

To the ICA Executive Committee  
President Steve Bullmore

Ålesund 2021.01.01

Copies to EC members, TC Stellan Berlin and measurer Keith Gordon

As the WC 2021 inspector, I have been asked to comment the preliminary NOR. I will argue for solutions that may ease the job for the WC organizer. I attach my proposal to a NOR. The organizer, Tønsberg Sailing Club, believed that they had received precise information from ICA. They were surprised when they were told that ICA wanted to approve the NOR even more. When an ICA inspector also showed up the NCA was involved. Tønsberg Sailing Club was in good faith, the situation is now calm and they appreciate the support I may give them.

#### **I recommend these main principles for the NOR:**

- With simplicity in the structure the open 2.4mR championship and the para championship may be sailed integrated.
- The 2.4mR Class rule ought to apply to both championships. There will be too many challenges for the organizer if two different class rules shall apply.
- Drug testing according to the WADA system should not be mentioned. It will give the organizer extraordinary challenges.

#### **Reasons and arguments**

##### **The corrector weight problem.**

If the OD class rule proposal should apply, it is important to understand how the ballast is limited. The ballast in the keel shall not exceed 181 kg in OD boats when they sail in para championships, but not when they sail in open 2.4mR open championships. For older boats the problem isn't present because they have struggled to increase the ballast up to the limitation. 2.4mR boats newer than around 2007, and some rebuilt older boats, carry more lead than 181 kg, most often 2 – 5 kg more, especially after rebuilding, but they still hold their permitted total weight. To have the opportunity to sail both para with keel ballast reduced to 181 kg and open class with maximum ballast, they must have a corrector weight fastened under the deck. That keep the keel ballast down to 181 kg for para sailing, and they may place the corrector weight in the keel when they are sailing in the open class. The OD class rule say about this:

OD class rule proposal C.6.2 CORRECTOR WEIGHTS (a)

*Corrector weights of lead shall be securely fixed to the hull when the boat weight is less than the minimum requirement. (b) Corrector weights shall be placed on the underside of the deck not more than 200 mm aft of the mast.*

My own boat from 2010 had a correction weight of around 2 kg hanging on two screws. What is "securely fixed" ? I asked that question in EC in 2012. EC member and TC leader Stellan Berlin answered that the corrector weight should be fastened by screws, but not more "securely fixed" than the sailor might rip I loose and put it into the keel when he wanted. Like in open class regattas. No decision was made.

The high location of the corrector weight reduces RM and make the boat slower than it would have been if the corrector weight was put in the keel, especially in windy conditions., as it would be if 2.4mR Class rule apply. This fact gives certain questions to consider:

How can para sailors sail according to the OD class rule proposal with the corrector weight in its high position, and at the same time sail according to the 2.4mR Class rule with the corrector weight in the keel, to achieve more power and speed when they also want to compete in the 2.4mR class?

Even if they have entered both classes, they obviously must choose one specific position for the corrector weight. It is easy to put it in the keel, it may be done in seconds on course and nobody can control it. That solution will give the sailor better chance for a good result in the para class and the corrector weight may in seconds be placed under the deck again on the home run. Some says that disabled never cheat but I have seen no proof for it.

If the EC ask the owners or the organizer to fasten the corrector weights absolutely securely in their high positions, what will then the consequence be? It will be that the para competition is not affected, but also that the sailor will have less chance for a good result in the open class. That harms the para sailor and it harms the open class as clever sailors have less chance. The ICA for the 2.4mR class should never harm neither para sailors or the 2.4mR class.

There is one obvious way out of the corrector weight problem. That is to base the sailing in both worlds on one class rule only, the 2.4mR class rule. Before the EC try to figure out a way to restrict some boats from optimal sailing by forcing sailors with correction weights, that means all boats newer than around 2007 and some more, I strongly advise ICA to consult WS.

#### **The sail and mast control.**

There are small differences between the 2.4mR class rule and the OD class rule proposal, but most of it may be managed. I mention one thing, the sail control.

As the 2.4mR include many designs with many different J and P measurements, the J which the sail is intended for shall be written on the jib and the P on the mainsail, see 2.4mR class rule G.2.2(C)

The OD class proposal does not have this requests because it only deal with the OD's J and P. Many sailmakers do not mark 2.4 sails with J and P because they want 2.4 to be an OD class or they don't understand that it isn't. Some even print on the edge of the sail that it is produced for OD only. We have argued for years with North Norway to convince them that also in house sail measurement shall comply with the class rule. Many sails have been remeasured to get their J and P, For many years North Sail Norway did not accept that 2.4 can be anything else than OD and all sails had to be re-marked by a measurer. Eventually, if the buyer clearly says that his order is for sails to an open 2.4mR class boat and not for an OD, they now obey the class rule.

To Tønsberg there will arrive boats from all over the world. If both the 2.4mR class rule and the OD class rule proposal will be in force for the two different WC it may happen that sails without J or P will be presented for control. Then the organizer must check if the boat will sail 2.4mR WC or the para WC. A sail for the 2.4mR WC must be rejected if it hasn't J or P. The same sail for a para boat will be accepted if there is no J or P. To do this is absolutely possible, but it put unnecessary strain to the organizer. The best solution is to use only one class rule for the whole event, the 2.4mR class rule.

### **The ICA should not exclude para sailors from the 2.4 para WC**

Sailors with a valid International Classification from WS are para sailors. However, some of them has rebuilt their boats away from the OD class proposal, but they are still para sailors. If the OD class rule proposal apply for the para WC, these sailors are excluded from para sailing. That is not right. If the 2.4mR class rule applies only, they can participate in both WCs.

### **Tank LWL testing**

I don't know if WS has requested sample tank LWL testing during this WCs as they sometimes have done before, but we know that WS will appreciate it if it might happen. I recommend the ICA to ask the WS. Norway has tank and if needed also the expertise.

If both class rules should be chosen, I mention that the 2.4mR class rule and the OD class rule proposal have two different ways to measure the limitation of how the extra 35 kg weight may be located, but the differences are small. If a boat's certified LWL correspond with the designer's outset proposal, 2978 mm, there is no difference in permitted location of the extra weight. If the registered LWL differs a little from the designer's recommendation, there may be some very few mm difference in the limitation of how the 35 kg lead may be located, but I cannot see that it will affect the test. If one class rule is chosen there is no problem at all. I have taken into the NOR that LWL tank testing may be conducted.

### **As many sailors as possible should be able to participate on full terms.**

The 2.4mR WC will be better if many sailors can compete on full terms, also the disabled. The 2.4mR ICA should hold that goal high and go for one class rule for both WCs.

### **Protect para sailors from being "disabled" when it is not necessary.**

Most para sailors want now and then to compete without being disabled. When the WCs are combined the para sailors should be permitted to compete on full terms. That is possible if the WCs are governed by one and the same class rule. To restrict the para sailors to boats that are slower because of ballast restrictions, is to harm the para sailors. That should not be promoted by the EC.

### **Wait with the OD class rule problem until the next AGM have sorted it out.**

The OD Class rule is still only a proposal that never can be approved and both the measurement system and the certificates are equally useless. That has been well known for at least 9 years. EC cannot decide anything about it because the OD class rule proposal was decided by AGM and therefore only can be legally changed by a new AGM. That AGM cannot take place before the worlds. It would be strange if the EC in this situation should force through a new use of the not approved OD class rule. ICA should not promote a para WC that harm the 2.4mR class in this way before the OD question has been settled. If the OD proceed, it should be launched an investigation to find if two championships on different class rules may be integrated without so many disadvantages.

### **Are para sailors more sophisticated than 2.4mR sailors or are they so harmed by their handicaps that they cannot sail to the same rule as able-bodied sailors?**

There is no doubt that the 2.4mR Class rule must apply to the open WC. The question is why the disabled persons need a special rule that limits their possibilities to fully compete also in the open WC. Why shall they be pitied in this way?

**To limit or prohibit boat polishing during the event, or not to do it.**

The preliminary NOR says: *Boats shall not be hauled out during the regatta, except with and according to the terms of prior written permission of the Race Committee.*

Sailors of bigger boats most often believe that a boat must be hauled out and placed on shore to be washed and polished. It may also be that 2.4 sailors appreciate the rule because it indicate that the 2.4 is equal to big boats. However, many 2.4 sailors brushes the sides and the keel of the boat while it is in water. Divers can also be hired; In Poole the cost for having the boat cleaned by divers every day the whole week was 20 £. The preliminary NOR does not prohibit neither brushing or cleaning by divers. Anyway, it is difficult to prohibit these methods. I am not sure what I mean so I have not changed the NOR.

**Drug testing according to WADA systems.**

Them organizer have been told from ICA that the WCs must have drug testing according to the WADA system. The most relevant document is "Testing and Investigations", 83 pages. I am not totally familiar with that or all other WADA documents, but I have noticed that the preparations seem to be conducted outside the TC, EC, ICA and WS jurisdiction. The Anti-Doping Organization itself will first prioritize between sports, disciplines, and events the actual year, along with gradually more cooperation from the sports' different authorities, see point 4.0 and especially from 4.4. Then athletes must be chosen – not all of them, but by "risk assessment" (who are most likely to cheat, have they cheated before, how clever are they, how exposed are the event and the sport etc). Then testing methods must be settled; (blood and/or urin) and testing procedures (how often random tests in the months before). If I understand it correctly WADA system drug testing will only take place if the 2.4mR and para WC 2021 already are chosen. In my opinion the EC ought to investigate that first. I guess WS will know.

The ICA should in my opinion not push for WADA drug testing in 2.4mR, a class where also elderly people of both genders participate. To pee for months at random times with people observing how the pee come out of sailors of both genders and all ages, is hardly a project to expand 2.4 sailing. For Tønsberg Sailing Club it will be overwhelming to organize lots of tests, testers, committees, laboratories, dozens of authorized pee collectors from New Zealand to Canada, travelling, hotels and probably also pay for it. I strongly advice that the WADA style drug testing must not be mentioned in the NOR. If the WCs are chosen, it must be mentioned and there will be a challenge to find a way to organized it that is possible for the Tønsberg Sailing Club to deal with.

**To prohibit training or not to do it.**

The preliminary NOR says: *The boats shall normally when not sailed be kept on their designated mooring spots.* That seems to mean that the organizer to some degree prohibit training during the evenings, testing of sails and other equipment. The sentence is difficult to understand and may be interpreted differently. I have never sailed a WC where boats and sails cannot be tested in the evenings when there are no races. I cut away the sentence.

**A little clarifying of the point about measurement.**

The main initial measurement is briefly mentioned in 5, the schedule, but it should also be mentioned as the first point of 6, to prepare the sailors that the Measurement Form will be delivered at the registration.

Pål Kragset