

Comité International du Vaurien
2015 CIV Summer Meeting
Sneek, Tuesday the 28th of July 2015
Minutes of Meeting

Beginning first meeting (extraordinary) 15:19

Presences:

Appert (FRA)
Girard (FRA)
Magherini (ITA)
Fokkema (NED)
Zappi (President Tech. Committee)
Raffaelli (CIV President)
Ferreira (POR)
Paulino (POR)
Lakshmanan (GER)

Legal number not achieved meeting postponed at 4:00 PM

Beginning second meeting (ordinary) 4:00 PM

Presences:

France 2 votes
Germany 2 votes
Portugal 2 votes
Spain 2 votes
Italy 2 votes
NED 2 votes
Chairman 1 vote
President Tech 1 vote

14 votes on 11 necessary, the meeting is open

1) Raffaelli distributes to everybody a draft for the modification of the statute (modification of the quorum for the validity of the ordinary meeting art. 9). He suggests two possibilities:

a) we lower to one third the quorum for the validity of the assembly. At the moment 1/2 quorum is 11 votes.

b) we keep 1/2 quorum, but if not met a second meeting will be held 2hrs after the first and there the quorum will simply be the presences

16:10 arrive Belgium members (1 vote)

Lakshmanan says that 1/3 proposal is better than no quorum because in that way even only two nations can make decisions

Zappi asks if legally possible

Raffaelli says that since only three votes come from the board, it means that at least two nations holding two votes are needed plus one nation holding one vote.

Raffaelli also says that it should be fixed a limit to the number of possible delegations (1 per nation) in order to avoid too much power to be held by one only nation.

At the end of the discussion the lowering of the quorum to one third is unanimously approved, and also the limit to the delegations.

2) Raffaelli points out art. 9.3 where is written that to elect the members of the board each country has one vote, and one is given to the president of the board. He says that usually the president of the outgoing board should not vote for the incoming board. He proposes to modify in order to make the board to be elected only by the countries.

Zappi points out that in art. 9.3 each nation has one vote, while in art. 9.2 nations can have one or two and so he proposes to proceed for any election as in art. 9.2.

Vote on Zappi proposal: nobody against, one abstention (Appert who says that for the election of the board everyone should have the same power in order to preserve the democracy of the election). After Appert's plead Raffaelli asks for a new vote but the result remains the same.

16:27 Polish members arrive (1vote)

3) Raffaelli introduces the problem of article 10 which says that each year the board should fix the amount of the fee to be paid to CIV. It also says that the fee should be double for nations that have more than 20 boats. But now there are nations paying 50, 150 and 250 euros. So either the fee or the statute have to be changed. 50 euros are paid by Poland, Belgium, Austria, Slovak, Czech Republic.

Appert asks how the number of boats is defined. Raffaelli answer it is a self declaration.

Zappi says that such a self declaration is important because it is sent to ISAF but Ferreira answers that it is an unsure way of determining each country's fleet.

Appert suggests to adjust the statute to the actual situation: 1-10 boats fee will be 50 euros, 10-20 boats will be 150 and more than 20 boats will be 250

Raffaelli says that the problem is that votes are attributed according to fees and so the quorum would be changed.

Lakshmanan says that asking 150 to nations that have small fleets would be too much.

Raffaelli proposes to change the fee to 100 and 200 respectively for smaller and bigger fleets since it would not change the international class yearly income and the vote system would remain the same.

Ferreira asks how much CIV pays to ISAF, Raffaelli says is 250 euros. Ferreira asks if it is possible to introduce ISAF fee criterion into CIV. Raffaelli says it is not relevant because the problem of the fee in CIV is related to votes so the criterion has to be different.

Lakshmanan asks if Belgium or Poland would like to pay more: of course not. Lakshmanan suggests that bigger nations should pay 250 instead of 200 on the base of an informal agreement.

Fokkema says that the board could make exceptions for smaller countries to be decided every year. Votes should remain one or two, but the fee would be decided every year in winter meeting with possible exceptions for smaller fleets.

The proposal is approved unanimously.

Raffaelli asks to have time until next winter meeting to write the modification of article 10. Approved unanimously. Modification will take place from next winter meeting on.

4) Next point of the agenda is modifications to art. 9.4 and 9.2.

- in ordinary decisions and CT decisions the statute has never been followed and so the chairman of the meeting has never been elected, implying that it is respectively the president of CIV and the president of CT who has always had two votes in case of ties. Lakshmanan asks what happens in case of absence of the president, Zappi says that in that case a president of the meeting has to be elected.

So the article remains how it is.

5) The other point is postal voting. Raffaelli says that we should modify art. 8.1, the modification he proposes says that only urgent issues that have to be decided between two ordinary meetings may be voted by postal voting. It should be the president to decide which matter is so urgent to be voted by postal voting. He says that the article should be changed in this way because there are issues not so urgent and too difficult to be decided by mail.

The modification of the article proposed is approved unanimously.

6) Zappi points out that art. 8.3 should say that the agenda of the meeting should include proposals from either members and the president, because now the president is not nominated. The proposal is approved unanimously.

7) Raffaelli says that at article 6 it is written that the members of the tech committee lasts for two years and propose to change it in order to extend to four years (like the members of the board). Everyone agrees.

Article 7 says that special commissions should have a minimum of three members, Raffaelli proposes that they may be formed even by a single member. Everyone agrees.

The extraordinary meeting is over at 17:20

17:24 Slovak representative arrives (1 vote)

At 17:25 the agenda of the ordinary meeting is opened

8) Raffaelli asks for approval to the minutes of 2014 winter meeting, paying attention to the point 4 of the minutes, in which it is said that the revised amatory plans will be different from the original ones. He asks: does it mean that Herbulot heirs will not get anymore fees from those plans? Appert says that the problem is only for the amatory builders, not for the professionals. Raffaelli asks to whom the amateurs has to pay if the plans are new? Zappi adds that with new plans in e-format there will be no more drawing costs.

Appert says that is not true because it will be necessary to print plans on paper on scale one to one since there are not values on the plans.

Lakshmanan says that anytime the original plan is sold the heirs should be paid.

Zappi says that the fee should be paid for the "name", it should be a sort of royalty.

Raffaelli asks if everyone agree that even on updated plans the fee should be paid, everyone agree.

The minutes of last November are approved.

Fokkema says that Johan Vissia would like to remain the ct members of the Netherlands.

9) The next point is the work made by as Vaurien France to adjourn the plans. Appert explains it saying that with new software it can be easier to understand the drawings. The matter is that planes and rules have different sections. The one presented is a first draft and Appert says that there may be mistakes. Also amateur building set plan is presented. The two models are overlapped to see what happens. The first conclusion is that the amateur set is respecting the rules. The next step could be that the tech committee defines 3D models based on the rules from which 2D drawings should be extracted.

To do that an agreement is necessary.

Lakshmanan suggest to updates the medium values with racing boats measurements.

Zappi says that the sections two has already been modified.

Ferreira says that builders have 6 sections while only four are checked at world championship.

Appert says that amateur have only four and in his work he only refers to amatory boats. Lakshmanan says that we can give medium values and then say that modifications can be made in respect of the rules.

Appert says that the work can take more than a year, if done for free.

Since there is no hurry it can be made in a year Raffaelli says.

Appert also says that wooden Vaurien could be made by machines in futures, thanks to the models he is after, he will keep the board informed about the steps.

10) CT report on measurement in Sneek:

Zappi says that at the measurements in Sneek for the first time there has been the possibility to measure the curvature and the results are encouraging because no boat was rejected and only one spinnaker was rejected (but corrected the next day).

He says that the rudder blade is tricky to measure and everyone agree on Peter's proposal, a proposal that does not change the rules but just the procedure: first the blade will be measured on the template, marking the tolerance according to the radium (the tolerance is 5 centimetres) and then the blade will be placed on to the hull.

11) Zappi proposes to recommend to builders to introduce a water tight section on the bow. Everyone agree.

12) Zappi talks about paddle on board and says that traditionally it has always been on board, but there could be made a proposal to make it mandatory only if asked by racing instructions.

13) He also talks about the stainless forestay that has to be attached to the forestay device even if shock cord is used.

14) Discussion follows about spinnaker numbers and Zappi says he will ask ISAF about their removal. The decision is to proceed by steps, asking ISAF attitude by informal email first.

15) Europe cup classification has been sent by Zampacavallo, but the Slovak member says that there are a lot of mistakes that affect the first three positions. A better way to obtain a more reliable leaderboard should be found. The Slovak member suggests that every country should appoint one responsible for the results of Europa cup, and he should send the results so that everyone can check them.

16) Raffaelli refers to the next WC. Portugal does not have anything to present at the moment, but Ferreira says that he will make flyers and shows the website and says that the venue will be Viana do Castello 23-30 July 2016.

There will be shuttle boats to reach the camping site on the other side of the river. They will come to the next winter meeting with a draft NoR. Ferreira says that he wants to make a complete measurement of the boat, even of its deck, at 2016 world championship.

17) Polish representative says about 2017 championship. They advocate for a new location and distribute a flyer about Yacht Club Jermak in Gudowo. They think there will be better conditions for sailing and camping. The lake is also bigger than the previous venue.

Raffaelli asks about winds direction and points out that the lake is very narrow.

Answer is that there are two areas of racing, un upper and a lower one whose orientations are different. Next year in spring they will be able to set a date.

Raffaelli asks to come to Paris with wind info. The polish representative asks for immediate approval of the new venue. Discussion arises about wind direction related to the dimension of the lake. The assembly decides to provisionally let Poland Asvaurien to go on organising the

championship in the new venue, but requires a new discussion to take place in next winter meeting with more data about wind before taking a final decision.

Polish representative insists that the previous venue was much worse.

Cabello says that what is important is to spread Vaurien in more countries.

Italy is in favor.

Netherlands says it is also important to have good races and would like to have the chance to choose on the basis of more data. Belgium agrees with Netherlands. Slovak says yes to the new venue. France yes and so Germany.

The discussion is adjourned to winter meeting.

Poland association is invited to give more data and is invited to be present in Paris for the winter meeting.

18) Germany says that 2018 championship will be the last week of July.

19) About 2019 championship Cabello hopes that other proposals can be made besides the Italian one, but Raffaelli reminds that at the moment Italy is the only proposal for 2019. Italy candidates Yacht Club Cala de' Medici and Canottieri Solvay in Rosignano area. Another candidate is Geas Colico on Como lake. Raffaelli says that a championship in Rosignano area is welcome provided that it is not organised by Canottieri Solvay because the club in recent times is showing to have not sufficient love for sailing, no welcome attitude and not sufficient politeness of its crew and senior staff. Raffaelli invites Italy to choose other clubs in Rosignano area.

20) About 2020 in France, a flyer is given presenting three areas: Quiberon, Biscarrosse-Parentis (lake) and Marseille.

21) Slovakia proposes itself for 2021.

22) Raffaelli points out that current VWCR do not forbid the splitting of the fleet but neither allow it. He says that something has to be changed in the rules in order to make it clear that splitting is allowed and how to manage it. He says that this should be discussed in the next winter meeting and invites all countries to prepare a proposal.

France asks to every nation to prepare a broad reflection to be brought to Paris about world championship rules and their possible evolution. France for example would like to make the event to last less days than now.

23) Another important issue is insurance. Raffaelli points out that sometimes it is hard to be refunded (or completely refunded) because of exemptions practised by some insurance companies. He underlines the need to strengthen effectiveness of insurance and liability of refunding and proposes to include in VWCR a rule which forbids insurance policies with any kind of exemption. He will ask for a vote in the next winter meeting.

24) Last point is the progress of work on communication strategy. Jaquinot proposes that all nations should publish in the international class website a sort of annual report, a sort of history of what has been made in that year. He says that everyone should speak in English on Facebook pages. A space on the international website should be dedicated to buy and sell boats and so on.

A written proposal is asked to Jaquinot for the next winter meeting by Raffaelli in order to establish a communication strategy.

25) Ferreira asks if there is a limited number of sailors per nation for the next championship. Raffaelli answers that the goal is to receive as many boats as possible, but every nation has the right to make its own policy about.

26) Next winter meeting will be held on the 21st and 22nd of November 2015.

No other subjects being submitted, the meeting closed at 16:30