



**Minutes of the second IRC Congress Meeting
held at the Mas Bellevue Hotel in Saint-Tropez
on Saturday 1st October 2005**

Present

Members:	Tony Mooney	Australia
	Lucien Lejeune	FRBY, Belgium
	Barrie Harmsworth	Dubaï and Emirates
	Radboud Crul	Netherlands
	Eric Fries	UNCL Vice President, France
	Chris Frost	South African IRC Owners' Association, South Africa
	Sergio Masserotti	UVAI, Italy
	Denis Kiely	Irish Sailing Association
	Paul King	GBR IRC Owners' Association, GBR
	Cahit Üren	TORC, Turkey
	Dan Nowlan	US Sailing Offshore Office, USA
	Godwin Zammit	Royal Malta Yacht Club, Malta
RORC/UNCL	Mike Urwin	RORC Rating Office Technical Director
	Peter Wykeham-Martin	RORC General Manager
	Jean-Claude Merlivat	UNCL Vice President, France
	Didier Dardot	UNCL President
	Jean Sans	UNCL Technical Committee
Observers:	Jenny Howells	RORC IRC Manager
	Ludovic Abollivier	UNCL, Centre de Calcul Executive, France
	Nicolas Lemarchand	UNCL, Centre de Calcul Executive, France
	Ricardo Provini	UVAI, Italy
	Guido Leone	UVAI, Italy
	Yannis Kontaxopoulos	Yacht Club of Greece
	Sergueï Kotsiouba	UTS Sport, Russia
	Dave Quinn	ISA Racing Manager, Ireland

1. PRELIMINARY

1.1 Chris Frost told the meeting of the apparent loss of the yacht MOQUINI, which is missing during a race from Mauritius to Durban. Among the crew were Kurt Ostendorf, husband of Sandy Ostendorf who administers IRC in South Africa, and several other friends of Chris. The Council stood in silence, remembering this tragic loss.

1.2 Introduction and welcome from Paul King, Chairman of the IRC Congress

Paul King welcomed all those present, particularly those who had travelled long distances.

1.3 Apologies for absence and proxy votes.

Apologies for absence had been received from Aurelio Gonzales Isla and Marta Eroles (RANC, Spain), Ron Barmatz (Israel), John Ferguson (Malaysia) Bill Gasson (Thailand) Mark Houghton (Hong Kong Yachting Association) and Gordon Maxted (Singapore)

Proxy votes :

Eric Fries is attending the meeting in behalf of Jean-Philippe Cau (President of the French IRC Committee).

Mike Urwin holds proxy votes for Mark Houghton, Ron Barmatz, Bill Gasson, and Gordon Maxted.

1.4 Approval of minutes of the 2004 IRC Meeting

Minutes of the 2004 IRC Congress Meeting in October 2004 were approved

1.5 Representation to the ISAF Offshore Committee

Paul King was confirmed as the IRC representative to the ISAF Offshore Committee.

2. IRC ACTIVITY

The total number of boats issued with IRC certificates at the end of 2004 is shown below together with numbers of boats at 31st August 2005.

Country	Continent	Total Boats Holding	Total Boats Holding	Issued
		Current Certificates	Current Certificates	
		At 31/12/2004	At 31/8/2005	By
Great Britain	Europe	1876	1827	RORC
Spain	Europe	836	880	UNCL
France	Europe	834	850	UNCL
Italy	Europe	586	521	UNCL
Australia	Oceania	492	294	RORC
Ireland	Europe	397	369	RORC
Turkey	Europe	250	196	UNCL
Portugal	Europe	93	124	RORC/UNCL
South Africa	Africa	92	45	RORC
Belgium	Europe	83	80	RORC/UNCL
Hong Kong	Asia	67	55	RORC
USA	N America	55	494	RORC
Thailand	Asia	49	27	RORC
Malta	Europe	46	45	RORC
Netherlands	Europe	46	54	RORC
Dubai & Gulf States	Africa	39	33	RORC
Singapore	Asia	32	25	RORC
Israel	Europe	27	22	RORC
Malaysia	Asia	20	8	RORC
Iceland	Europe	19	17	RORC
Philippines	Asia	15	17	RORC
Greece	Europe	N/A	16	UNCL
Germany	Europe	14	12	RORC
Russia	Europe	N/A	11	UNCL
Cyprus	Europe	11	0	RORC
Canada	N America	11	19	RORC
Other		14	27	RORC/UNCL
Total:		6004	6068	

It may be noted that the total number of boats at the end of 2004 was 6004. 18 countries had fleets of 25 boats or more on 5 continents, satisfying the requirements of ISAF Regulation 28.2(e)(i).

IRC continues to be used at a huge number of events around the world. The number of IRC rated boats continues to grow with predicted growth in the total number of boats of between 8% and 10% to the end of 2005. This significant increase in numbers in 2005 is very largely due to the adoption of IRC in the USA and continued growth in Spain and Australia. New countries like Greece, Russia, Argentina and New Zealand are appearing in the IRC world and will contribute in the near future to the increase of these figures.

3. IRC REPORTS

The Congress received and discussed written reports from AUS, BEL, UAE, FRA, GBR, GRE, HKG, ISR, ITA, MLT, NED, RUS, IRL, RSA, ESP, TUR, and USA. Verbal reports were presented by those present.

In discussion of the reports, the concerns relating to "Grand Prix" boats noted in the GBR report were echoed in Australia. Denis Kiely expressed also the view that the allowance for a single furling headsail was currently appropriate and should not be changed.

The observers from Greece and Russia both noted that the potential for IRC growth was being hindered by the lack of recognition by their MNAs. The Congress expressed concern at this situation.

4. IRC TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Mike Urwin gave a presentation on behalf of himself and Jean Sans on the work of the IRC Technical Committee. It was agreed that the substance of the presentation should be re-produced in the RORC and UNCL Yearbooks.

5. SUBMISSIONS

Each submission was presented and commented on by the representatives and observers at the meeting.

5.1 Endorsed certificates

Submitted by: AUS
Proposal: That a standard procedure be introduced for each country to issue IRC endorsed certificates.
Effect of Change: Improved consistency of IRC administration, particularly internationally.
IRC Technical Committee View: Support the proposal. The Centre De Calcul and Rating Office already use a common approach. The task is thus to formalise and publish this.
Decision: The Congress supports the submission and asks the Technical Committee to write a procedure. It was suggested that,

- the procedure should include a "code of conduct" for measurers,
- sails should be physically measured rather than relying on data from eg IMS,
- stamping of sails should be considered.

Additionally, standards for load cells should be defined. It was noted that in the USA, some boatyards have been "certified" to measure and own their own load cells.

5.2 MUW

Submitted by: BEL and MLT
Proposal: To print actual MUW on certificates as opposed to default value.
Effect of Change: None. Improve clarity to owners.
IRC Technical

Committee View: Support the proposal.
Decision: The wording must be reviewed. The Congress and the Technical Committee support the submission.

5.3 Hull and Keel

Submitted by: FRA
Proposal: Rule 24.1 and IRC petition form « Hull and Keel material » ...To restore equity between bulb and modern no bulb keels
Effect of Change: Potential improvement to IRC rating.
IRC Technical
Committee View: The Technical Committee already has a significant research project on keels underway. The issue is therefore already on the research agenda. While improvement to the IRC treatment of keels is likely, it is noteworthy however that in other parts of the world that bulb keels are seen as being a significant advantage. The issue is thus very far from simple!
Decision: Technical Committee has begun to work on this issue in 2005. It is difficult to set rules equitable in all cases. Hopefully, the Technical Committee will introduce changes at the end of the year.

5.4 Code 0

Submitted by: FRA
Proposal: Rule 26.3.4 Downwind sails definition : $SHW > 0.75 * SF \rightarrow$ Code O.
To take under consideration the advantages given by this efficient and expensive sail.
Effect of Change: Improved IRC rating. Reduction of cost to owners.
IRC Technical
Committee View: 'Code Zeros' have been on the research agenda for a number of years. To date, the IRC Technical Committee (in common with every other rule worldwide!) has been unable to arrive at a workable definition of a 'code zero'. We therefore support the principle of the proposal, but cannot offer an immediate solution.
Decision: Definition is an issue. What is a Code 0? Technical Committee do not support any modification for 2006. Further analysis of sails taxation will be performed in 2006. The Technical Committee will present results to the 2006 IRC Congress meeting.

5.5 Accommodation

Submitted by: FRA
Proposal: Rule 27.2 and Proposal «Accommodations». To improve interiors definition regarding to the quality of the materials. In fact, it is now possible to get the same apparent level of comfort with light modern materials (e.g : honeycomb).
Effect of Change: Improved IRC rating.
IRC Technical
Committee View: Support the proposal.
Decision: The Congress supports the submission.

5.6 Crew weight

Submitted by: FRA
Proposal: Rule 27.4, Crew number/weight : To print on the certificate Crew Number and/or Crew Weight for Race organizers being able to use it or not.
Effect of Change: Potentially improved flexibility for race organisers.
IRC Technical
Committee View: IRC certificates already include Crew Number. In most races, this is sufficient. The Technical Committee have however been working on alternative methods of calculating crew number and/or crew weight. These will in future be available to race committees wishing to use more sophisticated methods. The Technical

Committee therefore supports that alternative method of calculating crew weight should be available to race organisers, but that only Crew Number is printed on certificates.

Decision: The Congress supports the submission.

5.7 Factors (Hull, rig)

Submitted by: MLT
Proposal: IRC certificates display values for Hull, Rig, and Overhang factors. A generic explanation of Rig Factor is given in 26.2 of the rule. It is suggested that a similar explanation of Hull and Overhang Factors should be included in the rule. Since they also appear in the certificate a brief explanation of IRC displacement and DLR could be included as well. This would not in any way compromise the secrecy of the rule while satisfying the curiosity of the sailors.
Effect of Change: Improved understanding among owners.
IRC Technical
Committee View: Support in principle. The Technical Committee will review and propose appropriate wording.
Decision: The Congress supports the submission.

5.8 Heavy weather jib

Submitted by: MLT
Proposal: To control the materials for a heavy weather jib qualifying for single roller furling headsail allowance and clarify how the heavy weather jib may be set.
Effect of Change: To further constrain eligibility for the single roller furling headsail allowance
IRC Technical
Committee View: Not to support the proposal. It is impossible for even sailmakers to differentiate between sail cloth such as Pentex and eg Spectra. This would thus be impossible to police and enforce. On some boats, heavy weather headsails are set on an inner forestay. IRC should not be dictating how a boat is rigged for heavy weather.
Decision : The Congress do not support the submission.

5.9 Triple TCC number

Submitted by: NED
Proposal: To introduce 'triple number' scoring, ie three TCCs on each boat's IRC certificate.
Effect of Change: Increased complexity for owners and race organisers.
IRC Technical
Committee View: Reject the proposal. Repeated research by the RORC Rating Office dating back 10 years has consistently shown that while multiple number or other complex scoring systems can and do affect the results of individual races, when series results are considered, the effects are close to zero. The added complexity is thus of no significant benefit.
Decision : The Congress do not support the submission.

5.10 Short Handed certificate

Submitted by: USA
Proposal: Change IRC rule 9.2 to permit a yacht to have two concurrent valid certificates, one for "Normal Full Crew" racing and one for "Short-Handed" (single or double) Racing.
Effect of Change: Greater flexibility for owners wishing to compete in short handed races.
IRC Technical
Committee View: Support this proposal with the caveat that a short handed certificate may vary from a boats normal certificate only to the extent of changes to the headsail, single furling headsail allowance, spinnaker, STL and pole type. Changes to the

Decision : IRC Rule text will also need to be explicit on when a short handed certificate may be used.
On a vote of 9 for and 18 against with 11 abstentions, the Congress do not support the submission.

5.11 Dayboats

Submitted by : GBR
Proposal: At the time that IRC Rule 29.1 was first written, ISAF Offshore Special Regulations included only Categories 0 to 4. Category 5 did not exist. By omission, IRC Rule 29.1 has never been amended to reflect also Category 5. Appendix J of the ISAF Offshore Special Regulations states that: *Category 5 Special Regulations are intended for use in short races, close to shore in relatively warm and protected waters where adequate shelter and/or effective rescue is available all along the course, held in daylight only.* This has already been recognised by IRC Notice #05/01 amending this rule. It is therefore proposed to amend Rule 29.1:
29.1 A Dayboat is defined as a boat which cannot meet any of Categories 0 to 4 of the Offshore Special Regulations. The Rating Authority reserves the right to re-classify any boat without stating a reason.

Effect of change: Update to reflect change in ISAF regulations.
IRC Technical
Committee View: Support the proposal
Decision : The Congress supports the change

5.12 Crew Number

Submitted by : GBR
Proposal: Rule 27.4.6 was introduced some years ago when Race Committees on occasion required boats to race with their actual crew number aboard the boat. In practice, we are not aware of it ever having been used. Additionally race committee practice has since changed making the rule redundant. In the interests of simplicity it should therefore be removed. It should also be noted that race Committees may amend Rule 27.4 and therefore have considerable flexibility anyway. Rule 27.4.6 should therefore be deleted entirely:
~~27.4.6 For the purpose of a race or series of races in which a race committee has imposed crew limitations invoking IRC Crew Number, a boat may declare a lower maximum crew number. Any such declaration shall be made a minimum of seven days before the race (or first race if a series of races) and shall then not be further amended for the race or series.~~

Effect of change: None. Reduction in IRC Rule content.
IRC Technical
Committee View: Support the proposal
Decision : The Congress supports the change

5.13 Water Ballast Outlets

Submitted by : GBR
Proposal: Current Rule 27.3.4 requires that: *Water ballast outlets shall be normal to the hull surface.* In practice, many water ballasted boats use venturi type valves to fill and empty their tanks using the force of water flowing past the boat. These systems are well developed, reliable, and do not require a power source of any sort. There is thus no reason why they should be prohibited. Amend Rule 27.3.4:
27.3.4 Any water ballast tanks shall be securely fixed to the boat's structure and shall be cross connected through a system of isolating valves and pumps capable of manual operation. ~~Water ballast outlets shall be normal to the hull surface.~~ Stored power may be used for the operation of movable ballast systems.

Effect of change: None. Recognition of current practice.
IRC Technical
Committee View: Support the proposal.
Decision : The Congress supports the change. The Technical Committee also to review the wording in the context of wording in ISAF Offshore Special Regulations.

5.14 STIX, AVS, Category

Submitted by : GBR
Proposal: Rule 28.2 refers to SSSN but currently makes no reference to STIX, AVS or Category. Change Rule 28.2 to read:
28.2 Race committees may impose limits for race entry on safety grounds at their discretion. An SSS number, specific to the boat, and when data is available RORC/ISO STIX, AVS, and RORC/ISO Design Category will be printed on each boat's certificate for the guidance of owners and race organisers.

Effect of change: None. Inclusion of an omission and recognition of current practice.
IRC Technical
Committee View: Support the proposal
Decision : The Congress did not support the change. Concern was expressed that the Rating Offices would have difficulty in applying data correctly.

5.15 Data Protection

Submitted by : GBR
Proposal: Currently we ask owners to tick a box if they do not wish to have their names and addresses included on listings to eg clubs and sailmakers. However, valid certificates are (in common with all other known past and present rating rules) in effect treated as public property and anybody may request a copy certificate. That copy certificate has in the past included the owners name and address. To comply with UK data protection law, we should not in future include owners names and addresses on copy certificates issued to third parties. Additionally, we should overtly include a rule telling owners that copy certificates will be supplied:
9.11 On request and payment of a fee, and in accordance with any administrative rules published by the Rating Authority, the Rating Authority may supply a copy of a boat's valid or immediately expired IRC certificate, including owner name, to any interested party.

Effect of new Rule: To clarify that copy certificates, including owners' names, may be supplied to interested parties.
Decision : The Congress supports the proposition.

6. AOB

Denis Kiely expressed that view that in Ireland, one-off designs were favoured over production designs. No supporting views were expressed. Barrie Harmsworth suggested that it might be a perception issue related to the intensity with which one-offs are campaigned. Tony Mooney questioned whether small boats were disfavoured by IRC. No supporting views were expressed.

The Congress noted that in the future the RORC Rating Office would be levying a surcharge for new application received on paper as opposed to by e-mail using the Excel application form. Additionally, an "Expedited Processing Fee" was to be introduced for late application of rating.

It was agreed in principle that in future a closing date for submissions approximately 4 weeks before the date of the Congress would be set with submissions to be circulated immediately. The date of the Congress would also be moved back by approximately 2 weeks to assist members to properly

consider submissions. The IRC Congress 2006 will be hosted by the RORC. Date and location, together with submission dates will be circulated in the near future.

It was noted that the GBR submissions were in reality submissions from the IRC Technical Committee. This would be properly recognised in future.

* * *