DECISION Request No.: 12

**Request for Redress** 

Event: UKLA Open & National Championships 2023 ILCA 4, 6 & 7 Race Number: 9

Hearing Schedule: 2023-08-23 18:45

**PARTIES AND WITNESSES** 

Request No.: 12: ILCA - ILCA 4 - GBR 221490 - Leo Yates

Race Committee

**VALIDITY** 

Objection to Jury: No

Within Time Limit: Within Time Limit

Incident Identified: Yes

Proper Hail: Protest hailed

Red Flag Displayed: Yes

**Decision:** Request Valid

# **PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

An observer, Oliver Yates.

# **FACTS FOUND**

- 1. ILCA 7 and ILCA 4 fleets were sailing outer loop and inner loop respectively on the same course. The RC started ILCA 4 as soon as practicable after ILCA 7.
- 2. The wind was steady in direction and reducing in strength for the whole race.
- 3. SI paragraph 17.2 stated "If no boat has passed Mark 1 within the Mark 1 time limit (20 minutes) the race will be abandoned."
- 4. The RC had expected both fleets to reach Mark 1 in under 20 minutes, but the softening wind meant that, in the second fleet, the first ILCA 4 passed Mark 1 after 20 minutes and 25 seconds.
- 5. The race subsequently was managed by reducing the course length and shortening the course to finish at the end of leg 3.
- 6. The first boat finished after just under 1 hour. Target time was 50 minutes and time limit 70 minutes.
- 7. The requester ILCA 4 221490 was in a position between 5th and 8th at Mark 1, finished in 7th, and stated the race was fair except that SI 17.2 was not complied with.
- 8. The RC considered the race was fair to all boats and chose to let the race continue rather than abandon it.

Diagram: Diagram not endorsed

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RULES THAT APPLY**

Rules: 62.1(a), SI 17.2

- 1. The race committee acted properly in considering the fairness of the race to all the competitors affected, concluding it was fair, and deciding it was fairer to all competitors to continue the race rather than abandoning it.
- 2. Therefore there was no improper act or omission of the Race Committee in making this determination, and so the requirements for redress in RRS 62.1 are not met.

## **DECISION**

Redress is not given.

Note: The PC considered what the decision would have been had the requirements in RRS 62.1 been met. It concluded that the appropriate redress would have been to let the race results stand.

## PROTEST COMMITTEE

Committee Type Protest Committee Chaired By: Michael Butterfield (GBR) Date & Time: 2023-08-23 21:07 UTC

Printed: 24 Aug 10:13