

Evidence / Research obtained from PAL KRAGSET to support our concerns and formulate our proposal.

My problem has always been that I want to deal with truth and facts, not alternative facts, and morally decent behaviour. As president I wanted to be in close touch with ISAF, now WS, about the class. However, from the start I was not aware that contact with WS was strongly forbidden by the OD supporters. They had the majority in the EC, Stellan Berlin, Rikard Bjurstrøm and Bruce Millar.

The reason why WS by all means must be held away, lies in the OD strategy, which is very clever, created by Stellan and it goes like this:

- Before a new class can be approved, WS must have proposals from committees. One of them shall evaluate if the new class is too like an existing class and therefore will be harmful to it. **If so, the new class shall not be approved.** The consequence is that one of the 2.4 classes must disappear by internal “development” before the other can take over. This strategy basis must be hidden because many people will object to erase the 2.4mR class. People must be instead be told and falsely convinced that the OD will help the open class.
- Because there never will be two similar WS 2.4 classes, the class rule cannot be in the WS format. It but must “lean” to 2.4mR, use nearly the same name and the same sail ensign to be ready to take over. WS accepts only the standard format so WC contact about the class rule must by all means be avoided. People must be convinced that the class rule is good, which will be no problem because such a class rule cannot be reconstructed to a proper class rule before the 2.4mR is gone. Most sailors, even judges and measurers, are so ignorant that they may be convinced. It is especially important to convince honest and skilled persons, to make them fight for the OD. Disabled must be convinced even if most disabled do not want to be disabled. Their representatives are easier to convince.
- The ICA TC, EC and AGM must be taken over to prohibit decisions that may harm the strategy. Decisions from elsewhere that cannot be controlled must be twisted and interpreted in the OD direction.

Be aware of the last point in the strategy: That means that they by all means will try to silence you or remove you. I tried to be careful and I did not do much wrongly, but I knew too much, I had this stupid belief in truth and openness and they were anxious that I would say something to WS. The third attempt to get rid of me came in February 2013. Proposal from Stellan and the EC majority decided that I as president had no right to contact or to be in any contact with WS unless the EC first had decided what he had the permission to say or write. I had to refuse to be a president candidate for the next period.

The WS Equipment Rules Sub-Committee has been involved in the case earlier. I know it, but you cannot know it. I had implemented this in my text proposal below, but now I have softened it considerably. In November 2010 the case was reviewed by the WS Equipment Committee. There was a proposal from this lower ranked WS Equipment Rules Sub-Committee that recommended the Norlin Mk3 (with name) design to be the OD. The Equipment Committee did not agree and decided: **It was agreed that any One Design specification within the International 2.4mR Class wanting to be considered as a class in its own right should apply for ISAF Class status once it meets the requirements of the Regulations.** The EQ changed to the words “any OD specification”, most likely because WS cannot approve two classes that are so similar that they will harm each other. One of them must die first.

The report advises that ICA should set up a mechanism to prevent sailors to exploit the open 2.4mR Class rule. It is not legal for an ICA to restrict an approved WS Class rule in order to prohibit development, obviously to prevent the boats to be better than the ODs. That will harm the 2.4mR class. Only WS can decide restrictions to approved class rules.

The Norlin Mk3 has been a development class for 28 years and there are between 100 and 150 well known differences in the boats, all legal and welcome in a development class. Tightening the OD rule means to remove boats where rebuilding will be too expensive. The Norlin M3 is not suited to be an OD class and 2.4 sailing cannot afford to divide the class or scrap hundreds of boats.

The 2.4 class shall as we see it not only serve a group of experts who want to compete on the international and Olympic levels. 2.4 is an important class for sailors on all levels. That is best achieved by keeping the class as a development class.

The report recommend that the development of the OD class is delegated to TC on permanent basis. That recommendation is strictly against the ICA Constitution. TC has one and only one function, to report to the EC. If TC shall be placed over EC in any case, it must be proposed to AGM, adopted, and finally approved by WS. WS will hardly place the top ICA authority EC under a TC that the Constitution says shall report to the same EC.

The ODSC report recommend that representatives of the Para WS Committee and the WS Equipment Rules Sub-Committee should be consulted on a continuous base. Outside organizations, both igher ranked than the ICA and possibly with certain interests in the OD, should in our opinion not be given any permanent role in the ICA. Such a strange overpowering must anyway be proposed to AGM for changing the Constitution, be adopted by AGM and approved by the right authority in WS.

I believe that WS will not approve two very similar classes in their own rights because they obviously will harm each other. If that shall happen, one of them must die first. This must be investigated and WS must state that two similar WS classes can be approved as parallel classes. We cannot sign a report which we fear may contribute to the death of 2.4mR.

The report recommends that OD boats in the open Worlds should be measured in the OD system. That complicates the event and harm the 2,4mR class because there will be fewer sailors that compete in the 2.4mR class. In open 2.4mR Worlds all boats should be measured as 2.4mR.

I believe that the ICA OD class rule proposal is not written on the WS Standard Class Rule Format and cannot be used as a basis for OD measurement or certificates.

I recommend your consider:

1. The WS at level above the two organizations mentioned in the report, should be asked if two very similar WS classes that obviously will harm each other, both can be approved as WS international classes in their own rights.
2. The WS should be asked if the ICA OD Class Rule proposal can be used as the fundament for a Norlin Mk3 OD class or if the WS Standard Class Rule Format must be used.
3. When WS has answered both questions above positive, the EC may prepare the case for AGM, not before.