

22 August 2020

1. Wednesday 12th August - I learned from the boat owners that the boat will not be able to get to the start area or start if the race is conducted on Sunday 16th August.
2. Thursday 13th August – I called Nick Hutton, International Race Officer and Sailing Manager of the Royal Yacht Club of Tasmania to ask which of the three clubs on the Organising Authority is acting as the Race Committee for Sunday 16th August. I was advised by Nick that it would be the RYCT. Nick enquired why and I responded by explaining that if racing takes place our score would be worsened by no fault of our own due to damage caused by another boat breaking a rule.

Upon learning this Nick argued with me that the case had no merit due to our current score and the number of points at stake, and that we would be wasting volunteer race officials' time over a trivial winter series race. I responded by letting him know that is up to us to decide what is important to us and that we are entitled to make use of the rules applicable to the event. Nick continued to argue that what we are doing is a waste of time and wouldn't succeed.

I said that I can't believe we're having this conversation and that it is extremely inappropriate for an IRO to be arguing with a competitor about fair access to and use of the rules, and also explained that whether redress should be given is a matter for the protest committee not staff or the race committee. Nick said that he'd speak with the protest committee chairman Murray Jones and make sure they reject the matter. I said that if he did this I'd report them both to World Sailing because it would be grossly inappropriate for him to collude outside his remit, or for either to prejudice a request for redress.

3. Sunday 16th August – I called Nick Hutton to find out if that if the scheduled race is going ahead. Nick repeated his argument that such a request is frivolous and a waste of volunteer race officials' time arguing that I shouldn't put it in and even if I did it would be kicked out. I explained again that his argument is inappropriate and it's a matter for the protest committee to decide whether it has merit.

I felt harassed by Nick and asked him to stop it. He informed me that the race did start and is underway, and I submitted the request for redress.

4. The request for redress was received professionally by Nick Hutton and information about the scheduled time and place of the hearing was also given professionally by him. 5. Thursday 20th August – The redress hearing was held in the RYCT Board Room. In attendance was the boat owner Mark Bayles and Nick Hutton as observers, and a protest committee consisting of Murray Jones, International Judge as chairman with Phil Jackman, Richard Bevan and Chris Sheen making up its remainder. Richard Bevan and Phil Jackman are directors of the RYCT.

6. Before the hearing Mark Bayles discussed with Nick Hutton that he'd never attended a redress hearing before and that he's here for educational reasons. Nick responded by saying to Mark that it will be interesting because Glen is going to get a lesson.
7. The hearing was conducted very professionally and the request for redress was found to be invalid because it was submitted late. Murray Jones said that completes the formal part of the

hearing.

8. Before Murray Jones could continue, I asked for the request to be reopened as I believed that the protest committee made a significant error around when the cut-off time was for submitting the request. The protest committee listened to my argument and decided to stay with their original decision; invalid.
9. Murray Jones said again that the formal part of the hearing is completed. He went on to say that the informal part will now start and that he is giving me a sermon. Murray aggressively and lengthily criticised me for wasting volunteer race officials' time with a frivolous request, that he found it vexatious and unprofessional. He said that of all people, in my position [as a long standing employee of Australian Sailing looking after the RRS and race officials] I should know the rules better. He said that he was very disappointed in me that he should be called out to hear the matter.

I was shocked by the delivery and asked to respond. Murray said that I may, but briefly. I said that I do not think the request is frivolous and I will look at the case [to see if an appeal has merit] and also that I found it extremely inappropriate that an IJ would speak with a competitor in this tone in a hearing. Murray said that it is not in a hearing, it was informal. I said that you can't separate this from the hearing as we were all still sitting here at the same table in the same room.

10. Phil Jackman then spoke over the top of me and aggressively said that they can speak with me this way because it is in the informal part of the hearing and that's the end of it. 11. Neither Chris Sheen nor Richard Bevan said anything during the tirade.
12. We left the RYCT's Board Room, the protest committee left the RYCT. I asked for Nick Hutton to stay so that I could speak with him. Mark Bayles stayed on briefly listening to part of the discussion.
13. I said to Nick Hutton that I found the behaviour and speech from Murray Jones and Phil Jackman extremely offensive and upsetting. Nick defended their position saying that I should look at it from their point of view; it was seen as a frivolous claim for a race that didn't matter and that I shouldn't have put it in. We continued to discuss it in a calm and sensible way. I explained that all competitors have the right to make use of the rules, and that I did not see it as frivolous at all; there were points and the availability of a meaningful drop at stake. Nick then went on to say that volunteer race officials shouldn't be bothered by redress claims that hinged on a couple of points for a series that didn't matter. Nick also suggested that I may be a know-it-all from Sydney trying to show the locals how smart he is.
14. I left the RYCT.
15. Friday 18th August - Mark Bayles rang me and we discussed the hearing. Mark asked how I was and I said that I am devastated by the treatment I received at the end of the hearing. Mark empathised and said that he found it pretty ordinary, aggressive and was surprised that Murray Jones "came out of the blocks swinging." Mark was not at all surprised that I am upset. Mark said that he does not want to appeal. The reasons stated were that the behaviour of

protest committee indicated that if we were to seek to appeal under the RRS we would only be subject to further difficult treatment; that I would suffer professionally and personally, and that their boat would be treated as a trouble maker. I accepted Mark's decision and reasoning. I did explain to Mark that submitting an appeal is a process available to us and that it's only a matter of writing it up.

I said to Mark that I still believe there is a meritorious argument that the protest committee incorrectly applied the Case they relied on. Mark reiterated that he doesn't want to put us in a position of further poor treatment from race officials or the club. I said to Mark that the aggressive sermon in the 'informal' part of the hearing appeared to be premeditated. Mark agreed that it appeared that way.

Nick Hutton's tone was professional in all of his conversations with me. Our relationship has always been friendly as it is now long-standing. We sometimes have different views on policy or rules matters and, invariably, would engage in robust debate over those matters.

I believe it was inappropriate for Nick, as a senior staff of the RYCT; to lengthily argue with and look to influence a competitor who was seeking recourse under the rules; to dismissively predetermine the outcome of a hearing that is yet to be conducted; to belittle our sense of importance given to the matter; and to suggest that he would influence the protest committee's chairman, who is an RYCT volunteer, to dismiss the request.

Murray Jones' tone was professional during the formal part of the hearing. Our relationship has always been as friendly as it is now long-standing. We sometimes have different views on policy or rules matters and, invariably, would engage in robust debate over those matters.

Once Murray moved to the 'informal' part of the hearing the way I was spoken to was appalling. I believe it was inappropriate for Murray as the protest committee chairman appointed by the RYCT; to speak so aggressively and in such a condescending way with a competitor who was making use of the procedures under the rules of the event; demonstrate these behaviours to an otherwise inexperienced and untrained protest committee; to be dismissive of the request and prejudice its merits without it being heard; to belittle our sense of importance given to the matter; to publicly criticise my career professionalism as a long-standing and senior staff member of the national federation; attempt to separate the formal part of the hearing from the behaviour after those formalities had finished.

Phil Jackman and I have had a brief and intermittent relationship consisting only of interactions between him and myself related to our respective jobs. Phil has always been professional and courteous in those interactions. Phil was courteous during the formal part of the hearing.

I believe it was inappropriate for Phil as a volunteer race official and director of the RYCT to; speak aggressively and in such a condescending way with a competitor who was at his club to take part in a procedure the club was compelled to make available; attempt to separate the formal part of the hearing from the behaviour after those formalities had finished; defend the inappropriate behaviour of a race official appointed by his club.

Unfortunately, now the request for redress is closed because the behaviours of the Murray Jones, Nick Hutton and Phil Jackman effectively snuffed out any willingness for us to pursue the matter

under the appeal procedures available to all competitors under the RRS.

Equally unfortunately, relatively untrained and inexperienced club volunteers were shown behaviour that should not exist in any sport. A RYCT volunteer at the highest level of accreditation demonstrated an aggressive and condescending beating down of a competitor, in front of observers and his peers over the use of rules the race official is accredited to uphold.

I also feel that my professional reputation with senior local stakeholders was severely damaged; I left the hearing humiliated.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of several overlapping, fluid strokes that form a cursive-like shape.

Glen Stanaway