

Minutes – Executive Committee Meeting International 2.4 mR Class Association



Date: March 17th, 2005
Location: Teleconference from Miami, Florida USA
Time: 0945 (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

Agenda

1. Venue selection for 2006 World Championships
2. Discussion, revision, and adoption of a new ICA Constitution
3. Discussion, revision, and adoption of an ICA Licensing Agreement
4. Discussion, revision, and adoption of the 2006 Amendments to Class Rules

Minutes

1. Venue selection for 2006 World Championships

Danny McCoy stated the need to make a decision now because the application to host a World Championship must be received by ISAF no later than 1 August of each year. Stellan Berlin stated that the AGM should decide. Stellan Berlin asked if other applications have been received. Danny McCoy said no applications have been received, by the ICA, up to the date of this meeting. Danny McCoy stated that the 2004 AGM gave the decision making power to the Executive Committee to decide the venue location for the 2006 World Championships. Rikard Bjurström said that these decisions should be made two years in advance. Rikard Bjurström said if Helsinki, HSK does not receive word soon, the Yacht Club will host another World Championship for 2006. A vote was called for to accept Helsinki, HSK as the venue for the 2006 World Championships. The vote was passed unanimously.

2. Discussion, revision, and adoption of a new ICA Constitution

Danny McCoy explained that 10 other ISAF Class Constitutions were used to incorporate ideas into a draft of a new Class Constitution. It was explained that the current Constitution was very vague and not up to current standards comparable to other ISAF Class Constitutions. Stellan Berlin said that a good job was done in creating the new draft. Stellan Berlin also said that it is a great start and we finally have a Constitution that looks OK. Rikard Bjurström said that the new draft is a good one, but it should be placed on the ICA website and presented at the next AGM. Stellan Berlin agreed. Danny McCoy said that it should be added to the next AGM agenda, but the ICA should have a document ready for a vote at the AGM. Håkan Kellner suggested that we send it to ISAF for review before the ISAF deadline for submission of 1 August. Danny McCoy suggested a timeline for comments to be submitted in order to meet the ISAF deadline. Stellan Berlin said that there is no need to push it through and that the new Constitution should be supported by the Class. The EC decided that the ICA Secretary will send the proposed draft of the new Constitution to all NCA contacts and have it posted on the ICA website. A deadline of 1 June 2005 was set for an Internet vote by Email. All agreed.

3. Discussion, revision, and adoption of an ICA Licensing Agreement

Rikard Bjurström said that the need for an agreement is because there is not a good builder in North America. Rikard Bjurström said that he spoke with Peter Norlin and Peter Norlin said that he can give a license to other builders in North America because Gavia Yachts has not fulfilled their contractual obligations. Danny McCoy said that this has been a problem in the states for several years and that any new builder should be a quality builder to improve the Class and not hurt it. Heiko Kroeger said it is important to have more builders to control the quality and that the ICA should manage and control the design. Stellan Berlin said that it should be understood that this is a Construction Class and that it is up to the designer how the boats should be built. It was brought up that the Finnish Builder has concerns with what Gavia Yachts has done. It was agreed by all that this item be discussed at the AGM.

4. Discussion, revision, and adoption of the 2006 Amendments to Class Rules

Amendment 1:

Håkan Kellner said that the sentence, "*The leech shall form a strait line from the **Aft Head Point** to the intersection with the uppermost batten*" should be deleted as it is not possible according to the ERS. Håkan Kellner stated that it is only necessary to define the upper leech point and the upper width. Stellan Berlin and Rikard Bjurström agreed. Heiko Kroeger asked about the current sails being used with a larger roach and whether these sails would be grandfathered. Håkan Kellner said that when these rules go into effect, ALL sails sail comply with the current Class Rules.

Amendment 2:

Was decided by all that this is not needed.

Amendment 3:

This is not a new rule. It better defines the waterline. This new definition was accepted by all.

Amendment 4:

This is not a new rule. It better defines the waterline. This new definition was accepted by all.

Stellan Berlin brought up the point that these amendments should be voted upon at the AGM. Danny McCoy said that this year's AGM is after the ISAF deadline of 1 August for submissions to amend Class Rules. The EC decided that the ICA Secretary will send the proposed amendments to all NCA contacts and have them posted on the ICA website. Håkan Kellner said that 15 May 2005 should be the deadline for all NCAs to vote. All agreed.

Meeting ended at 1058 (local time)

Secretary Thomas Franklin

Appendix A: Proposed Class Rule Changes For 2006

**2.4mR Class Rules Amendments 2006 (Revised)
submitted by Sweden**

1. Top of Main sail

Due to what happened in Athens concerning the roach in the top I want to propose the following amendments to be inserted:

The **Upper Leech Point** shall be specified by the distance 500mm from the **Head Point**, and the **Upper Width** shall not be more than $0.19 \times E$. If needed the rules shall be completed with: The leech shall form a strait line from the **Aft Head Point** to the intersection with the uppermost batten.

By this amendment we will keep the main sails as they are today. Nobody will probably have to cut their leeches on old sails.

In Sweden, the meaning is that we want the 2.4mR boat to look like a R-yacht in the future and not like an Americas Cup boat. Furthermore, if the roaches are too big in the top, the masts will have to be rebuilt. All this will make the boat more expensive.

What will happen this summer? Can we make some recommendation not to use a sail which will not be permitted next summer?

2. Reinforcements of sails:

Today we have no limitations for reinforcements of sails. Perhaps is there no need for it?

If so I will propose the following dimensions:

Sail	Corner	Primary Reinforcement	Secondary Reinforcement
Mainsail	Head	270 mm	450 mm
	Clew	270 mm	450 mm
	Tack	270 mm	350 mm
Headsail	Head	270 mm	450 mm
	Clew	160 mm	400 mm
	Tack	160 mm	250 mm

Aspects on the dimensions are welcomed.

3. Rule D6.2

Proposed new reading

D.6.2 WATERLINE LENGTH

(a) The waterline length (LWL) shall be measured between the forward "L" mark (See H.4, D.8.2 and D.9.2 (a)) and the aftmost of:

1. the part of the hull at or below the LWL including any fairing strips attached to the hull but excluding the rudder and normal rudder hangings, or
2. The centre of the axis of the rudder stock.

Current reading

D.6.2 WATERLINE LENGTH

(a) The waterline length (LWL) shall be measured between the forward "L" mark (See H.4, D.8.2 and D.9.2 (a)) and aft most of :

1. Where the waterline meets the aft end of the hull, or

2. The centre of the axis of the rudder stock.

Comments: This is more like the 12mR rule, and includes any part of the hull under LWL which is aft of the hull in the LWL plane.

4. Rule D.8.2

New reading

D.8.2 HOLLOWES

- (a) There shall be no hollows in the surface of the hull between the LWL plane and the **sheerline** except at the stern within the buttock lines 100mm from the yachts centreline and below L1.

Should there be any hollows or notches in the stem of the yacht when measuring from points below the LWL plane, they shall be bridged across by a straight line from points on the stem within a vertical distance of 30mm above and below the LWL plane for the purpose of rating.

Current reading

D.8.2 HOLLOWES

- (a) There shall be no hollows in the surface of the hull between the LWL plane and the **sheerline** except an area at the stern between the buttock lines 100mm from the yacht centreline and below L1. Should there be any irregular hollows or notches in the stem of the yacht within a vertical distance of 30mm above or below the flotation water line, they shall be bridged across within the limits of said vertical distance. The extent that bridging increases the length for measurements or the waterline length, the increased length shall be used for the purpose of rating or displacement.

Comments: There seems to be a contradiction in the current rule between “there shall be no hollows between the sheerline and the LWL” and “should there be any hollows in the stem within a vertical distance of 30mm above or below LWL”. Change “floatation water line” to LWL as this is used in all other places in the rule. Delete “displacement” as that is included in the rating.

Håkan Kellner
Chairman, Technical Committee

Comments to 2.4mR Class Rules Amendments 2006 submitted by Stellan Berlin

I'm in favor of the limit of the roach suggested. I don't think that the sentence, “The leech shall form a strait line from the **Aft Head Point** to the intersection with the uppermost batten.” is needed.

I'm uncertain if limits on reinforcements are necessary. So far, we have not seen anyone misuse the freedom and I don't understand how this would be done. I think we shall accept the rule if someone can come up with an undesired consequence of the present freedom.

Appendix B: Comments to Licensing Agreement Suggested by Finland

submitted by Stellan Berlin

Meter boats has been developed and built for almost 100 years without any licensing of builders. I have not before heard or understood that this would constitute a problem.

The licensing idea adds administration to the class association. The benefit of the suggestion is unclear to me. The explanation given is more an explanation of why some builder should pay more than others. The idea making money on distributed ISAF plaques is a separate issue and could be brought up if the ICA needs more money. Such a suggestion should therefore be submitted with a motivation for the extra income of the association.

Being a development class it's natural that the regulation is on the boat and not on the builder. There is no building instruction as in a one-design class. Moreover, there is no limit on alterations to the boat as in a one-design class. There is therefore no point of controlling the builders.

The idea would support the present builders and make it more difficult for new to come into business. I don't see any need for restricting competition among builder rather the opposite.

I miss a definition of commercial. How many boats have to be built? What are the restrictions on marketing? If I build 7 boats for me and my friend and make them pay for my costs it is that commercial? Do we have the capacity to control and enforce these rules?

The rule also has to come with a clear set of criteria that a builder should fulfill to be licensed. It's not good enough that we license the ones that a majority of the EC likes. The next EC might like someone else. That would create a mess.

With the above arguments I find that the suggestion should be rejected.

Appendix C: Email Conversations

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

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

Sent: Friday, March 11, 2005 3:42 AM

To: Stellan Berlin; stellan.berlin@euromail.se; Rikard Bjurstrom; Thomas Franklin; djcoy@att.net; Marie & Håkan Kellner; Thomas Franklin

Subject: Antwort: Re: EC Meeting [MJ: Virus Checked]

Dear friends,

I had some conversation with Thomas about the rule changes and I would like to share my thoughts with you:

I think that the "license rule" will bring some money in the wallet of the class but I don't think that anybody has more control over the quality of the boats builded by licensed builders.

What happens if a builder decides to use a different material or a different technique? He doesn't need to ask somebody because it's his decision. The 2.4mR is still a development class. If he does well everything is OK but if not, no license will prevent that.

One possibility that will help to get boats on a high quality level is to open the Norlin MK III license to more builders. The market will decide who will survive.

The situation that we have almost 3 builders on 3 different continents is a dangerous situation. I think I'm not the only one who had some trouble with a builder.

About the mainsail:

In my personal opinion a bigger roach in the top looks very modern but I agree that it should be limited to prevent a gigantic roach which will work for just one regatta.

I would not say that we should prohibit the roach completely. But I also can live with a straight leech.

At the moment any roach is legal until a rulechange prohibits that.

The limitation of the size of the reinforcements is not needed. Bigger ones than the currently used ones make a sail heavier and don't have a big effect on wrinkles. If you look at the North and Faber+Muenker sails you see very small reinforcement areas. I've tried bigger ones without a success. I had the same wrinkles after some days of sailing.

I agree on Stellan's idea to have an extra AGM held over internet. It will help to shorten the meeting at the WC.

Ciao

Heiko

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

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

Sent: Wednesday, March 09, 2005 4:16 AM

To: Thomas Franklin

Hi Thomas,

I think the constiuion is ok.

About the license I agree that this will bring some money in the wallet of the class but I don't think that anybody has control over the quality of the boats builded by licensed builders.

What happens if Tom decides to use a different material or a different technique? He doesn't need to ask somebody because it's his decision. If he does well everything is OK but if not no license will prevent that.

One possibility that will help to get boats on a high quality level is to open the Norlin MK III license to more builders. Then the market will decide who will survive.

The situation that we have almost 3 builders on 3 different continents is a dangerous situation.

The other possibility is to change the class in a one design class where we can decide about every drop of resin and every mat.

Well - let's see what the others think about.

Ciao

Heiko

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, March 08, 2005 11:19 AM

To: Thomas Franklin

Hi Thomas,

I don't understand the "license rule". In my opinion there is no way to check if a builder is able to build the boat. I've see beautiful boats from builders which work in a trashbox and I'm not happy about the quality of Bjorndahl boats at the moment. The only advantage is that the Int. Class Ass. gets some money for each sold boat.

I don't agree that a one off builder should pay more money for his boat because he has to pay the measurer and not the Class Ass.

I've payed the measurer per hour he has spend to measure my boat.

A license should quarantee boats on a higher level.

I think it's more interesting if builders can get the Norlin MK III license easy for a reasonable price.

About the mainsail:

I think a bigger roach in the top looks good but it also should be limited because someone could build a gigantc roach which will work for just one regatta.

I would not say that we should prohibit the roach completely.

One thing is fact: at the moment any roach is legal until a rulechange prohibits it. All old sails have to be grandfathered.

The limitation of size of the reinforcements is not needed. Bigger ones make a sail heavier and don't have a big effect.

The rest seems to be ok.

Ciao

Heiko

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

From: Stellan Berlin [mailto:Stellan.Berlin@euromail.se]

Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2005 7:37 PM

To: Thomas Franklin

Cc: "Marie and Håkan Kellner(2. 4Sweden)"; Danny McCoy(2. 4Canada); Heiko Kroeger@work; "Rikard Bjurström(2. 4Finland)"

Subject: Re: EC Meeting

Dear friends,

I glad that we will have our first meeting!

The time seem to suit me well, except an uncertainty regarding "EST", which I think is a north American time zone. It would be helpful if you could relate that to "UTC".

Attached you will find my comments to the proposed rule changes.

I find the suggested new constitution a very good start. I do find some points that I would like to see altered or added. However, the 9 days of notice that I have had is to short for working it through thoroughly and formulating the thoughts. Moreover, as a representative of the class members I would like to have the time to consult with members having good knowledge in these matters.

My suggestion is therefore that the authors of the constitution present their work with motivation at the meeting. Thereafter we all get reasonable (2 months) time to consider and consult the members. We then finalize the suggestion if we can come to an agreement. If not the AGM may be presented several suggestions.

There is a tradition in the class that the AGM decides on where the Worlds is to be held. I think we should stick to that. The AGM shall decide on rule changes. Both these issues should be decided on before September. I therefore propose an extra AGM held over Internet. We have had that before and it worked out well. Gustaf organized it and I'm sure he can share his experience of how to organize it.

I'm not sure that I have all the information on the different venues applying for the Worlds 2006. Is there an official deadline for applications? Could it be that some nations assume that the decisions will be taken at the AGM in September and has not yet filed their application? It may be appropriate to send a note to all NCA:s of application deadline.

At the time of the suggested meeting I will be available on:
+46 8 5448 0776

Best Regards,
Stellan