

Rules Committee Report - 2025 Annual Meeting

2025 Annual Meeting Report

The ICSA Rules Committee met twice a month since the winter meeting. Our work focused around turning the directives that were voted on at the winter meeting into rules language to incorporate into the Procedural Rules.

[ICSA Procedural Rules - Annual Meeting Redlined Version](#)

1. Procedural Rule 4 - Which rules can be edited by a host school's Sailing Instructions
 - a. Greg Wilkinson created an At Hoc Committee formed of each conference commissioner and the Chair of the Rules Committee Dillon Paiva
 - b. This committee met and went line by line in the Procedural Rules to decide which category each rule should fall under
 - c. The committee agreed to "lock" almost every rule with a few exceptions
 - i. 18.d.ii - time limit for boats over 19 ft in length
 - ii. Appendices F and G - Expedited Protest Procedure and Guidelines for Umpire Debriefs
 - d. These changes to PR 4 also meant that old PR 18.f.iii was redundant

2. Increasing wind minimum to 4 knots under PR 18.g, left all other language in the section the same

3. 14 Race Maximum at events where more than one conference are in attendance
 - a. This seemed like an easy concept, however the number of races we sail was tied into our rules for rotation of boats. It took a significant re-write of PR 21 in order to accomplish our goal
 - b. Old PR 18.f.i (10 race maximum on a single day) was moved to be underneath PR 21 where it fit better
 - c. Old PR 22.a (minimum requirements for an official regatta) was moved to be underneath PR 21 where it fit better

4. Taking a penalty around windward marks
 - a. This was also inserted into new PR 21
 - b. Used language from the 2024 Olympics Sailing Instructions

5. PR 26 Serious Collisions
 - a. The board asked the rules committee to come up with language to insert into this rule to provide guidance for when judges should apply it
 - b. Our committee discussed this at length and went down many avenues to accomplish this goal
 - c. The language we have presented is nearly identical to the old rule, but it adds in the words "structural hull damage"
 - d. If this is not sufficient, the rules committee would like more direction from the board as to what it wants from this rule.
 - i. What is the goal of the rule?

- ii. How often has it been used?
- iii. Is the rule accomplishing it's goal?
- iv. Should an entire team be prevented from sailing because of the recklessness of a single person?

6. [Damage Chart for Team Racing](#)

- a. This originally came up as a request from a frequent collegiate team race umpire so that collisions resulting in damage could be handled with consistency across the ICSEA
- b. At the winter meeting, we asked the board if this would be something they would want to include for team racing, board voted yes but with little to no discussion on what should be included or how harsh penalties should be
- c. The chart we have presented accomplishes the goal of having consistency across all ICSEA team races but our discussions also circled back to some similar questions as above
 - i. What is the goal of this rule?
 - ii. Is it working?

7. Jib pumping guidelines

- a. As we were working on adding the jib pumping guidelines into PR Appendix E (Guidelines for on the Water Judging) we realized that this language might fit better into the separate document created by Matt Knowles that is published under the ICSEA resources [ICSEA Rule 42 Guidelines](#)
- b. After looking at both these documents the rules committee would like permission to reconcile these two documents into one single document so judges are not going back and forth between two documents that are similar but not the same

8. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Do we need a 4th team race tie break?
 - i. At this year's Team Race Nationals, BC, Navy and Tulane were in a 3 way tie for the last two spots in the round of 8. We were head to head based on RR results. A sail off ensued, which still left the teams tied. The next tie break was "head-to-head points" which luckily broke the tie. However, if the tie had NOT been broken on points, then the tie would have stood as it was making the round of 8 impossible.
 - ii. Is this a problem?
- b. Potential issues with wording in definition of "head-to-head races" and "head-to-head points"
 - i. In same scenario above, if the two teams who were tied and advanced into the top 6 ended up tied with a different third team for a podium position later in the event, there is a scenario where the tie cannot be fairly broken because the schools have met each other an uneven number of times
 - ii. We are working on language to fix this problem
 - iii. This brought up the question of "why do we use different tie breaks than the RRS?"