

Minutes – Executive Committee Meeting International 2.4 mR Class Association



Date: May 13th, 2005
Location: Teleconference from Miami, Florida USA
Time: 0908 (local time)

<u>Participants:</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Danny McCoy	President and Executive Committee Chairman
Thomas Franklin	Secretary
Heiko Kroeger	Executive Committee Member
Rikard Bjurström	Executive Committee Member
Stellan Berlin	Executive Committee Member
Håkan Kellner	Technical Committee Chairman
Serge Jorgensen	IFDS President
Linda Merkle	IFDS Technical Committee Chairperson

Agenda

1. Discussion, revision, and adoption of a new Paralympic Rule
2. Discussion of sending an ICA representative to Kieler Woche to test new Paralympic Rule
3. Discussion of Heiko to arrange with Organizing Committee, of Kieler Woche, for ICA to test new Paralympic Rule
4. 2004 AGM Minutes
5. 2006 World Championships Application from Helsinki, HSK

Minutes

1. Discussion, revision, and adoption of a new Paralympic Rule

Serge Jorgensen explained the problems with the current definition of the Norlin Mk III and the problems it created during the last Paralympic Regatta, in Athens. Serge Jorgensen suggested that the ICA develop some new rules to better define the equipment used for the Paralympic Regatta. Serge Jorgensen could not guarantee the future of the 2.4mR as approved equipment, in the sailing event, past 2008. Serge Jorgensen further explained that there are other boat Classes that can be used that do not present the same measuring problems. A discussion was had explaining the differences between Open Rules versus Closed Rules. Stellan Berlin pointed out the consequences of going One Design. It was pointed out that if the ICA went One Design, we would lose our ability to be a Construction Class and everyone owning "one-offs" would have to sell their boats and buy new boats. A new discussion started to create a Paralympic Rule. Thomas Franklin suggested creating something similar to an Appendix that the Sonar Class currently uses. Thomas Franklin stated that this Appendix could be used for IFDS sanctioned events including the Paralympic Regatta and that "Open Events" would be governed by the regular Class Rules. A new discussion was made to create an Appendix that would define: the hull, keel tip weight, and weight both above and below the freeboard. All agreed that these areas should be addressed in an Appendix. Håkan Kellner will work on a new Appendix. It was decided that templates should be created to help in the measuring process.

2. Discussion of sending an ICA representative to Kieler Woche to test new Paralympic Rule

Thomas Franklin explained that it is important to test early to work out any problems in the measuring process as there are limited venues for testing before the desired deadline created by IFDS, of the 2006 IFDS World Championships. The only other venue to test the new Paralympic Rule would be the 2005 IFDS World Championships, in Denmark, before the 1 August deadline to submit Rule Changes to ISAF. Heiko Kroeger said that he will work to find a German measurer as Håkan Kellner is not available for the event.

3. Discussion of Heiko to arrange with Organizing Committee, of Kieler Woche, for ICA to test new Paralympic Rule

Heiko Kroeger pointed out the limited space, at the Kieler Woche venue, and that it must be shared with other boat Classes. It was decided to wait to see how the Appendix for the Paralympic Rule developed before making any arrangements.

4. 2004 AGM Minutes

There was much discussion about who has the minutes from the 2004 AGM. Danny McCoy said that he has tried to contact Bjørnar Erikstad, by Email, but has had no success. Stellan Berlin said that he is in regular contact with Bjørnar Erikstad and he will work to get the minutes from the AGM.

5. 2006 World Championships Application from Helsinki, HSK

Danny McCoy stated the importance of having an application and a checklist given to the host club to prevent another World Championships like what happened in 2002. Thomas Franklin said that both the application to host and a checklist is available on the ICA website for downloading. Rikard Bjurström said he would contact Helsinki, HSK and have the club send the application to the ICA Secretary.

Meeting ended at 1047 (local time)

Secretary Thomas Franklin

Appendix A: Email Conversations

-----Original Message-----

From: Marie & Håkan Kellner [mailto:mkellner@telia.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 7:04 AM

To: 'Thomas Franklin'

Subject: SV: teleconference

Hello Thomas,

1. I have talked to Clive Evans, and he agrees with me that it probably is needed to have two different class rules, but he will think this over.
2. If we decide to have the one design class rules in the 2.4mR rule, then I think that this appendix must contain amendments to every single paragraph that has been changed. For instance I think section C should be totally rewritten in this appendix.
3. The appendix should be called K, as they are iterated in alphabetical order with the sections.
4. Comments to Rikard: 1. I don't mind what we call the class, but it must be quite clear what the rules concern. That's why I have called it 2.4mR Norlin Mark III. As little as possible have been changed from the 2.4mR Rules, but about "addition to Int 2.4mR CR" see above. If 2.4 ICA administrates the class ISAF will be the owner of the rules. 2. 182kg will be OK for a normal boat, but to make heavier boats or boats that need some extra equipment for disabled sailors competitive a lower weight is proposed. Let's say 180. 4. I have no experience about the difference between Björndahl's and Smith's boats. 5. Today there are boats with very light hulls, which allows for 190kg or more lead. If such a boat becomes a heavy keel then its performance will be improved quite a lot. The keel tip weight is rather easy to check. 6. My intention has been to make a one design rule that gives so equal boats as possible without disqualifying old Norlin Mark III boats. Perhaps it is better to permit two types of rudders and have the measurements of spreaders and amount of shrouds free as well?
5. Comment on Heiko's reply: The hull is defined as a hull constructed in a mould approved by P Norlin or ICA.. To check that the halves are assembled in a proper way there are four templates for checking.
6. I think it is up to IFDS to decide how free the rules shall be. Perhaps the rule about tilting the mast to windward should be altered so the shrouds may nor be adjusted at all for this class?
7. I have found that checking the rudder shape is missing in section C. I have also talked to Peter Norlin and he agrees with these rules.
8. Remember that it will be needed to have two different certificates, one for the 2.4mR rule and one for the one design class
9. I send you enclosed a copy with the differences to the 2.4mR rule highlighted in red.

Best regards

Håkan

-----Original Message-----

From: Rikard Bjurstrom [mailto:rikard.bjurstrom@nebsails.fi]

Sent: Saturday, May 07, 2005 7:18 AM

To: Thomas Franklin

Cc: Danny McCoy(2. 4Canada)

Subject: Class rules

Hi there,

I think Håkan has done a great job and the restrictions added to 2.4 I think almost everything is okay. I would like to change the following:

1. The boat that compete in the Paralympics shall be a 2.4 mR, not a different class called Norlin mk III (the design can be called Norlin mk III). The Paralympic and IFDS class rules should be in addition to the international 2.4 mR class rules.
2. The administrative authority should be the 2.4 ICA and its EC. ISAF shall have nothing to do with these rules, perhaps IFDS.
3. The amount of the ballast could be maximum 182 kg. (then it is nearer the normal 2.4 and most of the boats need no corrector weights at all).
4. Checking the hull against other boats must be defined better. The reference group of boats should consist from boats manufactured by Vene-Björndahl, Michael Smith (I do not know the company name) and Gavia yachts. (If you compare a Michael Smith manufactured boat with a group of Vene-Björndahl boats the Michael Smith manufactured boat will not qualify).
5. Keel tip weight is difficult to measure and if the boat complies with the 2.4 rule it cannot differ very much so it is not needed.
6. Both rudder types used today should be accepted so the shape of the rudder should comply with either of the two templates.

Kippis
Rikard

-----Original Message-----

From: heiko.kroeger@max-jenne.de [mailto:heiko.kroeger@max-jenne.de]

Sent: Monday, May 09, 2005 9:39 AM

To: Thomas Franklin

Subject: Antwort: RE: Antwort: RE: One design class rules [MJ: Virus Checked]

Hi Thomas,

About the paralympic rule:

I've written a lot of comments on the thoughts of Stellan and Hakan. I think they have a big knowledge about the boat and its history. For them it's easy to ask Peter Norlin details about his MK III design.

I don't wanted to write big stories but I'm quite sure that I made a comment on every important fact:

- we need to define hull measurement points
- we need to define the keel-profile and outline
- we need to define the rudder-profile and an outline
- we need to measure the keel-tip-weight
- we need a hull swing-test to check if the bow and stern are too light
- we don't need to test stiffness of the hull because the new divinicell-vinylester boats are very stiff and with legal materials not to improve. If you put in more mats and resin in the keel -area, the tip-weight will be heavier.
- if we want to test the stiffness of the keel-hull area we just need to glue a measurement-tape to the underside of the keel and measure to the small triangle on the side of the hull. Then (the boat has to be dry and in racing condition) the boat should be heated over 45 degrees and the distance can be measured. The distance is a indicator of the stiffness because a soft keel bends more and the distance will grow more than of a stiff boat.

But whatever we will define and try to rule. A creative head and a skilful boat builders hand is always able to build something we can't imagine at the moment.

If we don't have a one design-rule that rules everything we can't get 100% equal boats. By the way - Robert Scheidt has got tons of different mast-parts and sails for his Laser. He has tested them all and before a regatta he decides which equipment fits best to the expected conditions! So a one-design equipment is equal - but some is more equal.

If your eyes are better could it be a good idea to send a short summary of all comments to the whole EC? Then everybody should write a final comment.

Next step could be that Stellan tells Serge about our thoughts so that IFDS can decide about the rules. Before these rules will be fixed by IFDS, the EC should get them for a last comment.

Ciao
Heiko

THE FOLLOWING IS AN EMAIL CONVERSATION BETWEEN ISAF, IFDS, AND THE ICA

-----Original Message-----

From: Clive Evans [mailto:clive@isaf.co.uk]

Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 9:18 AM

To: 'Thomas Franklin'

Cc: 'Linda Merkle(US SAILING)'; 'Danny McCoy(2. 4Canada)'; 'Marie and Håkan Kellner(2. 4Sweden)'; 'Stellan Berlin(2. 4Sweden)'; 'Heiko Kroeger@work'; 'Rikard Bjurström(2. 4Finland)'

Subject: RE: 2.4mR Norlin specification

Dear Thomas,

I don't feel that there is any need for me to get involved in the teleconference. I would simply like to comment that it is the opinion of the ISAF technical department that in order to control a 'one design class' effectively it is necessary to have a set of closed class rules written in conjunction with a building specification.

I look forward to receiving a report on progress made during the teleconference.

Regards,

Clive Evans

Technical Coordinator

-----Original Message-----

From: Thomas Franklin [mailto:tjfran@bellsouth.net]

Sent: 10 May 2005 13:52

To: clive@isaf.co.uk

Cc: Linda Merkle(US SAILING); Danny McCoy(2. 4Canada); Marie and Håkan Kellner(2. 4Sweden); Stellan Berlin(2. 4Sweden); Heiko Kroeger@work; Rikard Bjurström(2. 4Finland)

Subject: RE: 2.4mR Norlin specification

Dear Clive,

We spoke via Email a few days ago regarding the feasibility of where to place this "Paralympic Rule" that we are in the process of defining. I have also spoken with Håkan Kellner who chairs our Technical Committee. This is where we currently stand. I have worked closely with the Technical Committee, with input from our Executive Committee, to develop a proposal for defining the 2.4mR for the purpose of IFDS sanctioned events. Please find attached a file of said document. The red portion of this document reflects ideas to define the 2.4mR.

Additionally, we are having a teleconference Friday, 13 May 2005 to discuss, revise and adopt a specification. This event will occur on or about 0900 (Miami time). I believe you are five (5) hours ahead. Present, at this teleconference will be the President and the Secretary of the International 2.4mR Class Association, its' Executive Committee, its' Technical Committee Chairman, the President of IFDS and the Chairperson of the IFDS Technical Committee.

The plan is as follows: From this teleconference, we will adopted a tentative specification where it will be tested at Kieler Woche 2005. A report will be submitted by the person administering the test as well as an independent representative of our Class Association that observes the test. The contents of these reports will be used

to ascertain whether refinement to the initial definition is required. If this proves to be the case, I will work with the Technical Committee Chairman of our Class Association to make the necessary changes on paper in order to comply with ISAF's requirements for submission. We will include this with our submission of 2006 Amendments to our Class Rules. Finally, we will test the "Paralympic Rule" again in Denmark during the 2005 IFDS World Championships.

This early work and two (2) testing venues should work out most if not all of the problems of the initial definition while simultaneously satisfying the needs of IFDS.

If you wish to be part of the teleconference, please submit me a telephone number where you can be reached at the aforementioned date and time. If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to ask.

Sincerely,
Thomas Franklin
Secretary—International 2.4mR Class Association

-----Original Message-----

From: LinSail@aol.com [mailto:LinSail@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 8:16 AM
To: clive@isaf.co.uk
Cc: tjfran@bellsouth.net
Subject: Re: 2.4mR Norlin specification

Dear Clive: Good to hear from you; there is a good bit of discussion going on which will culminate with a phone conference on this Friday. I am forwarding the information about that to you. My primary contact has been through Tom Franklin; his email is included as well. He will want to keep you in the information loop as well.

Linda Merkle
IFDS Technical Committee Chairman

-----Original Message-----

From: Clive Evans [mailto:clive@isaf.co.uk]
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2005 9:52 AM
To: Linda Merkle
Subject: 2.4mR Norlin specification

Dear Linda,

My name is Clive Evans, technical coordinator at ISAF. I am responsible for the 2.4mR class at the ISAF Secretariat.

I believe that the IFDS delegated your committee the task of producing a specification for the class to enable more accurate measurement at IFDS events. I was wondering if I could have a progress update on the document.

Clive Evans
Technical Coordinator