International One Metre
International Class Association
(IOM ICA)
2012 Annual General Meeting
(AGM)
Meeting Agenda

1. **Call To Order**
2. **Confirm Quorum**
3. **Approve Agenda**
4. **Declare Voting Strength**
5. **Election of Officers**
   5.1. Chairman
   Nominations for Barry Fox (CAN) for the position of Chairman have been received from FRA and CRO.
6. **Changes to Class Rules – See Appendix A**
   6.1. Changes to Class Rule A.11 and A.14 to align rules with current measurement forms and processes
   6.2. Changes to Class Rule A.9 to clarify handing of Requests For Interpretation
   6.3. Changes to Class Rule C.3.1 to reflect ISAF Regulations
   6.4. Changes to Class Rule C.5.3 to ratify Emergency Rule
   6.5. Changes to Class Rule D.2.4 to clarify voltage control on board the boat.
   6.6. Changes to Class Rule G.3.1 and G.4.1 to alter sail construction.
   6.7. Changes to Class Rule D.2.1 (a) (3) to allow pigmented resin in the hull
7. **Changes to Class Championship Rules – See Appendix B**
   7.1. Add IOM CCR Rule 12 to clarify the assignment of sail numbers
8. **Treasurer's Report**
9. **Discussion from the floor**
10. **Meeting Adjourned**

Appendix A – Resolutions for Changes to Class Rules

6. **Changes to Class Rules**

6.1 Changes to Class Rule A.11 and A.14.1 to align rules with current measurement forms and processes. – Submitted by GBR and VC Measurement

Current rule A.11 reads:

A.11 CERTIFICATION

A.11.1 For a **hull** not previously **certified**, all items required by the measurement form(s) to be measured shall be measured by an **official measurer** and the details entered onto the form(s).

A.11.2 The measurement form(s), and **certification** fee if required, shall be sent to the **certification authority** in the country where the **hull** is to be registered within 4 weeks after completion of measurement.

A.11.3 Upon receipt of a satisfactorily completed measurement form(s) and **certification** fee if required within the 4 week time limit, the **certification authority** may issue a **certificate**.

A.11.4 The **certification authority** shall retain the original measurement form(s), which shall be transferred to the new **certification authority** upon request if the **hull** is exported.

It is proposed to change the rule to read (changes are in blue):

A.11 CERTIFICATION

A.11.1 For a **boat** not previously **certified**, all items required by the measurement forms to be measured shall be measured by an **official measurer** and the details of **boat** and owner entered on the **certification control** form.

A.11.2 The **certification control** form and **certification** fee, if required, shall be sent to the **certification authority** in the country where the **boat** is to be registered within 4 weeks of completion of **certification control.**

A.11.3 Upon receipt of a satisfactorily completed **certification control** form and **certification** fee, if required, within the four-week time limit, the **certification authority** may issue a **certificate**.

A.11.4 The **certification authority** shall retain the original **certification control** form, which shall be transferred to the new **certification authority** upon request, if the **boat** is exported.

Current Rule A.14.1 reads:

A.14 RE-CERTIFICATION

A.14.1 A **hull** may be issued with a new **certificate**, showing dates of initial and new **certification control** as applicable:
(a) WHEN A CERTIFICATE BECOMES INVALID UPON CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP
and the new owner applies to the **certification authority** in the country where the **hull** is to be registered. The application shall include the old **certificate** and re**certification** fee if required. In the case of an imported **hull** the **certification authority** shall request the measurement form(s) from the previous **certification authority** and a new **hull** registration number shall be issued,

(b) WHEN A CERTIFICATE HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN, OR WHEN THE CERTIFICATE AND MEASUREMENT FORM(S) CANNOT BE LOCATED
and **certification control** as required for initial **certification** has been undertaken.

A.14.2 A **boat** that has ceased to comply with the **class rules** may be brought into compliance:
(a) WHEN THE LIMITATIONS AFFECTING THE EQUIPMENT ARE IN THE CLASS RULES
by carrying out **certification control** of affected equipment,
(b) WHEN THE LIMITATIONS AFFECTING THE EQUIPMENT ARE ON THECERTIFICATE
by carrying out **certification control** of affected equipment as required for initial **certification**.

It is proposed to change the rule to read (changes are in blue):

A.14 RE-CERTIFICATION

A.14.1 A **boat** may be issued with a new **certificate**, showing date of initial and new **certification control** as applicable:

(a) WHEN A **CERTIFICATE** BECOMES INVALID UPON CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP

and the new owner applies to the **certification authority** in the country where the **boat** is to be registered. The application shall include the old **certificate** and re-**certification** fee, if required. In the case of an imported **boat**, the **certification authority** shall request the **certification control** form from the previous **certification authority** and a new **boat** registration number shall be issued,

(b) WHEN A **CERTIFICATE** HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN, OR WHEN THE **CERTIFICATE** AND **CERTIFICATION CONTROL** FORM CANNOT BE LOCATED

and **certification control**, as required for initial **certification** has being undertaken.

Discussion:
There is a simple change of wording in the certification clause A.11, because the MFs are no longer sent to the certification authority and are replaced by the Certification Control Form.

Appendix A – Resolutions for Changes to Class Rules

6.2 - Changes to Class Rule A.9 to clarify handing of Requests For Interpretation – Submitted by GBR

Background

The question of a time limit for interpretations was mentioned in the introduction to this subject. Whilst it is clear that IOMICA Regulation 9 sets out a perfectly logical and practical procedure for handling class rule interpretations, there is a problem that has muddied the waters.

The problem is created by IOM class rule

A.9.1 GENERAL

"Interpretation of class rules, except as provided by A.9.2 shall be in accordance with the IRSA Regulations."

The IRSA regulation that applies to interpretations by IOMICA, regulation 6.3 and clause 6.3.1 implies referral back to IOMICA Regulation 9. As IRSA regulation 6.3.1 applies, then 6.3.2 does not apply. The dubious requirement of a two-year maximum lifespan in 6.3.2(e) does not apply either. The incorporation of non-permissive interpretations in closed rules is not practical as you can only mention in the CR what is permitted.

To regularise this situation and to make the question of the status of IOM interpretations clearer, the GBR NCA make a further rule change proposal, with the change shown in blue.

Proposed Wording for Class Rule A.9.1

"A.9.1 GENERAL

Interpretation of **class rules**, except as provided by A.9.2, shall be made in accordance with IOMICA regulations."

Appendix A – Resolutions for Changes to Class Rules

6.3 - Changes to Class Rule C.3.1 to reflect ISAF Regulations – Submitted by IOM ICA Exec

Existing Wording C.3.1

C.3.1 LIMITATIONS
The **boat** shall display only such advertising as permitted by the ISAF Advertising Code, Category C.

Discussion:
Investigation finds that Category C is not referenced in the ISAF Advertising Code.

Proposed Wording C.3.1

C.3.1 LIMITATIONS
The **boat** shall display only such advertising as permitted by the ISAF Advertising Code.

Appendix A – Resolutions for Changes to Class Rules

6.4 - Changes to Class Rule C.5.3 to ratify Emergency Rule – Submitted by IOM ICA Executive

An Emergency Rule was passed by the IOM ICA Executive to recognize a change in available radio technology that does not produce any performance advantage.

The wording in the Emergency Rule Change was:

An Emergency International One Metre Class Rule change or interpretation of the current IOM Class Rules has been requested by CAN NCA on 27 February 2012.

The IOM ICA Technical Subcommittee has discussed the matter and the following emergency change of the IOM Class Rules has been agreed:
Current IOM CR C.5.3(c)
"Except for control unit positioning and radio link information, no radio transmissions from the **boat** shall be made."
The problem with the current rule is that it is dealing with "transmissions from the **boat**". The majority of IOM skippers have no idea what their receivers are transmitting to transmitters. Therefore, the proposal is to declare what the skipper may use while racing.

New wording of IOM CR C.5.3(c):

"Crew may use only the following radio transmissions from the **boat**:
(1) control unit positioning,
(2) radio link information,
(3) monitoring of onboard battery(s) conditions."

Rule C.5.3 is in Part C so it is used when racing. According to the proposed new wording, it is clear that the transmitter and receiver may exchange more data, links, etc., which may be used while not racing.

To be in compliance with proposed IOM CR C.5.3(c) you may use any radio set but you must shut down features on your transmitter (display, audio message, etc.) which are not permitted by the IOM Class Rules. Battery monitoring is explicitly allowed in the proposed class rule change.

Proposed to ratify this Class Rule change.

Appendix A – Resolutions for Changes to Class Rules

6.5 - Changes to Class Rule D.2.4 to clarify voltage control on board the boat. -

It has become common practice to use batteries configured to supply higher voltage in IOM boats. It is also apparent that some well regarded equipment in use for a long time incorporates circuitry that allows the use of that higher voltage to provide better performance of the sailwinch and also reduces the voltage delivered to the other radio equipment on the boat. Inclusion of this circuitry is not specifically allowed by the Class Rules.

The rules allow, in D.2.4(3) that you may have “One **sheet** control unit”. However, Class Rule C.5.3(b) sates that “The **sheet** control unit shall control the **mainsail sheet** and **headsail sheet** only.”

To clarify the use of this function and to allow similar control of the voltage delivered to allowed remote control equipment, as defined in these two sections of the rules, it is proposed to add Class Rule D.2.4(a)(7) to read:

(7) a device to control downstream voltage delivered to permitted radio control equipment as defined by items listed under (1) to (6) of this rule.

Appendix A – Resolutions for Changes to Class Rules

6.6 - Changes to Class Rule G.3.1 and G.4.1 to alter sail construction - Submitted by GBR

Commentary

In 2003 a question was raised by ARYA, AUS about whether shape could be formed in sail material by the application of heat and/or force. This question was considered by the ISAF RSD technical committee and interpretation 2003-IOM-5 was issued stating that such sails were not permitted, as there was no class rule specifically permitting this method of shaping in sail construction. The relevant parts of the interpretation are included here.

Interpretations requested by the ARYA, AUS as follows:

2. Is it permitted to shape sail material by use of methods such as heat and/or force without seams?

IOMICA TC's answer approved by ISAF RSD

Sails may be made without **seams** i.e. made of one part according to the class rules G.3.1(a)(2) and G.4.1(a)(2). Construction techniques where parts are joined or added are mentioned in class rules G.3.2 and G.4.2. Heat and/or force used for shaping of sail material used with or without **seams** are not specifically permitted by the **closed class rules** such as the International One Metre Class Rules and therefore not permitted.

However the first sentence of this answer is not strictly what the relevant IOM class rule states and poses the question: are single panel sails permitted at all?

The rule G.3.1(a)(2) and G.4.1(a)(2) states that 'the **body of the sail** shall consist of …… parts…… joined by **seams'.**

A single part **sail** is NOT joined by **seams** and therefore this class rule wording appears not to permit this construction.

The process for handling and the status of interpretations is covered by IOMICA Regulation 9, as below.

IOM CLASS RULE INTERPRETATIONS

9.1. A rule interpretation shall have the status of a Class Rule and shall remain valid until superseded by a Class Rule change.

9.2.5. A proposed interpretation shall clarify the *IOM Class Rules* but an interpretation shall not be used to change an existing rule.

The effect of interpretation 2003-IOM-5 was both permissive, permitting the use of single panel sails and non-permissive with regard to shaping of sail material by heat and/or force and by IOMICA Regulation 9.1 above, had the status of a Class Rule. The permissive part has never been superseded by a class rule change and in view of the wording of the existing rule does require to be changed to permit single panel sails, if owners want single panel sails.

However, the non-permissive part of the interpretation cannot be incorporated into a closed rule, such as the IOM CR, because only permitted 'things' can be included. Despite that problem, this interpretation has the status of the class rule in compliance with IOMICA Regulation 9.

Following the recent widespread use of single panel moulded sails, the sail manufacturer involved asked IOMICA for an interpretation as to whether such sails were permitted.

Appendix A – Resolutions for Changes to Class Rules

Interpretation 2011-IOM-3 did not refer at all to what was in effect the class rule, created by the previous interpretation 2003-IOM-5. The IOMICA TC permitted such sails and by doing so contravened IOMICA regulation 9.2.5 by changing what was in effect the class rule created by interpretation 2003-IOM-5, which did not permit shaping by heat and/or force.

It is therefore necessary to regularise the situation by proposing an IOM class rule change,

~~1. To revise the wording of class rules G.3.3(a)(2) and G.4.1(a)(2) to permit single panel sails to relate to interpretation 2003-IOM-5.~~

2. To change what is in effect the current class rule created by interpretation 2003-IOM-05 to permit sails shaped by heat and/or force in line with the non-compliant interpretation 2011-IOM-03.

These proposals to go before the 2012 World Council will give IOM owners to decide this question of sail construction, rather than rely on the various technical committee's decisions. ~~There are 2 proposals. The first is to regularise the wording of the current rule to permit single panel sails and to include the normal methods of forming 3 dimensional shape. This proposal makes the assumption that the original intention of the rule was that sails could be made from a single panel.~~ The second proposal also includes shape being able to be formed by heat and/or force.

GBR NCA propose the following class rule changes, with the new parts shown in blue:

~~**PROPOSAL 1**~~

~~IOM CR~~

~~G.3.1(a)(2) The **body of the sail** shall consist of the same **ply** throughout and may:~~

~~(i) be a single part or have not more than four parts joined by a **seam** or **seams**~~

~~(iii) have 3 dimensional shape formed by any or all of the following:~~

~~(a) design of **luff** curve~~

~~(b) design of **seam** shape~~

~~G.4.1(a)(2) The **body of the sail** shall consist of the same **ply** throughout and may:~~

~~(i) be a single part or have not more than three parts joined by a **seam** or **seams**~~

~~(iii) have 3 dimensional shape formed by any or all of the following:~~

~~(a) design of **luff** curve~~

~~(b) design of **seam** shape~~

PROPOSAL 2

IOM CR

G.3.1(a)(2) The **body of the sail** shall consist of the same **ply** throughout and may:

(i) be a single part or have not more than four parts joined by a **seam** or **seams**

(iii) have 3 dimensional shape formed by any or all of the following:

(a) design of **luff** curve

(b) design of **seam** shape

Appendix A – Resolutions for Changes to Class Rules

(c) use of heat and/or force.

G.4.1(a)(2) The **body of the sail** shall consist of the same **ply** throughout and may:

(i) be a single part or have not more than three parts joined by a **seam** or **seams**

(iii) have 3 dimensional shape formed by any or all of the following:

(a) design of **luff** curve

(b) design of **seam** shape

(c) use of heat and/or force.

~~Having 2 proposals allows owners to decide firstly whether they want single panel sails (proposal 1) and secondly whether they also want the single panel sails to be shaped by heat and/or force (proposal 2).~~

Appendix A – Resolutions for Changes to Class Rules

6.7 - Changes to Class Rule D.2.1 (a) (3) to allow pigmented resin in the hull – Submitted by GBR

IOM NCA for GBR propose the following IOM CR change:

D.2.1 (a) (3) is changed to:

(3) Resin, which may be coloured and/or reinforced with glass fibres,

D.2.1 (b) is deleted

Reasons for proposing change

The original concept for the construction of the One Metre hull was that the rule should have a generous hull weight allowance so that it could be made easily by amateurs and economically by professionals, without the use of 'supposedly expensive' materials like carbon, kevlar etc. With this generous weight limit preventing any major performance difference it then wouldn't matter what material the hull is made of, because it will be adequately strong whether in balsa, GRP or any of the specified materials.

Problems have been encountered throughout the life of the rule with construction detail and particularly GRP and inspection of fibres. Interpretation 2010-IOM-1 appears to render this latter requirement to see the fibres redundant by permitting a wooden covering the inside of GRP. Anyone inspecting the inside of a compliant GRP hull will see the colour of the gel coat anyway as the colour permeates into the lay up resin. In this case there should be no reason why IOM GRP construction cannot revert to the GRP moulding industry norm of colour pigment in all the resin layers. This is the basis of our proposal.

It would be a benefit to the class in the future by making the moulding process cheaper, removing the need for double gel coat, painting processes etc and reducing the labour content needed to achieve a good solid, deep scratch tolerant and more durable hull colour. We do not know of any moulder that would not gladly welcome this change.

There was concern that just relying on the Owner's Declaration, that the hull is made of only specified materials, was insufficient to prevent non-permitted fibres being used.

However this is the rule already.

Hull construction is just one of many things covered by the declarations in both Boat and Rig Measurement Forms that the owner and indeed Official Measurers cannot verify. The suppliers of those parts have to be trusted.

Apart from the hull material, these include the density of ballast, the aluminium alloys in mast and booms, the wall thickness of those spars and the density of the rig corrector weights. If manufacturers and suppliers are marketing IOM parts, then these must comply with the IOM class rules to meet trade description requirements, which prevent them misleading consumers as to what they are spending their money on. Any supplier whose IOM parts fail to comply with class rules would immediately lose that business and probably face financial ruin. The risk of a problem is very small and far outweighed by the greater benefit to be gained from cheaper and better hulls.

Appendix B – Resolutions for Changes to Class Championship Rules

7 - Changes to Class Championship Rules

7.1 - Add IOM CCR Rule 12 to clarify the assignment of sail numbers**– Submitted Events Sub Committee**

There has been some inconsistency in how sail number conflicts are resolved. In order to provide direction to assist organizers in managing sail number conflicts it is necessary to add a new rule section to the Class Championship Rules.

The proposed wording is:

12. SAIL NUMBERS CONFLICT

12.1. In case of a conflict between 2 or more competitors regarding sail numbers, it shall be resolved by the use of additional sail number as stated in RRS E6.b.

12.2. The following order shall be used to define which competitor keeps its number :

(1) Personal agreement between competitors

(2) Final ranking of previous World championship (for a World Championship) or Continental championship (for a Continental championship).

(3) If none of the competitors affected were at a previous event as defined in 12.2(2) the decision will be based on the Stage in which the entry is accepted and by the date of entry receipt within each stage. Stage 1 entries will always get precedence over Stage 2 regardless of the date of entry receipt.