

Comments on IOMICA AGM 2019 Agenda/Proposals

Agenda Item 6.1

Proposal from CAN. Proposed change to class rule to clarify intent of CR C.7.4

The class rules currently require:

- 1) the distance from the lower point to the deck limit mark to be in the range 60 to 100 mm and
- 2) at an event that height distance may not be varied by more than + or – 5 mm.

It is proposed to strike out the second requirement. The reasons given are that the rule is ambiguous and that compliance is seldom checked.

Comment

Interestingly it is stated by the proposer that when the second requirement is removed:

This allows each of the three approved rigs to be set to anywhere within the allowed boundaries and then they must maintain that dimension throughout the event for which they were presented.

On the contrary. If the second requirement is removed there will be freedom to raise or lower the lower limit mark anywhere in the 60 – 100 mm range. How would an equipment inspector at an event know that he should measure and record those heights if the rule is removed?

Reason for the existing rule

It is claimed the proposed change clarifies the intent of the class rule. However, it does not do so, nor is the reason for having that rule seemingly understood.

The reason for restriction 2) is to stop each rig being raised in light airs to take advantage of faster wind at greater height before needing to change up and/or lowered in a breeze to reduce the heeling moment as much as possible before needing to change down.

Without this restriction it is reasonable to expect that sailors will develop the means to make these adjustments to maximise their performance. Competitors at the recent GBR IOM national championship sailed entirely in light airs may have noticed that the two CRO sailors had raised their headsails some 40-50 mm above the foredeck, almost certainly to take advantage of higher wind speed at the greater height. The current rule is consistent with many other class rules that are designed to equalise performance and restrain complexity and cost.

The reason 2) is not expressed as a rule prohibiting the lower point to be raised or lowered at all (i.e. no tolerance) is so that masts with a mast jack will remain compliant when the rig tension is adjusted.

If the existing rule is ambiguous then it should be re-written in a way that renders it un-ambiguous. It is irrelevant that this is seldom checked at events – on most boats it would be difficult to raise or lower the rig significantly anyway and there are other more important checks that equipment inspectors will want to make first.

I find no ambiguity here. As with most class rules the clauses are separate requirements and not alternatives - there is no 'either/or' statement. The sailor has to ensure his lower limit mark is between 60 and 100 mm from the deck. And he has to ensure he does not raise or lower the rig by more than 5 mm. He remains subject to the first requirement because the first requirement is not cancelled or over-ridden by the second.

Suggest

Vote against this proposal.

Make an amendment to the proposal to remove any ambiguity if one can be found.

Use the Q&A section on the IOMICA website to assist with understanding this issue if no rule change can be found to improve the understanding.

Agenda Item 7

Appendix B

7.1. Change wording within Class Championship Rules 4.2 to allow multiple Continental Championships biennially in the year there is no World Championship. Proposed by IOMICA Chairman.

This is a single proposal and we may vote only for or against the whole package. This is unfortunate because there are four basic components to the proposal which are not interdependent. If you want to vote for one or more and against one or more you will have to choose whether to have vote for all or reject all.

It may be better to **vote against** the proposal and ask the IOMICA to present the proposal as individual proposals. If all IOMICA member NCAs do this a better outcome should be achieved.

Briefly – Currently it is felt there are some snags

- 1 One continental championship only is permitted in years when a world championship does not take place.
- 2 Winners of those championships do not get an entry place to the next world championship
- 3 There may be difficulties in hosting continental championships.
- 4 Reverse the voted GBR Motion from the 2018 IOMICA AGM to allow more places for NCA's that are not on the continent of their own continental championships.

Briefly – it is proposed to resolve the above issues as follows

- 1 Permit each and every continent to have a continental championship in the years when a world championship does not take place.
- 2 Grant the winner of each continental championship a place at the next world championship.
- 3 Negotiate with IRSA to be able to: approve applications for world and continental events alone instead of by IRSA, reduce international jury requirement from five to three members to reduce cost, approve the race committee, technical committee, race management and social events alone instead of by IRSA.
- 4 Revert back to the CCR for places at continental championships allowing NCA's not from that continent places in stage 1 & Stage 2.

Comment

The proposal is basically sound and builds on the GBR proposal to the last IOMICA AGM. Some of the details of how the proposal is implemented are a little weird.

- 1 Eminently sensible. Hard to see why it was not like this from the beginning.
- 2 It will help increase the enthusiasm for hosting continental championships, increase the prestige of winning, and open up more routes to get places at world championships.

Reservations about 2

For example, the details of changes to provide for a route for winners or continental championships to a place at the next world championship are not straightforward. No place is granted at the next world championship for an African continental championship winner – why does the African winner not get a place? There are three places granted to sailors at the European championship – top of country X, top of country Y, top and country Z where X, Y and Z are the top countries at the EC. Why three for Europe? Is this continent somehow better, more privileged or more in need than the others. Why not the top three sailors? If countries X and Y dominated the European championship, the top sailor from country Z who finished 8th would get a place at the next worlds whereas the sailor from X who placed second to another sailor from X would not.

- 3 It would seem to make sense for IOMICA to be able to approve its own class events. However, it may be that while IOMICA affiliates to IRSA, and not directly to WS, that IOMICA still has to rely on IRSA to approve its events.

Reservations about 3

It is World Sailing that requires there to be five members of an international jury and without an international jury there may not be a world championship. I am not certain if this 'rule' also applies to Continental Championships but I assume so. Any discussion with IRSA is not likely to make any headway on this issue unless the standards for all world championships, or for all rc world championship, were to be lowered. Jury members can be found at very low cost IF the organising committee books them at an early stage. Often the OA leaves it far too late to find the jury – it should be one of the tasks that is done ahead of the event application itself. Are lower standards for our events what we should be seeking?

4 Looks to revert the GBR motion from the 2018 AGM and revert back to allowing more places at continental championships to nations outside of that continent in both stages 1 & 2.

Non continental NCA entries going in at stage 3 and 4 is the right thing to do as it maintains the priority for NCA's at their own high demand continental championships but allows smaller continental championships to be supplemented by non continental entries in stages 3 & 4 when their continent has exhausted entries.

Suggest

- 1 - Vote for this section.
- 2 – Vote for this section with reservations.
- 3 – Vote for this section with reservations.
- 4 - Vote against this section.

Graham Bantock

16th October 2019