



IRC CONGRESS 2011

IRC CONGRESS MEETING 2011
Saturday 15th & Sunday 16th October
Pullman Hotel, Paris

MINUTES



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Item	Title	Page
Saturday	15 th October	
	Present	3
1	Introduction	4
2	Apologies for absence and proxy votes	4
3	Minutes of the Meeting of the IRC Congress held on 16th October 2010	4
4	Matters arising not covered by the agenda	4
5	To note IRC Notices	5
6	To receive a report from the IRC Technical Committee	5
7	To receive a summary report of IRC distribution worldwide	5
8	To receive, consider and decide proposals for IRC Rule changes for 2012	6
9	To receive contributions from National IRC Representatives	16
10	To discuss and consider the future direction of IRC	18
11	To receive, consider and decide proposals for changes to the Constitution of the International Owners Association	22
12	Continental and International Regional Championships	22
13	To elect the IOOA representative on the IRC Policy Steering Group	22
14	To elect the representative of IRC Congress on the IRC Committee	22
15	To elect a Vice Chairman of the IRC Congress	23
16	Any Other Business	23
Sunday	16 th October	
1	IRC submissions to ISAF	24
2	Others submissions to ISAF relevant to IRC	30
3	Open discussion on IRC & ISAF	30
Appendix 1	National Votes	32
Appendix 2	Report from the IRC Technical Committee	33
Appendix 3	The Future direction of IRC	37
Appendix 4	Fleet Statistics	38
Appendix 5	Reports from National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities	42



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Present

Chairman: Peter Wykeham-Martin. (UK)

Vice Chairman: Malcolm Runnalls (AUS)

Vice Chairman: Alp Doguoglu (TUR)

Australia: Glen Stanaway, Yachting Australia

Australia: Matt Allen, CYCA/Australian IRC owners.

Belgium: Carl Sabbe, President of BELIRC

Bulgaria: Nikola Dukov

Dubai & Emirates: Barry Harmsworth, IRC owners.

France: Marc de Saint Denis, UNCL President

France: Jacques Pelletier, PROPIRC President

France: Catherine Pourre, President of the UNCL IRC Commission

France: Jean-Philippe Cau, UNCL IRC Commission

Germany: Volker Andreae, Chairman of the German Offshore Owners Association

Germany: Kay-Enno Brink

Greece: Marina Psychogiou

Greece: Konstantin Kalogeropoulos, Offshore Committee of the Hellenic Sailing Federation

Hong Kong: Gideon Mowser, Hong Kong Sailing Federation

Ireland: Denis Kiely, ICRA

Ireland: Mark Mills, ICRA

Japan: Kenji Sakamoto, JSAF

Japan: Haru-Hiko Kaku, JSAF

Netherlands: Peter de Jong, KNWV

Netherlands: Michiel Woort, KNWV

Netherlands: John van der Starre, Race Co-ordinator Noordzeeclub

Romania: Bogdan Alexandescu, YC Romania CEO

Spain: Vincens Domenech, RANC

Sweden: Eva Holmsten

Thailand: Simon James

Turkey: Alican Turali

USA: Dan Nowlan, US Sailing, Offshore Director

USA: Eric Baittinger, US Sailing, IRC Manager

IMA: Pete Lawson, International Maxi Association

UK: Eddie Warden-Owen, RORC Chief Executive

UK: Andrew McIrvine, RORC Commodore

In attendance:

IRC Technical Committee: Mike Urwin, Jean Sans

RORC Rating Office: Jenny Howells, James Dadd, Caroline Aubrey-Fletcher

UNCL Centre de Calcul: Ludovic Abollivier, Matthieu Visbecq

Saturday 15th October



IRC CONGRESS 2011

1. Introduction and welcome from Peter Wykeham-Martin, Chairman of the IRC Congress.

Peter Wykeham Martin, Chairman of the IRC Congress welcomed all attendees to the Congress and thanked Marc De Saint Denis and UNCL for hosting this years' meeting. The chairman stated that the most important item of the Congress was the future of IRC. (Item 10). He added that whilst IRC is alive and evolving, we need to consider developments and their impact on the Rule, and encouraged everyone to participate in the discussion. He then stated that no decisions would be taken on the future path for IRC in the meeting but he hoped for an interactive discussion that would produce elements for consideration by RORC/UNCL and the Technical Committee. This was Congress's opportunity to contribute actively to the debate on the future path for IRC.

2. Apologies for absence and proxy votes.

Matthieu Visbecq reported that there were no proxy votes requests for this Congress.

3. Minutes of the meeting of the IRC Congress held on ~~the~~ 16th October 2010.

The minutes of the meeting held on 16th October 2010 were accepted as a true record of that meeting and duly signed.

4. Matters arising not covered by the agenda.

Mike Urwin added the following comments:

- 8.1.5** Agreed rule change to 10.6. There will be further minor changes to the rule that will come up later in the agenda.
- 8.1.16.** Guidance notes for protest committees - Most of international judges are ignorant of measurement rules. It was therefore very difficult to produce a useful and comprehensive document on measurements rating protest. It was reported that a discussion was held with the RYA who agreed that there is a need for guidance notes. A document is underway and should be available by the end of 2011 or the beginning of 2012.
- 8.2.3.** This was a submission from Australia regarding activity reporting. No significant progress has been made. In many cases, rating offices are not aware of some information such as payments because the bills go straight to the Rules Authorities. No progress was made on this point.
- 8.2.13.** Mike reported that there had been some changes to the keel wording on certificates. Inclusion of greater rig detail on certificates had also been considered but not carried out because of the difficulty in being fully comprehensive.
- 10.2.** There was a submission that IRC made to ISAF in order to permit International Measurers and equipment inspectors to be appointed by IRC. An ISAF working party has been formed and it looks like this is going ahead. IRC will have the right to nominate International Measurers for IRC for approval by ISAF International Measurers sub-committee.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

5. To note IRC Notices.

5.1 Late changes to IRC Rules for 2011

Following discovery of a loophole, the definitions of FL & J were changed to better deal with boats flying loose-luffed headsails in December 2010.

Glen Stanaway stated that the 'FL & J' issue was addressed in a very prompt manner and thanked everyone involved.

5.2 IRC 2012 Keel Fin Materials

Currently, a yacht fitted with a steel keel fin rates differently than the same yacht with a hollow steel fin or a fin with fairings. There will be some changes next year as the actual treatment is felt inequitable. This was published in July 2011. The aim is to avoid that owners change their keels when it is not needed for other reason than the IRC TCC.

Matt Allen then asked if this change may lead to owner changing their keels for more high tech materials in order to lower the boat centre of gravity. Mike Urwin answered that it should be the reverse. The aim is to encourage people go sailing with the keel they already have.

Mark Mills asked if production materials would be penalised next year. Mike Urwin stated that there was no definitive answer at that moment.

6. To receive a report from the IRC Technical Committee.

Mike Urwin stated that looking at 2010 and 2011 statistics, given the economic climate; it does not seem unreasonable to have a decrease of approximately 1%. However, the number of new applications is falling, and therefore IRC is not attracting as many new boats, whereas existing owners appear to be happy.

It raises at least two questions left opened:

- Are owners keeping their boat for a longer period?
- Is IRC too conservative and therefore not attractive enough for new designs?

The country that has gained the most was France. Australia is growing as well and new fleets in Chile and Romania have appeared.

One reason for the decrease in USA is economic but also races like Newport to Bermuda race that are only every two years. Therefore some of the boats are revalidating every two years. Another interesting point, teams with very expensive programs have not changed their way of functioning. It is more about the average sailor not revalidating its certificate

Mike then reported that the technical Committee met in July for two days and that they studied 34 items in 2011.

There were no questions on this report.

7. To receive a summary report of IRC distribution worldwide.

Mike Urwin stated that for the first time, an IRC certificate with a TCC of more than 2.000 has been issued. He went on to say that it was interesting to notice that 25% of the IRC fleet is made up of boats of more than 20 years old. Boats of 5 years or less make up 30% of the fleet. Mike concluded that IRC is attracting a very broad range of yachts of broad ages.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Mike Urwin then asked Dan Nowlan if the request for endorsed certificates in the USA is inhibiting IRC. Dan answered that he thought so.

Peter Wykeham-Martin asked if event organisers should be addressing this. Dan answered that they do try to advise them.

Eric Baittinger then said that several events have been opened to non endorsed boats in order to attract newcomers. Glen Stanaway stated that the policy of Yachting Australia is to allow only endorsed certificates. Glen added that although it may appear inconvenient, it is worth measuring a boat entirely and then check one or two sails every year. The cost of an endorsed certificate is absorbed in 2 or 3 years but the competition is equitable as soon as the first year.

Barrie Harmsworth added that it is very hard for a smaller country to run races with endorsed certificates. Ireland stated that they supported Yachting Australia position and that in Ireland, endorsed certificates are accepted as the way forward.

8. To receive, consider and decide proposals for IRC Rule changes for 2012.

8.1 From the IRC Technical Committee.

Mike Urwin reported that the Rule changes from the Committee have been circulated twice. Most of them are not of huge importance and there are less than last year.

8.1.1 Rule 9.6 and 9.7

Reason for change: Rule 10, Rating Protests, refers back to Rule 9, Rating Review, for determination of when a certificate becomes invalid. Rules 9.6 and 9.7 however refer only to rating reviews and not to protests. This has caused confusion for juries and resulted in questions. Amending Rules 9.6 and 9.7 to reference also protests would resolve the problem without in practice changing anything.

Insert: 9.6 Where the TCC is reviewed and found to be not more than 0.005 greater than before, the contested rating shall be valid up to the date that the request for review was lodged with the Rating Authority, or in the case of a protest from the time that the protest was lodged with the race committee, except that if Rule 8.6 applies then from the date of the change. This Rule may be amended by Notice of Race only to the extent that the 0.005 limit may be reduced.

9.7 Where the TCC is reviewed, either as a result of a rating review or a protest, and found to be more than 0.005 greater than before, the contested certificate is invalid from the date of issue.

Effect of change: None. Clarification only.

This change was **accepted** by the Congress.

8.1.2 Rule 10.6

Reason for change: At the IRC Congress 2010, the Technical Committee were asked to review the wording of IRC Rule 10.6. The purpose of this rule is to enable the Rating Authority to take action if foul play is suspected. The purpose is not in any way to attempt to overrule or supersede the authority of a protest committee.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

The problem as the rule is written is that pedantically, unless the TCC increases by at least 0.010, the Rating Authority may not act. It is

therefore proposed that the requirement for a minimum increase in TCC should be deleted thus giving the Rating Authority complete freedom to act as and if it sees fit.

Amend: 10.6 When as a result of an action in a race or series, or the withdrawal of a certificate by the Rating Authority, a **boat's** rating is reviewed and its TCC increases ~~by more than 0.010~~, the **boat's** Member National Authority may be requested by the Rating Authority to investigate the circumstances and report its findings to the Rating Authority.

Effect of change: Increased flexibility for the IRC Rating Authority to deal with potential cases of foul play.

This is a wording review. As the rule currently states, the TCC needs to be modified by more than 0.010 in order to prompt further investigation. By deleting the words 'by more than 0.010', Mike Urwin stated that an increase in rule flexibility subsequently allows the Rating Authority to investigate when they believe that a team is cheating. The proposed wording to use if a **boat's** rating is reviewed is its TCC "changes" instead of "increases". The Technical Committee believed it is very valid as the flexibility will then be even higher.

This change was **accepted** by the Congress.

8.1.3 Rule 21.5.3

Reason for change: Rule 21.5.3 imposes lower limits on mainsail widths. In practical terms, these limits are only ever approached by boats with roller furling mainsails. In some cases of roller furling mainsails, the actual widths are significantly less than these lower limits. There is no practical reason why the lower limits should not be removed entirely.

Amend 21.5.3 MUW measurements less than $0.22 * E$, ~~to a lower limit of $0.125 * E$ may be declared.~~, MTW measurements less than $0.38 * E$ ~~to a lower limit of $0.25 * E$ may be declared.~~ and MHW measurements less than $0.65 * E$ ~~to a lower limit of $0.50 * E$ may be declared.~~ MUW, MTW and MHW, ~~or the appropriate lower limits if actual dimensions are less,~~ will be shown on the **boat's** certificate as the maximum permitted values.

Effect of change: Improved equity for boats with roller furling mainsails.

This change was **accepted** by the Congress.

8.1.4 Rule 21.7

Reason for change: Rule 21.7 imposes lower limits on headsail widths. For practical reasons, sail makers commonly cut the leech of headsails (particularly overlapping headsails without battens) hollow to minimise leech curl and flutter and to increase the life of the sail. This sensible design practice is not recognised by IRC. Review of the current minimum widths by the Technical Committee and consultation with sail makers shows no grounds why these minima should not be removed entirely in the interests of greater equity.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Amend

21.7.1 Headsail area (HSA) shall be calculated from:

$$\text{HSA} = 0.125 * \text{LL} * (2 * \text{LP} + 3 * \text{HHW} + 2 * \text{HTW})$$

In the calculation of HSA, if HHB is greater than the larger of 0.09m or 0.008*LL, then 5 times the excess shall be added to LL in the calculation of HSA.

- ~~(a) HHW and HTW shall not be taken as less than 50% and 25% respectively of LP.~~
- ~~(b) If HHB is greater than the larger of 0.09m or 0.008*LL, then 5 times the excess shall be added to LL in the calculation of HSA.~~

21.7.2 The following shall be declared. LL, LP, HHW, HTW, LLmax and HHB.

21.7.3 HSA, LP, HHW, and HTW ~~(or the lower limits above)~~ of the largest area headsail, LLmax and HHB (or the larger of 0.09m or 0.008*LL if that is greater) will be shown on the **boat's** certificate. HSA, LLmax and HHB are the maximum permitted values.

Effect of change: Improved equity for boats with hollow leech headsails, particularly overlapping headsails without battens.

This change was **accepted** by the Congress.

8.1.5 Rule 22.3.3

Reason for change: During 2011, a canting keel boat was launched with the keel angle limited not by physical means but by electronic limiters. Unlike for instance the length of a bowsprit, which can be seen by other boats, the keel cant angle cannot be seen by competing boats. There is thus no means by which another boat can judge whether such a boat has inadvertently exceeded the keel cant angle used for the measurement of Static Heel Angle. It is desirable therefore that there should be a physical mechanical lock on a canting keel.

Amend: 22.3.3 There is no limit to the static heel angle with ballast tanks fully filled on one side of the **boat** or with **moveable ballast** moved fully to one side. For **boats** with **variable ballast**, the maximum weight of water that can be carried on each side of the **boat** shall be declared. For **boats** with **moveable ballast**, the maximum static heel angle in the **boat weight** condition (see Rule 17) with the ballast moved fully to one side shall be declared. **A physical, mechanical limit shall be fitted to moveable ballast to prevent it being moved further than the position for the declared static heel angle. Such a system shall not rely on sensors or measurement to prevent the declared static heel angle being exceeded unintentionally.**

Effect of change: Improved rule compliance.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

This change was **accepted** by the Congress.

This subject led to a discussion about data availability to competitors in order to police each others during an event. Alp Doguoglu stated that key measurements were previously published on the TORC website. This data has now been removed as it was believed that it could be used in reverse engineering. He believed that it would be worth having more data available on the TCC listing. Marina Psychogiou added that all competitors racing at a given event have access to the IRC certificates of the other competitors. She therefore believed that there is no need to publish this data. Peter Wykeham-Martin stated that this should be discussed in Item 10.

8.1.6 Definition of LP

Reason for change: Some boats have spinnaker staysails with clew point aft of the normal headsail clew point. The current definition is unclear as to whether a cutter rig is considered to apply to any headsail that may be set or only to those that may be set simultaneously.

Amend: LP The **luff perpendicular** of the largest area headsail on board and which may be used while racing. For a **cutter rig**, LP is measured as the shortest distance from the aft most **clew point** of any headsail when set on the centre line of the **boat**, to the foremost headsail luff, which may be set **simultaneously** while racing.

Effect of change: None. Improved clarity.

This change was **accepted** by the Congress.

8.1.7 Definition of y and h

Reason for change: The current definition of y refers to *the aftmost point of the waterline*. This is incorrect. The second sentence referring to counter sterns is also unclear.

The definition of h also refers to waterline which should properly be waterplane.

Delete: ~~y The vertical distance between the aftmost point on the hull and the aftmost point of the waterline. In the case of a counter stern, projected to the aftmost point of the hull.~~

Insert: y The vertical distance between the aftmost point on the hull and the waterplane. In the case of a counter stern, the vertical distance between the aftmost point on the hull below the transom projected to the line of the aftmost point of the hull, and the waterplane.

Amend: h The vertical distance between the ~~waterline~~ waterplane and the lowest point on the stem at a tangent of 45° to the longitudinal axis.

Effect of change: Correction of errors and improved clarity.

This change was **accepted** by the Congress.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

8.1.8 Corrections

For information, the following corrections to omissions and typographic errors will be made.

- 8.1 In Rule 9.6, replace ~~8.6~~ with **8.9**.
- 8.2 In Rule 25.1 replace ~~48~~ with **16**.
- 8.3 In Rule 26.1 add **Competitors'** as first word and replace ~~20.9~~ with **20.7**.
- 8.4 In the definition of LH, replace ~~Length of Hull~~ with **Hull Length**.

These changes **were noted** by the Congress.

Rule 8.9

Alp Doguoglu asked Mike Urwin to bring Rule 8.6 into context. , Mike stated that it was a typographical error and that it should be '8.9' – Alp then asked what the implication was. Mike stated that if the owner physically changed the boat since the certificate was issued then he must declare it. If this was not declared then the Rating Authority would revert back to before it was changed.

8.2 From National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities.

8.2.1 France: Overlapping Headsails

Current Position:	It was reported that over the past few years, it has been noticed that the number of new designs made to perform with an overlapping jib is close to zero. Rating treatment of overlapping headsails is surely not the only reason explaining this change. Nevertheless, looking at the results of older boats designed to use overlapping headsails, it is felt that it becomes very difficult to be able to win races, particularly when doing windward –leeward.
Reason for change:	The development of sails design has led to very efficient sail plans using non overlapping headsails. These sails plans are working upwind even in light winds. Adapting this type of sail plans to older designs is not easy and implies important costs or may be unmanageable due to the involvement of too many changing parameters. Therefore, it is strongly felt that overlapping headsails are believed more efficient than they really are by the IRC formula. Reviewing the treatment of overlapping headsail may therefore help older designs to remain competitive under IRC.
Proposal:	The change is of course left to the IRC Technical Committee.
Effect of change:	Decrease the TCC of yachts using overlapping headsails to improve the fairness of competition between old designs (not IRC optimised at the beginning of their life) and newer designs.
IRC Technical Committee Comment:	The Technical Committee is currently undertaking a review of different styles of rig. Additionally, the proposed deletion of Rule 21.7.1 (a) will also have an effect.
Congress Comment:	Jacques Pelletier stated that 26% of the French IRC boats are older than 15 years. Most of the time, these yachts were designed to sail with overlapping jibs. It is felt that these boats are no more



IRC CONGRESS 2011

competitive under IRC due to the high TCC related to the usage of an overlapping jib.

Carl Sabbe added that with a GRAND SOLEIL 40 for instance, it is fair to say that the TCC has significantly decreased with a non overlapping jib but below 8 knots of true wind speed, in choppy seas, it is felt difficult to win even with the lower TCC.

Glen Stanaway asked if this was a local issue and stated that perhaps more research should be made.

Dan Nowlan then added that non overlapping jib can point higher and are easier to sheet. He thought that this should be taken into account by the maths.

Glen Stanaway stated that with the publishing of the results on web, it is much easier to see the effects.

Mike Urwin answered that there will be a review as both local effects and type of boat are relevant. Therefore it is not easy but the Technical Committee is happy to accept the submission.

The IRC chairman & Marina Psychogiou supported the submission too.

Australia and others did not.

This submission was **accepted**.

8.2.2 Great Britain: Innovative Features

Reason for change:	The GBR IRC Committee is generally supportive of innovation within IRC. The Committee is however concerned that innovative features should be conservatively treated, i.e. they should not be encouraged. It is understood that currently that is the position. The Committee wishes that policy to continue and to be reinforced.
Proposal:	That innovative features in the design of boats should continue to be accepted by IRC but should continue to be conservatively treated in terms of the calculation of TCC.
Effect of Change:	None. Confirmation of existing policy.
IRC Technical Committee Comment:	The Technical Committee supports the submission.
Congress Comment:	Andrew McIrvine stated that there is a fear that IRC favours high technology yachts only and that consequently, older designs are going to be swamped by new technology and designs. He therefore thought that they should be taxed initially. This taxation is then taken off. It is not a change but a reinforcement of the current IRC position. It was added that the Technical Committee has already accepted that point.

This submission was **accepted**.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

8.2.3 Great Britain: Spinnaker pole and bowsprit

Reason for change: Currently, a boat equipped with a bowsprit and no spinnaker pole rates lower than a boat equipped with a spinnaker pole. A boat equipped with a spinnaker pole may also carry a bowsprit with no increase in TCC provided that the bowsprit is no longer than the spinnaker pole. If the bowsprit on this latter boat is a fixed sprit, this boat then has the ability to set a code zero style sail with a tighter luff than would otherwise be the case. This is an unrated advantage.

Historically, a boat equipped with both a spinnaker pole and a bowsprit rated higher than a boat with just a spinnaker pole.

Proposal: [The GBR IRC Committee proposes that IRC should revert to rating a boat equipped with both a spinnaker pole and a bowsprit higher than a boat equipped with just a spinnaker pole.](#)

Effect of change: Closure of an unrated loophole

IRC Technical Committee Comment: The Technical Committee notes the submission. It is accepted that there is a small potential speed advantage (easier gybing and a potentially tighter luff), but this is not considered significant across a range of conditions and courses.

Additionally, implementation of this would require a knowledge of whether a bowsprit was fixed or not. This would require an additional item of information from all boats and might lead boats to develop expensive solutions for retractable bowsprits.

IRC also has no knowledge of forestay position relative to the stem of a boat. If a boat's forestay is set back from the stem, then a boat may tack a spinnaker to the deck forward of the forestay provided that the tack point is within rated STL. For calculation of TCC purposes, this is treated in the same way as a bowsprit. We would also therefore require mast position for all boats.

For all the above reasons, The Technical Committee does not support the submission.

Congress Comment: It is felt that owners can have a distinct advantage when they have both a bowsprit and a spinnaker pole. The GBR IRC Committee therefore asked the Technical Committee to review the current position and tax a boat differently when both are used.

The Technical Committee answered that although there is a potential speed advantage, it is difficult in reality to know for sure if a boat is using a bowsprit or not. For instance, the length of hull in front of the forestay can be used to tack a spinnaker. It raises the question of taking this length into account to include a bowsprit or not. Mike Urwin then added that if this is limited to fixed bowsprit only, this can lead to expensive solutions leading owners to have retractable bowsprit on their boat instead.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Andrew McIrvine added that the expense may be the other way as many boats may feel they need a fixed bowsprit if IRC does nothing on this point.

Volker Andreae stated that the question is: Does IRC want a more complex system and introduce new measures or not? For instance, ORC is taking into account boat pole and bowsprit length and treats them differently.

Before voting, Mark Mills explained that the gain of performance due to a possible tighter luff thanks to the usage of a bowsprit is not seen. The gain is simply in gibing. It is mainly practical and a safety issue. He then stated that an issue may appear if boats tend to use longer and longer bowsprits so that the usage of whisker pole becomes mandatory.

GBR and AUSTALIA voted for the submissions. Many others like France, Ireland, Netherlands, voted against.

Submission was **not accepted**.

8.2.4 Ireland: Number of spinnakers

Reason for change: It has been noted this season that in windy events many yachts did not have a suitable heavy airs spinnaker, leading to pressure to fly sails inappropriate for the conditions. Currently in most conditions a yacht choosing to rate with a suitable spinnaker against the eventuality of heavier winds is disadvantaging itself against its peers who do not dedicate one of their rated spinnakers against this eventuality. Rule 21.6.1 (b) partially addresses this contingency only for those events of Category 3 and above.

Proposal: To allow to be carried without rating adjustment one extra spinnaker appropriate solely for use in heavy airs, in addition to the current rated spinnaker inventory.

To ensure the extra spinnaker is not suitable for use in other conditions consideration was given to a limiting criteria based on cloth weight. However in order to avoid increased measurement burden and ensure easy policing, limits on the measurements of the spinnaker to a % of the maximum measured values are suggested. After preliminary discussions with Sail makers a suggested value of 80% of the SLU, SLE, SMG, and SF used to produce the rated SPA might be considered sufficient to limit the potential value of a sail in

light airs due to short luff length while producing a spinnaker of small area appropriate for use in heavy airs. An additional limitation

requiring it to be flown on the lowest suitable halyard might further limit the sails value to heavy airs.

Effect of change: Allows a yacht to carry a smaller spinnaker appropriate for downwind sailing in heavier airs without an additional rating adjustment, encouraging a more wide-ranging and seamanlike inventory.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

IRC Technical

Committee Comment:

While the Technical Committee has sympathy with the intent of the submission, it would be difficult to police and could have unintended consequences. It would for instance potentially offer a boat the option of carrying a 'code zero' as this additional spinnaker. Any limiting size would need to be based on SPA, not linear dimensions which are not rated parameters. The Technical Committee does not support the submission.

Congress Comment:

Mark Mills stated that there was a windy season in Ireland and a lot of boats did not carry a smaller spinnaker which would have been better suited to the conditions. He went on to say that it would encourage a more seaman like behaviour if a smaller spinnaker could be carried without another penalty. Peter Wykeham-Martin asked how this would be policed. Mark Mills stated that they had thought about a solution where this fourth spinnaker will have a maximum area equal to a percentage of SPA.

Australia did not support this submission. Glen Stanaway explained that such a sail can be used when reaching with a significant speed gain. This gain should raise the boats rating. Dubai supported Australia's position.

James Dadd added that if safety is the main reason then a spinnaker which is too big must not be used instead of a headsail. Otherwise, owners are already allowed to add a spinnaker but they have to accept the penalty. Kay Brinks suggested the bigger boats should be able to carry more spinnakers. Barrie Harmsworth did not support this point as he believed it would be too difficult to police. James Dadd added that this has come up before and that it is not really part of the submission.

Dan Nowlan asked if sailors were doing a Category 4 and higher Category race then they should use weather routing in order to know which sails to use. Belgium stated that they were also not in favour of this submission. Andrew McIrvine added that it was hard to predict weather over an entire regatta. The easiest solution would therefore be to race with an additional spinnaker and take the minimal penalty on rating.

This submission was **not accepted**.

8.2.5 Ireland: Crew number and crew weight:

Reason for change:

It is felt that the prior position of Crew Number/Weight being optional, to be invoked where desired by the Event Organisers, is preferable, providing more flexibility to owners and event organisers. It is proposed that IRC Rules should revert to the 2010 wording of Rule 22.4

Delete:

~~22.4.1 Boats rated as one-designs, as noted on the boat's certificate, shall conform with their one-design class rules in respect of crew number/weight limitations unless freed from this requirement by notice of race. See also Rule 13.7~~



IRC CONGRESS 2011

~~22.4.2 The Crew Number printed on each boat's certificate shall not be exceeded or the crew weight shall not exceed 85kg multiplied by the Crew Number printed on the certificate.~~

~~22.4.3 Rule 22.4 may be amended by Notice of Race.~~

Replace:

22.4.1 There is no limitation on crew numbers or weight under IRC except in the case of a short handed certificate (see Rule 8.2), for one designs, and in races requiring boats to hold an 'Endorsed' certificate (see Rule 8.4). Attention is drawn to Rule 3.4.

22.4.2 Boats rated as one-designs, as noted on the boat's certificate, shall conform with their one-design class rules in respect of crew number/weight limitations unless freed from this requirement by notice of race. See also Rule 13.7

22.4.3 In races requiring boats to hold 'Endorsed' certificates, the crew number printed on each boat's certificates shall not be exceeded.

22.4.4 In all other cases, the crew number printed on each boat's certificate is for information only, has no effect on TCC, and has no relevance under these Rules unless invoked by notice of race. Crew number may be amended by notice of race.

22.4.5 Race committees may invoke crew limitations, by number or by weight, in the notice of race.

22.4.6 Rule 22.4 may be amended by Notice of Race.

Effect of change: Returns to the long-standing position of Crew Number/Weight not being prescribed except where invoked in the Notice of Race.

IRC Technical Committee Comment: The Technical Committee makes no comment.

Congress Comment: It was reported that Irish owners would prefer the original system and therefore revert to 2010 and before rule. It was indeed felt that it is difficult to maintain crew, and owners would like to cut costs if possible. France answered that it is not necessary to change the current rule as race organizers have already the right to amend this rule in the Notice of Race. Glen Stanaway stated that Australia would not support the submission as they felt it was better as the default position. Dubai did not support the submission either. Carl Sabbe added that the rule should not be changed after one year as it would not give a good image of IRC. Peter Wykeham-Martin stated that Carl's point was a good one and James Dadd added that each member of the GBR IRC Committee were asked for comments on this subject for their specific geographical areas and reported that no-one applied these crew limits as they amended the rule in the Notice of Race.

This submission was **not accepted**.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

9. To receive contributions from National IRC Representatives (not including submissions for proposed rule changes).

- Australia:** Matt Allen stated that Australia feels very strongly that the current crew weight limit is too high. Consequently, Australia feels that a stereotype of racing where only teams playing with the limit of crew weight have a chance to win. Australia feels that this should be avoided and that IRC should clarify that to attract new crews. Moreover, Glen Stanaway stated that information should be made available for Rule Authorities in order to allow them to assemble statistics. Mike Urwin answered that the information is already available to everybody from online listings.
- Belgium:** Carl Sabbe reported IRC was working well. He added that they need a Belgian Owners Association and that they are already working on it. Although the number of boats is stable, the number of participants in races is decreasing.
- UAE & Emirates:** Barrie Harmsworth stated that not all people use the rules of sailing properly and that this is a major concern. Moreover, he finds distressing that some owners are willing to use the good will of people in the world of sailing without feeling the need to contribute themselves.
- Ireland:** Denis Kiely reported that the Irish IRC fleet is stable has been stable for a long time. Almost 400 boats were racing this year. Numbers went down in events and this is possibly a factor of recession. Most of the racing activity is driven by the major events like Laoghaire Regatta, Cork Week, etc. Non-spinnaker sailing is still growing with up to two classes of 15 to 20 boats for the major events. He added that Ireland is still practicing a dual scoring as it is felt very important to maintain this high number of boats racing. The system run alongside IRC is called ECHO.
- France:** Jacques Pelletier reported that short handed racing has proven to be very popular in France. Owners have issues sometimes with getting enough crew to race.
- Germany:** Volker Andreae stated that they had a strong IRC fleet but Germany has no real IRC events. Events use dual scoring. The systems are ORC and IRC.
- Spain:** Vincens Domenech from RANC stated that they only had a few more certificates than in 2010 but everything was running well.
- Thailand:** Simon James reported that the fleet is averaging 80 boats racing mainly in events. Club racing is not developed as most racing is event orientated. The main event is the King Cup with over 80 participants under IRC. Next year, a new trophy will be created. The aim is to include Malaysia and Singapore and try to encourage participants to move between events. He added that many charter boats are rated which is positive for IRC.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

- Netherlands:** John van der Starre reported that the fleet was quite stable and that boats are also sailed under ORC. ORC is more cruiser-racers orientated in Netherlands. The fleet is competitive and events are good. Moreover, a lot of racers are doing International programs. Many owners would like to see IRC and ORC merge.
- Turkey:** Alican Turali stated that it had been an active year for sailing in Turkey. The number of boats was almost the same and IRC had been the sole rating rule since 1995. The TORC organized the most prestigious trophy in Turkey with 40 to 70 boats racing, split into 5 classes. The double handed regatta was a real success. The 22nd Marmaris International Race was held with more than 150 participants from 23 countries using IRC.
- Japan:** Haru-Hiko Kaku stated that they had not submitted a report. Nevertheless, the number of 260 boats racing is very similar to 2010. IRC is almost the only rating system in Japan now but cost is a big issue. He explained that each owner has to pay for the boat registration, sail number and the IRC certificate. For small boats, the total cost is significant. He added that local measurers decide how much to charge the owner not JSAF. Consequently, this varies hugely. JSAF are working on a way to reduce the total cost and coming up with a package they can offer owners. Damages caused following the earthquake and the Tsunami meant that many boats were destroyed. To build new facilities and clean the water will take time, but JSAF will keep supporting owners and try to increase the size of the Japanese fleet.
- Romania:** Bogdan Alexandescu stated that it was a very good year for sailing in Romania. The partnership with BMW has been secured for next year's championship.
- Hong Kong:** Gideon Mowser reported that the number of certificates issued had not changed but new boats in the 40 foot range are joining the fleet. He added that endorsement of the whole fleet does not currently seem to be possible and currently only one race is asking for an endorsed certificate for the Class 0 only.
- Sweden:** Eva Holmsten stated that she was here as an observer and went on to say that the Royal Swedish Yacht Club is the only club to use IRC for the last three years. The fleet is therefore very small and they had to cancel two regattas this year. She also stated that they are also looking for a collaboration between IRC and ORC.
- Great Britain:** Andrew McIrvine stated that the number of certificates is slightly down from 2010, but offshore entries have been maintained. It has also become evident that going to events is more expensive. He added that Great Britain insists that every sail is measured by sail loft or approved sail measurer to increase the accuracy of the data. He went on to state that IRC and ORC are still talking about a merger. The amalgamation of UNCL and RORC Rating Offices are closer, but there are tax difficulties which need to be overcome in order for this to happen. He reported that ORC have been told that until IRC is under one administration, it would be difficult to merge ORC and IRC.
- Greece:** Konstantin Kalogeropoulos reported that they had had some successful events despite economic crisis. The economic crisis in



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Greece is their biggest problem and is the reason why numbers are down by 25%. However, they hope that things will pick up next year as there are four important sailing events in Greece.

USA:

Dan Nowlan stated that they are down in numbers this year but next year is the Bermuda Race. This should increase the fleet by approximately 80 boats. He also reported that the Bayview – Mac fleet is faltering. It is linked to the Canadian fleet so one affects the other. At the moment IRC seems to be the premier international rating rule in the US. Dan then went on to report that the New York Yacht Club has commissioned a new Grand Prix Rule, which is basically IRM but under a different name. The announcement will be made at the US Sailing AGM and there will be a national forum about where big boats will be going in the future. This will try and reinforce PHRF but ORR and IRC will also be discussed.

10. To discuss and consider the future direction of IRC.

A general discussion was held and the following points were made:

Endorsement:

Ireland stated that most owners were strongly in favour of endorsement. Nevertheless, they believe that IRC should remain flexible on this point.

France added that setting a system in France with 100% of the boats having endorsed certificates is almost impossible. France reported that they were currently asking the top boats of each fleet to be endorsed.

Glen Stanaway from Australia agreed that it's a good idea, but it should be up to different countries what they do and should not be enforced.

Pete Lawson reported an issue IMA encountered with endorsement. It was felt that no real definition of endorsement is applied so that it appears that different countries require different things.

Mike Urwin answered that policies were published on the IRC rating website and that the guidelines for endorsement were first published 5 years ago. Mike Urwin went on to say that IRC needs to be particularly careful if the endorsement policy is to be changed. Simplicity is a key issue and it will significantly reduce if endorsement becomes mandatory. He added that the additional cost for measurements may be an issue for some owners. In the United Kingdom, very few events require endorsed certificates. Nevertheless, owners naturally chose this solution when they are doing several races per year with IRC. That is why 48% of the UK fleet is endorsed. Moreover, owners know that it is much more common that the TCC goes down when a boat is endorsed. Mike Urwin concluded by saying that endorsed is plainly inappropriate for some events.

Pete Lawson answered that IMA have changed their word from "endorsed" to "approved".

Barrie Harmsworth stated that endorsement is only impossible due to the great number of different cultures involved in IRC and the variety of boats in a fleet and events using IRC around the world. Nevertheless, he believed that a world event should definitely be endorsed.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Carl Sabbe stated that it would be wise not to exaggerate the importance of being endorsed as it gives no insurance that teams will not cheat.

Glen Stanaway reminded the congress that the fundamental aim of an endorsed certificate is ensuring that the boat is rated as correctly as possible because the measures are as accurate as possible. He stated that he believes it is the only way to get fair racing for all competitors. He highlighted one issue with endorsement. Some countries are accepting measurements from sail loft whereas others are not. He added that IRC needs to have the same policy worldwide to be consistent.

Malcolm Runnalls agreed with Australia and stated that he would like to reinforce the guidelines for endorsement. Consistency around the world is the key to get fair racing between boats with an international regatta program.

Mike Urwin stated that this point had been noted and pointed out the guidelines in table format. Peter Wykeham-Martin asked IRC Technical Committee to look at the endorsement guidelines and try and unify them. Volker asked why the Fastnet Race does not ask for endorsed certificates. Peter Wykeham-Martin stated that the race organisers must be able to retain the right to decide. Greece suggested that perhaps owners should be able to keep their endorsed certificate for only 2 years without being re-measured.

Action: Technical Committee

Boat Data:

Alp Doguoglu stated that the competitors should have the chance to check a simple list of data online to see if there is an error with the data another competitor has declared. It will help "self policing" to develop. James Dadd stated that this data is already available. If there is a problem, then every team is allowed to go to the race office and ask to see the certificates. He added that too many owners are still coming to the Rating Office to ask them to protest. Alp Doguoglu stated that people do not know this. Marina Psychogiou added that the rules cannot be changed just because organisers and competitors do not know them. Alp Doguoglu went on to ask why more data like, HSA and SPA cannot be made available on the on line listing. Mark Mills answered that it will definitely help designers if more data is made available.

Action: Rating Office

Innovative Features:

Peter Wykeham-Martin stated that this should be accepted and encouraged, but do people feel comfortable allowing boats to go down a development line or should this be treated with caution?

Glen Stanaway stressed that we should be careful how we define innovation versus natural progression in design. Malcolm Runnalls added that an innovative feature become an evolution if it works properly. Matt Allen stated that IRC has been very good at protecting the existing fleet and this should remain a main goal. Consequently, innovative features should be treated with caution. Nevertheless, he suggested that features like carbon rigging should now be treated fairly.

Mike Urwin stated that care must be taken to ensure that IRC does not end up with a system that does not progress like IOR. If a particular development is not improving anything or is very expensive, it will not be treated fairly. It is all a matter of being cautious. It is not a good development for owners to spend a huge amount of money for the boat to go 1% faster. A prime driver for IRC is to encourage more safety and stability.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Lighter boats:

There is a change in the design trend in the 40 foot range with light and sea worthy designs. Nevertheless, they are not very competitive. Matt Allen stated that IRC needs to make more progress in the 35-40 foot fleet or the danger would be to lose a generation of sailors. Boats need to be smaller and more fun to race. Mark Mills stated that it is a fairly important issue. Boats in the size range need to be multi purpose. The danger with allowing very light and pure racers is the existing fleet gets pushed out. He reckoned that there are so many factors to be taken into account that it will be very difficult to find a new equilibrium. Mike Urwin added that most racing seems to be windward leeward and this is not good for the lighter boats. Dan Nowlan stated that he is keen of racing on lighter boats, but some of the science is lacking and perhaps more tests should be carried out. Andrew McIrvine added that the general consensus last year was that it was impossible to win with a light boat but with new designs like the Ker 40 and the Ker 44 have changed this vision. He stated that IRC needs to be very careful not to encourage this new fleet too much. The serious risk would be the loss of the current core of the IRC fleet. Peter Wykeham-Martin went on to say that IRC wants to see development, but the expertise of the Rating Authorities and the Technical Committee must be relied upon to make sure they are not outrageously advantaged or outrageously disadvantaged. Dan Nowlan suggested putting them into the grand prix rule.

Is there a place for a high level rating rule? – ECHO/ low level rules:

Dan Nowlan stated that the New York Yacht Club is trying to set up a new high level rating rule. Mike Urwin reported that RORC tried 12 years ago. The main difficulty is to persuade owners to buy boats under a new rule. He went on to say that designers will design a boat depending on the sort of races the owners enter, what rule those races are run under and what the major trophies are. Mike then asked if a High Performance Rule should be encouraged and the general consensus was no.

Dual Scoring:

Malcolm Runnalls stated that there is no downside to dual scoring and it is good for increasing participation in events. There are a lot of examples of how this had worked well for a number of years. Andrew McIrvine stated that the difference in results were not significant. It is thought that dual scoring might help in countries that run systems like PHRF to show them that they can progress. Dual scoring has not pushed teams one way or another. He then added that the High Performance Rule will probably be ignored largely unless the major trophies go to this rule. The conclusion from Great Britain was that dual scoring is not profitable as it splits fleets that should be together.

Alp Doguoglu stated that, in 1995, the challenge in Turkey was to have more boats racing. A freshman class was therefore introduced to help owners and crew to start racing, but it appeared one year in the freshman class was not enough. Could there be an introductory system to IRC? Denis Kiely then explained the ECHO system used in Ireland. The same prizes were awarded in ECHO as IRC. The price of an ECHO certificate is about a third of an IRC certificate. It is believed that the success of a strong racing fleet in Ireland is closely related to the fact that dual scoring is used.

Simon James from Thailand added that he represents owners who have “out of the box” production boats that only go racing three times a year. He believed a probationary certificate for one year may be a step forward as it is too complicated to get a full certificate for newcomers. He added that owners used to be able to use default data and he believed 90% of the owners with a probationary certificate will come back the year after for a full certificate. Simon James also admitted that the most important point is to have the boats on the water



IRC CONGRESS 2011

racing. Another example is Beneteau who gave an IRC certificate with every new boat delivered so that the owners did not have to apply for it.

Barry Harmsworth stated that the optimist and keelboats are the keys for future generations and new countries to go sailing. He went on to say that IRC must be the system chosen for keelboats. That is why he believed a particular effort should be made to develop IRC in countries like India and China. Many are currently racing in local club events where IRC is unknown.

Carl Sabbe from Belgium added that a simplified certificate may be profitable even if the TCC is unfair. At least, the boat is already racing with IRC and crew can compare their results with measured boats. This may be very helpful by helping them to jump to the last step of having a fully measured certificate. He added that two rating systems are used in Belgium, CR with 300 boats racing and IRC with around 70 boats racing. CR is cheaper and therefore more accessible. He then went on to say that owners racing only one or twice a year do not want to race against a top team. Mike Urwin answered that IRC has had an Incentive Scheme for several years. Rating offices were working closely with clubs to help owners to get their boats first certificates. Despite this real effort, the result was only a few newcomers even though the cost was 50% cheaper.

Promotion of IRC:

It was stated that this was more about marketing rather than promotion. Currently, IRC has currently no specific marketing line. Peter Wykeham-Martin asked Andrew for the RORC's view on marketing. Andrew reported that there is not much money to do this and there is no formal budget. Barry Harmsworth gave the example of the Optimist Class. They have paid a professional marketing officer. They started at 30 countries and have now a representative in more countries than ISAF. On the other hand, ISAF now have a proper marketing department. He stated that this will require a financial support which still needs to be defined. Sending people from the Technical Committee around the world was profitable but IRC now needs marketing professionals to develop the activity worldwide. According to Barry Harmsworth, the competitor's product should not be mentioned and the aim is to prove that IRC is the best rating rule in the world.

Bogdan Alexandescu suggested that perhaps regional championships are the best form of promotion. Malcolm Runnalls suggested that another name for it could be the Atlantic IRC Challenge for example. Eddie Warden-Owen stated that RORC gives support to and credence to large races and in turn this has helped to raise the profile of IRC worldwide. He went on to say that there was a need to do a grass roots marketing effort and educate people as this is the biggest problem. It was stated that the salesmen were attendees of the congress and in turn they should promote IRC in their countries. The Rule rates boats at different ends of the spectrum and everyone here should be proud of what has been achieved so far. Support of events is very important, it is one of the reasons that the two rating offices should merge. Peter Wykeham-Martin stated that there was a need to start marketing from grassroots. Eddie then stated that being involved with top level events is the best way to get aspirational sailors. The entry level is unendorsed and the higher level is endorsed, there needs to be educational marketing to get people to understand this.

Eddie Warden-Owen concluded that the sport of sailing is about achieving goals.

IRC World Championship:

Mike Urwin believed that IRC should not run a World Championship. Jean Sans thought there should be one. Barrie Harmsworth asked if there was an ISAF submission for the right to hold a world championship. Mike Urwin answered that there was but this was deferred.

Andrew McIrvine reported that ORC and IRC decided not to have a world championship.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Nevertheless, ORC had already started the process rolling and announced that they had sponsors. Andrew McIrvine then stated that when a closer look was taken it was more of a regional championship not a world championship as there just weren't enough countries taking part to make it a world championship. The selection of winners from country to country may be very difficult to set. That is why Andrew believed that regional championships seem more reasonable. Barrie Harmsworth reminded to the Congress that ISAF owns the name "World" and therefore ISAF approval is needed. Marina Psychogiou also believed that it is an Utopia to have a true World Championship. Nevertheless, ORC has the ISAF approval and this is felt at least in Greece as IRC looking inferior to ORC. Marina concluded that IRC needs to have the same rights than ORC. Andrew McIrvine answered that if IRC has this right but do not hold a World event, it may be seen as a joke. Moreover, perhaps it is easier to ask ISAF not to allow ORC to run a World Championship than having their approval to run an IRC World event but this will of course complicate the discussion with ORC.

Race courses:

Mike Urwin reported that there is a strong trend worldwide to hold inshore windward leeward races. He stated that this is perhaps not the best solution and that the diversity of courses should be increased in order to increase the diversity of boats types in IRC with a real chance to win.

Mark Mills suggested multiple handicaps depending upon the type of race in the future although setting this up may be too complex.

11. To receive, consider and decide proposals for changes to the Constitution of the International IRC Owners Association.

No proposals had been received.

12. Continental and International Regional Championships.

Dan Nowlan reported that this year a successful North American Championships was held in Toronto. Most attendees were Canadians.

Glen Stanaway added that Australia had held a National Championship based on points scored at 4 regattas. He then asked for clarification about the definition of an ISAF regional Championship.

Marina Psychogiou stated that it would be a Continental Championship for Australia.

Barrie Harmsworth added that we are not allowed to use the term "World".

Peter Wykeham-Martin stated that if a Rule Authority wants to run a Championship, it is worth checking directly with ISAF the names allowed to be used.

13. To elect the IIOA representative on the IRC Policy Steering Group.

Malcolm Runnalls was elected.

14. To elect the representative of IRC Congress on the IRC Committee.

Peter Wykeham-Martin proposed that the representative of the congress is co-opted from the congress body to leave it more open. The proposition was accepted.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

15. To elect a Vice Chairman of the IRC Congress.

Alp Doguoglu was the candidate to be re-elected as Vice Chairman of the Congress. Peter Wykeham-Martin proposed the nomination and Denis Kiely from Ireland seconded the proposal. Alp Doguoglu was elected as Vice Chairman for the next three years.

16. Any Other Business.

Carl Sabbe, president of BELIRC, asked if it would be possible to get a list of contacts of attendees. The answer to this was yes.

Matt Allen stated that there will be a submission next year from Australia requesting that the current crew weight limit should be prescriptive so that all competitors can race together.

The TORC (Turkey) asked if it would be possible to have an access to the My IRC program. James Dadd answered that the RORC Rating Office will be happy to help and to contact them.

RORC is developing an application named MiRO (My Race Officer) for smart phones and tablets. It is very close to being launched.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Sunday 16th October

1. IRC submissions to ISAF.

1.1 Report on IRC submissions to the 2010 ISAF Conference.

IRC made a submission last year to allow international measurers to be appointed by the Rating system. Mike Urwin stated that he is optimistic that in three weeks time at the ISAF Conference in Puerto Rico this will be accepted.

The second point which was discussed was the requirements to be an international measurer? To qualify, a measurer must officiate in at least two principal events within four years. The issue for IRC is: what is a principal event? Mike Urwin went on to say that the informal agreement is that IRC will propose a definition for IRC principal events and send this list to ISAF. IRC will try to note the principal events in as many countries as possible. Mike Urwin added that he would prefer not to define what a principal event is formally. Examples of principle events might include Spi Ouest, SNIM in France, Commodore's Cup, Cork Week and the Japan Cup.

There is a requirement to attend an ISAF measurement seminar and at the end there is a test to confirm the status of international measurers. It is a four year appointment, followed by a re-application process. Moreover, ISAF do look at the recommendations from other international measurers. ISAF's main goal is to ensure that international measurers are able to check the boats are respecting the Equipment Rules of Sailing. It is also important to note that International measurers will not have to know Offshore Special Regulations. This is a matter for race organizers.

1.2 IRC 2011 submissions to ISAF

1.2.1

ERS Interpretation

Purpose or Objective

To create a fast track route for the interpretation of ERS.

Proposal

Add New Regulations 29.3.5 and 29.3.6:

29.3.5 The Equipment Rules of Sailing Question and Answer Panel shall answer questions on the Equipment Rules of Sailing that are submitted to it by a class, a rating rule, an ISAF International Race Official, or a Member National Authority. The procedure that the panel will follow when answering such questions and the Questions and Answers that the panel decides to publish shall be posted on the Equipment Rules of Sailing Question and Answer Service page on the ISAF website, and a link to that page shall appear on both the Equipment Rules, ISAF Classes, Ratings and Handicap and the Race Officials pages. Questions and Answers published during a four-year rulebook cycle will normally be removed from the website no later than 1 January in the year in

which a revised rulebook is published. The panel may propose that a published Question and Answer be added to *The ERS Case Book*.

29.3.6 Answers to questions provided by the Equipment Rules of Sailing Question and Answer Panel published on the ISAF website are not authoritative interpretations and explanations of the Equipment Rules of Sailing. However, they are the carefully considered opinions of an experienced panel whose members have a thorough knowledge of the Equipment Rules of Sailing and extensive experience as competitors or as race officials.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Current Position

None.

Reason

Currently, the only route to obtain an interpretation of ERS is the ERS Case Book. Inclusion of a case requires a submission in accordance with Regulation 15 and is thus a lengthy process.

There is currently no process for a rapid response to questions arising from ERS. This absence creates problems for classes using ERS, encouraging informal local or class based interpretations, and is a deterrent to classes adopting ERS.

RRS have resolved this problem with the introduction of the Racing Rules Question and Answer Panel.

Interpretation of Offshore Special Regulations is governed by Regulation 30.3 which provides for interpretation by the Chairman of the Special Regulations Sub-committee.

Similarly, ISAF Regulation 16 gives the right of interpretation of the ISAF Constitution, including ISAF Regulations, to the Constitution Committee. Within this, Regulation 16.4 gives the Chairman of Constitution Committee the right to issue a provisional interpretation in case of 'urgency', subject to confirmation by the Constitution Committee.

Noting that ISAF Regulations include the Eligibility, Advertising, Ant-Doping and ISAF Sailor Classification Codes, all 'rules' governing the conduct of racing, with the sole exception of the Equipment Rules of Sailing, have processes in place for quick interpretation.

It is proposed that an Equipment Rules of Sailing Question and Answer Panel should be established. It is accepted that, identically with the RRS, answers given cannot be authoritative interpretations and can only be carefully considered opinions of an experienced panel.

1.2.2 Series and Age Dates

Purpose or Objective

To define Series and Age Dates.

Proposal

Insert new C.6.5

C.6.5 Age

(a) AGE DATE

The year in which the boat was first launched/certified, or the year in which the boat was re-launched/certified following hull shell modification, whichever is the later.

(b) SERIES DATE

The year in which the first boat of the class or production series was launched/certified.

Current Position

None

Reason

Rating Rules commonly include 'age allowance'. ISAF Offshore Special Regulations also refer in many places to the age of a boat. Class rules on occasion permit 'grandfathering'. Standard definitions of age would facilitate all of these.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

1.2.3 Batten

Purpose or Objective To define Batten.

Proposal Insert new G.1.4 (k):

G.1.4 (k)

BATTEN **An element added to the sail, other than a corner board, the purpose of which is to support a sail edge.**

Current Position None

Reason

ERS currently define a batten pocket but not a batten. It is desirable that this omission should be rectified.

1.2.4 Headsails and Spinnakers

Purpose or Objective To replace the current RRS 50.4 with ERS definitions of Headsails and Spinnakers appropriate to current usage and terminology.

Proposal Delete: ERS G.1.3 (b) and replace:

~~(b) HEADSAIL~~

~~A sail set forward of the mast spar, or of the foremost mast spar if more than one mast.~~

(b) HEADSAIL

Unless otherwise specified by class rules, any sail tacked down forward of the foremost mast which does not meet the definition of a spinnaker.

Insert: New ERS G.1.3 (c):

(c) **SPINNAKER**

Unless otherwise specified by class rules, a sail set forward of the foremost mast with half width (measured in accordance with G.7.5 (b)) equal to or greater than 75% of foot length and without battens.

Current Position As above.

Reason

As acknowledged by ISAF Racing Rules Committee RRS 50.4 is a definition more suited to be a part of ERS. It is also widely modified by class rules. The current ERS G.1.3 (b) does not differentiate between headsails and spinnakers. While this is commonly addressed by class rules, ERS standard definitions would nevertheless be useful.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

The proposed definitions provide a minimum basis for the definitions of headsails and spinnakers. A class wishing to invoke greater control, including e.g. intermediate girths/widths, has the right to do so.

The ERS Working Party should try again to get agreement from ISAF Racing Rules Committee to remove RRS 50.4 from RRS and replace it within ERS.

1.2.5 Outer Point Distance

Purpose or Objective To amend the definition of Outer Point Distance to reflect current practice on large yachts without affecting smaller boats.

Proposal Amend: ERS H.4.2:

H.4.2 Fittings, local curvature, ~~and~~ local cutaway **and any increase in the fore/aft dimension of a sail track and/or sail track support**, shall be ignored when measuring a **spar** or dimensions taken to a **spar**.

Current Position As above.

Reason

To facilitate hoisting large mainsails, it is common practice on large yachts for the mainsail luff track to flare and increase in fore/aft length for a considerable length (as much as 1/3 of mast length) towards the bottom of the mast. **Outer Point Distance** is measured from the aft edge of the mast **spar** which includes the luff track. H.4.2 requires that local curvature is ignored.

Curvature of 1/3 of mast length cannot be taken as 'local'. In these cases therefore, Outer Point Distance is artificially reduced offering a rating advantage for these large yachts. Any boat of a class without controls on fore/aft mast dimension could also use this to advantage.

1.2.6 Mainsail and Headsail Head Point

Purpose or Objective To amend the definition of Mainsail and Headsail Head Point to reflect current sail design practice on offshore boats without affecting smaller boats.

Proposal Amend: ERS G.4.2 (a) and (b):

- (a) MAINSAIL: The intersection of the **luff**, extended as necessary, **ignoring any cut-out or flare**, and the line through the highest point of the **sail** at 90° to the **luff**.
- (b) HEADSAIL: The intersection of the **luff**, extended as necessary **ignoring any cut-out or flare**, and the line through the highest point of the **sail**, excluding **attachments**, at 90° to the **luff**.

Current Position As above.

Reason

For offshore boats with headsails set in a luff groove and mainsails generally, it is very common for sail makers to locally flare the luff tape at the head to relieve peeling load and minimise the risk of the head of the sail being pulled from the luff groove under sailing loads. This is a sensible and seamanlike practice which confers no racing advantage.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Currently however, the relevant part of ERS G.4.2 simply says *the intersection of the luff extended as necessary*. In finding head point, inspectors therefore follow the line of any local flare, thus discouraging this practice. It is desirable that sail makers are not discouraged from adopting seamanlike designs.

1.2.7 Forestay and Shrouds

Purpose or Objective To amend the definitions of Forestay and Shrouds for safety and other reasons.

Proposal Amend: ERS F.1.6 (a) (i) and (iii):

(i) SHROUD

Permanently attached Rigging providing transverse support for a mast **spar** or hull **spar** which may also provide longitudinal support.

(iii) FORESTAY

Permanently attached Rigging providing forward support for a mast **spar**.

Current Position As above.

Reason

The current ERS F.1.6 (a) (iii) does not require that a FORESTAY or SHROUDS are permanently attached. In certain circumstances, this can offer an advantage to offshore boats. It is also highly desirable for safety reasons that forestays and shrouds should be permanently attached. Adding the word 'Permanent' to the beginning of F.1.6 (a) (i) and (iii) would resolve this without causing difficulty to other classes.

STAY's should however not be required to be permanently attached to cater for such as babystays and inner forestays which are routinely detached.

1.2.8 Double Luff Sails

Purpose or Objective To amend the current definition of double luff sails to correct an unintended error.

Proposal Amend: ERS G.1.4 (g):

(g) DOUBLE LUFF SAIL

A **sail** with more than one **luff**, or a sail passing round a ~~stay~~ **spar** and attached back on itself.

Current Position As above.

Reason

The ERS definition of **stay** is: '**Rigging** providing longitudinal support for a mast **spar** or hull **spar** and or supporting a **sail**'. The wire in a 'stuff luff' headsail (e.g. a 420 or 470 headsail) is therefore a **stay** because it supports the mast. Because the wire is contained in a pocket at the luff of the sail, the sail passes round the wire and the headsail then becomes a double luff headsail.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Additionally, the definition of sail includes **attachments** which include hanks. A headsail hank passes round the **stay** on which the **sail** is hoisted making that sail a double luff headsail.

This unintended problem is simply resolved without consequential effects by deleting '**stay**' or from the definition of DOUBLE LUFF SAIL.

1.2.9 Hollows in Sail Leeches

Purpose or Objective To improve understanding of the meaning of hollows in sail edges.

Proposal Amend:

G.2.4 Sail ~~Edge~~ Leech Hollow

Text of G.2.4 to remain unchanged.

Amend: **H.5.2 Hollows in Sail ~~Edges~~ Leeches**

Where there is a **sail ~~edge~~ leech hollow** and a measurement point falls in the hollow:

Remaining text unchanged.

Current Position As above.

Reason

Equipment Inspectors and sail makers frequently misunderstand the correct meaning of **Sail Edge Hollow** and fail to correctly measure hollows. The definition of **Sail Edge Hollow** in G.2.4 is clear that hollows only relate to concavities in the **leech** of a **sail**. Re-naming **Sail Edge Hollow** as **Sail Leech Hollow** would help general understanding. The texts of G.2.4 and H.5.2 will remain unchanged with only the defined name being changed.

1.2.10 Hollows in Sail Leeches

Purpose or Objective To remove an erroneous clause.

Proposal Amend:

H.5.2 Hollows in Sail Edges

Where there is a **sail edge hollow** and a measurement point falls in the hollow:

between adjacent **batten pockets**
between the **aft head point** and adjacent **batten pocket**
between the **clew point** and adjacent **batten pocket**
~~between the tack point and adjacent batten pocket~~
at an **attachment**

Remaining text unchanged.

Current Position As above.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Reason

ERS paragraph H.5.2 defines how hollows are measured. It includes: 'between the **tack point** and the adjacent **batten pocket**'. Noting that as defined by G.2.4, hollows can only be present in the leech of a sail, it is not physically possible for there to be a **sail edge hollow** between the tack point and the adjacent batten pocket.

2. Discussion of other submissions to ISAF relevant to IRC.

It was reported that 270 Submissions have been submitted to ISAF this year. However, only a few of them may have an influence upon IRC. A number are also submissions parallel to the IRC submissions relating to ERS.

The Submission about Racing Rule 49 is to require a maximum deflection at the middle of the lifelines. Mike Urwin believed that this is completely unrealistic. James Dadd and Mike Urwin will therefore press the ISAF committee and try to demonstrate that no tension or deflection should be prescribed by RRS 49.

Submission 262 is relevant to IRC. Congress noted these and other relevant submissions.

Congress reviewed and noted the various submissions to amend ISAF Offshore Special Regulations.

3. Open discussion on the topic IRC – ISAF.

IRC WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP

ISAF will review the number of World championships allowed. It is believed that there are too many. Barry Harmsworth stated that IRC does not comply with all the requirements. It is therefore very unlikely that ISAF will come up with the acceptance of an IRC World Championship.

It was proposed to withdraw IRC's request to run its own World Championship. Peter Wykeham-Martin also proposed that this issue was left to Andrew McIrvine. ORC have promised that they will not run another World Championship. It is part of the negotiation and consequently, it is very unlikely that ORC will run a World Championship in 2012.

Andrew McIrvine stated that he believes that IRC needs to let ISAF decide alone if ORC has the right to run its World Championship. This was accepted by the participants.

IRC & ERS FUTURE

Mike Urwin stated that the ideal solution will be to have a complete fusion of ERS definitions for IRC. Unfortunately, this point has not been reached yet. Alp Doguoglu suggested that the contest between IRC and ERS may not be needed. James Dadd clarified that it is a contribution not a competition. The aim is to ensure measurements definitions are as clear and universal as possible. It was then concluded that IRC needs to maintain a very constructive dialogue with ISAF. Mike Urwin stated that he had hoped IRC would have had fewer submissions to send to the ERS. Unfortunately, the communication had proven difficult. The key will be co-operation.

OSR

There was a discussion about category 3 and OSR flexibility in general. It was concluded that it is worth keeping flexibility in OSR.

The Next meeting will be held in October 2012 in England.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Appendix 1

National Votes

The number of votes for each country is as shown by the table below. Countries not listed have fleets of less than 25 boats and in accordance with the Constitution of the International IRC Owners Association, paragraph 4.5, they are not eligible to vote.

COUNTRY	NUMBER OF BOATS	VOTES
GREAT BRITAIN	1766	9
FRANCE	975	5
ITALY	905	5
AUSTRALIA	544	4
USA	464	3
IRELAND	423	3
TURKEY	360	3
JAPAN	258	3
SPAIN	159	2
NETHERLANDS	146	2
GREECE	117	2
HONG KONG	93	1
THAILAND	80	1
BELGIUM	74	1
UAE	68	1
MALTA	66	1
CANADA	60	1
SOUTH AFRICA	55	1
NEW ZEALAND	55	1
GERMANY	53	1
URUGUAY	45	1
FINLAND	40	1
CHINA	40	1
BULGARIA	39	1
SWEDEN	37	1
ISRAEL	35	1
SINGAPORE	29	1



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Appendix 2

Report from the IRC Technical Committee

1. IRC Activity

The total number of boats issued with IRC certificates in 2005 to 2010 and to 31st August 2011 is shown below.

Country	Continent	Region	Certificate Year								Endorsed %	2011 to 31/8/11
			2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 to 31/8/10	2010			
Great Britain	Europe	North	1878	1839	2043	2029	1806	1723	1766	49	1675	
France	Europe	North	904	966	924	1074	937	889	975	9	933	
Italy	Europe	North	763	840	931	962	840	711	905	2	657	
Australia	Oceania	South	527	578	570	528	535	344	544	92	367	
USA	N America	North	549	589	610	611	488	432	464	89	358	
Ireland	Europe	North	389	402	429	455	443	409	423	82	393	
Turkey	Europe	North	260	280	292	327	342	261	360	51	276	
Japan	Asia	North	1	33	89	122	221	252	258	45	263	
Spain	Europe	North	934	155	164	165	167	151	159	27	159	
Netherlands	Europe	North	58	54	152	162	172	136	146	28	133	
Greece	Europe	North	0	56	109	101	105	108	117	87	95	
Hong Kong	Asia	South	76	85	94	120	93	69	93	30	75	
Thailand	Asia	South	50	48	49	64	72	22	80	11	23	
Belgium	Europe	North	79	91	99	100	87	66	74	11	75	
UAE/Gulf States	Africa	South	67	56	79	67	72	10	68	32	18	
Malta	Europe	North	49	42	47	65	64	58	66	14	51	
Canada	N America	North	22	24	23	32	51	59	60	93	82	
South Africa	Africa	South	91	91	84	76	63	31	55	89	32	
New Zealand	Oceania	South	15	142	97	94	78	33	55	85	29	
Germany	Europe	North	16	24	39	64	65	50	53	36	55	
Uruguay	S America	South				47	45	32	45	89	1	
Finland	Europe	North				13	34	38	40	93	36	
China	Asia	North	0	0	0	0	37	31	40	3	31	
Bulgaria	Europe	North				41	42	35	39	92	27	
Sweden	Europe	North				28	37	35	37	92	18	
Israel	Europe	North	27	27	21	23	23	27	35	17	30	
Singapore	Asia	South	29	45	41	41	37	18	29	52	30	
Argentina	S America	South	0	50	90	37	27	7	24	92	1	
Portugal	Europe	North	127	133	95	101	56	23	23	9	13	
Malaysia	Asia	South	19	23	27	23	23	13	21	19	12	
Romania	Europe	North							18	0	32	
Denmark	Europe	North						17	17	59	9	
Norway	Europe	North				8	9	14	16	81	10	
Croatia	Europe	North				15	20	16	16	0	6	
Iceland	Europe	North	18	14	15	14	12	13	13	15	10	
Philippines	Asia	South	19	13	13	12	13	8	13	23	7	
Maurice Island	Oceania	South				9	6	1	12	0	4	
Brazil	S America	South							7	71	0	
Switzerland	Europe	North				20	16	2	3	100	6	
Korea	Asia	North					9	3	3	33	4	
Bermuda	N America	North	0	4	8	9	3	1	1	100	0	
Chile	S America	South							0	N/A	40	
Russia	Europe	North	0	16	7	7	7	0	0	N/A	0	
World & Other (<5)	N/A	N/A	164	125	114	74	215	111	49	20	113	
		Totals:	7131	6845	7355	7740	7372	6259	7222	44	6189	
		As % of previous year:		96.0	107.5	105.2	95.2		98.0		98.9	



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Between the 2009 and 2010 Certificate Years, there was a further small decrease in the number of boats rated of 150 boats, or 2.0%. Noting again the continued poor state of the global economy during 2010, this is unsurprising. It is noteworthy however that against this trend, both the French and Italian fleets have shown some growth. Growth also continued in some of the newer IRC countries, notably JPN, TUR, GRE, ISR and CAN.

As requested at the 2010 IRC Congress, data is now included for the % of Endorsed certificates in each country. Overall, 44% of boats held Endorsed certificates in 2010 with the number in each country ranging from 0% to 100%.

For reference, the latest available data at 31st August 2011 is also shown. Care should be taken in reading this data, particularly for South countries which are only 3 months into their year. The notable statistic within this is that both Chile and Romania have this year achieved fleets in excess of 25 boats.

At the end of 2010, 27 countries on all 6 continents had fleets of 25 boats or more, satisfying the requirements of ISAF Regulation 12.2(e)(i). At the end of August 2011, 25 countries had achieved this level with the likelihood of a further 4 by the end of the year. At the end of 2010, 38 countries had fleets of 5 or more boats.

The table below shows the comparison of the numbers of boats rated at 31st August for the period 2006, to 2011:

Country	Boats at 31/08/06	Boats at 31/08/07	Boats at 31/08/08	Boats at 31/08/09	Boats at 31/08/10	Boats at 31/08/11	Change 31/08/10 to 31/08/11	Comment
France	829	858	980	860	889	933	44	
Chile						40	40	South
Romania					0	32	32	
Australia	328	285	357	341	344	367	23	South
Canada	25	22	30	49	59	82	23	
Turkey	212	237	249	236	261	276	15	
Singapore	21	45	25	29	18	30	12	South
Japan	14	81	117	208	252	263	11	
Belgium	80	89	95	80	66	75	9	
Spain	141	154	156	146	151	159	8	
UAE	21	56	26	12	10	18	8	South
Hong Kong	58	85	65	70	69	75	6	South
Germany	17	38	51	57	50	55	5	
Switzerland	2	10	18	15	2	6	4	
Israel	24	19	19	20	27	30	3	
Maurice Island	0	0	8	4	1	4	3	South
Korea				9	3	4	1	
South Africa	37	91	53	47	31	32	1	South
Thailand	10	48	19	14	22	23	1	South
Brazil						0	0	South
China					31	31	0	
Russia	14	3	5	3	0	0	0	
Bermuda	4	7	9	2	1	0	-1	
Malaysia	4	23	13	11	13	12	-1	South
Philippines	0	13	1	7	8	7	-1	South
Finland	1	3	13	33	38	36	-2	
Iceland	14	15	14	12	13	10	-3	
Netherlands	50	129	134	153	136	133	-3	



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Country	Boats at 31/08/06	Boats at 31/08/07	Boats at 31/08/08	Boats at 31/08/09	Boats at 31/08/10	Boats at 31/08/11	Change 31/08/10 to 31/08/11	Comment
New Zealand	36	142	49	50	33	29	-4	South
Norway	0	0	8	8	14	10	-4	
Argentina	39	56	27	27	7	1	-6	South
Malta	41	41	57	57	58	51	-7	
Bulgaria	0	1	38	39	35	27	-8	
Denmark					17	9	-8	
Croatia	0	1	8	15	16	6	-10	
Portugal	130	85	100	56	23	13	-10	
Greece	43	101	98	100	108	95	-13	
Ireland	396	415	447	433	409	393	-16	
Sweden	1	3	30	28	35	18	-17	
Uruguay	0	21	39	33	32	1	-31	South
Great Britain	1785	1952	1987	1749	1723	1675	-48	
Italy	604	685	766	624	711	657	-54	
USA	562	574	584	449	432	358	-74	
World & Other (<5)	56	36	51	138	111	113	2	
Totals:	5599	6424	6746	6224	6259	6189	-70	
		14.7	5.0	-7.7	0.6		-1.1	

We believe that the decline in certificate numbers in established IRC countries continues to reflect the current economic conditions.

We are again encouraged by the growth during 2010 in newer IRC countries, CHI, ROM, CAN. It is also noteworthy that, against other trends, the number of certificated boats in Italy, France and Turkey has again increased during 2011.

In overall summary, noting the stability of numbers of rated boats at the end of August for the past three years, notwithstanding the global economic climate, IRC numbers remain stable.

2. Measurement

The Istanbul international measurement seminar reported last year was successfully completed with Rob Taylor from the ISAF Technical Office as co-presenter and used the measurer training material jointly developed with the RYA and ISAF.

No international measurer seminars have been held during 2011.

The IRC submission to ISAF to permit IRC measurers to become ISAF International Measurers was deferred for further study. We are optimistic that the Working Party will recommend acceptance at this year's ISAF Conference.

Based on our experiences to date, work has also continued in co-operation with others towards the continued development of the Equipment Rules of Sailing. A number of submissions to this year's ISAF Conference have resulted.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

3. Technical

The changes to the IRC treatment of smaller lighter boats forecast last year were implemented for 2011. Further work during 2011 suggests that further changes will be implemented for 2012.

The PDF portfolio linking IRC Rules with the Equipment Rules of Sailing is now published on www.ircrating.org. We believe that this will be of considerable benefit to all.

The Technical Committee has been working this year on an agenda including 34 different subjects. Many of these are detail issues and will only result in minor changes to IRC Rules and/or rating calculations. Much of this work has been conducted by E-Mail with a formal 2 day meeting in London in July.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Appendix 3

The future direction of IRC

IRC and its predecessor CHS have now been in existence for approaching 30 years. The IRC fleet now encompasses everything from classics with gaff rigs through rejuvenated IOR designs, sportsboats, TP 52s, mini maxis, superyachts, and every size and type of cruiser/racer imaginable. IRC has spread from a few tens of boats in the English Channel to 7000+ boats in approaching 40 countries.

Over IRC's life, we have seen a steady movement away from the distorted, pot bellied IOR type, probably with a buoyant keel, to today's wholesome functional modern cruiser/racer. We have seen the adoption of bowsprits, asymmetric spinnakers, carbon masts, better, lighter and stronger sail cloth, code zeros, composite standing rigging, water ballast, canting keels, powered sail handling systems and all the myriad other features of modern boats. Boats have got faster, more seaworthy, more dual purpose and longer lived.

But, where next?

Issues (among many others) that delegates to the IRC Congress might wish to consider include:

- Should IRC continue to embrace all comers? This might well result in race results being more and more determined by conditions. Is this acceptable?
- Should IRC continue to embrace new technology? Composite standing rigging and code zeros for example? And if so, should such features be beneficially, fairly or penally treated?
- Do owners generally wish to embrace the possibility created by modern hi-tech construction materials of lighter faster boats? Or are the current breed of cruiser/racers and racer/cruisers already quite fast enough and enough of a handful for the average owner and his crew?
- Should IRC overtly embrace such as the TP 52s and mini maxis? Given these boats usual separation into separate classes is this even relevant to the average owner? Or is it only relevant to those who compete in events such as the Fastnet Race with a prestigious overall trophy?
- Should there be an IRC World Championship? Would such an event have any meaning?
- Courses. If race committees only ever run windward/leeward courses, designers will design boats for that, which is unhealthy. Should IRC try and influence the types of courses that are set?
- Local handicap systems and their interaction with IRC.
- Is there a place for a 'high level' rating rule?
- How does the steady trend away from weekend racing towards evening series and regatta weeks affect IRC?



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Appendix 4

Fleet Statistics 2010

The table below gives summary fleet statistic for IRC fleets in 2010.

Country	Certificate Year 2010												
	Fleet	LH < 9m		LH 9 - 12m		LH 12 - 15m		LH > 15m		New applications		LH	TCC
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Average	Average
Chile	0	0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	0.00
Uruguay	45	22	48.9	22	48.9	0	0.0	1	2.2	5	11.1	8.88	0.909
Iceland	13	6	46.2	7	53.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.7	9.21	0.967
UAE/Gulf States	68	30	44.1	29	42.6	7	10.3	2	2.9	13	19.1	9.27	0.975
Singapore	29	14	48.3	8	27.6	7	24.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	9.68	0.997
Argentina	24	5	20.8	18	75.0	0	0.0	1	4.2	12	50.0	9.76	1.017
Ireland	423	127	30.0	261	61.7	31	7.3	4	0.9	27	6.4	9.78	0.955
Maurice Island	12	5	41.7	7	58.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	25.0	10.00	0.938
Japan	258	32	12.4	184	71.3	38	14.7	4	1.6	66	25.6	10.39	1.041
Great Britain	1766	405	22.9	1024	58.0	257	14.6	80	4.5	276	15.6	10.61	0.981
Romania	18	2	11.1	12	66.7	4	22.2	0	0.0	4	22.2	10.71	0.959
South Africa	55	17	30.9	19	34.5	15	27.3	4	7.3	10	18.2	10.83	1.052
Bulgaria	39	12	30.8	13	33.3	10	25.6	4	10.3	8	20.5	10.96	0.988
Portugal	23	4	17.4	12	52.2	6	26.1	1	4.3	6	26.1	10.96	1.037
France	975	112	11.5	623	63.9	176	18.1	64	6.6	218	22.4	11.24	1.029
Israel	35	5	14.3	19	54.3	9	25.7	2	5.7	15	42.9	11.33	1.011
Greece	117	17	14.5	62	53.0	30	25.6	8	6.8	21	17.9	11.34	1.028
Belgium	74	8	10.8	39	52.7	21	28.4	6	8.1	15	20.3	11.41	1.038
Malaysia	21	4	19.0	9	42.9	5	23.8	3	14.3	2	9.5	11.50	1.021
Switzerland	3	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	3	100.0	11.51	1.055
Canada	60	1	1.7	40	66.7	15	25.0	4	6.7	18	30.0	11.54	1.056
Finland	40	3	7.5	15	37.5	21	52.5	1	2.5	15	37.5	11.57	1.076
Philippines	13	1	7.7	9	69.2	2	15.4	1	7.7	1	7.7	11.58	1.041
Turkey	360	45	12.5	174	48.3	121	33.6	20	5.6	92	25.6	11.75	1.009
Sweden	37	2	5.4	23	62.2	9	24.3	3	8.1	17	45.9	11.85	1.096
Australia	544	18	3.3	309	56.8	161	29.6	56	10.3	99	18.2	12.19	1.094
Thailand	80	10	12.5	28	35.0	32	40.0	10	12.5	26	32.5	12.30	1.039
Netherlands	146	6	4.1	70	47.9	56	38.4	14	9.6	23	15.8	12.34	1.061
Brazil	7	0	0.0	5	71.4	0	0.0	2	28.6	0	0.0	12.37	1.161
Spain	159	18	11.3	88	55.3	25	15.7	28	17.6	28	17.6	12.40	1.058
Croatia	16	3	18.8	7	43.8	3	18.8	3	18.8	2	12.5	12.43	1.108
Italy	905	30	3.3	475	52.5	294	32.5	106	11.7	217	24.0	12.45	1.069
China	40	7	17.5	28	70.0	1	2.5	4	10.0	8	20.0	12.50	1.071
Bermuda	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12.66	1.172
Hong Kong	93	10	10.8	38	40.9	25	26.9	20	21.5	14	15.1	12.69	1.099
Malta	66	1	1.5	28	42.4	31	47.0	6	9.1	14	21.2	12.72	1.057
New Zealand	55	3	5.5	27	49.1	13	23.6	12	21.8	10	18.2	12.94	1.102
USA	464	4	0.9	166	35.8	200	43.1	94	20.3	63	13.6	13.43	1.128
Denmark	17	0	0.0	4	23.5	8	47.1	5	29.4	13	76.5	14.17	1.204
Norway	16	0	0.0	2	12.5	9	56.3	5	31.3	10	62.5	14.28	1.199
Korea	3	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	14.63	1.140
Germany	53	0	0.0	6	11.3	26	49.1	21	39.6	16	30.2	15.26	1.185
Russia	0	0		0		0		0		0			
Others	49												
	7222												



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Within this, average length across the whole fleet can be shown to be 11.48m, a marginal increase over 2009's 11.31m, and average TCC 1.028, identical to 2009. The lowest rated boat in 2010 (a bilge keel Vivacity 20 in South Africa had a TCC of 0.745. The highest rated boat in 2010 (the American super maxi RAMBLER 100) had a TCC of 1.972.

Salient points to note then include:

36 countries had fleets of 5 or more boats.

The country with both the lowest average LH and TCC is Uruguay.

The country with the highest average LH is Germany.

The country with the highest average TCC is Denmark. Noting the small total size of the Danish fleet, this may not be statistically significant.

7 countries (SWI, BRA, BER, DEN, NOR, KOR, GER, MAU,) had no boats with LH less than 10m. A further 10 countries (USA, MLT, CAN, AUS, ITA, NED, SWE, NZL, FIN, PHI) had less than 10% of their fleets with LH less than 9m.

5 countries (MAU, UAE, ISL, SIN, URU) had more than 40% of their fleets with LH less than 9m.

10 countries (ESP, CRO, USA, HKG, NZL, BRA, DEN, NOR, KOR, GER) had more than 15% of their fleet with LH greater than 15m.

In 7 countries (ISR, SWE, ARG, NOR, DEN, SWI) more than 40% of all applications were new applications.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

The table below gives fleet statistic for the age of IRC boats in 2011.

Country	No. of Boats	>20 years	15 - 20 years	10 - 15 years	5 - 10 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 10 years
		Age Date <1992	Age Date 1992 - 1996	Age Date 1997 - 2001	Age Date 2002 - 2006	Age Date 2007 - 2011	Age Date 2002 - 2011
		%	%	%	%	%	%
Australia	367	17.7	11.2	14.4	25.1	31.6	56.7
Belgium	76	26.3	7.9	15.8	14.5	35.5	50.0
Bulgaria	27	25.9	11.1	7.4	14.8	40.7	55.6
Canada	82	43.9	6.1	11.0	18.3	20.7	39.0
China	30	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Croatia	6	0.0	16.7	16.7	50.0	16.7	66.7
Denmark	9	0.0	0.0	66.7	11.1	22.2	33.3
Finland	36	16.7	2.8	22.2	25.0	33.3	58.3
France	941	18.1	8.0	11.2	24.3	38.5	62.8
Germany	55	27.3	3.6	12.7	20.0	36.4	56.4
Great Britain	1708	35.4	8.5	14.3	20.0	21.7	41.7
Greece	95	26.3	10.5	21.1	18.9	23.2	42.1
Hong Kong	75	34.7	8.0	10.7	12.0	34.7	46.7
Iceland	10	20.0	30.0	20.0	30.0	0.0	30.0
Ireland	394	39.8	8.1	16.0	21.8	14.2	36.0
Israel	30	16.7	6.7	13.3	23.3	40.0	63.3
Italy	657	15.5	5.8	11.3	30.6	36.8	67.4
Japan	264	14.8	25.8	18.6	18.9	22.0	40.9
Malaysia	12	25.0	16.7	25.0	16.7	16.7	33.3
Malta	53	3.8	13.2	11.3	34.0	37.7	71.7
Netherlands	135	14.8	7.4	14.8	22.2	40.7	63.0
New Zealand	28	39.3	10.7	7.1	28.6	14.3	42.9
Norway	10	0.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	60.0	80.0
Portugal	13	23.1	7.7	15.4	30.8	23.1	53.8
Romania	32	28.1	3.1	3.1	15.6	50.0	65.6
Singapore	30	23.3	0.0	3.3	10.0	63.3	73.3
South Africa	32	18.8	21.9	6.3	25.0	28.1	53.1
Spain	162	25.3	7.4	18.5	30.2	18.5	48.8
Sweden	18	0.0	5.6	11.1	22.2	61.1	83.3
Thailand	23	26.1	4.3	13.0	26.1	30.4	56.5
Turkey	276	12.7	5.4	15.6	25.0	41.3	66.3
UAE	18	33.3	11.1	11.1	27.8	16.7	44.4
USA	362	26.0	7.5	15.2	24.9	26.5	51.4
Others	54	13.0	3.7	11.1	20.4	51.9	72.2
All	6120	25.0	8.7	13.8	22.9	29.5	52.5

Some points to note include:

Overall, 52.5% (2010 53.9%) of boats are less than 10 years old, 22.5% (2010 22.2%) are 10 – 20 years old, and 25.0% (2010 23.8%) are more than 20 years old.

The two original CHS (from which IRC was developed) fleets, GBR and FRA continue to show very different trends. 35.4% of GBR boats are more than 20 years old while in FRA this is just 18.1%. 62.8% of FRA boats are less than 10 years old while in GBR this is just 41.7%.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

There is an apparent trend towards newer IRC countries (NOR, SWE, FIN, GER) having a higher percentage of newer boats.

Ignoring the special case of CHN, SIN with 63.3% of boats less than 5 years old has the 'newest' fleet.

ISL has no boats less than 5 years old. Ignoring this small fleet, IRL with 14.2% has the fewest boats less than 5 years old.

CAN with 43.9% of boats older than 20 years, with just 39.0% of boats less than 10 years old, and with significant fleet growth this year, demonstrates the benefits of active marketing of IRC.

The Technical Committee hesitates to draw conclusions from this data except to note that at face value, IRC Rule 2.2 'The IRC concept protects the existing IRC fleet' is demonstrably being satisfied.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Appendix 5

Reports from National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities for 2011.

National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authority Reports

1. Australia.

Issues not subject to submission.

IRC Crew Weight

The IRC Crew Weight Rules are non-specific and aren't lending the clear leadership and support to manage this area of the rule and a boat's potential performance that it otherwise may. The rule should be specific in what it does and does not allow as weight on the rail is clearly a major contributor to a boat's performance.

Online Tools for Rule Authorities

The issue of what reporting tools are available for Rule Authorities has come up again with the UNCL asking countries to submit statistics that are available through the IRC database. It seems incongruous that Rule Authorities have to develop their own systems independently when common reports could be available to all as a single solution supplied by the Rating Authority.

Processing Ratings Remotely

The 2010 US Sailing submission for Rule Authorities to be able to process their own ratings should be revisited as a high priority. The ORC provides this facility, and in turn countries can provide their boat owners high levels of service for ORCi certificates. The Rating Authorities should look to provide a system for qualifying Rule Authorities to use a similar facility for IRC so that it may grow beyond the centrally controlled and limited system that it currently is. This should be escalated to a priority.

Notes for Race Organisers

It would be helpful for Race Organisers if the notes in the IRC Year Book could be expanded to provide clear and encouraging advice on how to include systematic equipment registration and checking at large or key events. This is looked at in Section 4 Policing, but the very title and the comment of it being a 'thorny issue' elicits a negative response to what is an important role for the Organising Authority to play. There may also be advice needed for what inclusions should be in the race documents to ensure the equipment inspector is properly recognised for the event under the RRS.

Treatment of 30 to 45 Foot Race Boats

Australian boat owners would like the IRC Technical Committee to raise the level of priority on addressing the perceived inequity in the handling of fast race boats in the 30 to 45 foot range. This is not only fast light heavy 40s competing against heavy and slower 40s, but also the difficulties in rating a light fast 40 against a light fast 52 where the 52 seems to be invariably favoured.

2. Belgium

For the year 2010:

Number of boats on December 31, 2010:

67



IRC CONGRESS 2011

- Number of new boats: 14
- Number of boats below 10 meters: 25
- Number of boats between 10 en 12 meters: 18
- Number of boats between 12 and 15 meters: 19
- Number of boats above 15 meters: 5
- Percentage of endorsed boats: 1 % (1 boat out of 67)

For the year 2011:

- Number of boats on August 31, 2011: 69
- Number of new boats: 14
- Number of boats below 10 meters: 21
- Number of boats between 10 en 12 meters: 23
- Number of boats between 12 and 15 meters: 22
- Number of boats above 15 meters: 3
- Percentage of endorsed boats: 13% (9 boats out of 68)

3. Canadian Yachting Association



Sailing to Win
La voile pour la victoire

Sailing for Life
La voile pour la vie

General Descriptive Report:

There have been 97 certificates issued to 84 boats to date in Canada this year. These numbers show a strong increase from the 69 certificates / 55 boats in Canada in 2010. The North American IRC Championships were hosted in Ontario, Canada by the Royal Canadian Yacht Club in Toronto, there were 57 boats entered. The most active IRC fleet in Canada continues to be the Lake Ontario fleet. There are 3 measurers in Canada, all based in Ontario.

IRC Activity & Growth:

# of IRC Boats as of December 31 st 2010		55
# of IRC Boats as of August 31 st 2011		84
	2010	2011
# of New Boats	15	29
# of Boats Below 10m	10	16
# of Boats Between 10m & 12m	29	44
# of Boats Between 12m & 15m	14	23
# of Boats Above 15m	2	2

Major 2011 IRC Events in Canada:

- ABYC Open Regatta: May 28-29, 2011
- RCYC Open Regatta: June 11-12, 2011
- PCYC Open Regatta: July 9-10, 2011
- IRC Canadian Championship: July 29-31, 2011
- IRC North American Championships: August 11- 14, 2011
- EYC Open Regatta: August 27-28, 2011
- QCYC/NYC Open Regatta: September 10, 2011
- RCYC Boswell Trophy Race: October 2, 2011



IRC CONGRESS 2011

4. Denmark

1) Report from the Danish IRC Representative to the UNCL Centre de Calcul.

- Number of boats on December 31, 2010: 17
- Number of boats on August 31, 2011: 8

The following for both 2010 & 2011:

- Number of new boats: None
- Number of boats below 10 meters: 1
- Number of boats between 10 and 12 m: 2
- Number of boats between 12 and 15 m: 9
- Number of boats above 15 m: 5
- Percentage of endorsed boats: 58.8 %
- An overview of the IRC situation in the country: None
- Note of any particular IRC issues to be drawn to the attention of Congress but which are not the basis of a formal submission: None

2) National submissions to the 2011 IRC Congress: None

Flemming Nielsen
Danish IRC Representative

5. Great Britain & Northern Ireland

Comments

The number of IRC rated boats at the end of 2010 was slightly reduced from 2009 (1766, cf 1810). A comparison of numbers between Aug 2010 and Aug 2009 shows a reduction of 51 boats (3%). However, this is not considered surprising in the current economic climate.

Again, a very wide range of different boat types, sizes and ages has been reported as winning races during 2011.

From 1/1/2011 the GBR IRC Rule Authority required sail makers to be formally approved under the ISAF In-House Certification scheme to supply data for an endorsed certificate. Despite some initial problems, this is proving successful and continues to be developed.

In GBR the great majority of clubs modify IRC rules relating to crew number generally either by complete deletion or by increase of the maximum permissible number.

The GBR IRC Committee noted that many aspects contributed to club level owners not racing under IRC, including cost and lack of available crew, and the perception of it being a high-level rule.

The GBR IRC Committee noted that the RORC Rating Office is closely involved with ISAF relating to structural regulations for keels.

Four IRC regional championships and a national championship were successfully held in GBR in 2011.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

IRC Technical Committee Submissions

The GBR IRC Committee supports all the IRC Technical Committee submissions.

GBR Submissions to Congress

There are two submissions from GBR to the IRC Congress relating to the rating of innovative features, and bowsprits/spinnaker poles.

IRC Submissions to ISAF

The GBR IRC Committee approved all the submissions from IRC to ISAF, which mainly refer to ERS definitions.

6. Greece

Number of yachts, December 2010:

New:	24
Up to 10m:	32
10m - 12m:	39
12m - 15m:	28
Over 15m:	6
Total:	105

Number of yachts, September 2011:

New:	7
Up to 10m:	23
10m - 12m:	32
12m - 15m:	19
Over 15m:	3
Total:	77

Almost all issued certificates are endorsed.

This year has proven a very important one for the IRC in Greece. An **IRC national championship** was held for the first time, in conjunction with the North Aegean Sailing Week. The event took place in Skopelos, a beautiful island located in the northern Aegean, organized by the Thessaloniki Offshore Racing Club, which has a successful track record of IRC events in the last years, and co-organized by the Hellenic Offshore Committee. The event proved to be a success, despite the economic crisis.

Greece is going through, attracting a total of 40 yachts from all over Greece, 12 of them competing for the 2011 IRC champion title.

The 2012 IRC national championship is scheduled to be organized in conjunction with Syros Race, immediately after the popular Aegean Regatta, which is already planned to finish in Syros. This will hopefully help the logistics and encourage participation in the event.

2011 is not over yet, however it is obvious that, comparing with the 2010 figures, there is a significant decrease of about 25% in the number of issued certificates. This sad development is certainly the effect of the economic crisis; simply some owners chose not to acquire both an IRC and an ORC certificate for 2011. Effectively, the participation in IRC events was reduced.

There was an initiative by the Hellenic Offshore Committee to reactivate the IRC owners association, by informing the owners and organizing a meeting. The participation was poor, however the Committee will continue and try to find ways to motivate the interest, including the financial support to the association for organizing IRC presentation events. Additionally, the Committee will encourage the issuing of non-endorsed IRC certificates using already existing measurements, in order to minimize the expenses for acquiring an IRC certificate, especially for low-budget club racing boats and events.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

As the economic environment is fuzzier than ever, any prediction for the following year is chancy, however the Hellenic Offshore Committee has already planned the actions to satisfy its commitment to the Greek sailing community.

7. South Africa

Number of boats on December 31, 2010:	53
Number of boats on August 31, 2011:	31
Number of boats expected by Dec. 31, 2011:	53

Boats figures for 2010:

New boats:	5
boats below 10m:	22
boats 10-12m:	13
boats 12-15m:	15
boats >15m:	3

Boats figures for 2011:

New boats:	12
boats below 10m:	10
boats 10-12m:	7
boats 12-15m:	12
boats >15m:	2

South African Sailing (SAS) issues only Endorsed certificates.

OVERVIEW:

A further 20 boats are expected to revalidate in the 2011 year, indicating that the class in South Africa is not growing but it is not in decline either. In Kwa Zulu Natal (KZN province) IRC has only been used for Blue Water Racing this season, reducing numbers, but there has been some growth in the Cape region where the National Championships are being held in False Bay later in the year. Then too, re-introduction of the Cape to Rio trans-Atlantic race has added to interest and enthusiasm.

There have been several new entries in the Cape, mostly around 40ft. The fairness of the IRC system has been confirmed with a considerable range of boats visiting the podium.

Thanks to promotion by Lord Irvine Laidlaw from Scotland a new regatta, the Mid Summer Fling,- was introduced in Table Bay. Despite the very short notice an IRC fleet of 9 boats participated in what is expected to be a growing annual event.

The fifth annual Crocs Summer Regatta in mid December featured the usual good fun, and highly competitive racing. Weather conditions were near perfect in a time slot that nicely fills a vacuum left by the late, lamented Rothmans Week, a victim of the demise of cigarette brand advertising. Boats from England, Johannesburg and Durban joined those from the Cape to take the IRC class to 18 entrants. To avoid sole reliance on windward-leeward courses, the committee looked at premier regattas overseas, including the Rolex Commodores Cup and Cowes Week in a variation that was welcomed by most entrants. Courses were also set to take the fleet near restaurants and hotels on the beach in order to build publicity for the sport.

The undisputed king of coastal regattas in South Africa, the Mykonos Offshore, drew a record entry this year. In some ways this televised event is the modern sailor's version of a mini



IRC CONGRESS 2011

local Trans-Atlantic, beginning with all the excitement of a downwind run of some 60 miles followed by a stay in a safe harbour and plenty of partying, followed by a day long pursuit race.

The tendency towards bigger boats has increased competition for good crew, resulting in short-handed racing gaining in popularity. The year-round monthly meets are drawing 20 plus entrants.

Racing in all our classes has been closer than ever. Unfortunately, though, this surge in sometimes unbridled competitive instinct appears to have given rise to an alarming number of incidents leaving an unacceptable number of holed topsides. The problem is being attended to.

2011 RESULTS:

Mykonos Offshore:

IRC 1:	1 st	Hi Fidelity	Welborne 46	E De Villiers
	2 nd	Windpower	Landmark 43	P Gutsche/R Nankin
	3 rd	Cape Fling	Corby 49	I Laidlaw/X Mecoy
IRC 2:	1 st	Unruly	Pacer 27 Sport	I Gibson/ R Tanner
	2 nd	Pacer 1	Pacer 27 Sport	T Dykins/R Turner
	3 rd	Music Sebago	Pacer 27 Sport	G Nottingham/R Vlieg
IRC 3:	1 st	A-L	Farr 38	R van Rooyen
	2 nd	Pants on Fire	J105	D Assis/M Mendes
	3 rd	Just Fun	Mount Gay 30	B Preston/ M Devitt

Cross Summer:

1 st	Windpower	Landmark 43	P Gutsche/R Nankin
2 nd	Corum	Briand 43	J Reuver/ M Joubert
3 rd	Ballyhoo II	Mumm 36	R Garratt/D Hudson

Mid Summer Fling:

1 st	Windpower	Landmark 43	P Gutsche/R Nankin
2 nd	A-L	Farr 38	R van Rooyen
3 rd	Lobelia	IMX 40	G Kling/R Meek

MSC Week:

1 st	BMA	Beneteau 40.7	S Ritchie
2 nd	Flying Spaghetti Monster	Mount Gay 30	G Hurter
3 rd	Skitzo	Fast 42	N Milln

8. Spain

The fleet in Spain is more or less the same of the last year in 2010.

Number of boats on December 31, 2010	156	
Number of boats on August 31, 2011	160	
	2010	2011
Number of new boats	33	41
Certificates of yachts of LOA < 10m.	45	45
Certificates of yachts of LOA 10 to <12m.	59	67
Certificates of yachts of LOA 12 to <15m.	25	32
Certificates of yachts of LOA >15m.	27	16



IRC CONGRESS 2011

Certificates ENDORSED 2010	88	(56% of the fleet)
Certificates ENDORSED 2011	78	(49% of the fleet)

Vincens Doménech
RANC

9. Turkey

- Country : TURKEY
- Name of the owners' association: TURKISH OFFSHORE RACING CLUB
- Name of the representative: ALICAN TURALI
- Number of yachts on December 31, 2010: 373
- Number of boats on Aug. 31,2011:

2010	2011
286	
- Number of new boats: 48 38
- Number of boats below 10 meters: 93 99
- Number of boats 10-12 meters: 94 100
- Number of boats 12-15 meters: 78 71
- Number of boats above 15 meters : 14 16
- Percentage of endorsed boats: 63 % 66 %
- Evolution of the IRC fleet compare to the other rules (PHRF, IMS, ORC): NO OTHER RULES

• COMMENTS

- 2011 was again an active year of sail racing in Turkey.
- IRC Rule is the sole rating rule used by TORC as the Rule Authority since 1995.
- The Turkish Offshore Racing Club Trophy, which is the most prestigious among sailors in Turkey, consists of 21 races (a mix of round the buoy competition and geographical courses) from March to October . The attendance varied from 40 to 70 in 5 IRC classes, classified by TCC factor.
- Istanbul Sailing Club has 9 races on 2011 with same classes and 40 to 70 yachts.
- Double handled regattas were realized third time this year by TORC and BAYK (Bodrum Offshore Racing Club) and won critical acclaim among the sailing community and shall be continued.
- Marmara Sailing Club and Marina Dragos Yacht Club's Joint Trophy is an organisation where organiser clubs have assigned one or more races in their program thereto, and this has now successfully settled. In 2011, it consisted of 3 races with participation of 30-35 boats.
- The highest participation of the year was for the Turkish Navy Cup Offshore Regatta, celebrating the 40th edition, with a fleet of 73 boats, starting from Istanbul and finishing at Cesme/Izmir 270 nm, non stop.
- In other venues, namely Cesme/Izmir, Bodrum, Göcek and Marmaris racing scene was also very active. With the initiatives of Bodrum and Marmaris clubs who lead successful Winter Trophies covering 14-16 races in 7-8 weekend events from January to May , race season is now over 12 months in southern Turkey.
- Marmaris International Race Week by end of October and Loryma Summer Cup on end of August, organized by Marmaris International Yacht Club (MIYC) with TORC support for race management are two major events. Marmaris Week celebrates this year its 22nd edition and will attract more than 1000 sailors in 140 boats from 23 different countries, 30 boats still on waiting list. MIYC in 2010 also started a winter trophy and participation is gradually increasing, currently around 25-30 yachts completing 10-12 races. They also organize the Channel Regatta jointly with Rhodes Yacht Club since 6 years.
- Göcek Yacht Club is continuing with Spring (60-70 yachts) and Autumn regattas with 30 to 45 yachts.
- All those venues are supported by TORC/UNCL trained measurers.



IRC CONGRESS 2011

- In 2010 number of endorsed yachts increased considerably to 66 % of the certificates.
- **Propositions:**
 - Rule definition (reference of the rule) which is concerned by your proposition:
NONE
 - Comments and required evolutions:
NONE
 - Proposition for a new writing of the rule:
NONE

10. Uruguay

We are very happy with UNCL and IRC and were concerned as this is the only measurement rule under which we race.

11. USA

•	Number of boats on December 31, 2010	478		
•	Number of boats on August 31, 2011	381		
	<u>2010</u> <u>2011</u> <u>% of 2010</u>			
•	Number of new boats	69	52	
•	Number of boats below 10 meters	24	8	33
•	Number of boats between 10 and 12 m	154	121	79
•	Number of boats between 12 and 15 m	203	168	83
•	Number of boats above 15 m	97	84	87
•	Percentage of endorsed boats	90%	92%	

Additional info:

- IRC remains the measurement rule used in the most events in the US
- More events are accepting standard certificates
- 2011 was not a Newport to Bermuda race year. Cyclical falloff in the number of valid certificates on top of the downward pressure of the economic downturn.

Year	Valid Certs	% Chg from Prior Year	
2006	624		
2007	578	-0.07	
2008	592	0.02	Bermuda year but economic situation likely held numbers down
2009	492	-0.17	Non Bermuda year
2010	478	-0.03	Bermuda year but economic pressure continue
2011	390 (est.)	-0.18	Non Bermuda year

Major IRC Events:

Ft. Lauderdale to Key West Race:	January
Key West Race Week:	January
Pineapple Cup Montego Bay Race:	February (alternating years)
Fort Lauderdale to Charleston Race:	April
Charleston Race Week:	April
American YC Spring Series:	April/May
San Diego YC Yachting Cup:	May
Storm Trysail Block Island Race:	May
St Francis YC Stone Cup:	May



IRC CONGRESS 2011

New York YC Annual Regatta:	June
Newport to Bermuda Race:	June (alternating years)
Port Huron to Mackinac Race Bayview YC:	July
Block Island Race Week and IRC East Coast Championship:	July (alternating years)
Aldo Alessio Regatta - St Francis YC:	August
Ida Lewis Distance Race:	August
Stamford YC Vineyard Race:	August
St Francis YC Big Boat Series:	September
American YC Fall Series:	September
Long Island Sound IRC Championship:	September
IRC Mid-Atlantic Championship:	October