

**NOTICE OF  
EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL MEETING  
OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL NACRA 17 CLASS ASSOCIATION**

---

In accordance with the International Nacra 17 Class Association Constitution, this Notice, dated October 3, 2017, gives the required 28 days notice, under the Constitution, of an Extraordinary General Meeting of the Class. The meeting will be held on November 1, 2017 at 1900hrs Central European Time.

The meeting shall be conducted via online teleconference and only members of the World Council shall be entitled to vote. Observers may be admitted.

The vote will be conducted by email vote for 48 hours after the call concludes.

---

**Resolutions**

There is 1 Ordinary Resolution and 10 Special Resolutions to be considered. The Class budget for 2018 is also presented for approval.

## **Ordinary Resolution 1: Policy Decision – C Board Division Racing**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

### Proposal

To cease holding C-Board Division racing Nacra 17 World Championships and European Championships.

### Purpose

With limited demand for such racing in 2017, and an assumption of greater availability of Full Foiling boats, the effort required to hold divisional racing does not seem justified.

### Question

Do you wish to have the class organize further C-Board Division Racing? (Yes/No)

### Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **APPROVAL**.

## **Special Resolution 1: Allow 3:1 Traveler System**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

### Proposal

Insert new Class Rule as follows:

C.6.1 BOAT

C 6.1 MODIFICATIONS (a)

(vii) The rope purchase of the traveller system may be increased to a maximum of 3:1 with no additional holes drilled into the boat.

### Purpose

To allow sailors to rig a 3:1 traveler system as they wish on foiling Nacra 17's. Note, as per the Class Rules, no additional holes may be drilled into the boat.

### Question

Do you wish to endorse this resolution? (Yes/No)

### Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **APPROVAL**.

### Technical Committee Comments

TC recommends **APPROVAL** by slim margin.

Unresolved Issues related to this proposal for new function of the traveler system include safety with more rope outside when trapezing, the compromise of the one design principle with different block systems on rear beam, perceived small difference in loading with 2:1 to warrant the change, lots of boats are already out there with 2:1 and 3:1 advantages female helms. Comments in support suggest that if there is no real difference in loading between 2:1 and 3:1 then teams will not choose 3:1. There may be disadvantages like extra rope in use which will influence against selection by teams. It could also be that such new function can be made safe, and may be necessary remedial function in support of the Olympic Mixed Multihull event.

## Technical Committee Feedback in Detail

Sept 26 Peter Vink Yes because it can be a good thing if we can find a good and simple system, it will help female skippers and it will reduce the load on your hands when sailing. Maybe this is an idea to approach this? Teams can look at this this winter by them self and forward their ideas to the tech committee! The class can approve this and we Nacra can put this as a standard part on future boat delivery's! This way I think you don't need a class rule change and you will keep it all one design! I believe this system should have the option to go 1 to 2 or 1 to 3

Sept 25 Murray Jones: I need to see an example of how this is set up.

Sept 21 Moana Vaireaux NO. I totally agree with Thomas on this point

Sept 20 Thomas Zajac: I don't think it's really necessary, as there isn't any hard load on it. It will give mainly woman steering teams an advantage. The teams with a 3:1 system may be able to leave their traveller in windward, which might be better and useful in some conditions - do we want this?

Sept 30 TZ: I still wouldn't change it to 3:1.

- Its not a big difference in the load
- It may cause more safety problems, as u need to have more rope outside when trapezing
- not one design with the different block systems on the rearbeam
- many boats are already out without this system

Sept 20 Carla Schiefer: YES. A simple fix to address presented problem

Oct 1 Chris Henderson - We are talking about a one design class, and sure if Nacra felt it was necessary they would fit it, so not in favour.

Oct 1 Murray Jones: I can't see the down side for allowing the 3:1. I would allow the sailors to choose which system suits them best.

If there is not much load on the traveller, teams won't adopt the 3:1. If they decide to, they have some disadvantages to overcome as well, as Thomas pointed out with the extra length of rope.

Oct 2 Dave McNabb- I support the resolution. This proposal allows choice in rope purchase arrangements 2:1 or 3:1 for all teams, with needed new or extended function for some female and male helms. The needed function may simply have been overlooked by NS at design stage or otherwise reasonably considered and installed by NS in support of the Olympic Mixed Multihull event, if there had been lots of time for testing before releasing the full foiling boat. It could be said the new or extended function is necessary remedial function that needs to be installed retroactively. It is reasonable to me at this stage in the life of the boat to consider such a remedial proposal that supports equity and fairness within and between mixed teams. Give

teams the choice. If there is broad class support for the idea of allowing choice 2:1 or 3:1 then I also support the idea of working with NS and teams as necessary, to come up with a safe and specific builder specification recommendation to the class.

## **Special Resolution 2: Using Gennakers Upwind**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

### Proposal

Insert new Class Rule as follows:

C.11.5 GENNAKER

(c) USE

(i) A boat shall not set the gennaker when sailing on a leg to a windward mark from a leeward mark.

### Purpose of this Vote

To restrict the use of the gennaker on upwind legs.

### Question

Do you approve to adopt the proposed class rule change? (Yes/No)

### Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **APPROVAL** in a split vote.

### Technical Committee Comments

TC Recommends **APPROVAL**

More members by a small margin accepted the point of view that the boat is not designed for gennaker upwind and there will be no warranty on the boat for such use. High cost of multiple gennakers could exclude some teams and some countries from starting or continuing campaigns. Otherwise experience reveals the boat simply sails faster with gennaker upwind in up to 7 or 8 knots and some against the proposal felt teams should have the choice. Sailing with gennaker upwind adds excitement for teams and visual appeal for spectators. It was also felt that another way of handling the issue is to change the discussion to focus on how to make gennaker upwind work at 7-8 knots.

Regardless of the fate of this special resolution proposal, there may be further guidance from the Class at future events regarding the definition of such use. It is the

intention of this special resolution proposal that a boat shall not set a gennaker after its warning signal and when sailing the course on a proper course to a mark upwind from a mark downwind.

World Sailing may ultimately decide this issue based on its review of the proposed use of gennaker upwind and all of the relevant circumstances, including no boat warranty for such use.

In anticipation of evolutionary changes to the boat for implementation post 2020 Games, NS have been asked to investigate what changes would be required to allow NS to warranty the boat for using gennaker upwind.

#### Technical Committee Feedback in Detail

Sept 26 Peter Vink

NO, Here some reasons why I'm against

will increase sailing cost

boat is not designed for it, so there is a high risk of damage and breakage

crew weight will go up

sheet loads will go up

It will benefit the teams with bigger budgets

due to the increased costs (as example massive increase in spinnaker usage) it is more likely that teams with less budgeted cannot continue or will not enter the class. This will end up in less country's and therefor a weaker political position

No warranty from manufacturer on any parts than can be related to the use of sailing upwind with a spinnaker. Boat is not designed for it!

Sept 25 Murray Jones

No I would not write this into a rule.

We should consider more carefully where we want the class to go. As Ben and Marcus have pointed out we may feel pressure staying an Olympic class. The boat appeals to athletes who like to sail a fast technically challenging boat. The Foiling Nacra up wind in 7 kts and less without the gennaker is slow and boring for competitors and spectators.

Sept 21 Moana Vaireaux

The problem is that using the gennaker upwind works until a high range of 9 or 10 kts of wind. Then the load on the boat is too important and we will break spinakers mast cleat etc... If the gennaker upwind work only until 7 kts, then we will not have any problem.

Yes I approve to adopt this class rule change but I regret not being able to use it until 7kts of wind...

Sept 20 Thomas Zajac

As already discussed in La Grande Motte. My personal view is, that we should allow teams to make their best performance with their material. And its simply faster going in light air with the Gennaker, opens up tactical possibilities (going with or without it) and it s more athletic (we just don t sit with our helmets in the boat and do kind of nothing). As this topic was a big discussion topic, it s good it goes for a vote.

Sept 20 Carla Schieffer

NO. The Spinnaker or an Improved Gennaker Improves the sailing of the boat. Since Sailors buy many a year this does not add a substantial cost. It could be improved but the manufacturer to have sails last longer and adds to the visual appeal of the boat.

Sept 30 TZ: I agree with Murray. And I stick to my points already made. We had 10days sailing in Cagliari end of sept with gennaker upwind. Nothing happened. It was paying off a lot in winds under 7-8 Knots. In 7-8kn it was more or less the same performance, as the boats without the gennaker upwind. In more then 8-9kn the gennaker upwind wasn t working anymore, cause of a worse VMG.

I would keep it open and let the class decide, but my recommendation is to put no rule on it.

Oct 1 Chris Henderson- Using the gennaker upwind wind will be good to watch, but I am sure that Nacra will not support this as the original design did not take this into consideration when designing and sure they will not warranty any parts if this is allowed.

Oct 1 Murray: I haven't changed my mind on this, I would not jump in and change the rule. To me it is clearly a better outcome to have the gennakers upwind in Light winds. Perhaps we are having the wrong debate. Should we be discussing how to make it work better, rather than throw it out.

Oct 1 Dave McNabb- The boat is not designed for it.



### **Special Resolution 3: Sail Numbers**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

#### Proposal:

Amend Class Rules as follows:

##### C.11.3 MAINSAIL

##### (b) IDENTIFICATION

Sail numbers shall be:

(i) The number shown on the ISAF/World Sailing International Class building plaque; or

(ii) In the International Nacra 17 Class World Championships (Excluding Junior World Championships), Continental Championship and Sailing World Cup events, any helm or crew ever having placed in the top 25 at a Nacra 17 Class World Championship previously shall use an ICA issued personal sail number between 1 – 99, which shall be renewed on an annual basis. Helms having raced at the previous Olympic Games, shall use the number corresponding with their Olympic finish.

(iii) The number shown on the ISAF/World Sailing International Class building plaque of any hull still owned by them, on any boat owned by them or on any boat loaned or chartered for an event.

(iv) The national letters and the sail numbers shall be black in colour and applied according to the dimensions as defined in Appendix section K immediately under batten nr. 4. The national letters and numbers shall comply with the RRS Appendix G except where specified otherwise in (b) IDENTIFICATION and in Appendix section K.

(v) The area between the second from the top and third sail batten of the mainsail shall be kept free of competitor advertising, and shall be reserved for the Class Insignia, as specified in Appendix Section K.

(vi) After the sale of the boat, the new owner shall use the sail number as in accordance with the ISAF/World Sailing hull plaque or his own personal number on his sails. In the event of a conflict, Hulls number 1 – 99 shall have the prefix “0” before the sail number.

Delete: Existing Class Rules (after amendment)

##### A.10 SAIL NUMBERS & CLASS INSIGNIA

A.10.1 Sail numbers shall be:

(a) the number corresponding to the number on the World Sailing International Class building plaque, shall be used in the first 3 digits; or

(b) where the helm has finished in the top 3 in the preceding Nacra 17 World Championship their sail number shall be that place, single digit. Positioning of the numbers are specified in Appendix Section K.

(c) sailors may use the sail number shown on the World Sailing International Class building plaque of any hull still owned by them on any other boat owned by them or on a boat chartered or loaned for an event.

A.10.2 The area between the second from the top and third sail batten of the mainsail shall be kept free of competitor advertising, and shall be reserved for the Class Insignia, as specified in Appendix Section K.

AND

C.11.3 MAINSAIL

(b) IDENTIFICATION

The national letters and the sail numbers shall be black in colour and applied according to the dimensions as defined in Appendix section K immediately under batten nr. 4. The national letters and numbers shall comply with the RRS Appendix G except where specified otherwise in Appendix section K.

#### Purpose of this Vote

To allow top sailors to 'brand' their sail numbers and provide longer term brand association between sailing teams and their fans. To reorder and consolidate presentation of MAINSAIL IDENTIFICATION.

#### Question

Do you approve to adopt the proposed class rule change? (Yes/No)

#### Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **APPROVAL**.

#### Technical Committee Comments

TC recommends **APPROVAL**

Proposal wording edited to properly position and align with Class Rules and eliminate duplication for presentation purposes.

Technical Committee Feedback in Detail

Sept 26 Peter Vink Yes

Sept 25 Murray Jones

Yes (is this the 49er system?)

Sept 21 Moana Vaireaux Yes

Sept 20 Thomas Zajac Totally Agree

Sept 20 Carla Schiefer NO. This does not affect the sailing of the boat but does make Equipment Inspection difficult since we would need to know at the time if measurement if sailor or crew has “ever” won said championships

Oct 1 Chris Henderson- I see no problem with this as it is used by several other classes and works well.

## **Special Resolution 4: Foot Straps**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

### Proposal:

Amend Class Rule as follows:

#### C.7 HULL

##### C.7.1 MODIFICATIONS

(d) Four foot straps may be fitted to each hull, at least one of which, and no more than two, must be rear of the aft cross beam. The forward foot straps must only be anchored to the hull using the anchor points built into the hulls as supplied and/or anchored to the shroud base and/or anchored to the forward beam.

Delete: Existing Class Rule (after amendment)

##### C.7.1 MODIFICATIONS

(d) Three foot straps may be fitted to each hull, of which the aft one must be rear of the aft cross beam. The forward two foot straps must only be anchored to the hull using the anchor points built into the hulls as supplied.

### Purpose of this Vote

To give teams the freedom to create a large foot loop allowing crews to move up and down the boat while still maintaining some negative contact with the boat via foot loop.

### Question

Do you approve to adopt the proposed class rule change? (Yes/No)

### Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **APPROVAL**.

### Technical Committee Comments

TC recommends **APPROVAL**

although the concern for safety of a larger loop is not resolved in the TC discussions. There was one suggestion of a trial period of 6 months.

### Technical Committee Feedback in Detail

Sept 26 Peter Vink

No, Because I believe we all are missing something here and that is safety. By allowing such a big foot straps, it can be possible that your leg or ankle gets stuck under the foot strap, because you can slip under it! Even a normal foot straps can be dangerous if it is set to big. Ask any windsurf or kite board manufacturer about this and they will tell you exactly the same. Allowing this on the boat is asking for big problems!

Sept 25 Murray Jones Yes

Sept 21 Moana Vaireaux YES perfect. I think put a simple strap from the shroud base to the forward beam will be good for the crew when foiling upwind (like on usa boats). We tried it on prototype in Sheveningen and it don't need any holes.

Sept 20 Carla Schiefer Yes. Safety issue depending on weight of driver and crew.

Oct 1 Chris Henderson- I don't have any problems with this but down to sailors to vote.

Oct 1 Murray Jones: Rather than change rules now, can we do a trial period to allow this for say 6 months and then decide on the rule. Regarding safety, my feeling is with the long strap your foot is more likely to come out than a normal foot strap

## **Special Resolution 5: Restriction on Tape**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

### Proposal

Amend Class Rule as follows:

C.6 BOAT

C 6.1 MODIFICATIONS (a)

(ii) adhesive tape applied above the floatation trim achieved with the boat floating in condition for inspection of equipment including boat weight C.6.4.

Delete: Existing Class Rule (after amendment)

C.6.1 (BOAT) MODIFICATIONS

(ii) adhesive tape

### Purpose

Currently use of adhesive tape is unrestricted, and with some underwater items having drag the temptation exists to create exotic fairings out of tape, whereas the class should seek a simpler form of one design racing.

### Question

Do you wish to endorse this resolution? (Yes/No)

### Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **APPROVAL**.

### Technical Committee Comments

TC recommends **APPROVAL**

Wording of proposal keeps any adhesive tape above water and incorporates the defined term floatation trim found in the ERS at C.6.3 (c). The term Waterline was considered although not used because its ERS definition connects to the defined term measurement trim which requires new class rules defining two new measurement

points perpendicular to each hull. Using the defined term floatation trim aligns better for this manufacturer class. Any event equipment compliance disputes can be settled by taking the sample process as specified in the class rules. Other event equipment inspection challenges include the possibility of post Inspection addition of tape below the waterline which may require mitigation in NOR and SI's...ie no swimming near the boat after inspection until the end of the event.

#### Technical Committee Feedback in Detail

Sept 26 Peter Vink Yes

Sept 26 Laura Marimon the wetted waterline needs to be defined as being with zero degrees of heel (to avoid confusion on tape on bridles)

Sept 25 Murray Jones Yes Do we want to consider wording to limit aero fairings as well?

Sept 21 Moana Vaireaux YES I agree because it difficult to judge if it's tape or exotic fairing. But if we can solve the problem of drag of the bearing by another method it can be good for the performance of the boat in the future

Sept 20 Carla Schiefer Yes. These drag issues need a more permanent fix.

Sept 30 TZ: Normal Tape wasn't sticking a hole week on the lower bearings to avoid drag made by the step between the hull and the lower bearing. I guess if we allow it, people will start to "lamine" the tape there. But I agree it s too much drag right now

Oct 1 Chris Henderson- With all fairing, I feel we should be working with the manufacturer to improve how the item is supplied, and not allow teams to spend high sums of money on having the boat and foils optimized.

Oct 1 Murray Jones: As a separate subject, should we discuss the use of tape for aero fairings? Where do we draw the line? Spreaders as an example.

## **Special Resolution 6: Filling Rudder Elevator Bolts**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

### Proposal:

Insert new Class Rule as follows:

C.8 HULL APPENDAGES

C.8.1 MAINTENANCE

(d) Two bolt head voids created by joining the rudder to the elevator may be filled and fared.

### Purpose of this Vote

To reduce drag in a simple manner.

### Question

Do you approve to adopt the proposed class rule change? (Yes/No)

### Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **APPROVAL**.

### Technical Committee Comments

TC recommends **APPROVAL**

with some interest to require NS to address the issue in manufacturing with the expectation of improved results.

### Technical Committee Feedback in Detail

Sept 26 Peter Vink Yes

Sept 25 Murray Jones Yes

Sept 21 Moana Vaireaux Yes



Sept 20 Thomas Zajac Totally Agree

Sept 20 Carla Schiefer

Not sure if these screws have been replaced by inserts in the rudder. This issue needs to be address by the manufacturer. My opinion is it is a huge worm hole that requires engineering and in order to maintain one design should be done by manufacturer.

Oct 1 Chris Henderson- Same as above. Down to the supplier to improve.

## **Special Resolution 7: Filling of Void between Rudder and Elevator**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

### Proposal

Insert new Class Rule as follows:

C.8 HULL APPENDAGES

C.8.1 MAINTENANCE

(e) A void found between the rudder and the elevator may be filled and fared

### Purpose of this Vote

To reduce drag and loss of lift in a simple manner.

### Question

Do you approve to adopt the proposed class rule change? (Yes/No)

### Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **APPROVAL**.

### Technical Committee Comments

TC recommends **APPROVAL**

with a suggestion that NS address the issue in manufacturing with the expectation of improved results.

### Technical Committee Feedback in Detail

Sept 26 Peter Vink Yes

Sept 25 Murraray Jones Yes if we don't the manufacturer will have to do a perfect job on all.

Sept 21 Moana Vaireaux Yes

Sept 20 Carla Schiefer No. Manufacturing issue.

Sept 30 TZ: Yes, even if Carla is right, but it seems not to be possible that DNA is solving it, so we should allow it.

Oct 1 Chris Henderson- Down to the supplier to improve

## **Special Resolution 8: Open Adjustment on Daggerboards**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

### Proposal:

Insert new Class Rule as follows:

C.7 Hull

C.7.1 MODIFICATIONS

(f) Teams may rig their rope systems for adjusting the worm drive attached to the daggerboard any way they see fit, so long as they utilize the supplied bearings as the only parts holding the daggerboards, and use the supplied worm drive remains the direct adjustment mechanism of the top bearing, and no permanent fittings may be added to the boat.

### Purpose of this Vote

To allow teams to experiment in a compliant manner with various methods of adjusting the daggerboards while sailing for a 6 months before a spec change is implemented to permanently implement any changes that might be necessary.

### Question

Do you approve to adopt the proposed class rule change? (Yes/No)

### Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **APPROVAL**.

### Technical Committee Comments

TC recommends **REJECTION**

Majority feel teams need more time gaining experience sailing with the boat, and that the proposal is premature. Any change in class rule or builders specification will need to have fidelity to one design principle.

### Technical Committee Feedback in Detail

Sept 26 Peter Vink Yes, But not including the board trim systems hardware (worm drive and bearing cassette). This will give options to setup the rope trim systems as you like. But I think this is already open under the current class rules!

Sept 25 Murray Jones Yes Let's see how the sailors sail the boats with it open. It can only enhance the performance of the boat or if it is too much hassle to raise and lower the sailors won't do it so you don't need a rule.

Sept 21 Moana Vaireaux I don't know. Me too I need more explications about this topic

Sept 20 Thomas Zajac What exactly was the idea of the Executive Committee, about this resolution? What s the Purpose?

Sept 20 Chris Henderson there is no mention of the request from Iker to modify the rake system by adding blocks and changing the routing which I still feel does not comply with the current rules. Any comments please.

Sept 20 Carla Schiefer Yes. But again with a design from manufacturer to maintain one design.

Oct 1 Chris Henderson- Again give teams more time to train before making any changes.

Oct 1 Murray Jones: I am confused about the scope of this resolution. I assumed it was opening up the raising and lowering of the dagger boards as well. Which I have said before could improve the performance of the boat in some conditions. We have not given the sailors a chance to sail the boats to maximum potential. Why would we not keep it open for 6 months?

## **Special Resolution 9: Speed Device**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

### Proposal

Amend class rule as follows:

#### C.5. PORTABLE EQUIPMENT

##### C.5.1 OPTIONAL

(c) One 'Velocitek Speedpuck' electronic speed device with bracket, with only speed, maximum speed, heading and heading memory, or similar devices approved by the Technical Committee.

(d) Spare parts and tools, removable for weighing.

(e) Camera recording equipment and attachments, where permitted by the Notice of Race and/or Sailing Instructions and removable for weighing.

Delete: Existing Rules (c) and (d)(rules after amendment)

#### C.5 PORTABLE EQUIPMENT

##### C.5.1 OPTIONAL

(a) Timing devices.

(b) One compass with bracket, which may include a timing device. If electronic, only a compass with heading, heading memory and timing functions is permitted.

(c) Spare parts and tools, removable for weighing.

(d) Camera recording equipment and attachments, where permitted by the Notice of Race and/or Sailing Instructions and removable for weighing.

### Purpose of this Vote

To allow teams to get digital speed feedback as they sail.

### Question

Do you approve to adopt the proposed class rule change? (Yes/No)

### Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **APPROVAL** in a split vote.

### Technical Committee Comments

TC recommends **REJECTION**

Slight majority felt technology and teams are well beyond simple electronic speed device, with many owning GPS enabled watches and other devices. If technology was permitted then some supported the idea of the Velocitek Speedpuck specifically, with TC considering other speed only devices on request of teams.

### Technical Committee Feedback in Detail

Sept 21, 2016 Ben Remocker

The model of velocitek specified is the Speed Puck, which has only 1 function, which is to display the speed travelled. The purpose of this is to help teams to foil upwind. This model cannot be used as a start line aid.

Sept 26 Peter Vink

Would be a great thing to get a bid out of the Stone Age in this area on sailing boats! These devices are not expensive anymore and should be part of an high performance boat. Here an idea how this kind of devices is also helping in promoting the sport <https://woosports.com/kite/>

Sept 26 Laura Marimon

If the class wants to start racing with AC style reaching starts, I think the GPS would be beneficial

Sept 25 Murray Jones

No. Teams can do what they like when they are training, With more sailing the teams will all figure out when to foil by feel.

Sept 21 Moana Vaireaux Yes but "velocitek speedpuck" with only the speed or compass

Sept 20 Thomas Zajac

This will change the game a lot, if we are allowed to use it: I m using this Velocitek on Big boats. It has GPS and u can program the starting line. Also i think we are anyway not allowed to use GPS devises on the World cups. And it s really expensive. i think we can drop this proposed rule change.

Sept 21 Leo Sanchez

What happens with some Garmin watches?

Sept 20 Chris Henderson

I am happy with all rule changes, except the use of electronic speed devices which I feel is not necessary.

Sept 20 Carla Schiefer No not during racing.

Sept 30 TZ: With only the Speedpuck, showing only the speed and the compass.

Oct 1 Chris Henderson- Only to be used during training and not during races.

Oct 1 Murray: I would be surprised if only a speed function would be useful while racing. I think the sailors are well past this level. I would hold off allowing this on the boat. I would rather discuss watches that are worn, and what should be acceptable. With a maximum screen size and the requirement that it is worn on the wrist we may be able to allow a lot of normal watches without it being an advantage while racing. A lot of people own watches like this anyway and they can use the gps data for post race analysis.



## **Special Resolution 10: Minimum Rope Diameter**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

### Proposal

Amend Class Rule as follows:

C.6 BOAT

C.6.1 MODIFICATIONS (a)

(iv) Except the mainsheet, spinnaker sheets, and traveler sheets which shall have a minimum diameter of 6mm where handled from a trapezing position, and as otherwise noted in Section I- RIGGING LIST, ropes of any length and diameter may be added, if a new function is not created.

Delete: Existing Rules (after amendment)

C.6 BOAT

C.6.1 MODIFICATIONS (a)

(iv) ropes of any length and diameter may be added as long as it does not create a new function to the boat.

### Purpose of this Vote

To reduce long term health issues from gripping narrow ropes and reduce the pinching effects possible when the boat stops suddenly.

### Question

Do you approve to adopt the proposed class rule change? (Yes/No)

### Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **REJECTION**.

### Technical Committee Comments

TC recommends **REJECTION**

Majority believes smaller ropes are not in the interests of teams and there is no reason to introduce a rule. Keep it simple either because smaller is not practical or simply that teams will self select their ropes. Size of ropes will be difficult to police. Some empathy for larger 8mm ropes with smaller tapers that could not reach a hand when sailing.

#### Technical Committee Feedback in Detail

Sept 26 Peter Vink

Yes, but it should be 8 mm and not 6mm. rule should be such that you are still allowed to taper but that this taper could not reach you hand when sailing!

Sept 26 Laura Marimon

I agree with Peter and Thomas on the fact that you will be allowed to taper the ropes as long as it is not in your hands whilst sailing in a conventional situation. For the minimum thickness I believe 6 or 7mm will need to be on the rule (8mm as proposed by Peter is a bit excessive and a large number of teams will need to change their sheets).

Sept 25 Murray Jones

No. All the teams customize their ropes to suit their individual needs, we shouldn't restrict this. I don't think anyone will use a Mainsheet, Traveller or Spin sheet in the handling area less than 6 mm. Let's not have more rules than is necessary.

Sept 21 Moana Vaireaux Yes, why not?

Sept 20 Thomas Zajac

I'm not a fan of rules like this. Don't think it's an important issue and I don't know any teams using less than 6mm of the part they use in their hands - for example the mainsheet is tapered into less than 6mm of the rope running inside the blocks. If we put this rule, we are not allowed to taper main or gennaker sheet? This will make it much harder to work with. I think we can drop this proposed rule change.

Sept 30 TZ: Still No.

-Agree with Murray, that all the ropes are customize and we should keep it

-no one in the fleet is using less than 6mm anyway, therefore the rule is not necessary

-more than 7 or 8mm makes things worse again, cause of friction in the blocks

-hard to measure as ropes are changing fast. Sometimes a 7mm rope gets a 6 or less when u squeeze them

-as sheets are tapered it's also complicated to find a good rule. How do u prove where u have a sheet in your hand? Sitting in the boat, trapezing?

Oct 1 Chris Henderson- Impossible to police rope sizes, and not in the interest of sailors to go to small.

Oct 1 Murray Jones: I think we are making up rules for no reason at all. Lets keep it simple, going too small is a handling disadvantage so no need for a rule.

**Special Resolution 11: Constitution – Change the make up of the Nacra 17 Executive**

Submitted by Sofia Bekatorou, Vice President

Proposal

Change Clause 9.1 (d) of the Nacra 17 Class Constitution to read:

1 representatives appointed by the Copyright Holder

Change Clause 7.1 of the Nacra 17 Class Constitution to read:

The World Council shall consist of the members of the Executive Committee and of one Representative of each Nation that has members with the Association. Where a National Nacra 17 Class Association is established the Representative shall be a nominee of that National Nacra 17 Class Association.

Purpose

To balance the Executive more in favor of the sailors by reducing the number of Copyright Holders representatives to one.

Question

Do you wish to endorse this resolution? (Yes/No)

Executive Committee Comments

Executive recommends **APPROVAL**.

**PROPOSED 2018 budget:**

Submitted by Marcus Spillane, President, on behalf of the Executive Committee

<b>International Nacra 17 Class Association</b>			
<b>All amounts in Euros</b>			
	<b>FY16 Actual</b>	<b>FY17 Forecast</b>	<b>FY18 Budget</b>
<b>Income</b>			
Championship Revenue			
European Championships	-	4,100	6,400
World Championships	2,193	5,500	7,000
Junior World Championships	-	-	500
<b>Total Championship Revenue</b>	<b>2,193</b>	<b>9,600</b>	<b>13,900</b>
Membership Dues	3,150	3,500	4,500
Class Equipment Fee	11,730	12,845	9,000
Miscellaneous	-	-	-
Sponsorship	-	-	-
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>17,073</b>	<b>25,945</b>	<b>27,400</b>
<b>Expense</b>			
Bank Charges	334	300	500
Dues and Subscriptions	257	500	500
Management Fee	12,525	-	12,000
Miscellaneous	1,372	1,500	500
Non deductible VAT	1,196	1,000	-
Sponsor Fulfillment	3,589	-	-
Technical & Measurement	4,280	-	1,000
Travel	8,540	12,184	12,000
Website	520	5,000	-
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>32,613</b>	<b>20,484</b>	<b>26,500</b>
<b>Net Ordinary Income</b>	<b>(15,540)</b>	<b>5,461</b>	<b>900</b>

Question

Do you approve the 2018 Class Budget as above? (Yes/No)