

2.4 MR One Design?

Nedenfor har jeg samlet en række indlæg i debatten – disse er samlet i kronologisk orden men det ældste materiale først.

E-mail fra Danny McCoy 9/12 2008:

To All

Please find as directed from the 2008 AGM minutes, the "Selection Process for One Design Builders". Please discuss with your NCA membership and send me back your approval. For any explanation or clarification, all inquiries should be directed to Peter Wilson peterwilson186@yahoo.com.

This is a fairly straightforward document and the EC would appreciate WC approval by January 1, 2009.

Mark LeBlanc presented: The US NCA suggested that there needs to be defined process where new builders are interviewed, assets defined, etc. The discussion was short as everybody acknowledged the importance of this. Marc LeBlanc made a motion to say the procurement and selection is defined and presented to the WC for approval, 2nd by Pekka Seitola

Motion vote was carried ITA voted against

Process for selecting and qualifying builders for the One-Design 2.4

1. Overall strategy:

- a. Work with Charger Composites to assure a smooth production transition so no gap in the availability of new boats will occur.
- b. If other currently licensed or sub-licensed builders of the Norlin Mk III are interested in building the 2.4 OD they may contact the ODRC and ask to be given the opportunity to qualify for building the one-design boat.
- c. Consideration will be given to contacting established builders and/or distributors of other one-design boats who have proven capability to build and/or distribute and promote quality one-design boats.

2. Builder Qualification: The following are important areas for consideration in the selection of builders, but not absolute requirements.

- a. ISAF In-House Certification: Builders should either commit to meet, or already meet requirements established by ISAF. (<http://www.sailing.org/13160.php>)
- b. Proven ability to build a quality boat (ideally one-design) with consistency of production standards over time.
- c. Capacity to meet demand (minimum will be 12 boats per year with no more than a two month delivery time from date of order).
- d. Proven ability to promote and build a class.
- e. Distribution network (if appropriate for the continent, e.g., Europe)
- f. Positive reputation.

3. Selection Process – Selection Committee. Initially this process will be managed by the One-Design Rule Committee. When the ODRC is disbanded by the World Council, the WC will appoint a One-Design Management Committee to oversee current builders, and when appropriate, qualify and select new builders.

- a. As appropriate, the One-Design Rule Committee (ODRC) shall in person, or through qualified appointees, contact, interview, and conduct due process of assessment with prospective builders.
- b. The ODRC may use outside experts as consultants, and shall call upon qualified measurers and the Technical Committee to help it evaluate prospective builders.
- c. The ODRC shall develop the license agreements for qualified builders it may consider for selection.
- d. The ODRC shall approve builders it believes are qualified to build the one-design 2.4.

Submitted by the One-Design Rule Committee 12/8/08 for World Council Approval

E-mail fra Steve Bullmore, UK – 18/12 2008:

Hi Danny

I had a meeting with Martin WhittinghamJones last night and he has lead me to believe that the agreement was that the One Design Committee should recommend builders to a full World Council vote. We would like this to be the adopted practice which may lead you to amend the relevant section in your wording - 3d which would now read - *The ODRC shall recommend approved builders it believes are qualified to build the one-design 2.4mR to the World Council for endorsement.*

I am sure that for as major decision as this it is right that every country has the right to approve or challenge the builders put up.

E.mail fra Roger Cleworth, US – 23/12 2008

All, Attached are the USA NCA's thoughts about the Builder Selection Process. I think we need to think seriously about what is involved. This is an important moment for our Class. Thank you for your attention to this, Roger

Builder Selection Process

US Class Position

To begin, this should be called a licensing agreement. Here's why:

I think we can all agree that as sailors of the 2.4's, first and foremost, we would like to sail boats of the best quality. This is most important to everyone and if we keep this in focus all related issues fall into place.

To begin, the benchmark of ISAF In House Certification would hold any potential builder and the ICA to meeting extremely high standards. The ISAF IHC covers areas of measurement, adherence to class rules and allows for audits of the builders business and building methods. However meeting the demands of this ISAF Certification appears to be a large task and I do not believe our executive board has the resources to stay on top of this certification. Just the audit procedures alone

[http://www.sailing.org/tools/documents/AuditPlan- \[4258\].pdf](http://www.sailing.org/tools/documents/AuditPlan- [4258].pdf) would require monthly, quarterly, yearly and semi yearly commitments. There also penalties if this information is not kept up. Here is a link to the minimum criteria

[http://www.sailing.org/tools/documents/CertificationSystemMinimumCriteria- \[2519\].pdf](http://www.sailing.org/tools/documents/CertificationSystemMinimumCriteria- [2519].pdf)

Is this really something our small class can maintain?

I think it is better to get our own in house measurer and then use some of these IHC requirements to establish Class Criteria for Builders.

The ISAF IHC is too involved for the International Class to participate.

The second control to having a quality boat would be measurement. If a set of line drawings are made available to builders, a class measurer could verify as to whether the boats conforms to class standards and to standards of quality.

Certified Measurement ensures the One Design Rule is followed.

The third control to having quality boats are the sailors themselves. If sailors are given a choice, they will pick what is best for them. I believe there are a great number of 2.4 sailors who do not race the boats and would like to have a good quality boat but not necessarily a race car. Other sailors only to race and compete and want a boat built to extremely high standards. It is important to represent both types of class members. They are important to growing the size of our class and both should have choices which make it comfortable for them to be a member of the class. If you are a racer there should be builders that build high performance or custom 2.4s. If you are a day sailor, maybe price is more important and you do not need a race car. Both situations should be available without sacrificing ODR quality standards and ISAF IHC.

Allowing different builders to enter the 2.4 market allows sailors to determine which builder is the right builder for them and the ODR and License Agreement assures the sailor of receiving a quality boat.

The class should install a Builders Licensing Agreement, BLA, which contains:

1. Stipulations of how a builder must meet Class standards. i.e. follow line drawings, use of certain fabrication materials and processes, meet measurement criteria.
2. Legal rights the class has when a builder no longer meets these standards.

Things the BLA should not include:

1. How many boats per year are built. Making a minimum number of boats per year, a requirement, is only useful when there is competition from another potential builder who wants to build or sell in the same market. However, if there is a high quality boat builder who wants to build only a few boats a year he should not be prevented from doing so. Competition is a great tool for selecting who is best at meeting the demands of 2.4 sailors and competition should be respected for its ability to do what's best for the class.
2. Limiting builders of the boats to only builders that have built and been successful in the One Design Arena and to builders that have a proven ability. Again let's let the ISAF IHC, our Class Measurer and the sailors buying boats, decide who the builders should be. If given several choices, sailors will select what is best for them. The Class should only be involved with making sure their class members are buying a boat that meets quality and measurement standards.
3. Promoting the Class. Other than having each builder pay a royalty to the class for each boat built, the decision on whether someone is a good builder or not should not rely on whether they are good at promoting the class. I think each sailor is the best promoter, the best salesman for the class. It is in the best interest of the builder to promote the class and a business savvy builder would consider promoting the class but this should not be a requirement.

The OneDesign

Rule Committee (ODRC) should have the responsibility of issuing and maintain BLA's.

Builders License Agreement (BLA)

What should be in the BLA? A Builder MUST:

1. Submit a Manufacturing Plan to the International Class for developing a 2.4mR OD Boat (Norlins MKIII). This Plan should include:
 - a. Process to develop a mold from a set of line drawings or other class approved method of developing a mold.
 - b. Description of process controls such as materials and materials lay up procedures and meeting other class specifications
2. Provide transportation and fees to have a class measurer certify the builders production boat under the 2.4mR ODR
3. Meet ongoing measurement certifications.
4. Pay Royalty fee to Class for each boat sold.

This BLA keeps it simple, and we all like simple. Volunteer man hours are a premium for our class. Maintaining an ISAF IHC would require many more volunteer hours or even a part time staff member to maintain the records required.

Basically we can use our own, in house, measurer and then use some of the IHC requirements to establish Class Criteria for Builders. The Builders will pay the Measurer's transportation and measurement fees. The Class Criteria document, incorporated into the BLA would be the key to insuring that quality boats are built for our class.

Roger Cleworth
President US 2.4mR Class

E-mail fra Peter Wilson – 23/12 2008:

Hi Roger,

Thanks for your thorough response. We will consider all your points as well as those coming from other NCA's. While I cannot speak for the whole One-Design Rule Committee, I think it may be worthwhile to comment on some of your points now, as many are already covered in the proposed OD rule and in our builder license agreement template.

- A builder selection process is much more than negotiating a license agreement, which is included as point 3c. We have already developed a template for a one-design builder licensing agreement which addresses most of the points you have covered in your letter. The points you make that are not addressed will, of course, be considered.
- The proposed one-design rule;
 - provides for many of the very requirements you have indicated should be in the license agreement. Some of them are also in the builders license agreement. Those that are not, will be considered by the ODRC
 - requires a builder to have each boat certified, either through IHC if so qualified by ISAF, or by an official measurer, and has very clear requirements on construction that must be followed and monitored by the ICA.
 - provides for making line drawings available to a builder, and refers to them in section J.
- We had already begun to look at the ISAF IHC 'minimum criteria' document you refer to, and that could, with some additions (as you suggest), become the foundation for a framework that may onerous beyond the ICA's and builder's capabilities. You will note that the proposed selection process makes use of the class technical committee (and other experts) which is comprised of measurers, so we have the flexibility to start with a builder who does not have ISAF IHC.

Thanks again for the US comments.

Peter

E-mail fra Bruce Millar, CAN – 29/12-2008:

Danny and all,

Attached is a response to the "Selection Process of One Design Builders" on behalf of the Canadian 2.4mR Class.

The document "WC Selection Process_ Canada Response.pdf" outlines the response step by step through the document and should be considered Canada's WC Vote on each item.

Bruce Millar, President Canadian 2.4mR Class Association

Response from Canadian 2.4mR Class Assoc. – Bruce Millar

Process for selecting and qualifying builders for the One-Design 2.4

1. Overall strategy:

- a. Work with Charger Composites to assure a smooth production transition so no gap in the availability of new boats will occur.
- b. If other currently licensed or sub-licensed builders of the Norlin Mk III are interested in building the 2.4 OD they may contact the ODRC and ask to be given the opportunity to qualify for building the one-design boat.
- c. Consideration will be given to contacting established builders and/or distributors of other one-design boats who have proven capability to build and/or distribute and promote quality one-design boats.

Comment: *The above statements are very general in nature and could be expressed in an overall statement such as: “The class will work with all potential manufactures to ensure that quality 2.4 One Design boats will built, available and supported..”*

2. Builder Qualification: The following are important areas for consideration in the selection of builders, but not absolute requirements.

- a. ISAF In-House Certification: Builders should either commit to meet, or already meet requirements established by ISAF.

(<http://www.sailing.org/13160.php>)

Disagree Comment: *The ISAF In-House Certification will be too costly and cumbersome for any small boat builder or the class. This standard is meant for most multi boat manufactures. If a large builder with this certification intends to build the 2.4OD then they will be able to incorporate this into their manufacturing procedures but this should not be considered a *qualification* for 2.4OD. (Canada has similar position as stated in the USA response.)*

- b. Proven ability to build a quality boat (ideally one-design) with consistency of production standards over time.

Disagree Comment: *Who and how is the class or committees going to judge this? This would only apply to existing boat builders but cannot be used in deciding new manufactures. (Canada has similar position as stated in the USA response.)*

- c. Capacity to meet demand (minimum will be 12 boats per year with no more than a two month delivery time from date of order).

Disagree Comment: *Different types of manufactures should be encouraged. This is not going to be achievable in the short term for most manufactures. Quantity does not mean quality. (Canada has similar position as stated in the USA response.)*

- d. Proven ability to promote and build a class.

Disagree Comment: *Most classes are promoted and built by sailors. Sometimes class associations can assist in this. Builders are important from a support position during a pre-sale, sale and follow-up such as parts availability etc. (Canada has similar position as stated in the USA response.)*

- e. Distribution network (if appropriate for the continent, e.g., Europe)

Agree Comment: *This should be directed more towards parts for boats. Builders could have parts inventories that can be accessed quickly. Most builders can send parts worldwide easily for their locations but the cost of overnight shipping could be prohibitive. Complete boats can be shipped*

worldwide, but by having boat inventories or additional builders in all continental markets would help grow fleets.

f. Positive reputation.

Agree / Disagree Comment: Everyone would like to see this. Builders who care about marketing will always try and achieve this. This is something that will be earned over time and cannot be judged until a builder has boats in the marketplace. It cannot be used in selecting a new manufacturer unless the builder has a reputation for building other boats.

3. Selection Process – Selection Committee. Initially this process will be managed by the One-Design Rule Committee. When the ODRC is disbanded by the World Council, the WC will appoint a One-Design Management Committee to oversee current builders, and when appropriate, qualify and select new builders.

a. As appropriate, the One-Design Rule Committee (ODRC) shall in person, or through qualified appointees, contact, interview, and conduct due process of assessment with prospective builders.

Agree Comment: The ODRC are the members closest to the process and would be the logical choice for evaluating providing they could be objective and impartial. We are not sure if a person with direct personal gain (Peter Norlin) should be part of this process as it may be a conflict of interest. The Costs to class should be carefully evaluated to avoid waste. There needs to be a very publicly defined process and the class members should be kept abreast of the progress. The ODRC members must be ready and willing and able to perform these duties in a timely manner, otherwise a specific group (ODMC) should be assembled.

b. The ODRC may use outside experts as consultants, and shall call upon qualified measurers and the Technical Committee to help it evaluate prospective builders.

Agree Comment: Again define how they are going to achieve this? Measurers and the TC can evaluate products built to a rule but what tools will they use to evaluate prospective builders.

c. The ODRC shall develop the license agreements for qualified builders it may consider for selection.

Agree Comment: This is something that the ODRC is doing but the agreement should be evaluated and revised based on membership comments to ensure that it contains as few errors as possible. We want to get it right the first time *before* selecting builders.

d. The ODRC shall approve builders it believes are qualified to build the onedesign 2.4.

Agree Comment: Yes, but the prospective builders should be given an opportunity to make a presentation. This could be a one or two page pdf file that the class distributes to NCA's. Class members should be able to comment on prospective builders to ODRC before final decisions are made. The process needs to be an open one.

*Submitted by the One-Design Rule Committee 12/8/08 for World Council Approval
Individual Comments received from Canadian 2.4mR Sailors on the original distributed document.*

" I quickly scanned the document and think there needs to be some criteria for financial stability of the boat builder. The builder should have been in business for at least one year should have a bank reference which can be followed up and should provide basic financial statements for the previous year."

" I Think this is fair and will, providing approval, to have other boats built in other locations such as Canada!"

"I have no problem with the criteria. However, I have a real concern as to whether there are any builders who fit the criteria who are willing to build the boats."

Canadian 2.4mR Class sailors

E-mail Bruce Millar, CAN – 29/12-2008:

Danny, Peter and all,

I have recently sent the Canadian Position on the "Selection Process of One Design Builders" document distributed on December 10, 2008. The document in the other email is our official class position.

Attached here you will find a document (Three Step Builder Selection.pdf) that is my personal position and idea for One Design Builders Selection. This is NOT sanctioned by our class membership nor have they seen this until now.

I am putting this out to offer other alternate ideas to the class.

I know the class executive are looking to have our wonderful little boat produced by some major boat builder but my own belief is that this is no going to happen in the foreseeable future. I believe that the new OD boats will be built by smaller manufactures who believe in the class and the boat.

Charger has done a terrific job of improving the quality of construction but we need more builders like this around the world. Currency fluctuations and distance from Charger are slowing the growth of the class. With the new OD version of the boat we have an opportunity to expand its reach to other markets.

Please read over the attached document and let me know what you think.

Thank you

Bruce Millar (Canada)

Three Step, 2.4 One-Design Builder Selection Criteria

By Bruce Millar

Purpose of Establishing a Builder Selection Criteria

On December 10, 2008 Class President Danny McCoy asked for approval of a document provided by the One-Design Rule Committee. This document is titled "**Selection Process for One Design Builders**". The document was written to in response to the following motion at the 2008 AGM:

"Mark LeBlanc presented: The US NCA suggested that there needs to be defined process where new builders are interviewed, assets defined, etc. The discussion was short as everybody acknowledged the importance of this. Marc LeBlanc made a motion to say the procurement and selection is defined and presented to the WC for approval, 2nd by Pekka Seitola"

Although I was not at the AGM meeting I believe that this position stems from discussions, which go back in time to previously produced 2.4mR class boats. I believe the following statement is the root of the issue:

"2.4mR class sailors, executive and World Council are all concerned that the new One-Design boats are of consistent quality construction and that boats they produce are supported by the builder."

In the following documents I am providing my ideas and views on how to establish a system of builder licensing and class / sailor quality control. There is no perfect system but my suggested system uses financial obligations along with specific target dates to establish continued progress of certification. In my system the class would take greater responsibility to help sailors evaluate the quality of a boat. This would assist sailors in deciding which builder is best suited for their needs.

I believe a free market system of competition will help produce quality boats that legally conform to a set of rules. I believe this is a relatively easy system to implement in a short timeline order while leaving control in the class hands.

I hope these documents generate additional discussion and serve as a template for the class to select builders. This document is an ongoing idea in my head and is hopefully detailed enough to express my ideas.

Please be aware that the opinions and ideas expressed in this document are my ideas

and thoughts and are NOT those of the Canadian 2.4mR Class.

I invite your comments or questions via email and will respond as fast as I can.

Personal Background (Bruce Millar)

Home: Vancouver BC, Canada

Occupation: President /Owner - theboatcard.ca Inc.

Sail No. CAN 39

Sailing 2.4mR Class since 2001

President Canadian 2.4mR Class since 2004

I have been a self-employed businessman for the past 25 years. Over this time I have learned a few things about delivering a quality product. My businesses have been in the highly government regulated areas of Aviation and Boating Safety.

As with other 2.4mR sailors out there I am concerned with the quality of boats. The 2.4 One-Design Rule Committee has obviously been working hard to try and mitigate some of the factors to ensure that the OD boats are of high quality and supported well.

The committee has attempted to write into the rules of construction items that address poor methods of the past, eg. Mandatory bulkheads, maximum mast step deflection, etc. The adoption of ISAF in house certification (IHC) has also been expressed a method to increase quality. Although this ISAF – IHC is good in principle it appears far too expensive and cumbersome for a small manufacturer and a class of our size class. .

In all the years that I have been in business for myself I have seldom come across a rule that guarantees quality product or service. Quality is built into the products delivered to customers.

In the case of boat construction I believe that the sailors are well equipped to provide judgment on both construction and service. The International class can assist prospective owners on deciding which boat or boats meet a high standard.

I believe that the class could be much more effective in mitigating poor quality boats.

This needs to be done by more than a set of construction rules. Boats built to a set of rules are the first steps and a sailor / class system of quality control would be ongoing.

Multi Step Builder License

Objective

Have a ***Two Step Builder License and a Step Three for the Class.***

Summary

Step One - Pre-Production Builder License (Cost to builder = € 2000.00 license fee)

Step One is an initial builder license that requires a prospective manufacturer to pay a fee and meet certain initial production requirements within an initial 12 month period.

Step Two - Full Production Builder License (Cost to builder = € 300.00 per boat)

Step Two is a full production license that allows boats to be sold to the public and is valid for a period of 60 months. Some yearly requirements are needed to maintain license.

Step Three- 2.4 One-Design Class Initiatives (Cost to builder = € 0)

Step Three is a set of initiatives that are done buy the class Executive and World Council. Theses are intended offer fair comparisons to boat purchasers and provide the class with methods of compliance to the rule. There is some cost to the class, which can be paid for out of the Step One and Step Two fees collected by the class.

Multi Step Costs

Step One

Require prospective boat builders to pay an **up front license fee. Eg € 2000.00** (Two Thousand Euros) for the purpose of obtaining initial **Step One Pre-Production Builder License**.

This fee is paid directly to the class to be used in the administration of issuing licenses to builders. This includes paperwork, drawings, inspectors, measurers and other items associated with One Design licensing and administration.

Step Two

As stated in previous documents a production per boat fee that is paid to the class in support of designer royalties (Peter Norlin) and for continued administration of boat registry etc. as maintained by the class.

This fee should be **a fixed fee** rather than a percentage of the list price.

The fee should be based on the financial currency (Euro's) of the class. It is my belief that the amount needs to be consistent for all parties. With constantly changing currency values and potential variations in boat pricing this will just lead to confusion and possible manipulation. Having multiple changing rates and fee is not a good business practice for the class financing. This fee could be adjusted on a regular basis (eg rate of inflation) to maintain fairness and consistency.

Based on the current price of an existing Charger production boat and the proposed 3.5% fee this would be approximately €300. (Three Hundred Euro's)

Step Three

There is no fee with Step Three.

There is some cost to the class, which can be paid for out of the Step One and Step Two fees collected by the class. There is no additional cost to builders or boat owners. Boat owners entering regattas must still pay entry fee. Regatta entry fees will be not affected by this program.

Rational

The rational behind all this procedure is as follows:

- By requiring the builder to commit to a short term (12 month) initial step of investment of finances and time to achieve specific steps of production it keeps anyone who is not fully committed to progressing to a full production step. Simple economics will keep so-called fly by night builder from considering involvement. Vessel lines are not released until initial application and fee is paid.
- By requiring the builder to have production molds completed and inspected before the 12 month Step One period expires it provides additional financial commitment to achieve approval.
- Step one builders fee is used by class to ensure timely processing of paperwork, inspection etc. for compliance.
- A builder would have completed at least one production style molded boat by the end of the 12 month *Step One* period. This boat would then be evaluated and

measured to ensure it is in compliance with the OD rule.

- Until full approval of Step One is completed no boat will be able to be sold to the public.
- Should Step One builder not meet the appropriate deadline they would be required to **re-apply** for **Step One Pre-Production Builder License** including payment of the full fee a second time. They would then have an additional 12 months to achieve the requirements. Failure by the manufacturer to meet the requirements by the end of the second 12 month period would terminate all agreements and further application by this manufacturer would not be accepted.
- For an existing builders such as Charger, this initial fee can easily be amortized into their first year production first year fees.
(€ 2000.00 / 40 boats = € 50 per boat)

Step One - Pre-Production Builder License

Purpose

- To establish minimum criteria for builders entering into building One Design 2.4 Class boats.
- By imposing an initial fee you compel companies to take a business like approach with the class and weed out potential under funded entities.
- Establishes a limited time line for builders to produce any pre-production boats to production version.
- To provide class with verification that builder is proceeding to production within reasonable timeline.

Validity

- 12 months from granting date.

Pre-Production Requirements

Class Requirements

- o Class to provide vessel lines, building specifications and documents.
- o Have class representative verify required molds exist.
- o Measurer

Builder Requirements

- o Provide class with initial pre-production license fee.
- o Builder to develop plug for molds
- o Production Hull and Deck molds built and finalized.
- o Produce at least one boat from molds for measurement compliance.
- o Have boat measured by class assigned measurer to verify compliance with rule.
- o At first World Championship after 12 month period present a production boat to class representatives, measurers and sailors for inspection and compliance verification

Note: Builders that can meet the requirements can apply for Full Production License at any time in the 12 months.

© Copyright 2008 – Bruce Millar

8

Step Two - Post-Production Builder License

Purpose

- To grant Post-Production builder license.

Validity

- 60 months from Pre-Production compliance.

Post-Production Requirements

Class Requirements

- o Class to provide measurement verification of compliance with rule.
- o Grant full production license and appropriate paper work.
- o Audit or verify builder information as needed
- o Display builder information and contact on class web site.

o Support builder as appropriate

o World championship scoring

Builder Requirements

o Provide class with all appropriate documentation.

o Pay appropriate license fees to class to obtain production number and decal..

o Production boat from each manufacture to be presented for display at every world championship for as long as builder license is valid.

Step Three- 2.4 OD Class Initiatives

The class can initiate many items in Step three immediately.

Enhanced World Championship and Other Regatta Scoring.

As every world championship is held the entries and scoring could be modified to help sailors identify which boats are achieving results. This is a common practice for equipment manufactures in their marketing strategies. Overall scoring would include details on each one-design boat entered. Eg. Manufacturer, Year Built, Serial number, Rig type, Sails type, etc.) The details would become mandatory information displayed in regatta scoring.

Display of Current Production Boat at World Championship

Require that each and every manufacture with a *Valid Full Production License* display a boat 2 or 3 days in advance for all sailors and class officials to visually inspect at every World Championship. Sailors can touch, feel and ask questions about a boat on display. Potential buyers can also comparison shop with different builders boats side by side.

There will be no secret cloaked boats. This will also give class officials a chance to carefully measure and verify the boat is in compliance with the rule. Failure to display a boat could be grounds for canceling a license. The boat could be factory or customer owned. Privately owned boats must be under contract to factory for display purposes.

Manufactures Information on Class Web Site

The class could set up standard templates for information on each and every boat that is currently licensed for production. Information would be available on construction method, core materials, number of boats produced, contact information etc, etc. This information could be displayed so that all the details are identically formatted on the class web site. There would be no need to click to a manufacture site for initial scrutiny. An information area would be available for the builder to display relevant marketing material. Customers could comparison shop between 2.4OD boats similarly to they way they would for a camera or computer from electronic stores online.

Random Spot Checks of Boats or Manufacturing Facilities.

Boats would most commonly be checked as part of entries to regattas. The class could also do facility checks to verify that boats produced there are in compliance with the rule. This has also been expressed in other documents indicating that builders would be given 7 days or so notice of upcoming check. This would not be that common, as the boats at regattas would be easily be verified. The class could from time to time have measurement checks at regattas other than World Championships

Conclusion

This document is a product of many days and hours thinking about what is best for the 2.4mR class and its sailors. I continue to think about what is best for sailors like myself who enjoy sailing this boat.

I do not believe the class should select builders on a pre-judgment basis. By having a financially based system of entry like the one I propose it will encourage individuals and company's to work towards building quality 2.4OD boats. With class support and rating systems in place it will soon become apparent which boats are the top performers. The proof will be in results just as it is in sailboat racing.

I believe we need to have dedicated builders of different sizes in all parts of

the world to succeed. Not every sailor is interested in winning the world championship, but all would like a quality boat that is class legal.

Additional Personal Comments

I am still troubled by the move to adopt a One-Design Rule without seeing the entire rule presented. Specifically section "J" of the new rule is something I have never seen.

I think the class needs to become more transparent to its members and present all of the rules and processes to the membership. We have a class website where documentation can be published for all to see. With the difficult economic times we are now facing I believe it will be challenging to attract new sailors as well as boat builders to the 2.4mR Class. We sail a great little boat so it is up to us to sell the world. I believe if the class has strong leadership from its executive, committees, NMA's and dedication and input from its membership the 2.4mR class and the One-Design Division will grow.

Bruce Millar

E-mail fra Harald Rolfsnes, NOR – 31/12 2008:

Hello.

It is mostly OK to us, except pt. 2.d. wich seems to rigid.

Happy New Year to all !

Harald Rolfsnes

Norway

E-mail fra Jean-Marie Vennin, FRA – 3/1 2009:

Hello M. President,

First of all, let the 2.4 FRA National Class wish to the 2.4 world community all the bests for this new year .

Concerning the P.S.Q.B., after meeting with the President, here under the FRA position :

FRA position about the following PSQB

Process for Selecting and Qualifying Builders(PSQB) for the One-Design 2.4

1. Overall strategy:

a. Work with Charger Composites to assure a smooth production transition so no gap in the availability of new boats will occur.

FRA position: Agree

b. If other currently licensed or sub-licensed builders of the Norlin Mk III are interested in building the 2.4 OD they may contact the ODRC and ask to be given the opportunity to qualify for building the one-design boat.

FRA position: Agree

c. Consideration will be given to contacting established builders and/or distributors of other one-design boats who have proven capability to build and/or distribute and promote quality one-design boats.

FRA position: Agree

2. Builder Qualification: The following are important areas for consideration in the selection of builders, but not absolute requirements.

a. ISAF In-House Certification(IHC): Builders should either commit to meet, or already meet requirements established by ISAF. (<http://www.sailing.org/13160.php>)

FRA Comment:

IHC is the ideal system upon the quality. The selected manufacturer must have this target for the next 24 months.

It must have previously his proper Quality Process System to reach our need of quality in front of the IHC- ISAF requirement.

b. Proven ability to build a quality boat (ideally one-design) with consistency of production standards over time.

FRA position: If a new manufacturer has one or several over boat-production, this is agree

c. Capacity to meet demand (minimum will be 12 boats per year with no more than a two month delivery time from date of order).

FRA position: Agree with a Minimum of 25 units/year and 2 months delivery-date

d. Proven ability to promote and build a class.

FRA position: Agree

e. Distribution network (if appropriate for the continent, e.g., Europe)

FRA position: The fact of several builders round the world is to minimise the delivery freight value. So each unit must have spare-parts available.

In this condition FRA agree.

f. Positive reputation.

FRA position: Against.

3. Selection Process – Selection Committee. Initially this process will be managed by the One-Design Rule Committee. When the ODRC is disbanded by the World Council, the WC will appoint a One-Design Management Committee to oversee current builders, and when appropriate, qualify and select new builders.

a. As appropriate, the One-Design Rule Committee (ODRC) shall in person, or through qualified appointees, contact, interview, and conduct due process of assessment with prospective builders.

FRA position: The ODRC members must absolutely were out of the « Conflict of Interest » in this process. In this case FRA agree

b. The ODRC may use outside experts as consultants, and shall call upon qualified measurers and the Technical Committee to help it evaluate prospective builders.

FRA position: Same as above concerning all « outside technical advices » and the national measureur is able on this subject.

In this case FRA agree

c. The ODRC shall develop the license agreements for qualified builders it may consider for selection.

FRA position: The ODRC will advise the NCA's for any introduction of a new builders without any change in the process. In this case FRA agree

d. The ODRC shall approve builders it believes are qualified to build the one-design 2.4.

FRA position:

CAN comments say: This could be a one or two page pdf file that the class distributes to NCA's. Class members should be able to comment on prospective builders to ODRC before final decisions are made. The process needs to be an open one.

In this case FRA agree