

JUG NEWS

Issues and News for Judges and Umpires

October 2005

Watts Your View?

Chairman Chris Watts reviews the progress of this year's big initiative:

Well, the Charter has been launched. In some clubs it has had a high profile as it has given support to members over coming problems within the club; in others it has been adopted on a point of principle and in others it has not featured in Committee discussions or considered not for us. All quite valid responses, but the official take up (not all clubs notified the RYA of their positive response) was in excess of most of the Working Party's expectations. Plans are now in preparation for the next stage of keeping the momentum going.

The term "view" in the title of this piece is a key one, because the view of what the standards of racing behaviour are, will depend on the club or class that you are in. How can sailors tell what the norm is? Some classes behave impeccably at all times, high standards of behaviour are demanded and there is a complete adherence to the rules, to them that is the norm for all sailing. In other classes there is a growing culture of ignoring rules and bad behaviour; to them that is the norm for all sailing. Of course there are many shades between these two cases and these will also be seen as the norm by most of those sailors.

To get an average view, sailors would need to sail in a variety of classes at a variety of venues and only a small proportion of racing sailors do this. On the other hand, this is precisely just what most active judges and umpires do.

Judges and umpires are uniquely placed in a position to advise classes and clubs on standards of racing in their fleets and on where assistance can be found to deal with any concerns they might have.

There could be a view that if one wants to keep a secret then it should be published on the RYA website, but please do spend some time looking at the charter support materials and in particular at the best practices documents for race officials. The ones for judges and umpires are called JUG 1 and 2.

Document JUG 1 was produced as a result of the discussion groups held at the last conference, but does not repeat the advice already contained in ISAF Manuals. It is very much about how we as judges and umpires act at different levels of event, and how we interact with competitors. It is a working document and will be updated as time goes on. Initial feedback has been very positive but your comments on this will be appreciated.

Document JUG 2 on how a jury or protest committee will act comes from **John Doerr** after the Cadet Worlds in Australia. The section on outside assistance was produced because of concern over hungry sharks, but it was welcomed by the Olympic class sailors in Portland Harbour in February and at all Ladder events since. It is well worth using at most events and can be pinned to the official notice board before the event and highlighted in any briefing you give.

The Charter and supporting documentation were produced by sailors to support clubs and classes in dealing with the difficult situations that might arise. As judges and umpires you are in the best of positions, with an excellent view, to be able to assist clubs and classes in these processes and in establishing a realistic view of the quality of their racing,

Chris Watts

Eurosaf

I am once again looking for large events held in the UK during 2006 where we might be able to place a visiting official. Without the quality placements in this country it is very difficult to get the really good events for you at events in Europe.

Your help is needed!

Contact **Chris Watts** or **Joanne Moulton**.

ANDREW COKAYNE

Eddie Ramsden gave this personal tribute at the funeral of Andrew Cokayne, UK Laser class treasurer and IJ who was taken ill and died suddenly while on the water at a Laser event in the North-East.

Andrew Cokayne was my friend, and a fellow sailing judge. His untimely passing will, of course, mean different things to different people – I can only say what it means to me.

I first remember meeting Andrew at a judges training course in Portugal and although I already knew of his involvement in the Laser class, it was as a sailing judge that I really came to know Andrew and to respect and befriend him.

As one of only 39 ISAF appointed IJ's in the United Kingdom, Andrew was proud of his position and served on a number of International Juries throughout Europe, including World Championships for the 505 and Topper classes, European Championships for the J/22 and the Star Juniors as well as Athens Eurolymp Week.

We judged many Laser events together, including the Masters European Championships in 2004 as well as working on important National events, such as the RYA Eric Twiname Youth event. For me judging with Andrew was simply more fun than with anyone else.

As a judge, Andrew was outstanding and his exceptional experience and knowledge in the Laser Class, in particular, added to his standing and the high regard in which he was held by race officials. Andrew was popular with competitors, who found him friendly and sympathetic, always willing to listen with an understanding ear. As his friend, I know that he did not always find it easy to give an adverse decision, particularly to a young sailor, but somehow he always seemed to manage to get competitors to accept disappointment with good grace.

This is but a bare outline of Andrew as a judge, but, of course there was, much, much more to him than that!

Andrew was a big man physically and in almost every other sense; he was big in spirit, generous in personal loyalty & integrity, courteous, supportive and thoughtful of others. He had a huge grin coupled with a wry, jolly sense of humour and an infectious giggle.

Andrew telephoned me regularly; sometimes we would discuss something to do with sailing, but more often than not we would just chat and enjoy the company of each other.

His last 'phone call to me was by mobile on the day before he was suddenly taken from us. We were both on the water – him at Hartlepool and me judging a Topper event in south Wales. "What's the cricket score then?" was his opening remark and then we were full of the usual banter, my final words being, "look after yourself." Little did I know that this light-hearted chat was the last time we would speak.



And that is the way I shall remember my friend, full of life, full of fun and doing what he loved to do most. Andrew, a gregarious, thoughtful man of integrity, humour, decency, old-fashioned courtesy, generosity and kindness! He was a big character who loved life, loved his friends, loved his sport and above all, loved his family.

I shall miss Andrew. All of his many friends in the RYA and ISAF will miss Andrew. But most of all, of course, he will be missed by Glynis, Bret, Clive and Viki. Our only compensation is that he left us while doing what he enjoyed. But, I have lost my friend and, for me, judging will never be the same again!

Rule 41 and MOB

John Doerr's experience with Rule 41 as Chairman of the International Jury at the Cadet Australian and World Championships 2004, Adelaide, Southern Australia was a key element in formulating the new JUG 2 document which follows his report:

Rule 41 has been causing some concern in a few instances. Late last year, ISAF posted an answer to a Q & A (number 130) stating that a person recovered from the water by a rescue boat had received outside assistance and therefore broke rule 41. The RYA, through its rules group, has been seeking and succeeded having the Q & A removed. Some of us remember a case, no longer published, that decided recovering a crew from the water did not break rule 41 provided the racing boat returned to pick up the crew. While this does not help single-handers much it avoids the very undesirable situation where a crew member refuses help to avoid a DSQ and then gets into serious difficulty. The consequences of this are unthinkable.

By coincidence, in December I chaired the International Jury for the Cadet Australian and then the World Championship held in Adelaide, South Australia. David Tillett, chairman of ISAF Racing Rules Committee was also on the jury. The week before the first event a local teenager with family members connected to the Adelaide Sailing Club was attacked and killed by a shark in the very waters of the Championships. You can imagine the reaction. Suddenly, sailing was a television sport!!

The club did a magnificent job. They put into place and published safety plans to restore confidence. This included working with the local authorities to constantly survey the area from the air while dramatically increasing the number of safety craft. The increase in powered craft probably posed a greater danger to crews in the water than sharks! I have no idea how many people have recently been injured by power craft in this area of the world, but this was the only shark attack in the last 20 years.

I met with the organizers and quickly agreed; **THERE IS NO WAY WE CAN LEAVE PEOPLE IN THE WATER OR HAVE THEM RESISTING BEING RECOVERED FROM THE WATER ON THE GROUNDS THEY MIGHT BE DSQ.** It is no coincidence that this is entirely consistent with the RYA approach to the issue.

In order to make this a reality we added the following sailing instruction:

“Penalties for breaches of rule 41 (Outside Help) shall be at the discretion of the jury. Any outside help shall be reported to the jury on a form available from the race office before the end of protest time of the day concerned.”

and, as a part of the document posted on the official notice board giving information from the jury to competitors, we included.

“Outside Help

A crew that is recovered from the water by another boat (racing or not) does not break rule 41 provided the crew's boat is in the same area as the recovery when they are reunited. Receiving help to right a capsized or having made progress in the race when a recovered crew is reunited with their boat does break rule 41. Any occurrence of help must be reported to the jury who shall then decide the appropriate action. The sailing instructions provide that the penalty is at the discretion of the jury. The jury will not penalise actions based solely on safety.”

The most controversial rules issue here is the meaning of the word ‘boat’ in rule 1. This rule clearly places an obligation on boats subject to the RRS, but both David Tillett and I totally agreed that when applying the exception to rule 41 the term ‘boat’ should not be limited to a boat subject to the RRS. (Incidentally, there are a number of examples within the rules when the word ‘boat’ has different meanings. It sometimes includes vessel, equipment and crew – rule 31. It sometimes means crew only – rule 60.1. It sometimes means vessel only – rule 78.) It was important that the ISAF Q&A 130 had been deleted as this proposed a contrary interpretation and it would have been very difficult for the Chairmen of ISAF Racing Rules Committee and Race Officials Committee to go against an ISAF Q & A! Having said this, we all agree that a change to rule 41 would be helpful and the RYA will continue to work with ISAF to make this happen.

In the end, we had 5 or 6 ‘shark sightings’, most turning out to be dolphins or seals! We had 6 reports of outside assistance. For 5 of these, the jury decided that the actions were ‘solely based on safety’ and took no further action. The odd one out was a report of a support boat

helping the competitor re-run their mainsheet after the knot in the end had come undone. The jury encouraged the competitor to retire, rather than being protested!

(Please note that this event was conducted under the 2001-4 rules. While rule 41 has been modified I do

not think it would have changed anything that we did and further changes to the rule would be helpful.)

John Doerr

RYA Racing Charter

Best Practice

Information to Competitors from the Jury

1. Rule 42 – Propulsion

A single judge will signal a yellow flag protest when satisfied a boat has broken rule 42 irrespective of the number of judges observing the incident.

The following points may help understand the application of rule 42:

- Official ISAF interpretations of rule 42, obtainable at <http://sailing.org/rrs2005/42interpretations2005.doc>
- When a boat's second rule 42 protest in the regatta is signalled in a race that is subsequently postponed, recalled or abandoned, the boat may compete in the restarted race. However, for each boat, every yellow flag protest counts in the total number of such protests.
- Although judges will signal a rule 42 protest as soon as possible, this might be after the boat has crossed the finishing line. In the case of a boat's first protest, the boat must take the Two-Turns penalty, return to the course side of the finishing line and finish.

If a boat is yellow-flag protested, the competitor may ask the judges for an explanation after the completion of the race. It can be done either on the water or by asking the jury office to arrange a meeting with the judges. The jury may brief all competitors regarding rule 42 protests at daily meetings.

2. Observers at Hearings

It is intended that hearings are open to observers but this will be subject to the space available in the hearings and at the discretion of the jury. Preference will be given to the parties to the hearing who may always bring one person to observe, although in some circumstances the jury may decide to restrict observers. Observers sit further back from the parties and are not permitted to speak. If the hearing is adjourned, observers and parties are not permitted to speak to each other. Cellular phones must not disturb the hearing and no photographic or recording equipment are permitted in the jury room. A document headed **Information for Observers at Jury Hearings** will be provided to observers prior to the hearing (see RYA/JUG3).

One representative of the media may be allowed to attend a hearing as an observer.

3. Requests for Redress for Alleged Race Committee Error in Scoring a Boat OCS or BFD

Boats sometimes want to challenge the race committee's decision to score them OCS or BFD by requesting redress under rule 62.1(a).

For a boat to be given redress, conclusive evidence must be presented to the jury that the race committee has made an error in recording the OCS. Even video evidence is rarely conclusive. In the absence of conclusive evidence to the contrary the jury will uphold the race committee's OCS decision. Evidence of the relative positions of two boats that are scored differently is not conclusive evidence that either boat started properly.

4. On the Water

Sailing is essentially a self-policing sport. The jury expect that competitors will take a penalty promptly when appropriate. The primary responsibility for protesting breaches of the rules is with the competitors, not the jury.

However, in addition to taking action in accordance with Appendix P (Immediate Penalties for Breaking Rule 42) the jury may lodge protests in accordance with rule 60.3, or the jury may issue a warning. In cases of an apparent breach of good sportsmanship the jury will act. Examples of such breaches are:

- Reckless sailing – sailing likely to result in damage or injury.
- Apparent deliberate breaches of rules.
- Intimidating other boats – often evidenced by unnecessary shouting or foul language.
- Failing to take a penalty after knowingly touching a mark
- Team racing – sailing to benefit another competitor to the detriment of your own position.

5. Rule 69 – Allegations of Gross Misconduct

Any form of cheating, including not telling the truth in a hearing, is considered to be a breach of sportsmanship and may give rise to a hearing under rule 69 resulting in heavy penalty.

6. Video Evidence

If a party to a hearing wishes to bring video evidence it is their responsibility to provide the equipment required to view the video.

7. Rule 41 – Outside Help

A crew that is recovered from the water by another boat (racing or not) does not break rule 41 provided the crew's boat is in the same area as the recovery when they are reunited. Receiving help to right a capsize or having made progress in the race when a recovered crew is reunited with their boat does break rule 41. Any occurrence of help must be reported to the jury who shall then decide the appropriate action. The jury will not penalise actions based solely on safety.

8. Jury Chairman

Competitors, team leaders and coaches may discuss procedure and policy with the jury chairman. He/she may be contacted through the race office and will be available each day before and after sailing.

A Year on Racing Rules Committee?

Racing Rules Committee tries to find places for National and International Judges to spend a year on the Committee, and there may be a vacancy in January 2006. Those who have done this in the past say that it has been a great learning experience - and good fun. The Committee decides appeals, questions and references - about 30 a year - and recommends and discusses ISAF submissions. As you will already be aware from the RYA website, it also publishes a growing range of

cases and guidance notes. Racing Rules Committee meets around 10 times a year, at 5pm on a Thursday, usually at RORC in London, meetings lasting up to three hours. The RYA meets travel expenses.

If you are interested, or would like further information, please contact the Chairman of the Committee, **Trevor Lewis**, at TrevorLewis@trevorlewisnorwich.freeserve.co.uk

Tel: 01603 621126

Another element of our commitment to the Racing Charter is summarised in this document produced by **Chris Watts** following up the points made by working groups at last spring's conference:

Judging and Umpiring Best Practice

COMMUNICATION OR OTHER ACTION	CLUB RACING	LADDER AND TRAINING EVENTS	OPEN MEETING	NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP	CONTINENTAL OR WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP
-------------------------------	-------------	----------------------------	--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

ASHORE

Communication with Club, OA and RC.	Encourage club or sailing committee to seek advice on Club SIs	Encourage organising authority to seek advice on NoR and event SIs. Make sure PC (or Jury) decisions are notified to other officials		Establish sensitive contact with organising authority to offer advice on event NoR and SIs.	
Verbal Communication with Competitors	Through casual conversations and club training evenings. Friendly, supportive and coaching style. Ref. JUG2 doc.	Event briefing at start of event and after racing debriefing.	Event briefing before racing, and after racing debriefing, where sought.	Event and morning briefings. Daily briefing for coaches. Feed back after racing to competitors and coaches where sought, provided it is available to all. Walk the compound chatting to competitors. Questions to PC should be in writing and answers published for the benefit of all competitors.	
		Friendly, supportive and coaching style and make yourself available. Ref. JUG2 doc.			
Notices to Competitors	Through club newsletter.	Via event notice board, which must be kept updated, neat and tidy.			
Communication with fellow officials	Supportive and helpful. Ref. JUG2 doc.	Supportive and helpful. Welcome and look after inexperienced or new colleagues. Ref. JUG2 doc.			

AFLOAT ([Ref. JUG2 doc.](#))

Comm'n with R.O. and Safety Officials	Supportive and sensitive to keeping good relationships.				
Communication with coaches and spectators	N/A	Remind of obligations under SIs and insist that they are honoured.			
Communication with Competitors	Coach	Be available, but warn relevant competitors between racing if behaviour is border-line.	Be available to competitors astern of Committee boat between races. Explain your decisions in a friendly but firm manner.		
Boat handling	With sympathy to the competitors. Keep boat wash to a minimum.				
Rule 2 Incidents	Advise competitor of what they have done and why it is undesirable.		Protest.		
	Do this in a friendly coaching style.	Threaten to protest if they do not retire.	Protest if they do not retire.		
Possible rule 69 incidents	Record what you saw and write a report for P.C. (or Jury)				
Rule 42 protests <small>Ref. ISAF Interpretations (www.sailing.org)</small>	Explain to competitor what they have done wrong & assist them in understanding what is legal / illegal.	Protest the obvious and discuss after the race where you had them under a yellow light.	Protest as per the interpretations. Explain to competitor at time and afterwards if needed.		
		Paperwork must refer to the interpretations.			

**Radio
Communication**

Keep concise but be available for race officials,

AFLOAT / ASHORE

Hearings

Advisory

Friendly and supportive, but professional.

Philip Gage picks up on a change to the Racing Rules of Sailing in 2005 and raises some interesting questions about the logic behind them:

Preamble to the Rules of Part 2

I like the idea that Sailing is a self-policing sport. It works. As we scatter our boats over wide distances anything else is doomed to fail. Self-policing is enshrined in the rules in the first unnumbered basic principle.

SPORTSMANSHIP AND THE RULES

Competitors in the sport of sailing are governed by a body of rules that they are expected to follow *and enforce*. A fundamental principle of sportsmanship is that when competitors break a rule they will promptly take a penalty, which may be to retire.

These are my italics. We the competitors enforce the rules. We are the obvious police presence on the streets that prevents crime. We keep our own game honest.

When I started a detailed look at the latest revision, which is now in force, I started to twitch when I read the preamble to the rules of part 2.

The rules of Part 2 apply between boats that are sailing in or near the racing area and intend to race, are racing, or have been racing. However, a boat not racing shall not be penalized for breaking one of these rules, except rule 22.1. When a boat sailing under these rules meets a vessel that is not, she shall comply with the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (IRPCAS) or government right-of-way rules. **However, an alleged breach of those rules shall not be grounds for a protest except by the race committee or protest committee.** If the sailing instructions so state, the rules of Part 2 are replaced by **the right-of-way rules** of the IRPCAS or by government right-of-way rules.

The new bit is in bold. It seems to fly in the face of the principle of self-policing. It means that if you see me force a cruising yacht that is on starboard give way to me on port (“Can’t you see I’m racing?”) then you can do nothing about it. You can’t bring a protest, the cruising yacht hasn’t a clue about

protesting, or even to whom she should make a report, and if you do make a report to the race committee or protest commit they are prevented by the rules from acting on that report.

Now the racing rules revision process is long and considered. It has a high degree of intellectual rigour. There must be some good reason for the change. I tried to find this by following the ISAF web chain, from the minutes of the meeting back to the original submission and discovered the words.

The purpose is to provide that the government regulations are not rules that “govern the event” as described in the definition Rule, even though boats racing must comply with government regulations that regulate the behavior of all vessels. One reason for not giving the government regulations this status is that they are designed for different purposes and can be interpreted more reliably by persons more knowledgeable and experienced with them than most sailing judges. Another reason is that most sailors sensibly avoid interfering with non-racing vessels or commercial traffic without learning the applicable regulations in detail. The sailors therefore probably do not want the government regulations to become tactical weapons of offense or defense in the way that the racing rules are.

As soon as I saw the words “the sailors therefore probably do not want” I started to lose a little faith in the intellectual rigorousness of the process. The words “lazy thinking” came into my mind.

The argument is that because sailors do not know the IRPCAS or government right of way rules in great detail they should not be allowed to enforce them. Most do not know the racing rules of sailing in great detail. We could equally argue:

“most sailors sensibly avoid interfering with racing vessels without learning the applicable regulations in detail. The sailors therefore probably do not want the racing rules of

sailing to become tactical weapons of offense or defense.”

Clearly absolute rubbish but it is just an echo of the thinking in this preamble

Anyone who sails on open waters has a duty to know, even if superficially, the Prevention of Collision Regulations. They apply to “all vessels on the high seas and in all waters connected therewith navigable by seagoing vessels”. To say that “they can be interpreted more reliably by persons more knowledgeable and experienced with them than most sailing judges” merely makes one weep at the lack of competence in these judges. If they accept invitations to events where competitors are likely to find themselves bound by the regulations then they should learn how to handle the protests. Or is this more “lazy thinking”?

For any skilled judge the particular body of rules to be applied is irrelevant. What is unchanging is the process of investigation and determination of facts. Any one who has pretensions to be a National or International judge should then be able to look up the regulations and apply the appropriate ones.

So the rules wizards do not want us to police our own sport in this area. But they do want the sport policed. They say

“An additional consideration is whether, when a racing boat commits a violation of a government regulation that, for example, has endangered lives or risked a serious collision, the offending boat and her crew should be protested and penalized... The careful handling of such incidents has been important in several communities and has avoided hostility that might have developed to the detriment of the sport.”

Was such careful handling done by “by persons more knowledgeable and experienced with (the regulations) than most sailing judges” or was it done by protest committees that took the time and trouble to familiarize themselves with the regulations? People with less intellectual laziness maybe.

But then we come to offshore racing. Up until now the sailing instructions have been permitted to substitute the IRPCAS for the rules of Part 2. This has usually been at night, or when far from land. Now though there is a change. Only the “Right-of-way” rules of the IRPCAS may be brought into play, the reason is

“A third part of the proposal is that when sailing instructions adopt the IRPCAS or government regulations in place of the Part 2 rules, only the

relevant parts of the regulations will apply. This will help to avoid problems that have arisen in the past.”

All well and good if only there were any right-of-way rules in the IRPCAS. These regulations are about the prevention of collision, not about the granting of right of way. In fact the regulations do not grant anyone right of way. It is impossible to isolate any section as being “right of way rules”. As an example under the regulations a sailing vessel on port tack shall give way to a sailing vessel on starboard tack. But at night how do you tell which boat is on which tack? Lights of course, What colour? See the regulations. Which direction do they shine? See the regulations. What do you mean by RED? See the regulations. These specifications cannot by any stretch of imagination be called “right of way regulations”, but form a vital part in determining which boat is which.

This would be obvious to any one who had actually studied the regulations and thought through the wording of the preamble. Am I suggesting that “lazy thinking” has crept in again?

Mind you at night or in poor visibility the lights and sound signals of the IRPCAS are brought in by rule 48, so you may well be wondering why the revised wording sought to exclude them in the first place.

Now back to the first paragraph. Here we are at night and there is a port and starboard situation. I want to protest you under the IRPCAS. **However, an alleged breach of those rules shall not be grounds for a protest except by the race committee or protest committee**, quoth the preamble. Does this preclude me from protesting you when the IRPCAS has replaced the rules of Part 2? There seems to be some ambiguity here.

The preamble to the rules of Part 2 is one of the sacred parts of the rules. It may not be changed by prescription, class rule or sailing instruction. It follows that there is an obligation on the part of the ISAF racing rules committee to get it right and unambiguous. Some countries have interpreted the previous preamble in different ways. The UK has always found that the breaches of the IRPCAS are protestable, other countries only if so stated by the sailing instructions. There is room for clarification and interpretation. There is no room for forcing all events to prohibit protests under these regulations. There is no room for sloppy thought.

Philip Gage

Philip raised this topic with Racing Rules Committee in the form of a series of questions which RRC discussed at length, finally coming up with the responses which form Case 2005/1.

The introductory paragraphs are printed below; the full text with detailed argument is in the new Casebook and can be accessed on the RYA website under racing publications

RYA 2005/1

The interpretation and enforcement of the IRPCAS and of government right-of-way rules is a matter for the bodies empowered by national law to do so, unless such a regulation is explicitly applicable to the event, or unless a boat that is racing may have broken such a regulation in respect of a vessel not racing. Only then does a protest committee have competence under the RRS to consider IRPCAS and government right-of-way rules.

When sailing instructions say that the rules of Part 2 are replaced by the IRPCAS, the rules that now apply are Part B of IRPCAS, subject to the general provisions of Part A. RRS 48 makes Part C applicable even if Part B is not applicable. It is not possible to replace only some Part 2 rules with only some Part B IRPCAS rules.

An IRPCAS or government right-of-way rule can be made to apply to boats racing in addition to the RRS, as a document governing the event.

The IRPCAS or government right-of-way rules apply between a boat that is racing and a vessel that is not, but only the race committee or protest committee can protest the boat for breaking such a rule. A boat can protest under those rules only for an incident between boats that would be, were or had been racing, and then only when the rule concerned was made explicitly applicable in the notice of race and sailing instructions. She cannot protest under rule 2 independently of this. She may however lodge a report concerning an incident between a boat that was racing and a vessel that was not, which might lead the protest committee to begin action under rule 69.1(a).

*Already up and running at the start of the season was the scheme for placing nominated judges with each of the RYA junior classes. **David Brunskill** reports on the story so far:*

The Junior Class Judge Programme

First season – 2005

The Junior Class Judge Programme was born out of an initiative within the RYA Pathway programme and it's probably worthwhile to state its purpose as originally envisaged.

“To provide skilled judges on a year round basis to recognised RYA pathway junior classes. These include the Optimist, Topper, Cadet and Mirror classes. The volunteer judge's role would be to take a full and active part in the development of rules knowledge and adherence within the Class, by working with competitors, organisers and coaches.”

The first challenge was to recruit the judges. The role requires a significant time commitment. The judges have to give a minimum of five weekends to the classes plus other days for meetings and training. And the role is very exposed with the potential for difficult situations with children, clubs, class associations and parents.

Twelve judges expressed interest but it was extremely difficult to match the aspirations and time availability to the needs of the classes. However we were delighted to be able to appoint Liz Procter, Martin Smith, Martin Smethers and Charlie Watson to the Cadet, Optimist, Mirror and Topper classes respectively.

The next challenge of the scheme is to develop the rules knowledge and observation within the classes. It is currently difficult to say how far we have got with this.

Before being able to put programmes in for rules training and then promotion of and adherence to the RYA Racing Charter and the racing rules we have to be able to demonstrate that we can add value. At class (mostly parent driven) level there was in some cases resistance to judges being appointed at all. This came partly out of the costs involved when sending judges around the country rather than recruiting them locally on a regatta by regatta basis, as well as the additional costs of resources such as RIBs. This is somewhat more understandable in the

context that all the others involved in the delivery of regattas are volunteers and rarely claim any expenses. Most are parents and so at least have some incentive to be at the regattas. However judges do clearly need to be from outside and impartial. In addition there was - and still is to some extent – a lack of understanding on what the presence of a class judge can offer.

The selectors for some of the classes are still under way. Hence it is much too early to catalogue all the instances of positive and negative feedback and see how the programme is going. However a preliminary report will be submitted to JUG towards the end of September and a junior class judges' review meeting is planned for early December. I will hope to provide an update of our plans for 2006 before Christmas.

There is no doubt though that the presence of class judges is already having a positive effect with organisers in certain clubs, not normally used to interacting with judges operating to national RYA standards. From a sailor's point of view the conduct of protest hearings is far more consistent than previously, as are the calls they can expect hear on

The next Best Practice document is one of particular interest to the junior classes although more and more sailors are beginning to attend protest hearings as observers – perhaps a natural development from the experience of many of them in youth and other squads where they have been accustomed to the presence of their coaches in hearings:

the water- even if they do not always agree with them!

The sailors are also finding it much easier to approach class judges for advice. The Judges - with their "Class Judge" uniform - are visible and available and being approached more by both sailors and parents. Current best practice includes some form of wash-up on the class association web-site post event, in order to clarify the sailors' interpretation of rules where confusion or poor adherence exists. So far the linkage with class coaches is patchy. However as the scheme develops we are confident that we will interact well with the training programmes with all "RYA Pathway" classes.

Whilst there is still some unwillingness to raise the entry fees in order to resource judging at regattas, the classes (and indeed competitors) all see greater consistency as being a positive step and are beginning to assume the responsibility for delivering fair and consistent racing as part of their remit.

So while it's still early days, there are positive signs for the future.

RYA Racing Charter Best Practice

Information for Observers at Jury Hearings

(to be given to all observers prior to hearing)

Observers

1. Observers' attendance is at all times at the discretion of the Jury Chairman.
2. A party may object to an observer attending the hearing and the Jury Chairman shall determine whether it is appropriate for attendance.

Conduct for Observers

1. No cellular telephones, cameras or any other electronic recording or transmitting devices are permitted in the jury room.
2. No communication is permitted between parties and observers in the jury room.
3. No communication is permitted between parties and observers outside the jury room during an adjournment of the hearing, or whilst the jury is deliberating prior to giving a decision.
4. Observers may not appear as witnesses.
5. The Jury Chairman may revoke the invitation of one or more observers to attend the hearing at any time during the hearing.

Media Representatives

1. Any accredited media representative may apply to the Jury Chairman to be included on a list of approved media representatives that may attend jury hearings as observers.
2. One representative from the approved list of media representatives may be permitted to attend a hearing.
3. Any such representative may make a request to the Jury Chairman to be an observer at a particular hearing.
4. The media representative shall report to the Jury Secretary.

Conduct for the Media Representative

1. As an observer, all the requirements for observers (above) must be complied with.
2. By accepting the position of approved media representative for the hearing, the representative agrees to report relevant information arising from the hearing to other media representatives.
3. The approved media representative must comply with any reasonable request for information about the hearing from other accredited media representatives.

The text of all three of these Racing Charter documents is available on the RYA website, as are the steadily increasing number of Guidance Notes addressing a wide range of topics to do with the organization of racing and the application of the rules.

<http://www.rya.org.uk/Racing/Racingrules/guidancenotes>

Dates for Your Diary

Judge Courses

Three Judges courses are currently planned:

Northern Ireland: 19/20 November 2005
Scotland: 17/19 February 2006
RYA House, Hamble: Winter 2006

Further information from Jo Moulton
joanne.moulton@rya.org.uk

Umpire Courses

Match Racing Umpire Course:

24-27 November 05, Queen Mary Sailing Club

Team Racing Umpire Course:

11-12 February 06, Queen Mary Sailing Club
Further information from Jo Moulton
joanne.moulton@rya.org.uk

National Race Officials Conference

The RYA has arranged a National Race Officials Conference, for race officers, judges and umpires, for the weekend of 25/26 March 2006 at Lilleshall Sports & Conference Centre. A booking form and programme will be issued in due course, but there will be items of interest for all three groups on each day. The programme will not start before 1000 on Saturday and will finish by 1600 on Sunday. A dinner will be held on Saturday evening

If you want to have a look at Lilleshall, their website address is:

<http://www.nationalsportscentres.co.uk/>

RESERVE THE DATES AND NOTE THE VENUE IN YOUR DIARY NOW!

Further information from Jo Moulton
joanne.moulton@rya.org.uk