

## **IM24CA Open Technical Committee Meeting**

**28.09.2020 – Zoom platform**

**12 pm PT / 3 pm ET / 8 pm UK / 9 pm CET / 10 pm EET / 5 am AEDT Sydney**

### **In Attendance:**

Laura Grondin – IM24CA Chair (USA)  
Mike Gozzard – IM24CA Tech Comm Chair (CAN)  
Branko Parunov – IM24CA Chief Measurer and Technical Advisor (SLO)  
Arto Kiiski – IM24CA Tech Comm member (FIN)  
Jan Schmidt – IM24CA Tech Comm member (GER)  
Gary Schwarting – USM24CA Technical Chair (USA)  
Miles Quinton – IM24CA Vice Chair Europe (GBR)  
Duncan Stamper – IM24CA Vice Chair Americas (CAN)  
Kevin Nixon – IM24CA Vice Chair Asia Pacific (AUS)  
Paul Arntson (Krk) – IM24CA Member North America (USA)  
John Abel – IM24CA Championship Coordinator (CAN)  
Dan Berezin – President, Canadian Melges 24 Class Association (CAN)  
Michael Schineis – President, Austrian Melges 24 Class Association (AUT)  
Soren Blume Svendsen – President, Danish Melges 24 Class Association (DEN)  
Nicklaus Dewitt Fordham – Danish Melges 24 Class Association (DEN)  
Piret Salmistu – IM24CA Administrator (EST)

The purpose of the meeting is to review the technical proposals prior to the deadline for making revisions, October 9<sup>th</sup>, in case revisions are necessary or make sense based upon the feedback at this open meeting.

### **Class Rule changes submissions you'll find in this DropBox folder:**

[https://www.dropbox.com/sh/1u9uzaiv34i27bv/AABeh\\_0VPSuAsS-UE9W8baHva?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/1u9uzaiv34i27bv/AABeh_0VPSuAsS-UE9W8baHva?dl=0)

- [CAN – C 11.7 - Crew location when racing](#)
- [CAN – C.11.x - Crew location when racing](#) – addition to the Class Rules
- [USA – C.2.2. Weights](#) – Remove Weight Rule Completely
- [Tech Comm - CR A.6 House Keeping](#)
- [Tech Comm - C.11.1 Boat Handling Rules](#)
- [Tech Comm - C.11.2 Boat Handling Rules](#)
- [Tech Comm - C.11.3 Boat Handling Rules](#)
- [Tech Comm - C.11.5 Boat Handling Rules](#)
- [Tech Comm - C.11.6 Boat Handling Rules](#)
- [Tech Comm - H2 Boom](#)

### **Submissions to change the Constitution you'll find in this DropBox folder:**

1. [Tech Comm - IM24CA Constitution - Housekeeping Constitution Change Proposals](#)

### **Meeting Summary:**

New for 2020 was the idea to break the traditional Technical Committee meeting into two parts and hold these meetings well in advance of the AGM. This first meeting was intended to allow open discussion of the submissions made by the NCAs with two underlying goals. First, to determine if the proposals are in the best interest of the class and then if so, to allow for any further revision of the submission to make them as effective as possible. Unlike past years, we

wanted this discussion to occur before the submissions are presented to the class for a vote. While opinions and positions were encouraged, the idea now was to try and identify any unforeseen consequence of these proposals and give each of these submissions the best chance of being effective if they are later ratified by the class.

Each submission was reviewed individually with a brief explanation were required. The following is a brief summary in relative order they were reviewed at the meeting:

- Tech Comm – CR A.6 – This was simple house keeping with no objections or questions. The submission stands as written.
- CAN – C11.7 – Review began with a brief discussion on the reasoning for this proposal. Not all members were aware of the misconceptions some newer class members had with the current rule. Once explained, there were no objections and the submission stands as written.
- Tech Comm – C11.1 – After a brief explanation, basically everyone agreed that this new wording is much simpler and is easier to understand. The submission stands without revision.
- Tech Comm – C11.2 – After a very brief discussion as this is predicated by C11.2, everyone agreed the new wording much simpler and is easier to understand. The submission stands.
- Tech Comm – C11.3 – Clarification was discussed on where hiking is permitted relative to the spinnaker block and aft deck. Clarification on helm person positions while sailing and what is and isn't considered hiking was discussed. With no further comment or objection the all agree to let the submission stand.
- Tech Comm - C11.6 – A healthy discussion ensued on the genesis of this clarification with particular attention to the wording “thigh/buttock”. Comments were made by IMCA Chief Measurer Branko Parunov on the intent of this rule. Comments were made by International Juror Arto Kiiski on the “on the water” administration of this rule. Discussion concluded with no objections and the submission stands.
- Tech Comm – H2 Boom – A brief explanation with no objections. Submission stands.
- CAN – C11.x – A healthy discussion ensued first on the need for this rule which then expanded into its implementation and unintended consequences. Of note most thought that the companionway area of the boat should be exempt. In the end all agreed the proposal should be revised to make being in the companionway defined as not down below and that better use of the word “momentary” would help enforcement. Majority concluded the submission would be better if the suggested revisions were included. C11.x will become C11.8 and is sent back to Canada for further consideration.
- Tech Comm – C11.5 – An extended discussion started with the premise that the current rule as written was fundamentally untenable. After a brief over view, Arto spoke at length as to the contradiction we currently have within this modification of RRS 42.3 (c) and the opinions and concerns of the class's International Jurors. This is a particularly difficult and complicated issue that is hard to understand but basically our current C11.5 (2020) rule is perceived to allow unlimited pumping of all sails while at the same time limit the unlimited pump to only when conditions permit and then only to initiate surfing or planing. Once planing, you can not pump again. The rule can not be both unlimited and limited at the same time. However, it is acceptable to exempt the asymmetrical spinnaker from this rule because it requires active trimming that cannot be differentiated from pumping. It was suggested that World Sailing ratified the current rule when really they should not have. It was further suggested that we consider adapting the 505 class rule which amends 43.2(c) to 3 pumps of the main and jib however it was thought this would be too hard to implement and control. As no immediate solution could be found it was eventually agreed that the class should revert back to the previous wording of C11.5(2017-18) as it was clear that the current class rule cannot remain in effect. The group unanimously agreed the submission be sent back to the technical committee to be revise to restore the previous version of C11.5.

- USA – C.2.2 – This contentious proposal was left until last and discussed at length. Once all opinions were stated and discussed in open dialog, the committee focused on trying to come up with suggestions, compromises and revisions that may make the submission more workable if eventually ratified by the class. Of note discussions identified potential safety related issues if the crew weight had no maximum upper limit which would eventually be too much for the boat and rig to withstand. Suggestions were made that perhaps an upper weight limit should be set close to 380 or 390kg to protect the boat. There was also a brief discussion on a potential lower limit of 200kg. The committee also noted potential issues with crew substitutions as per C2.1 and suggested possible amendments to C2.1(b) and C2.1(d) that might help. One possible compromise may be to consider keeping the weigh in during registration so that if a substitute crew is required it could be controlled to within 10% as example. Several members also expressed a concern that without a weight limit there would be fewer opportunities for women or youths to be involved in the class as those “lighter” people would not be needed as much to make the current weight restriction work. As well, it was expressed that a weight limit is in keeping with a one-design class (although not all one-design classes have one). The USMCA was represented by Gary Schwarting and Paul (Kraak) Arntson and both were active in the discussion. Eventually the consensus was that USMCA should consider having another go at this submission possibly including some of these suggestions and comments.

After almost two hours there was a very brief discussion on the constitutional proposals which wrapped up quickly as we were well past our allotted time. Meeting was adjourned.