



IRC Congress 2014

Submissions

From National IRC Owners Associations

And IRC Rule Authorities

For 2015

A word used as defined by ERS is printed in **bold**.

A word used as defined by IRC Definitions is printed underlined.

Proposed additions are printed in blue.

Proposed deletions are printed in ~~struckthrough-red~~.

Original version :	1.
Version:	1.
Changes:	New document.
Version:	2 and 3.
Changes:	Not circulated.
Version:	4.
Changes:	Addition of late submissions 2 to 6.
Version:	5.
Changes:	Addition of late submission 7.
Version:	6.
Changes:	Addition of Technical Committee comment to late submission 7.
Version:	7.
Changes:	Addition of late submissions 8.



IRC Congress 2014

1. Belgium. Details concerning weight on the IRC certificates

Reason for change: During conformity checks, an appointed controller can be asked to verify whether the boat has all the equipment on board that was on board at the moment of weighing (cushions, number of batteries, doors, table, galley, etc), and as a consequence should also be on board while racing. Today these things are not always mentioned explicitly on the IRC certificates. If a boat is weighed with batteries and cushions, we find “Weight includes batteries/cushions”. If the boat is weighed with batteries and without cushions, we find “Weight includes batteries”, and nothing is mentioned about the cushions. Also the number of batteries is not always mentioned (although this should be mentioned on the weighing report).

Amend: This does not require a rule change, but a change of the content of the IRC certificate.

Effect of change More clarity during conformity checks.

IRC TC Comment: The IRC TC has sympathy with the submission but notes that requiring owners to declare the number of cushions and batteries carried would be yet one more example of creeping complexity. The IRC TC will however change the wording on certificates as follows:

Weight ~~without~~ **excludes** batteries/cushions
Weight includes batteries/cushions
Weight includes batteries, **excludes cushions**
Weight includes cushions, **excludes batteries**



IRC Congress 2014

The following submissions were received and circulated after the 14 day deadline before this year's IRC Congress and in accordance therefore with the International IRC Owners' Association Constitution, paragraph 4.3, will only be decided by a 75% majority vote:

4.3 The IRC Congress meets annually to propose changes to IRC Rules, except rule 2.6 and other powers reserved to the RORC and UNCL and the IRC Technical Committee. Submissions for changes to IRC Rules shall be received by the IRC Rating Authority a minimum of 21 days and circulated to all IRC Rule Authorities a minimum of 14 days before a meeting of the IRC Congress. Submissions received and circulated after this date will only be decided by a 75% majority vote.



IRC Congress 2014

2. Australia (1). Rule 2 Fundamental Policy

Reason for change: Other rules refer to the Rating Authority but rule 2.8 specifically identifies RORC Rating Office and UNCL.

Amend: 2.8 Any exploitation of the inherent simplicity of the IRC Rule will be discouraged. The ~~RORC Rating Office and UNCL~~ Rating Authority therefore reserve the right to make adjustments or amendments to any part of IRC at any time in order to prevent undesirable or unforeseen lines of development.

Effect of change None. Correction of an administrative nature.

IRC TC Comment: Rating Authority is defined as *the RORC Rating Office and the UNCL Centre de Calcul acting jointly*. The legal owners of the IRC Rule are however Seahorse Rating Ltd (trading as the RORC Rating Office) and UNCL (not the UNCL Centre de Calcul). The use in IRC Rule 2.8 of *RORC Rating Office and UNCL* is therefore deliberate.



IRC Congress 2014

3. Australia (2). Rule 21 Rig and Sails

Reason for change: Rule 21 provides for traditional headsail and spinnaker arrangements. Sail design trends have seen a proliferation of furling 'code 0' sails. Sail designers are working to the provisions of the rating rules when designing sails rather than what makes for rounded performance and seaworthiness. This is effectively type-forming sail development to suit the rule, rather than the rule being developed around sensible sails.

Development: Consider the development of the rules to capture the essence of the most effective aspects and dimension ranges for a furling code 0, which may sit between the definitions of a spinnaker and attributes of the traditional headsail. This may require the formation of a working party including the sail-making industry, ISAF Equipment Committee, the IRC Rating Authority and the ORC.

Effect of change: Improved cost effectiveness for boat owners when considering sail choices and more efficient sail shapes. It will likely result in additional definitions in the ERS, IRC and ORC rules.

IRC TC Comment: This is not an easy or straightforward issue. The Technical Committee is not keen on defining a new type of sail. It is also believed (from past discussions) that the reaction of the ERS Working Party will be that this is a matter for Class Rules, not ERS.

The IRC Technical Committee is continually seeking to improve IRC and has looked at this in the past and will re-visit it during the coming year.



IRC Congress 2014

4. France (1). Evolution concerning diminution of weight and number of crew

Reason for change: For several years the topic of crew weight has been clearly identified as an element of performance and is directly linked with the number of crew. It has been during last Congress expressed that owners have more difficulties to complete a full crew with maximum of crew members or crew weight allowed. It seems that it may be an element of attractiveness of our sport.

Amend: This does not require a rule change or this requires a rule change depending how TC will treat this subject. But we clearly ask for an evolution.

Effect of change: Crew weight more closely taken into account as element of performance and trend for crew with fewer members

IRC TC Comment: IRC Rule 22.4 already permits an Organising Authority to reduce IRC Crew Number if it so wishes.

The IRC Policy Steering Group has recently advised the Technical Committee that, it considers that:

- crew number is preferred to crew weight.
- if there is a more sophisticated way to decide crew number than LOA then that would be beneficial.
- there is no need to reduce crew number further.



IRC Congress 2014

5. France (2). Sails measurements and Endorsed certificates

Reason for change: During conformity checks before races with Endorsed certificates avoid recut of brand new sails duly verified.

Referenced rules:

- 8.5 An ENDORSED IRC certificate is one for which the data on the certificate has been audited and if necessary verified by measurement, or other methods in accordance with current published standards. An owner may apply to their Rule Authority to have an IRC rating certificate Endorsed. The Rule Authority will inform the owner of any measurement, including weighing, or other checks required prior to issue by the Rating Authority of a certificate carrying (irrespective of certificate print language) the notation ENDORSED under the IRC Rating Authority stamp (see also Rule 13).

Amend: As part of an event open only to boats having endorsed certificates, during an equipment inspection of a boat carrying a certificate endorsed by a measurer authorized by his National Authority to make the eligible measures needed to issue the endorsed certificate, the organizing committee must approve amendments to the certificate of the boat when the measures of sails or parts of rigs increase the rating of the boat and differ from those shown on the certificate.

Effect of change: This new rule might replace rule 8.10.4

IRC TC Comment: The IRC Technical Committee is wholly against this change because it could lead to abuse.

For example, to minimise optimisation of boats to short term weather forecasts, many events impose a cut-off date for changes to certificates. If a boat was permitted to amend her certificate after Equipment Inspection, she could then submit a certificate before the cut-off date with small sails. If then immediately before the event, the short term forecast is for light winds, she then presents larger sails for inspection and amends her certificate thus obviating the cut-off date and taking advantage of the short term weather forecast.

For measurement parameters that can not be readily corrected (as for example with sails), the Technical Committee recommends the following:



IRC Congress 2014

If boat measurements exceed the data declared on the current IRC certificate, and the discrepancy can be easily corrected, the boat will be required to correct the discrepancy. Amended certificates will only be issued in exceptional circumstances when the discrepancy cannot be easily corrected and with the express permission of the Race Committee.



IRC Congress 2014

6. Spain. Sails stamped in an ENDORSED certificate

Reason for change: The sail more largest area of the mainsail, genoa and spinnaker must be stamped (measures validated) with its action by an official measurer. But the rest of the sails on board cannot be stamped.

In the High-level Races the sail inventory on board a boat is very big for what would facilitate in a conformity checks in the race that all the sails (except safety) were stamped in an ENDORSED certificate.

Amend: N/A

Effect of change to add to IRC Rule for to facility the checks of the sails in the High-level Races.

IRC TC Comment: The Technical Committee is concerned at increasing the administration for owners of an Endorsed certificate.

However, in GBR and other countries, national rules for the Endorsement of certificates require that sails are either officially measured by an official measurer or by an ISAF In House Certified sail loft. In the former case, we request our measurers to sign the sail. In the latter case, a requirement is that the sail carries an identification label trackable back to the official measurement data.

It is therefore already possible for an IRC Rule Authority to require that Endorsed IRC certificates within its jurisdiction are officially stamped.



IRC Congress 2014

7. Japan. Definition, Heavy Weather Jib

Reason for change: The calculation of H/W jib max area for single furling boat in the IRC certificate is using FL and J. However, the foretriangle height by ERS definition is not $(FL^2 - J^2)^{0.5}$. Therefore, in the definition part of IRC, APPENDIX 1, the term, **foretriangle height** in HWJ and Storm Jib should not be in bold type to differentiate from ERS term.

Amend: As above

Effect of change Correction of an error.

IRC TC Comment: The use of FL and J to calculate area for a 'heavy weather jib' for printing on IRC certificates is used solely to attempt to assist owners. This approach is inevitably an approximation.

The Technical Committee is deliberate in wanting to use the OSR definition of Heavy Weather Jib (HWJ) so that only a single definition of HWJ is used. To that extent, trying to be helpful to owners may actually in practice be unhelpful.

The Technical Committee therefore requests IRC Congress's opinion as to whether an (approximate) HWJ area should be printed on certificates at all.

Secondly, in order to be absolutely clear and precise, the Technical Committee seeks approval from IRC Congress to amend the definitions of HWJ and Storm Jib as follows:

~~HWJ: Heavy weather jib. A headsail of area not greater than 13.5% foretriangle height squared.~~

HWJ: Heavy Weather Jib. See ISAF Offshore Special regulations, paragraph 4.26.

~~Storm Jib: A headsail of area not greater than 5% foretriangle height squared, luff length not greater than 65% of foretriangle height, and not containing aromatic polyamides, carbon or similar fibres.~~

Storm Jib: See ISAF Offshore Special regulations, paragraph 4.26.

Effect of change Clarity and removal of potential ambiguity. No practical effect.



IRC Congress 2014

8. Belgium (2). Technical verification of declared dimensions

Reason for change: Mistakes are made by owners when data are submitted to produce an IRC certificate. This cannot be avoided completely, but there are possibilities to detect some of these mistakes in an automated way. We have e.g. seen an IRC certificate where x is smaller than h . We believe that this is impossible due to the way x and h are measured. As a consequence this certificate must be the result of a mistake somewhere in the process of producing it.

Proposed Change We encourage that technical verification is improved and automated to detect all data that must be erroneous wherever this is possible.

Amend: This does not require a rule change, but a change of the data entry in the system that produces the certificates.

Effect of change: Reduce errors in certificates as much as possible.

IRC TC Comment: The Technical Committee is grateful for this error being drawn to our attention.

Both the IRC new application form and the IRC software include many tests to minimise the possibility of errors of this sort. These tests include a test for x less than h . We are therefore unsure how this error got through. We will review the error trapping to establish what has happened.