunction with the ERS. To: These class rules shall be read in conjunction with the 2005-2008 ERS</p>
	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 17: Definition of Fundamental Measurement Comment: The term “Fundamental Measurement” no longer means compliance with class rules. The ERS definition has been changed to mean, basically, the method used to measure. Compliance with class rules is now covered by a new rule Certification Control [C.4.2]. Both the terms Certify [C.5.2] and Certificate [C.5.3] have been updated to reflect this by replacing “fundamental measurement” with “certification control”. In order to bring the IOM CR back into compliance it is suggested that wherever used in the CR the term “fundamental measurement” be replaced with “certification control” Proposal: (IOM CR change suggestion) A.13.1 (d), A.14.1, A.14.1(b), A.14.2(a), A.14.2(b), Part II, C.6.1, D.1.1, G.2.1, G.2.2 “fundamental measurement” replaced with “certification control”.</p>
	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 18: Definition of Equipment Limitation Mark Comment: There is no definition for Equipment Limitation Mark in the ERS. We believe that the marks referred to in the CR are stamps or other marks placed by a race committee during an event. Proposal: (IOM CR change suggestion) That the term Event Limitation Mark replace the term “equipment limitation mark” in CR C.6.2, C.7.1 and C.8.2.</p>
	<p>AGM Exec Proposal 19: Definition of Lower Limit Point Comment: There is no ERS definition for the term “Lower Limit Point”. This rule should simply refer to the term Lower Point [F.5.4]. Proposal: (IOM CR change suggestion) The term Lower Limit Point in CR C.7.4 (a) is replaced with the term Lower Point.</p>