



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

Saturday, 12th and Sunday 13<sup>th</sup> October 2013

### Minutes

#### Representatives and observers

Peter Wykeham-Martin	Chairman
Alp Doguoglu	Vice Chairman
Malcolm Runnalls	Vice Chairman
Glen Stanaway	Yachting Australia
John Crawley	Canadian Yachting Association
Vicens Domenech	RANC, Spain
Jean-Philippe Cau	France, PropIRC (French IRC Owners' Association)
Andy Hill	GBR IRC Owners' Association
Volker Andreae	Germany
Gideon Mowser	Hong Kong Sailing Federation
Mark Mills	Irish Cruiser Racer Association
Haru-Hiko Kaku	Japanese Sailing Federation
Kazuyuki Suzuki	Japanese Sailing Federation
Alican Turali	Turkish Offshore Racing Club
Barrie Harmsworth	UAE Owners Association
Eric Baittinger	US Sailing
Dan Nowlan	US Sailing
Nikola Dukov	Representative from Bulgaria
Carl Sabbe	Representative from Belgium
Pierre Joullié	Representative from Brazil
Godwin Zammit	Representative from Malta
Pete Lawson	Representative from IMA
Eddie Warden-Owen	RORC
Catherine Pourre	UNCL IRC Commission
Jean Sans	IRC Technical Committee
Mike Urwin	IRC Technical Committee
James Dadd	RORC Chief Measurer
Jenny Howells	RORC Technical Manager
Matthieu Visbecq	UNCL Centre de Calcul
<b>Observers:</b>	
Andrew Yates	RORC Rating Office
Marc de Saint-Denis	UNCL President
Ludovic Abollivier	UNCL Centre de Calcul
Jacques Pelletier	France, PropIRC
Jean-Claude Merlivat	UNCL, IRC Commission
Mike Greville	RORC President
<b>Secretary :</b>	
Rose Lounes	UNCL



## **IRC Congress Meeting 2013**

**Saturday 12th October 2013**

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

The meeting started at 0945. Peter Wykeham-Martin thanked everyone for attending especially those who have travelled a long way.

### **2. Apologies for absence and proxy votes.**

It was noted that Jean-Philippe Cau held proxy votes for Romania, Greece and Chile. Malcolm Runnalls held proxy votes for Thailand and Carl Sabbe for the Netherlands. John Van Der Starre apologized for his undesired absence.

### **3. Minutes of the meeting of the IRC Congress held on 13th October 2012.**

The 2012 minutes were signed as correct.

### **4. Matters arising not covered by the agenda.**

There were no matters arising.

### **5. To note IRC 2013 Notices.**

#### **5.1 LP – Cutter Rig (attached in appendices)**

Mike Urwin explained the background to this notice (it was in response to a question about setting a 2<sup>nd</sup> headsail when reaching). The phrase 'on a beat to windward' was used specifically because it is exactly as in RRS 18.

Godwin Zammit asked for clarification: LP for a cutter rig is fictitious, so how does it work in the calculation of HSA? Mike Urwin explained that in practice we use default headsail widths for cutter configurations.

The rule change was accepted by the Congress.

#### **5.2 Adjustable Mast Foot and Forestay – IRC Notice 2013/02**

Mike Urwin explained the background to this notice and that arose from repeated suggestions that the current rule is being abused. Salient points of this proposal are:

Superyachts are excluded as they are invariably fitted with hydraulic furlers with built in adjustment. We do not wish to tax them.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

The current rating adjustment is considered too high and reinforces the potential for abuse. The intention is to reduce the tax to approximately 50% of the current level.

There will be multiple levels of rating tax, and guidance had been published explaining typical rating effects.

The Technical Committee is also working on guidance on which systems will be affected. Permanently installed systems will be rated irrespective of whether the pump is carried on board or not. To do otherwise would encourage boats to have 'chase boats' carrying the pump. Temporarily installed systems such as a removable bar through the mast will not be rated. IRC should not encourage the usage of portable systems while racing because of safety issues that may occur.

### **Discussion :**

Carl Sabbe voiced concerns about the proposal being unfair for production boats that have a built in mast jack to save space in the boat, but would never use it while racing. Malcolm Runnalls and Jean-Philippe Cau echoed this concern.

Carl asked why the guidance had been published, and Mike Urwin replied that it was to help those planning production for following year.

Andrew Yates pointed out that those boats getting an increased rating would also have a potential performance gain. Glen Stanaway agreed, and supported the intentions of the Technical Committee.

Carl Sabbe did not agree with taxing boats on the basis of IRC not trusting owners, it was not a good precedent; James Dadd said that the IRC Technical Committee default position is of course to trust sailors, but in this particular case sailors do not seem to trust each other. It is therefore felt necessary to react and propose this rule change.

Mark Mills reported that the mini-maxi fleet, where the ability to adjust the mast foot is important, is one that has raised this issue. He added that the issue emphasises the division between grand-prix and cruiser/racing fleets.

Pete Lawson argued that the subject had been brought up a number of times with mini-maxi fleet and that there was no evidence of abuse, did not think the rule should be changed until there is strong evidence that the current rule is abused. However, Mike Urwin reported that the IRC rating offices have had direct comments from mini-maxi fleet.

Haruhiko Kaku believed that the proposed taxation has less affect than adding a set of runners (0.002-3), and would act as an incentive more than a tax.

Peter Wykeham-Martin asked whether any comments had been received by the Rating Offices about IRC Notice 2013/02. Mike Urwin had received only two comments, both from high end boats who were both happy with the proposal. He had received no comments from cruiser/racer fleet. Jean Sans has had some comments from a few owners of cruiser/racers who thought that this proposal was not fair for all the fleet.

Pete Lawson asked about further guidance for owners and Mike Urwin replied that it will be available before the end of the year.

Godwin Zammit added that the new rule doesn't say you can't use a temporary installed system; Mike Urwin replied that unless a system is declared it can not be used while racing. In reply to the comment that adjustment below decks was not easy to police, Mike pointed out that it is the same as moving gear below, which has been an issue for last 40 years. This rule change is to prevent the adjustment of mast foot / forestay becoming an issue for the next 40 years.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

Carl Sabbe thought that that bringing aboard a pump is changing equipment while racing, this is surely not allowed? The advantage for those with chase boats is only between races.

Peter Wykeham-Martin asked what the guidance will include, and Mike Urwin said that draft words included “permanently installed, irrespective of whether the pump is portable and even if not aboard.”

Dan Nowlan suggested that some portable devices are unsafe if used while racing or under sail and Mike Urwin confirmed that this is the case. The Technical Committee is concerned that sailors having these devices would be tempted to use it while racing if they got a rating tax, and IRC must not encourage un-seamanlike practices.

Barrie Harmsworth and Peter Wykeham-Martin noted that ISAF Special Regulations require mast foot to be fixed.

Barrie Harmsworth added that this is about performance advantage, not cheating.

Carl Sabbe said that IRC has to try to avoid boats having to buy expensive devices that will become mandatory to win if not taxed enough. Mike Urwin concluded that all comments were noted and that the Technical Committee would review the proposed tax.

*Guidance will be ready in the near future, no definite date.*

### **6. To receive contributions from attending National IRC Representatives (not including submissions for proposed rule changes).**

Written reports had been received and circulated from : Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, France, Great Britain, The Netherlands, Japan, Malta, Turkey and USA. In discussion of these:

#### **FRANCE**

Jean-Philippe Cau reported that France has larger IRC fleets in the Med than on the Atlantic and North Coasts. There are no new owners or boats and it is difficult to attract young people and crews. Looking at Winter racing in La Trinite-sur-Mer, it seems that young people are not attracted by this type of course. HN (Handicap National) is popular (simple, amateur racing one or twice a year).

Peter Wykeham-Martin reported that the same issues have come up from other countries.

Asymmetric-sails: French owners think they have to change to asymmetric spinnaker from symmetric. Mike Urwin pointed out that IRC does not rate the spinnaker shape, and that the issue is whether the spinnaker is set on a pole or bowsprit. Jean Philippe Cau gave the example of the Soto 40 which has an advantage in 20+ knots with an asymmetric spinnaker set on a bowsprit. This advantage is also seen for smaller and heavier boats.

#### **AUSTRALIA**

Glen Stenaway reported that the IRC Australian fleet is declining although owners are buying new boats, both custom and production designs. The decline is due to a complex range of issues, but cost is not involved. The major issue faced in Australia this year has been non-compliance with class rules, and more particularly measurements. Two Rule 69 hearings had to be dealt with and a lot of phone calls were received about non-compliance.

Style trends are a positive thing and should be embraced as it is healthy for future of our sport and reflects the desires of boat owners.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### **BELGIUM**

Carl Sabbe reported that the Belgium fleet is slightly decreasing. IRC is not the issue here but other parameters such as the lack of new boats, and owners getting older without a lot of newcomers. Other issues outside of sailing are also responsible for this decrease.

### **BULGARIA**

Nikola Dukov reported no extra comments. The Bulgarian report can be consulted further on *Reports from National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities for 2013*.

### **CHINA**

No attendee at the IRC congress but the report can be consulted further on *Reports from National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities for 2013*.

### **CROATIA**

No attendee at the IRC congress but the report can be consulted further on *Reports from National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities for 2013*.

### **GREAT BRITAIN**

Andy Hill reported that the Limited Validity TCC scheme seems to have helped alleviate the reduction in rated boats and would continue to be offered in 2014. There is a concern about the lack of young sailors and new boats on the racing scene. This comment seems to be true not only in Great Britain but in Europe generally.

### **THE NETHERLANDS**

Carl Sabbe reported on behalf of John Van der Starre that The Netherlands are situated in between IRC / ORC areas. ORC events are increasing maybe thanks to the World Championship that will be held in Kiel in 2014. When there is a new VPP this also attracts new people to ORC.

Dan Nowlan asked whether ORCi / ORCc are growing in the Netherlands, but Carl Sabbe was not sure.

### **JAPAN**

Haru-Hiko Kaku reported that it was the 8<sup>th</sup> season of IRC in Japan. JSAF visits IRC fleets every year in February which helps to encourage fleets and keep numbers growing. They hope to develop Asia area regattas with for instance China and Thailand.

Kazuyuki Suzuki said that the 2020 Olympics games will be held in Tokyo Bay. Consequently an increase in dinghy sailing has been noticeable, but it also has an effect upon IRC racing to train the sailors.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### MALTA

Godwin Zammit reported that a small decline in certificate numbers is noticeable this year in Malta and regular participation had dropped from 25 - 30 boats to less than 20 boats this year. Lack of money and crew, and too many events close together may explain this situation. Better organisation, marketing and promotion are needed. However, it was noted that the Rolex Middle Sea Race is flourishing.

It is also felt in Malta that there is a need to protect the older existing fleet, particularly boats with poles or large headsails, and heavy boats. The Technical Committee was asked to consider this issue.

### TURKEY

Alican Turali explained that IRC is the only rating rule in Turkey and there are a lot of IRC events. One major event of the year is Marmaris Race Week where 190 boats are expected. It should be noted that the number of wealthy owners is reducing and half of the fleet is now sponsored by companies.

### USA

Dan Nowlan reported that a questionnaire has gone out to PHRF fleets about the health of their fleets, and the result of this questionnaire will be shared with Congress. He considers that Endorsement is one of IRC strength.

The certificate numbers have decreased since US-IRC has stopped actively promoting the rule. IRC is popular for offshore races but it is most widely used for inshore 'round the cans' racing. Dan noted that most of the IRC boats are based on the East Coast, and suggested that this is because of its stronger connection with Europe and the wish to share an International rule.

**The following comments are not in appendices:**

### HONG-KONG

Gideon Mowser reported that the Hong Kong fleet generally steady but there are some new boats coming in, mainly around 40'. Limited mooring availability is a potential problem for IRC growth. A new IRC owners' association has been set up. All races are run under IRC but the idea of dual scoring was well received by owners.

### GERMANY

Volker Andreae reported that IRC was introduced 7 years ago by the GER owners' association, but that there is no longer IRC racing in the Baltic or Germany. The German fleet is now composed of 30 boats racing mainly in UK and Mediterranean.

### UAE

Barrie Harmsworth reported not much change in the last year but Dubai-Muscat race was back on the calendar. He considers that UAE reflects the Asia situation, in that there is good potential for IRC growth but it is not exploited.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### IRELAND

Mark Mills explained that given the economic situation the number of IRC certificates has decreased but less than expected. ICRA was very proactive in training and creating “try sailing” days nationwide in order to encourage young people go racing, and improve the current situation of a lack of crew. It must be noted that dual scoring with ECHO is a major factor in the success of IRC.

### 7. To receive a report from the IRC Technical Committee, including IRC distribution worldwide, Mike Urwin and Jean Sans.

Mike Urwin reported the following salient points:

- The number of certificates by the end of 2012 fell to 6614 worldwide.
- A few countries like Japan or Uruguay have their fleet increasing.
- Chile has joined IRC.

### 8. To consider Crew IRC Limitations

Mike Urwin reported that crew limitations were discussed at Technical Committee and it was decided to poll rule authorities/owners associations for views.

The Technical Committee’s proposal can be summarised as no limitation on crew numbers except for short-handed certificates and One Designs.

Jenny Howells pointed out that the final sentence of the proposed rule 22.4.3 should say “Crew number **limitations** may be amended by Notice of Race.” This was agreed.

#### Discussion :

Mark Mills questioned if the initial crew number is too high or too low.

Alp Doguoglu noted that the rule 22.4.3 states that the crew number has no affect on TCC and thought that we should not overtly state that. Mike Urwin explained that the reason for including the statement is because RORC get a lot of calls and queries from owners about changing crew number on their certificate.

Godwin Zammit pointed out that the wording does not suggest that crew number does not affect performance, only TCC. He felt that the amendment to the rule makes sense.

It was clarified that a Rule Authority can vary Rule 22.4.4 under Rule 11.1. Alp Doguoglu suggested that it is worth including “Rule Authorities” in 22.4.4. The following amendment was accepted: “IRC Rule Authority prescription or a Notice of Race may vary crew limitations...”

Jacques Pelletier strongly disagreed with the rule change:

- Last year Congress voted that the crew rule should remain stable. Race organisers have the ability to choose between weight and number of crew. He reaffirmed that the current rule should not be change.
- There is a big concern regarding French crew racing in England because the RORC amend the rule while in France they limit it [see comment below re RORC 2014]. He pointed out that crew weight is a factor of boat speed.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

- If the rule is changed, in France the crew number/weight would still be limited. In the UK owners would feel that they needed more crew to race. It would be an issue when FRA and GBR fleets meet together.

Glen Stanaway agreed and added that no-one should underestimate the effect of crew weight on performance. He was disappointed to see it on the agenda again because he thought it was finalised last year.

Volker Andreae agrees with France especially concerning the stability of the rule. The ORC had used the crew limitations in the IRC rule as ammunition against IRC in the past. Owners do not want to take extra people on the rail especially for offshore races such as Fastnet.

Eddie Warden Owen advised that the RORC committee has voted to use the crew number on the rating certificate for the coming season. No additional crew will be allowed.

Carl Sabbe thinks that it is not a good idea to change the rule again but he would like a less complex rule. He welcomed RORC's change of policy as what they do is influential with other clubs. The position of RORC is more important than the IRC rule in this respect.

Glen Stanaway / Catherine Pourre pointed out that it is already possible to choose to use crew number only with the current rule, whereas the new rule is more complex.

Mike Urwin said that the Technical Committee proposal was responding to queries received.

Godwin Zammit asked to Mike Urwin if he can confirm that the IRC program takes no account of crew number. Mike Urwin confirmed that there is, in effect, an implicit crew weight.

Peter Wykeham Martin proposed to **vote** for either the proposed new rule (even if wording amended); or to stay with current rule.

### **VOTE RESULTS:**

For new rule : 17

Against new rule : 22

Therefore the proposal was rejected and the crew number/weight rule will remain as 2013.

### **Discussion about crew number calculation:**

Mark Mills reminded the Congress of his question about calculation of initial crew number as it is a major issue. In Ireland, they would like a reduction in crew number. Ken Read quote (North Sails) thinks IRC crew numbers should be reduced by 20% due to costs and too many people on the boat.

Barrie Harmsworth explained that in emerging/developing nations there is a problem getting crew for boats.. Not all areas have heavy airs, and IRC should not encourage the need to have more crew.

Carl Sabbe added that the principle of reducing crew number is good, but owners need to be advised well before the change. Boat configurations are set up for current crew numbers and such a change would influence choices on new sails; the whole boat may have to be reconfigured for a lower crew number.

Godwin Zammit did not think that crew number should be changed. The IRC TCC presumably is based on the current crew weight, and boats can have fewer crew if they want.

Mike Greville said that his own boat (Ker 39) has a crew number of 10 and he needs that many. Reducing crew number would mean that less experienced people got excluded.





## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

Pierre Joullié added that in Brazil IRC crew numbers are higher than they are used to in ORC or one design rules such as the Soto 40. He would prefer a reduction of crew number by 10%.

Jacques Pelletier suggested a study be undertaken on reducing crew number. Glen Stanaway pointed out that after the 2012 meeting a working party of Malcolm Runnalls, Jacques Pelletier and Barrie Harmsworth was created to look at the crew number/weight issue. No progress had been made on this point.

James Dadd gave the results of the survey which shows that the majority were happy with the base crew number; however, Mark Mills thought that development should not be driven by an informal survey. In his opinion, crew number should be reduced in the future.

Catherine Pourre asked how reducing the size of the crew number could be done? James Dadd replied that it is very simple technically. The question is what the sailing world wants us to do. He did not think that the Technical Committee should be the ones to make this decision. Peter Wykeham-Martin suggested that individual countries could do the research for their own fleets.

Catherine Pourre said that this could influence boat design in the future, for instance capacity for fewer crew and more interesting sailing. IRC should consider this when looking at its future vision. The problem with asking current owners for their opinion is the natural bias depending on their own boat.

Mark Mills suggested that older boats need more crew than new boats, and that age could be a factor in the calculation.

James Dadd reiterated that this should be a research agenda for IRC Congress not the Technical Committee.

Carl Sabbe would like to try and find an agreement which would be based not nationally but at a European level.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### 9. To receive, consider and decide proposals for IRC Rule changes for 2014.

#### 9.1 From the IRC Technical Committee.

##### 9.1.1 Rule 8.2.1

Reason for change: Read literally, IRC Rule 8.2.1 specifies that a short handed certificate is valid only for short handed racing. In other words, a race committee may not score short handed boats in an overall race score using the short-handed TCC. In practice, organisers such as the RORC offer short handed classes which are scored separately, but the short handed boats are also scored within the overall fleet. This can be simply corrected by amending Rule 8.2.1

Amend: 8.2.1 A **boat** may additionally hold a separate short-handed certificate. This short-handed certificate shall be valid only for racing in classes, or divisions of classes, for no more than 2 **crew**, included in a Notice of Race. *When specified in a Notice of Race, boats holding short handed certificates, and racing in a short handed class or division, may also be scored in the overall results of the race.* The short-handed certificate will be clearly identified and shall only vary from the primary certificate in respect of, **mainsail widths**, headsail dimensions, single furling headsail allowance, the use of stored power, SPA, STL, **spinnaker pole/bowsprit**, **moveable ballast** and **variable ballast**. A boat holding a shorthanded certificate may use only that certificate for races for no more than 2 **crew**.

Effect of change: None. Correction of an omission to reflect common practice.

**Decision: AGREED.**

##### 9.1.2 Rule 8.10.3

Reason for change: IRC Rule 8.10.3 defines when a boat is not in compliance with her certificate. By omission, as currently drafted, it does not address re-measurement for the purposes of a protest. This omission can be simply corrected:

Amend: 8.10.3 If during **Equipment Inspection** by an **Equipment Inspector**, or during measurement carried out under Rules [10.2](#) or 13.6, any rated dimension is found to exceed a maximum value or to **be** less than a minimum value, then the **boat** is not in compliance with her certificate.

Effect of change: None. Correction of an omission.

**Decision : AGREED.**

##### 9.1.3 Rule 9.6

Reason for change: As written, if read literally, in the case of a protest, Rule 9.6 says that the certificate will not be invalidated until the time that the protest is formally lodged. ie, it will remain valid for the race in which the protest is lodged. This is plainly incorrect. We should consider re-wording to say:



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

Amend: 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~~ up to but excluding the race in which the protest was lodged, except that if Rule 8.9 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*

Effect of change: None. Correction of an error to say what we actually want..

**Decision : AGREED**

### 9.1.4 Rule 15

Reason for change: Changes to the RRS and ERS implemented in 2013 have not been reflected in IRC Rule 15. In RRS 52, the expression 'stored power' has been deleted and replaced by the expression 'power provided by the crew'. In ERS, paragraph B.5 has been deleted entirely. Both of these changes should be reflected in IRC Rules.

Amend: 15 MANUAL POWER

15.1 RRS 52, Manual Power, ~~and ERS B.5~~ shall not apply. This Rule may be amended by notice of race.

15.2 (a) *For the purpose of this rule, stored power is defined as power other than power provided by the crew.*

(b) The use of stored power for the hoisting of **mainsails**, or the reefing or furling of **sails** need not be declared.

(c) **Boats** using stored power solely for the adjustment or operation of **backstays** shall declare this to the Rating Authority.

(d) **Boats** using stored power for the adjustment or operation of **running rigging** other than as noted in rules 15.2(b) & (c) shall declare this to the Rating Authority.

Effect of change: None. Correction of an omission.

In discussion, Carl Sabbe proposed that the definition of stored power should be included as an IRC definition which would then be referenced in Rule 15. This was accepted as a sensible change to achieve the same thing.

**Decision : AGREED as amended.**

Mike Greville asked whether forestays were included with backstays.  
Mike Urwin replied that it is not the case.

### 9.1.5 Rules 13.1, 22.1 and 22.2

Reason for change: IRC Rule 22.1.1 states "The rated parameters assume that the **boat** is fitted out at least to the production specification and/or to *the condition when last measured/inspected*". The emphasised sentence may be used by owners who



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

have not informed the Rating Authority of changes to the boat, claiming that 'the measurer has seen the boat', although it is still their responsibility to declare changes. In addition this Rule is a mixture of different subjects in one paragraph and is not clear. In Rule 22.2.1 the reference to a 'basic cruising configuration' is considered outdated.

For clarity it is proposed to amend rule 22.1.1 by the deletion of the first sentence and add this as new Rule 22.3 re-worded to better express what is meant, delete the last sentence of Rule 22.1.1 and replace this more appropriately in Rule 13.1. The remainder of Rules 22.1.1 and 22.1.2 are then combined as new rule 22.1.1.

- Amend: 13.1 Measurement data shall be obtained by direct measurement or derived from another rating certificate, whenever possible. **If another rating certificate is being used as the basis for data then any changes since the issue of that certificate shall be notified to the Rating Authority.**
- Delete: ~~22.1.1 The rated parameters assume that the boat is fitted out at least to the production specification and/or to the condition when last measured/inspected. Detachable items (such as but not limited to bunk cushions) permitted by Rule 17 to be aboard for measurement shall be carried in their normal positions while racing. If another rating certificate is being used as the basis for data then any changes since the issue of that certificate shall be notified to the Rating Authority.~~
- ~~22.1.2 For races requiring compliance with Offshore Special Regulations Category 4 only (or local equivalent), a Notice of Race may state that boats rated with bunk cushions on board may remove the bunk cushions. No compensating weight need be carried.~~
- Insert: 22.1 Detachable items
- 22.1.1 Detachable items (such as but not limited to bunk cushions) permitted by Rule 17 to be aboard for measurement shall be carried in their normal positions while racing. For races requiring compliance with Offshore Special Regulations Category 4 only (or local equivalent), a Notice of Race may state that boats rated with bunk cushions on board may remove the bunk cushions. No compensating weight need be carried.
- Amend: 22.2.1 Hull factor (HF) is an assessment by the Rating Authority of the features of the **boat** and their character and efficiency. ~~when compared to a basic cruising configuration.~~
- Insert: 22.2.3 The rated Hull Factor assumes that the **boat** is fitted out at least to the production specification and/or to the condition when last measured/inspected. This does not negate owners' responsibilities under Rules 8.9, 22.2.2 and RRS 78.1.
- Effect of change: Improved clarity without change of meaning.

Mike Urwin explained that this rule change is trying to achieve clearer rules and better understanding, there is no change to the overall meaning. GBR IRC Committee had suggested the following addition: "... at least to the production specification **and materials...**" in Rule 22.2.3.

Godwin Zammit queried the ability to remove bunk cushions. Mike Urwin explained that it is not new in the rule, and Andrew Hill pointed out that it has to be in the NOR to be permissible.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

**Decision :** AGREED including the amendment to Rule 22.2.3.

### 9.1.6 Rule 21.1.6 (b)

Reason for change: IRC Notice 2013/02 announced the IRC Technical Committee's decision to revise the treatment of adjustable mast foot and/or forestay. In future, all boats with Hull Length < 30.48 m fitted with or carrying on board equipment capable of adjusting the mast foot or forestay while racing will carry a rating adjustment, irrespective of whether or not the boat intends to use the equipment while racing.

Rule 21.1.6 (b) therefore needs amendment to reflect this.

Amend: 21.1.6 (b) A **boat** fitted with or carrying on board systems, to adjust the forestay or the mast foot while racing shall declare this to the Rating Authority. Locked conventional turnbuckles need not be declared. ~~Unless the boat declares that such systems will not be used while racing, the~~ The **boat** may then adjust the forestay and the mast foot vertically and/or longitudinally while racing, but shall not detach the forestay.

Effect of change: Implement an IRC Technical Committee change..

It was agreed that the first sentence should read '...on board **permanently installed** systems'.

Malcolm Runnalls asked how this affected boats in Fremantle, Western Australia, where they have to lower their masts to get in and out of the river. It was suggested that the rule should include words like 'an IRC rule authority prescription may approve amendments to this rule'. Glen Stanaway pointed out that the rule number would need to be added to rule 11.1.

**Decision :** AGREED. Technical Committee was asked by the Congress to review the wording..

### 9.1.7 Rule 21.3.5

Reason for change: On review, IRC Rule 21.3.5 is considered to be redundant, and also potentially confusing and misleading.

The IRC definition of Spinnaker tack length, STL, includes how all of a **spinnaker pole**, a **bowsprit**, and a **whisker pole** are measured. There is thus no need to repeat this in Rule 21.3.5 and it is undesirable to do so.

The phrase 'the **bowsprit** will be considered to be a **spinnaker pole**' is potentially confusing and misleading in that Rule 21.3.4 c) may then be misinterpreted.

It is proposed therefore to delete Rule 21.3.5 entirely.

Delete: ~~21.3.5 If a spinnaker can be tacked to a **bowsprit** in front of the forestay, the **bowsprit** will be considered to be a **spinnaker pole** and STL measured as the greater of the length of the longest **spinnaker pole** or to the extremity of the **bowsprit**.~~

Effect of change: Improved understanding of IRC Rules without practical effect. Reduction in the length of IRC Rules.

**Decision :** AGREED



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### 9.1.8 Definition of LP

- Reason for change: This was the subject of IRC Notice 01/2013 in response to a question relating to the ERS definition of a cutter rig. This must now be formally incorporated into IRC Rules:
- Amend LP The **luff perpendicular** of the largest area headsail on board and which may be used while racing. For ~~a cutter rig~~ any boat that may set more than one headsail when on a beat to windward, LP is measured as the shortest distance from the aftmost **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. Clarity and completeness.

**Decision : AGREED**

## 9.2 Submissions From National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities.

### 9.2.1 GBR IRC Committee, Rule 22.4.2

- Reason for change: The GBR IRC Committee debated IRC crew limitations noting that, with the exception of major regattas, policing and enforcing crew limitations based on weight is completely impractical. The GBR IRC Committee therefore proposes that the default IRC crew limitation should be based on Crew Number, ie the parameter that the overwhelming majority of events that incorporate crew limitations use.
- Amend: 22.4.2 ~~The crew weight shall not exceed 85kg multiplied by the Crew Number printed on the certificate.~~ Unless otherwise stated by a Notice of Race, the crew number printed on each boat's certificates shall not be exceeded. This rule does not apply to short-handed certificates issued under rule 8.2.1.
- Effect of change: Amendment to reflect the way in which crew limitations are incorporated in the majority of regattas.
- IRC Technical Committee Comment: No comment

Andy Hill summarised that the proposal is to change from crew weight to crew number. Peter Wykeham-Martin noted that this submission was superseded by the earlier vote for no changes to the current rule.

**Decision : Change not agreed by the Congress.**

### 9.2.2 Japan

#### Requests/Submissions

We have not heard major problems regarding running events with IRC rating. A couple of issues, however, were noted as follows:



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### 1. HSA

The new measurement, HUW, was not taken seriously by the owner and we found many boats having bigger HUW than default. In the end, we were informed that as long as HSA and LLmax are not exceeded as stated in the rule, then HHW, HTW and HUW can be different from the certificate. This means a boat with excessive HUW is probably OK, because the rest of the measurements are usually smaller than the certificate. Nevertheless, this headsail area interpretation is not quite clear, because certificate clearly shows those measurement values and people think this is not the same as SPA and these numbers are something you must conform to. Therefore, a clarification may be necessary.

IRC Technical

Committee Comment: It is already planned that on 2014 IRC certificates that LL, LP, HHW, HTW and HUW will be shown in italics with a \* against the data (ie as linear spinnaker data is currently shown) to indicate that the values are for information only..

Haru-Hiko Kaku summarised the proposal: stating that they are facing confusion with headsail data. Mike Urwin replied that it is already planned to change certificate layout.

**Decision : no vote and no other comments.**

### 2. Age date

While older boats can be competitive with some credit from age allowance, there are some instances new boats are having hard time. For example, popular class like FARR 30 has been manufactured for many years and age dates are varied from 1995 to 2008 or newer. Because the age allowance is calculated and applied to the TCC automatically with average of the series and age dates, the age factor can be more significant than realistic. Also there are some cases actual age date for a particular boat is unknown due to owner change. In such a case, declared age date may not be reliable. The fact one-design certificate does not take account of the age date is another inconsistency. We feel age allowance, if necessary, should be based solely on the series date so that while older boat has a credit, boats in the same class can enjoy competing each other just like one-design fleet.

IRC Technical Committee Comment: The IRC Technical Committee does not support the proposed change.. We consider that the current calculation of Age Allowance is equitable.

Haru-Hiko Kaku explained why Japan would like age allowance to be based solely on series date. Mike Urwin explained basis for current age allowance (series + age dates).

**Decision : This proposal was rejected by the Congress.**

#### 9.2.3 Malta (Godwin Zammit)

This year I have no specific proposals to make to the Congress but can make some comments about the IRC in general some of which are not new but which may still be relevant.

#### Design trends

As design evolves the IRC rule is expected to respond to new trends. There is a shift from the large overlapping headsails on older designs to non-overlapping jibs which seem to be more efficient and which are becoming practically the norm on newer boats. These newer boats are increasingly being designed asymmetric spinnakers which are becoming more efficient downwind, rather than Symmetric spinnakers on pole. Both these trends are made particularly efficient when coupled with lighter and faster hulls.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

There is a feeling among owners of older boats that they pay too much for headsail area and the use of the pole. As new trends develop and become more efficient the Rating rule should review its treatment of their relative performances to maintain equitability without penalising new design trends. I am sure that the Technical Committee is fully aware of these developments and gives these issues due consideration in its regular review.

### **IRC Technical Committee comment :**

The IRC Technical Committee notes the comments and advises that it does continually monitor the relative performance of different styles of rigs. Noting that various changes have been made in recent years, we currently consider that IRC is reasonably equitable in these respects. More changes are nevertheless in hand for the near future.

### **Multiple TCCs**

IRC is a single number system which rates boats on the basis of their overall performance. Inevitably when boats with differing performance characteristics are racing together, the type of course and weather conditions can have a significant effect on results. Offshore, the weather is always relevant and this has to be accepted as part of the nature of the sport. In inshore races it is possible to set courses that have a component of all points of sailing to reflect the overall nature of the rating. However windward-leeward courses will remain popular and it might be possible to have a second TCC for windward-leeward courses which could be produced to take into account the performance of particular boats on these courses and result in more equitable scoring.

In the past triple ratings for different wind bands have also been suggested but in practice this might prove difficult to adopt putting race committees in a position where they have to select the right wind band in possibly variable wind conditions where such a selection would influence results.

**IRC Technical Committee Comment :** No comment.

### **Discussion:**

Mike Urwin explained that it is possible but in other cases (eg ORC) it has not been universally accepted. The choice was therefore up to the race committee. It leads to issues in cases of wind changes during racing. Barrie Harmsworth added that the main issue is the wind speeds. It is a nightmare for race committee as it varies from front to back of fleet.

Mark Mills thought that wind angles should be taken into account rather than wind speeds. He thought that there should be one Inshore rating and one Offshore rating and it would be specified in the Notice of Race which one will be used. Conditions on the day would therefore not influence which rating was used. Volker Andreae explained that ORC only has offshore single random (OSR), or inshore (only for Windward Leeward races) and that it seems to work quite well.

James Dadd said that this is undesirable, and would also increase the number of TCCs for owners to be unhappy about. He emphasised that it is more important for event organisers to vary course types more, and IRC should keep pushing on this. He added that IRC has existed for 30 years as a single number and asked whether owners really want multiple TCCs? Boats can optimise the rating for the races they are doing. Barrie Harmsworth agreed and said that IRC shouldn't give race managers any more problems than they have now.

Matthieu Visbecq replied that although optimisation of sails is possible, you cannot change the hull shape of your boat. Some designs are competitive offshore but not doing windward leeward races and for others it is the contrary. He thought that IRC is losing some boats because of this. He agreed with Mark Mills proposal for offshore/inshore ratings. It is technically possible to do and the Technical Committee should think about it more if Rule Authorities suggest it.





## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

Peter Wykeham-Martin asked for the feeling from the room as to whether IRC should have multiple ratings? There was no vote but an informal 'show of hands' showed almost a 50/50 split.

Peter Wykeham-Martin asked also the Congress members to give their feeling about having one rating for windward-leeward races and another for offshore races, or for different wind speeds. The general opinion supported W/L and offshore TCCs, not wind speed.

Peter Wykeham-Martin asked the Congress if they want the Technical Committee to look at the subject? Jean-Claude Merlivat added that we are not here today to find a solution, and cannot answer for owners, but he agreed with the idea that the TC should look at this.

James Dadd asked if Congress took into account that we could only do it by increasing the number of required measurements, but Mark Mills thought that it could be done more generally with existing information. Matthieu Visbecq said that using two TCC is not complicated if one TCC is used for windward-leeward races and another for all other races. With Jean Sans he has already run trials and is confident that it could be done with existing IRC measurements.

Volker Andreae said that we really need only 1 or 2 rating rules, and the UMS is the first step to bringing rating rules together. IRC should not necessarily provide the same type of multiple numbers as ORC, and he did not consider it to be within the spirit of IRC.

Peter Wykeham-Martin would like to understand when inshore become offshore. What would be the TCC used for Round the Island Race for example? Mark Mills stated that the Round the Island Race would suit an offshore rating. Godwin Zammit intended it to be for Windward/Leeward races rather than general inshore. He thought it is not related to proximity to shore but to course type/wind direction. Dan Nowlan liked the idea of two rating numbers. It may also have unanticipated benefit in the current crew weight issue and maybe fewer crew will be needed to go offshore. It may ameliorate some of the problems.

Barrie Harmsworth considered that multiple numbers would cause big problems for race organisers. Glen Stanaway discouraged investigation in this area. IRC is about simplicity and that is what drives its success. Australian sailors would not embrace multiple ratings. James Dadd added that the biggest issue about IRC is that it is too grand prix orientated, and this could cause more problems with more complexity. He agreed with Glen Stanaway that it would be a mistake.

Godwin Zammitt suggested that one of the problems currently is that cruiser/racers are not competitive on windward-leeward courses.

Alp Doguoglu asked what the new TCCs would be, and what the current TCC is based on? Mark Mills replied that it is too early to ask such questions. He added that in the climate of decline it would be remiss to not investigate this as a study (including study of past races). He considers the existing TCC to be appropriate for inshore generally if Race Committees vary course types, and less prominent TCC could be added for offshore races as optional. Volker Andreae noted that in ORC the surfing boats have a high rating for offshore, and the inshore rating is only for W/L races.

Dan Nowlan asked if a survey of the IRC racers on this subject has been performed (no) - is this something the market would like to see from IRC? Peter Wykeham-Martin said that the same survey should be done with clubs.

**Decision:** Peter Wykeham-Martin concluded that the Congress asked the Technical Committee to produce a paper of options, pros and cons, so that Congress can discuss next year in a better informed way. It must also be investigated as to whether it is something the market would like.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### 9.3.3 Belgium

#### 1. Rule 2.1.6(b) and IRC Notice 2013/02

Reason for change: The proposed change of IRC Notice 2013/02 intends to increase the TCC of a boat that has the possibility to adjust the forestay or the mast foot, even if the boat does not intend to use this equipment while racing. The reason for this intended change is that some boats do have these systems, and declare that these systems will not be used, but that they do use these systems anyhow while racing. It is practically impossible for competitors to see this unpermitted use and thus also impossible to protest against this unpermitted use.

We believe that it is not a good idea to increase the TCC of a boat for equipment that it possesses, if it does not carry this equipment on board. A mast jack sometimes only exists of a hole in the bottom of the mast, through which a metal tube can be put, that can then be activated by a removable hydraulic pump. According to the current rule 2.1.6(b) a boat should declare this equipment, and the TCC will increase in 2014, even if the boat does not carry this equipment while racing. The concerned owner may very well consider not to declare this equipment, and it will be impossible for an authorized measurer or a member of the jury to verify whether the owner really does not possess such equipment, since the only evidence is a hole in the bottom of the mast. The proposed change will hence not solve the problem, that owners can possess systems that they don't declare correctly.

Similarly, a boat that possesses 4 spinnakers but only does carry 3 spinnakers while racing, does also not have to declare this. Such boat is however allowed to choose which 3 of her 4 spinnakers she will take on board before every race (or series), e.g. depending on the weather forecasts. Such boat will hence also have an advantage compared to a boat that only possesses 3 spinnakers, without seeing her TCC increased for this advantage.

Proposed Change It seems to us a better solution when the boat has only to declare this equipment, if it carries this equipment while racing, independent of whether she intends to use this equipment or not. This can better be verified by an authorized measurer during an endorsement, or by a member of the jury when a boat returns to the port after a race.

Amend: 21.6 b) A Boat fitted ~~with or~~ carrying on board systems, to adjust the forestay or the mast foot ~~while racing~~ shall declare this to the Rating Authority. Locked conventional turnbuckles need not be declared. Unless ~~Boat declares that such systems will not be used while racing,~~ the boat may then adjust the forestay and the mast foot vertically and/or longitudinally while racing, but shall not detach the forestay

Effect of change: The rule will be more clear and it will be easier to verify the concerned advantage.

IRC Technical  
Committee Comment: No comment.

#### Discussion :

Carl Sabbe explained again why he thought the current Technical Committee proposal is not fair and should be reviewed.

Barrie Harmsworth agreed and added that you cannot make rules on the basis that people are going to cheat. Rules should just be fair.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

James Dadd explained that IRC has taken the honesty approach so far but has been told repeatedly that is not working for this rule.

Peter Wykeham Martin repeated that it is the same issue and the same conclusion than this morning's agreement, and that Mike Urwin took into account Carl's amendment.

**Decision :** The Technical Committee should review the proposal. The Belgium submission is not voted. A new proposal shall be established by the Technical Committee soon.

### 2. Rule 15.2

Reason for change: Similarly to the possible use of equipment that can adjust the forestay or the mast foot, it is also practically impossible to verify whether a boat that is equipped with systems to use stored power to adjust backstays or running rigging, and that does declare that it will not use this while racing, is effectively not using these systems while racing.

Proposed Change If there is a need to change 2.1.6(b), rule 15.2 should be changed accordingly, to have a consistent application of possible advantages that are created by equipment that is carried on board while racing.

Amend: 15.2.a) ~~The use of stored power for the hoisting of mainsails, or the reefing or furling of sails need not be declared.~~  
Boats carrying on board systems to apply stored power that can only be used for the hoisting of mainsails, or the reefing or furling of sails need not to declare this equipment.

Amend: 15.2.b) ~~Boats using stored power solely for the adjustment or —operation of backstays shall declare this to the Rating Authority~~  
Boats carrying on board systems to apply stored power solely for the adjustment or operation of backstays shall declare this to the Rating Authority.

Amend: 15.2.c) ~~Boats using stored power for the adjustment or operation of running rigging other than as noted in rules 15.2(a) & (b) shall declare this to the Rating Authority~~  
Boats carrying on board system to apply stored power for the adjustment or operation of running rigging other than as noted in rules 15.2(a) & (b) shall declare this to the Rating Authority.

Effect of change : The rule will be more clear and it will be easier to verify the concerned advantage.

IRC Technical Committee Comment : No comment.

### Discussion :

Carl Sabbe explained that this submission was due to the wording for stored power not being consistent with the proposed moveable mast foot / forestay rule wording. People abuse this rule by not declaring stored power but using it when racing. The subject was only on the table due to the inconsistency. Alp Doguoglu supported this.

Mike Urwin replied that the difference with adjustable mast foot is that any cruising boat over 50 feet will have powered winches, so you would include them and many other designs. Cruising boats are not designed as racing boats. Adjusting forestay/mast directly affects boat speed whatever the type of boats whereas stored power, unless high-line-speed, is no quicker than crew.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

Carl Sabbe answered that in that case, it is worth allowing them across the board if there is no advantage. Mike Urwin argued that it would be a problem because of the real advantage it would give to boats with high line speed winches.

**Decision:** The Congress rejected this proposal.

### 9.3.4 Universal Measurement System

Mike Urwin summarised the paper (in appendices). Dan Nowlan reported that additional goal is to train measurers under all the rules. It would be nice also to just have one website to apply for any rating certificate.

Volker Andreae would like to know if inclining test will be defined by UMS. Mike Urwin answered that it will be included where relevant.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

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

Peter Wykeham-Martin introduced the subject.

Before proceeding, Mark Mills reported that he would like to request a show of hands about crew number reduction, and the answer was yes.

#### CREW NUMBER AND CREW WEIGHT

Godwin Zammit replied that we need to encourage more sailors on the water. We should not reduce crew number. Mike Greville replied that the number written on the certificate is a maximum so if it's more than you need then you are free to take fewer. IRC should not try to influence the whole sailing world by reducing IRC crew number.

Malcolm Runnalls agreed that prime concern around the world is trying to get crew. Reducing IRC crew number would go some way towards addressing this problem.

Alp Doguoglu thought that reducing crew numbers might encourage those boats who are not racing currently because of not enough crew. Alp has a J/105 and never races with full number of 8, and also races double handed; he agreed that the current number is too high.

Referring to Ken Read's comments that reducing crew number would save money for owners, Eddie Warden Owen replied that Ken Read's letter was regarding Grand Prix boats, whereas IRC is looking at grass roots. Boats are now easier to sail efficiently with fewer people. He wondered if IRC need to go one step further? (ie reduced IRC crew number).

Mark Mills understood that it would be quite simple to look at from a mathematical point of view.

Mike Urwin agreed that this is possible but this discussion was about the future of our sport. The message from seminars was 'let's get away from Grand Prix boats and back to the bedrock of the sport (cruiser racers, family sailed etc.)'. People don't want to sail with more people and don't want to race against those with large crews. He concluded that it is the fundamental issue.

Pierre Joullié took the example of his 54 foot boat. The crew number written on the IRC certificate is 16 but usually the boat is sailed with 12 crews. He indeed feels that his boat is disadvantaged compared with those sailing with full quota. Carl Sabbe wondered if this cannot be treated like the number of spinnakers, eg rated and the owner can change the number.

Jean Sans suggested that base crew weight could be calculated from LH, beam, DLR.

Mike Urwin asked whether Congress thought crew number should affect the TCC? There would be a base crew number (lower than now) but a boat can elect to carry more and be rated for it. He confirmed when questioned that he personally did not think it was a good idea.

Eddie Warden Owen explained that from a race organiser point of view, he would not want to be weighing people. IRC is about simplicity. James Dadd added that IRC would need to ask event organisers as they have to police this.

Mike Greville agreed with Eddie about simplicity and said that IRC has been successful; anything to improve flexibility and inclusivity without undermining credibility and accuracy is good and should be looked at. However, we should tread carefully and avoid complexity.

Peter Wykeham-Martin did not think any impulsive decision should be made without facts and figures.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

**Decision :** James Dadd concluded that there seems to be consensus that the current IRC crew number is too high. He asked Congress to give the Technical Committee guidelines for the direction of research.

### MARKETING

Peter Wykeham-Martin began this discussion by this question: Should IRC be marketed better or more and if so where? Barrie Harmsworth would like to remember that the cruiser/racing scene would not have developed as it has without CHS/IRC. It's worth marketing especially in Asia and noted the rejuvenated Asian Sailing Federation. There are areas that have never heard of IRC.

Mike Greville replied that the Rating Office does market IRC to some extent, but we have to tread carefully around the world. It is on offer and sells itself by being very good. Experience shows that marketing it hard can create resistance.

Malcom Runnalls would like to know the situation in emerging countries? Mike Urwin said that many of these such as Russia, China, Chile fall under UNCL administration. Catherine Pourre answered that UNCL is trying to help develop IRC in China and other emerging countries with local Rule Authorities, but it would take time. China is not a sailing orientated country although the interest is growing, but slowly.

Peter Wykeham Martin highlighted that attractive events like the Rolex Caribbean 600 will attract IRC. Events start to drive the rule, either new events or those switching to IRC.

Pierre Joullié reported that Brazilian owners were dissatisfied with ORC which was the traditional rule in Brazil for the last 10 years. There is also a local rating rule for cruising old boats. However, some owners of cruiser-racers were not happy with the subjectivity of the local rule, so IRC is very popular. They already measured 31 boats in 2013, and they are many more to come. Pierre expects 80-90 boats in 2014.

Godwin Zammit wanted to add that most issues are not about IRC at all, but sailing in general. Marketing should be about events rather than IRC. Race organisers need to make events more attractive to encourage entries.

Mark Mills added that selling IRC is not different to selling anything else. USA used to have a 'salesperson' until 2008 and since then numbers have dropped considerably. IRC should be marketing more proactively; Eric Baittinger agreed that IRC should be looking for professional marketing support.

Mike Urwin replied that the RORC has invested in some professional marketing help this year. It has increased media references to IRC but the effect is not yet known. Seminars in UK were actively promoted and very successful. There are no extra certificate numbers in the UK but it is impossible to know whether the promotion and seminars have prevented dropout or not. It is very hard to judge success of marketing especially in something as nebulous as a rating rule, but that is no reason not to try.

Volker Andreae said that ratings in general are too expensive and complicated. As an owner he does not look at whether the TCC is accurate, but only if he is happy with the TCC compared with his friends'. Owners like simplicity and do not want extra complexity.

Alp Doguoglu stated that we should encourage initiatives. For instance in Turkey: from 2008-2013, the number of certificates has increased by 30%+ (430 in 2013). A major contributor was boats owned by sailing schools and sponsored by corporations. Young dinghy sailors growing up buy a boat and go to companies offering instruction, and finish with a sailing team. Half of the fleet are now this type of boat. TORC has supported this idea but not actively marketed it.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### DUAL SCORING

Glen Stanaway stated that in many places in Australia they dual score local handicap with IRC. It does not seem to affect participation but IRC results have better integrity and value.

Peter Wykeham-Martin thought that local handicap systems where he sails have encouraged lower level sailors to try IRC afterwards. Mike Urwin concluded that we need to make the sport as accessible as possible and local handicap systems allow that.

Catherine Pourre reported that in France the local handicap system is named HN and is used more by family or boats just racing once a year. Lots of young sailors start with J/80s (there are large fleets in France), and prefer racing one design than IRC. We need to attract them to IRC events.

Godwin Zammit added that the cruiser class in Malta is for boats rated with a furling headsail and one asymmetric spinnaker. It worked until people buy new and high tech sails and upset the cruisers. Local handicap has been tried but owners don't like it.

Non-spinnaker TCC : Mark Mills reported that in Ireland a big move towards white sail / gentleman's classes is noticeable. He wondered if IRC should not allow people to use non-spinnaker TCC in any class (at the moment it is restricted to 'non-spinnaker' classes). Mike Urwin explained that the reason not to allow it is because it will be abused, for instance by those taking advantage of late weather reports. Mark Mills replied that maybe it should be allowed for seamanship reasons. Mike Urwin explained that one exception is Cowes Week but the owner had to use the non spinnaker TCC for the whole week and not individual days.

### 11. To discuss any proposed amendments to the IIRCOA Constitution.

No comments.

### 12. Continental and international Regional Championship

Glen Stanaway asked if there will be any International or Regional Championship. Mike Urwin answered no.

Godwin Zammit added that World Championships are never truly world but only regional, as can be seen from the entries to ORC World Championships. The same would apply for Continental Championships. However, he did think that regional championships could work (for instance the Baltic, Med, etc.)

Peter Wykeham-Martin pointed out that the RORC GBR National Championship attracts boats from abroad.

### 13. To discuss IRC submissions to ISAF.

None

### 14. Any Other Business.

Volker Andreae asked if an agreement between ORC and IRC is still scheduled as he had no news on the one new rule. Mike Greville answered that it was a good objective but the conclusion after 4-5 years is that it is going to be impossible to merge. The systems are too far apart on philosophy and approach and recent discussions have come to nothing. The status quo is the best option for IRC.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

Dan Nowlan said that the Universal Measurement System is as close as we will get, and that we should just make it easy for owners to deal with multiple rules.

Mike Urwin added that Universal Measurement System has created closer relations between RORC, US Sailing and the ORC (Nicola Sironi), and can only be good for the future of the sport.

Mike Urwin congratulated Alp Doguoglu on becoming a member of ISAF Oceanic and Offshore Committee, which will be good for IRC.

**END**

\* \* \*

*Major points from the meeting were posted live on Twitter at @IRCrating*





## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

Sunday, 13<sup>th</sup> October 2013 at 0930

### Open discussion on the topic IRC – ISAF (directed by Peter Wykeham-Martin)

**Note :** *ISAF Offshore Special Regulations Committee are currently re-drafting OSRs with the aim not of changing them but rather to simplify, to improve the language used and to improve understanding generally. Contributions to this process from the IRC Congress would be welcomed.*

The key subjects of the discussions were as follows :

- A complete revision of the Offshore Special Regulations (OSR) is scheduled.
- Within a working party, James Dadd is working on revising the way of measuring guardrail tension.
- As far as stanchions are concerned, the only prohibited material is currently carbon. An Australian working party has tested stanchions this year in support of changing the OSR regulations to allow carbon stanchions. GBR will oppose this submission.
- PLB and EPIRB registration varies from one country to another. In certain countries it is not even possible. Hence, there is currently an issue within OSR because these devices are listed as boat equipment. Maybe it should be worth listing them as crew equipment. There is a lot of work to review these regulations.
- Red hand flares and parachutes are difficult to dispose of at the end of their lifecycle. “Laser flares” are not accepted yet but they may be accepted in the near future. GBR is against this proposal.
- Liferaft servicing: The RYA proposes to delete most of the current recommendation in order to simplify the requirements. The proposal includes that valise packed liferafts must be serviced every year instead of every three years.
- There is also a proposal to review the MOB procedure.
- Another interesting proposal for IRC and racing in general is to change the minimum required diameter of HMPE Dyneema lifelines to 4mm instead of 3mm, but there is no evidence that it will be enough.

\* \* \*



**IRC Congress Meeting 2013**

## **Reports**

**From National IRC Owners Associations**

**and IRC Rule Authorities**

**For 2013**



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### 1. Australia

In Australia, IRC maintains its position as the premier system used widely across keel boat racing from club to international level events. IRC enjoys ongoing support from RFD Australia (part of the Survitec Group) who proudly invests in the sport.

All major events use IRC for scoring of their main trophies, with over-all winners decided on IRC. The most prominent of which would be the Rolex Sydney Hobart, an event with tremendous global exposure and international entries and crews.

There is a national championship run annually; the Audi IRC Australian Championships that provides competition for competitors in three classes mainly based on size and or performance. The event was last held in January 2013 as part of the Festival of Sails in Geelong, and produced the following Australian Champions:

IRC Class A winners 2013:

1. SHOGUN V - R. Hanna - TP 52
2. HOOLIGAN – M. Blackmore – TP 52
3. CALM 2 – J. van der Slot – TP 52

IRC Class B winners 2013:

1. IKON – B. McCracken – First 45
2. SENNA – B. Garner – First 45
3. REVERIE – A. Woodward – First 45

IRC Class C winners 2013:

1. EXECUTIVE DECISION – G.Botica – Adams 10
2. WILD ROSE – R. Hickman – Farr 43
3. INVINCIBLE – H. Clark – Farr 104

The next national championship will be held over Easter 2014 at the Newcastle Yacht Club just north of Sydney. It is expected that the Audi IRC Australian Championship 2014 will put the best of Australian IRC keel boat racing on show.

Within the Australian fleet there are strong opinions that the IRC rule still significantly favours the TP52 style designs in the 50 to 60 foot range, and the production cruiser racer Beneteau First 40 or First 45 in the 35 to 45 foot range. These perceptions are strong enough to influence boat buyer behaviour and are having an effect on the confidence of the remaining fleet.

To protect the interests of the fleet, Yachting Australia vigorously maintains a skilled network of measurers who invest a significant amount of time and trouble in staying informed about the IRC rule. Approximately 20 measurers attend an annual conference; this year's being held in Melbourne. These committed measurers, who are supported by Yachting Australia staff of Amy Howie and Rayshele Martin, contribute significantly to uphold the integrity of ratings in Australia. For convenience some owners of known One Design or Standard Designs use standard data, but the majority will make the effort to have their yachts fully measured.

### 2. Belgium

**Evolution of IRC in Belgium in 2013 :**

There have been no major changes in the IRC fleet, neither in the IRC race program for 2013 compared to 2012. The race program is concentrated around 5 weekends along the Belgian coast with an extension to Ramsgate in the South-East of England and Breskens in the South of Holland.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

Light Vessel weekend of RBSC changed its formula from a 2 day program with up-down races, to a long distance race of 150 nm to celebrate the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the club. This attracted some long distance sailors, but it frightened some teams that are more oriented to upwind-downwind sailing.

Nine Belgian teams participated to the Fastnet race, of which two ended in the top 3 of their series and another boat ended 7<sup>th</sup>.

One of the concerns in Belgium is the lack of new teams coming to the water. In 2013 no new teams appeared in the fleet. Other teams reduced their program. The consequence is a slight decrease of the average number of boats in the race fleets. This trend is not only an IRC trend. It can also be seen in other sailing fleets.

### 3. Bulgaria

Number of boats to 31.12.2012 : - 31

Number of boats to 31.08.2013 : - 35

Number of boats newly 2013 : - 4

Percentage of certificates:

. Endorset 92%

. Nonendorset 8%

This year, for the first time since 2009, we were observing an improvement of the IRC situation in Bulgaria. The Bulgarian yacht owners had two consecutive meetings which contributed to a significant result in convergence of the positions of Bulgarian yachtsmen on the application of IRC in the country.

The Bulgarian fleet of boats with IRC certificates has increased approximately over 10% which is a minimal growth but is a good indicator of the IRC direction in the country.

In 2013 were conducted 7 IRC regattas and best of them were the following:

- Offshore Cor Caroli - Bavaria Yachts 2013;
- Kaliakriya Cup 2013;
- Bulgarian - Romanian Black Sea International Regatta 2013.

This year the Bulgarian Association of IRC yacht owners has separated from Bulgarian Sailing Federation. This way, they will manage their own IRC system in Bulgaria. We believe this will be beneficial for the improvement of the IRC situation in Bulgaria in 2014.

Plamen Georgiev  
BULSAF IRC Chairman

### 4. China

In China, there are more and more IRC races get organized some of them are major regattas. IRC has become one of the most popular rating system used in China since 2009 with all the efforts from CYA (Chinese Yachting Association) and people involved. Especially, in the last one year, owners started to realize the consequence of endorsed Certificates. The number of boats getting Endorsed certificates is increasing with the number of all IRC rated boats in China. IRC has a good tendency in China in the next few years. We are also trying to get some seminar organized to let more people understand IRC. People who understand IRC will tend to have more fun in races.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### 5. Croatia

Present situation about handicap yacht sailing in Croatia is confused, at least.

Since 2008, when I started with IRC the official handicap system, concurred by HJS (Croatian Sailing Federation) has been IMS/ORC. It took me a great effort to popularize IRC among yacht owners and sailing clubs to organize races with IRC handicap system. UNCL remembers how HJS was fighting to take control over IRC certificates issuing, the main reason was tax money that they thought they were entitled to. In the same time IMS/ORC was privately controlled by group of individuals who were making a great profit of it. But little by little situation started to change, world crises has influenced sailing as well and our yacht owners were not ready to spend additional money on IRC racing especially getting nothing in return from HJS. ORC was greatly affected as well and now there are about 10 yachts regularly racing in ORC only.

This year, in August, HJS opened tender for "Croatian Handicape System" with intention to buy it up and declare as Croatian Handicape system. The authors would get some 1350€ and transfer all exclusive rights to HJS.

Three offers have been received, one based on YARDSTICK and other two more as theoretical discussion how and what to do and not as elaborated system.

No decision has been taken so far and I am sure it will take quite some time to get to it. I will follow the subject closely and keep you posted.

If UNCL/RORC find it appropriate and of any interest to offer some special conditions we could reopen this subject with HJS.

My rough estimate rise to about 50 boats that would be interested to race under IRC in Croatia.

In the meantime I will continue to be at owners' service for IRC certificates for those attending international races in Mediterranean.

Nenad PLOVANIC

Kraljevica, 09.09.2013.

### 6. France

In 2013 we notice that the number of PropIRC (French owners association) members dropped by around 8%, which result in a slight reduction of the number of boat starts on usual regattas, and by contrast a higher interest for the well-known regattas such as Fastnet or Giraglia and convivial one as Tour de Belle-Ile and Voiles de Saint-Tropez.

In four years we have lost 1/3 of our members. It should be noted that in order to maintain the correct number of participants in the races, the Organizers open them to the HN rule (which has become Osiris), continuously supported by the National Authority, and which has as a direct result a slight decrease of fleets by class. Starts with more than 20 boats per class IRC are becoming rare.

The monotype J80 stagnates, but the format of the new J70 could convince and take over.

In general, the teams do less IRC regattas particularly in the Atlantic, and the renewal of the fleet and especially the crew is almost null. L'IRC stagnates and is disappearing. Only the Mediterranean fleet persists. The cost and conviviality are usually the two arguments used to illustrate generally this rather negative trend. Concerning the IRC capacity, the recurrent subjects which provoke the most remarks from our members are:

**Point 1** : Boats with Box Rules such as GP 42, TP 52 and the new trends such as KER 40 beat more and more often in certain conditions their competitors who push water. For boats more than 40', this is a heavier trend with lighter, faster boats that are more fun, but more expensive and only used for racing. These boats are light, and even very light and/or empty, with little volume and with little height inside. Associated with fixed bow-sprit and asymmetric spinnakers, and correctly manipulated they can become unbeatable on windward-leeward courses and in the strong medium where their gliding speed downwind enable them to disappear far in front of the more classical boats. This trend is considered as a penalty for the



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

owners of “Big” cruising boats who would like to participate in regattas while using their boats with reasonable budgets.

**Point 2** Today we can notice an obvious advantage of asymmetrical spinnaker boats with tack on light and fix bow-sprits (accounted by IRC as removable bow-sprit, like J-boats). As the ASY cuts have been improved, the deficit of the VMG between 15 and 25 knots is more than compensated for by the increased surface, not to mention the bonus made by less time and for irregular courses. The argument for easy maneuvering can also be used in favor of asymmetric spinnakers. This is considered by a good number of existing boat owners as a compulsory evolution to stay at the top.

### **Point 3 :** Weight and crew members

More and more boats choose a configuration with asymmetrical spinnakers, which makes maneuvering easier. Part of the crew is now only used as leeward.

The consequence is it is more and more difficult to create a crew for a race which lasts several days. When you add the cost and logistic complexity which this entails, it is easily understandable that owners are changing to other type of competition (i.e. double or single handed courses).

This encourages a decrease in the number of crew members.

It also appears that this rule is often cancelled by the race instructions.

It should also be noted that the N (crew number) printed on IRC certificate is sometimes higher than the figure indicated on the boat's CE plate.

These 3 points are directly linked to the perception and the evolution of the IRC in France.

We have successively seen boats with lighter and stiffer movements with non-overlap sails and simpler rigs and more successful with the arrival of carbon.

The heavy boats with overlap sails have disappeared slowly but surely from our waters. Nowadays, the trend is for lighter and gliding boats, and the systematic use of asymmetrical spinnakers. We have noticed that the (very partial) renewal of fleets already happened this way for the boats bigger than 40'.

It seems necessary to find solutions at every level so that present ships can maintain their capacity to win regattas, because the owners of these boats will turn away from the IRC, and eventually abandon regattas.

Jean-Philippe CAU,

## 7. Great Britain & Northern Ireland (GBR)

### Comments

- The number of IRC rated boats at the end of 2012 had fallen further from 2011 (1551, cf 1702). A comparison of numbers between Aug 2013 and Aug 2012 shows a reduction of 198 boats (13%). The economic climate plainly has a part to play, but it is considered that wider and more far reaching effects related to the sport of sailing are equally or more relevant.
- In addition to the above, 124 boats will have been issued with Limited Validity IRC TCCs during 2013. This goes some considerable way towards mitigating the loss in numbers. It is of course impossible to say how many full certificates have been lost. The indications are however that more boats will have used IRC during 2013 than in the absence of this experimental scheme. A full report on this is available from the RORC Rating Office.
- The GBR IRC Rule Authority conducted 13 regional cruiser/racer seminars during 2013 to promote IRC and to encourage clubs to adopt and use the rule. These were very well received and have resulted in a number of initiatives including a scheme of 'IRC Advocates' based all around GBR. The full report is available at:



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

[http://www.rorcrating.com/images/stories/pdf/2013/seminars\\_report\\_final.pdf](http://www.rorcrating.com/images/stories/pdf/2013/seminars_report_final.pdf).

- The GBR IRC Rule Authority continues to work closely with the RYA to develop a national strategy for cruiser racing in GBR.
- The Committee noted that many GBR regattas are continuing to struggle to maintain numbers of entrants. What does appear to be the case is that events which are easy to do and include also attractions beyond simply the racing are holding up better.
- The Committee discussed the future of IRC, noting that the perception of IRC being a high-level rule is increasingly deterring club level owners and discussed, without drawing any conclusions, whether stricter sail limitations might help in this respect. It was suggested during the discussion that an internet based video to help owners with measurement, particularly of rig and sails, might be helpful. The cost of racing, the need to work with clubs, and to encourage the owners of cruiser/racers were all noted.
- Again, a very wide range of different boat types, sizes and ages has been reported as winning races during 2013.
- Four IRC regional championships and a national championship were successfully held in GBR in 2013.

### IRC Technical Committee Submissions

The GBR IRC Committee supports all the IRC Technical Committee submissions for changes to IRC Rules for 2014.

### GBR Submissions to Congress

There is one submission from GBR to the IRC Congress related to Crew Number, IRC Rule 22.4.2.

## 8. The Netherlands.

In 2013 the Noordzeeclub, as Class Organisation for IRC and ORC Classes in Holland, has organized in cooperation with the Dutch Royal Yachting Association (KNWV) three top level IRC events making a total of 24 races to get the overall winners in IRC 1,2 and 3 in Holland, including the IRC Dutch Open Championships.

The total number of participants and certificates decreased a little compared to 2012, now we have 149 IRC certificates compared to 153 last year. Number of participants also decreased in our IRC Nationals from 45 last year to 37 this year. Remarkable is the decrease in IRC 3 which went from 16 to 8 competitors, as IRC 1 increased from 10 to 12.

In the Netherlands we have races and events both in IRC and ORC and we see a continuous flow from top-IRC towards ORC, especially with the upcoming WK ORCi in Kiel, which has a lot of interest together with the new VPP giving a boost to ORC in Holland. Next year there will also be a Dutch Championship ORC(i) next to IRC for the first time. We can conclude that in the Netherlands IRC as a rating system is now at an equal level next to ORC and is no longer the only top racing handicap system in the Netherlands.

John Van der Starre,  
Race Coördinator Noordzeeclub.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### 9. Japan

#### Comments:

This is our 8<sup>th</sup> season of IRC in Japan. With a total number of certificates 303, as of 31 August, we saw small increase from 2012. Of the 303, 142 certificates are endorsed and 161 are non-endorsed.

We have been conducting IRC measurer's seminars all over Japan since we introduced this rating system. Although the seminars were held to train new measurers, this was big help to let people know about IRC, especially in the remote areas. We have seen many people started using IRC because of our visit to them.

### 10. Malta

There was little change in the RMYC fleet in 2013 although there was small a reduction on last year with around 48 boats rated to date. 53 certificates were issued including amendments and trials. A few more certificates are likely to be requested particularly for the Rolex Middle Sea Race.

	Total Certs	Rated Boats	New Boats
August 2012	61	55	2
December 2012	78	65	3
August 2013	53	48	2

We do not have a particular policy requiring endorsement of certificates and accept owner declaration as the default position under IRC. However applications are submitted through the club and checked before submission. The club assists owners in compiling most applications and all boats in the fleet are well known.

The composition of the fleet remains largely the same, mostly modern production boats within the 10 – 15 metre length band and a couple of all out racers. Only two new boats were rated this year.

As in previous years despite a relatively large fleet of rated boats for our small population, the number of boats that race regularly is less than one would wish for. Of some concern is the reduction in participation from the more cruiser oriented boats. These had been enticed to race in recent years in a dedicated cruiser class limited to furling headsails and asymmetric spinnakers but interest here seems to be waning.

The programme which runs from March to December includes local coastal races, weekend regattas and short offshore races to destinations in nearby Sicily all run under IRC.

The reasons for this are varied and include the relatively large number of events held when most owners only find time to enter a few of them, shortage of good crew and other competing interests. We are currently undergoing a review of our sailing programmes with a view to regenerating interest in racing events. There is a need to reduce the number of events to allow more time between each event for racers to prepare and look forward to the races as well as for better organisation and promotion. The shortage of crew is also a problem which the club is looking to address in the longer term by setting up sailing tuition programmes aimed particularly at young adults who may be new to sailing and have not previously had the opportunity to sail.





## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

Two offshore international races the Malta- Syracuse race and the 606 mile Rolex Middle Sea Race include both IRC and ORC Categories. The Rolex Middle Sea Race is due to start on the 19<sup>th</sup> October with 77 entries confirmed. In this race almost all the boats are expected to enter the IRC Category with a significant number of boats entering both categories. Dual scoring these races attracts entries that normally race under either of the two rating systems while enticing them to enter in the other as well.

Godwin Zammit

Commodore RMYC - IRC representative, Malta.

### 11. TURKEY

- Name of the owners' association : TURKISH OFFSHORE RACING CLUB
- Name of the representative : ALICAN TURALI
  
- Number of yachts on December 31, 2012 : 368
- Number of boats on Aug. 31, 201 : 280
- Number of new boats : 2011-38 2012-84 2013-40
- Number of boats below 10 meters : 2011-96 2012-100 2013-74
- Number of boats 10-12 meters : 2011-100 2012-106 2013-102
- Number of boats 12-15 meters : 2011-71 2012-83 2013-91
- Number of boats above 15 meters : 2011-16 2012-19 2013-13
- Percentage of endorsed boats : 2011-66 % 2012- 65 % 2013-68 %
- Evolution of the IRC fleet compare to the other rules (PHRF, IMS, ORC... ) : NO OTHER RULES
  
- 2013 has been marked by the increasing number of yachts and races. There have been 40 new yachts and totally 216 races all around Turkish waters. IRC Rule is the sole rating rule represented by TORC as the Rule Authority since 1995.
  
- The Turkish Offshore Racing Club Trophy, has been a series of races, consisting of spring and summer races, that are deemed as the most popular trophy of the Turkish Sailing Community. The Trophy is made up of 16 inshore and 4 offshore races. Apart from that, there are two series DUO, 3 other series composed of 11 races sponsored by AMERICAN EXPRESS (AMEX Bosphorus Cup, AMEX Turgutreis Cup ve AMEX Gocek Cup) and the Winter Series Races consisting of 7 races. The participation to those races are approximately 60-70 yachts, that are classified solely by TCC factor, in IRC divisions.
  
- Istanbul Sailing Club has organised 8 races at the Sea of Marmara with participation of 50-60 yachts.
  
- Double handed regattas were realized fourth time this year by TORC and BAYK (Bodrum Offshore Racing Club) and won critical recognition among the sailing community and shall be continued .
  
- The Turkish Navy Cup Regatta has been organized for the 42nd time, with a fleet of 65 boats, starting from Bosphorus/Istanbul and finishing at Cesme/Izmir 270 nm,
  
- In other venues, namely Cesme/Izmir, Bodrum, Gocek and Marmaris, racing scene was also very active. With the initiatives of Bodrum and Marmaris clubs, who lead successful Winter-Trophies covering 14-21 races in 7-8 weekend events from January to May, race season is continuing now for 12 months in Southern Turkey.  
Apart from İstanbul races, Winter Trophy is organised in İzmir, Bodrum, Marmaris, Gocek at between January & May and also Autumn Races are organised between July & October. Approximately 30-40 yachts participate to those Trophies in each event.  
Marmaris Race Week by the end of October , and Loryma Summer Cup by end of August, both organized by Marmaris International Yacht Club(MIYC), with TORC support for race management, are the two major events. Marmaris Week celebrates this year its 24. anniversary and will attract more than



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

1200 sailors in 170 boats from 20 different countries, They also organize the Channel Regatta jointly with Rhodes Yacht Club since 8 years and Loryma Cup since 3 years.

- Göcek Yacht Club is continuing its programme on May with Göcek Regatta (50 yachts) and in November Autumn Regatta with 60 yachts.
- All those venues are supported by TORC/UNCL trained measurers. In 2013 number of endorsed yachts increased considerably to 68 % of the certificates.
- 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

### 12. USA

- Number of boats on December 31, 2012 342
- Number of boats on August 31, 2013 263
- |                                | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> (Aug 31) |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| • Number of new boats          | 67          | 61          | 37                   |
| • Percentage of endorsed boats | 91%         | 86%         | 87%                  |

There is no national endorsement policy. Event organizers make the determination based on the needs of the individual events. While most required endorsed certificates previously, over the last few years most events have stopped requiring endorsed. Only few upper echelon events now have the requirement: Kew West Race Week, St Francis YC Big Boat Series and Newport-Bermuda Race.

#### Additional info:

- The number of certificate continues to drop. Economic factors are a large reason. Other reasons are less clear.
- Nonetheless, IRC remains the measurement rule used in the most events in the US.
- Strongest presence continues in the Northeast; more than 60% of USA certificates.

#### Major IRC Events:

Ft. Lauderdale to Key West Race - January  
Key West Race Week - January  
Pineapple Cup Montego Bay Race - February (alternating years)  
American YC Spring Series - April/May  
Storm Trysail Block Island Race - May  
New York YC Annual Regatta - June  
Newport to Bermuda Race - June (alternating years)  
Block Island Race Week - July (alternating years)  
Aldo Alessio Regatta - St Francis YC - July  
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 East Coast Championship-October  
Nassau Cup Ocean Race - November  
Wirth M. Munroe Fort Lauderdale to Palm Beach Yacht Race - December



# IRC Congress Meeting 2013

## Report From The IRC Technical Committee

### 1. IRC Activity

The total number of boats issued with IRC certificates in 2005 to 2012 and to 31<sup>st</sup> August 2013 is shown below.

Country	Continent	Region	Certificate Year									
			2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2012 to 31/8/12	2013 to 31/8/13
Great Britain	Europe	North	1878	1839	2043	2029	1806	1766	1702	1551	1526	1327
France	Europe	North	904	966	924	1074	937	975	1016	913	816	787
Italy	Europe	North	763	840	931	962	840	905	846	814	651	590
Australia	Oceania	South	527	578	570	528	535	544	525	498	361	323
Turkey	Europe	North	260	280	292	327	342	360	363	404	302	278
Ireland	Europe	North	389	402	429	455	443	423	386	355	355	315
USA	N America	North	549	589	610	611	488	464	380	324	306	252
Japan	Asia	North	1	33	89	122	221	258	276	298	277	303
Netherlands	Europe	North	58	54	152	162	172	146	138	149	148	146
Spain	Europe	North	934	155	164	165	167	159	169	134	129	120
Hong Kong	Asia	South	76	85	94	120	93	93	97	94	76	76
China	Asia	North	0	0	0	0	37	40	46	93	63	34
Greece	Europe	North	0	56	109	101	105	117	104	80	73	60
Thailand	Asia	South	50	48	49	64	72	80	77	74	24	21
Chile	S America	South						0	89	68	0	2
Canada	N America	North	22	24	23	32	51	60	82	67	67	54
Malta	Europe	North	49	42	47	65	64	66	62	65	59	51
Belgium	Europe	North	79	91	99	100	87	74	76	64	58	62
UAE/Gulf States	Africa	South	67	56	79	67	72	68	53	61	12	8
South Africa	Africa	South	91	91	84	76	63	55	49	52	30	30
Germany	Europe	North	16	24	39	64	65	53	56	47	42	44
Israel	Europe	North	27	27	21	23	23	35	34	43	35	32
New Zealand	Oceania	South	15	142	97	94	78	55	46	37	27	18
Singapore	Asia	South	29	45	41	41	37	29	35	32	26	25
Romania	Europe	North						18	32	31	30	23
Bulgaria	Europe	North				41	42	39	29	29	28	33
Uruguay	S America	South				47	45	45	27	27	0	12
Finland	Europe	North				13	34	40	37	22	22	18
Argentina	S America	South	0	50	90	37	27	24	13	16	0	0
Colombia	S America	South							21	16	2	0
Croatia	Europe	North				15	20	16	10	15	8	8
Malaysia	Asia	South	19	23	27	23	23	21	22	15	14	8
Iceland	Europe	North	18	14	15	14	12	13	10	13	13	12
Philippines	Asia	South	19	13	13	12	13	13	14	9	3	0
Switzerland	Europe	North				20	16	3	6	3	2	1
Norway	Europe	North				8	9	16	11	2	2	7
Sweden	Europe	North				28	37	37	19	1	1	0
Denmark	Europe	North						17	8	0	1	1
Portugal	Europe	North	127	133	95	101	56	23	14	0	0	0
World & Other (<5)	N/A	N/A	164	125	114	74	215	49	86	98	86	67
		Totals:	7131	6825	7340	7715	7347	7199	7066	6614	5675	5148
		As % of previous year:		95.7	107.5	105.1	95.2	98.0	98.2	93.6		90.7



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

Between the 2011 and 2012 Certificate Years, there has been a further decrease in the number of boats rated of 452 boats, or 6.4%, significantly more than last year's 133 boats (1.8%) . Noting again the continued poor state of the global economy during 2012, this is unsurprising. The Technical Committee however considers that wider and more fundamental issues relating to changes in the overall pattern of how owners go racing are also relevant. This view is reinforced by the continued fall to the end of August this year. The only countries to see any significant growth during 2012 were China, Turkey, Japan and The Netherlands. The countries losing the most were Great Britain, France and the USA. To the end of August 2013, only Japan and Uruguay saw any significant growth while Great Britain, Italy and the USA were the most significant losers.

At the end of 2012, 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 2013, 21 countries had achieved this level with the likelihood of a further 5 by the end of the year. At the end of 2012, 34 countries had fleets of 5 or more boats.

The table below shows the comparison of the numbers of boats rated at 31<sup>st</sup> August for the period 2006, to 2012:

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	Boats at 31/08/12	Boats at 31/08/13	Change 31/08/12 to 31/08/13	Comment
Japan	14	81	117	208	252	263	277	303	26	
Uruguay	0	21	39	33	32	1	0	12	12	
Bulgaria	0	1	38	39	35	27	28	33	5	
Norway	0	0	8	8	14	10	2	7	5	
Belgium	80	89	95	80	66	75	58	62	4	
Chile						40	0	2	2	South
Germany	17	38	51	57	50	55	42	44	2	
Argentina	39	56	27	27	7	1	0	0	0	South
Croatia	0	1	8	15	16	6	8	8	0	
Denmark					17	9	1	1	0	
Hong Kong	58	85	65	70	69	75	76	76	0	South
Portugal	130	85	100	56	23	13	0	0	0	
South Africa	37	91	53	47	31	32	30	30	0	South
Iceland	14	15	14	12	13	10	13	12	-1	
Singapore	21	45	25	29	18	30	26	25	-1	South
Sweden	1	3	30	28	35	18	1	0	-1	
Switzerland	2	10	18	15	2	6	2	1	-1	
Colombia							2	0	-2	South
Netherlands	50	129	134	153	136	133	148	146	-2	
Israel	24	19	19	20	27	30	35	32	-3	
Philippines	0	13	1	7	8	7	3	0	-3	South
Thailand	10	48	19	14	22	23	24	21	-3	South
Finland	1	3	13	33	38	36	22	18	-4	
UAE	21	56	26	12	10	18	12	8	-4	South
Malaysia	4	23	13	11	13	12	14	8	-6	South
Romania					0	32	30	23	-7	



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

	Boats at	Boats at	Boats at	Boats at	Boats at	Boats at	Boats at	Boats at	Change 08/12 to 18/13	
Country	31/08/06	31/08/07	31/08/08	31/08/09	31/08/10	31/08/11	31/08/12	31/08/13		Comment
Malta	41	41	57	57	58	51	59	51	-8	
New Zealand	36	142	49	50	33	29	27	18	-9	South
Spain	141	154	156	146	151	159	129	120	-9	
Canada	25	22	30	49	59	82	67	54	-13	
Greece	43	101	98	100	108	95	73	60	-13	
Turkey	212	237	249	236	261	276	302	278	-24	
China					31	31	63	34	-29	
France	829	858	980	860	889	933	816	787	-29	
Australia	328	285	357	341	344	367	361	323	-38	South
Ireland	396	415	447	433	409	393	355	315	-40	
USA	562	574	584	449	432	358	306	252	-54	
Italy	604	685	766	624	711	657	651	590	-61	
Great Britain	1785	1952	1987	1749	1723	1675	1526	1327	-199	
World & Other (<5)	56	36	51	138	111	113	86	67	-19	
Totals:	5581	6414	6724	6206	6254	6181	5675	5148	-527	
		114.9	104.8	92.3	100.8	98.8	91.8	90.7		

As noted above, while we believe that the decline in certificate numbers in established IRC countries continues to reflect the current economic conditions, the IRC Technical Committee is concerned at the significant and apparently accelerating continuing fall in the numbers of rated boats.

In overall summary, the IRC Technical Committee expresses its concern at the continuing decline in the number of boats rated under IRC.

## 2. Measurement

No international measurer seminars have been held during 2012.

At the ISAF Conference in 2012, 4 IRC International Measurers were appointed, Adam Cowley, James Dadd, Malcolm Runnals and Mike Urwin. It is anticipated that one further application will be made this year. We continue to work with the ISAF International Measurers Sub-Committee to expand the range of IRC Principal Events to facilitate worldwide coverage. It is not anticipated that there will ever be more than perhaps 10 – 12 IRC International Measurers.

As will be reported at the IRC Congress, we are working with the ORC and US Sailing on a project called the Universal Measurement System. The fundamental aims of the project are to reduce the complexity for owners required to race under multiple rating rules. Initially, the participating rules are ORCi, ORC Club, IRC, ORR and HPR. The primary mechanism to achieve this will be the development of a common electronic data collection and transfer protocol between the participating rules – in effect a 'boat passport'. Secondary benefits will be a reduction in the chances of error by rating offices and (hopefully!) improvements in the efficiency of the rating offices.



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### 3. Technical

The Technical Committee has been working this year on a wide ranging agenda. Much of this is detail issues which will only result in minor changes to IRC Rules and/or rating calculations although one or two projects may result in more significant changes. Most of this work has been conducted by E-Mail with a formal 2 day meeting in London in July.

\* \* \*



# IRC Congress Meeting 2013

## IRC Crew limitations

### 1. Preamble

The IRC Technical Committee again considered IRC crew limitations at a meeting earlier this year. The only conclusion drawn at this meeting was that there were a number of philosophical questions that we were unable to answer among ourselves.

As a result, a questionnaire was devised and circulated to all IRC Rule Authorities or National IRC Owners Associations in each country as appropriate.

The following discusses the outcome of the questionnaire and the resulting IRC Technical Committee recommendations.

### 2. The Questionnaire

Responses have been received from 13 countries as detailed by Appendix 1.

Appendix 2 shows comments received in addition to the questionnaire answers.

The comment from NED relating to shorthanded certificates was addressed with a late rule change for 2013.

In answer to the question from AUS, the IRC Technical Committee has no intention of introducing variable Crew Number.

### 3. Analysis

The following primary points may be noted:

- 3.1 In 92% of countries, some form of crew limitation is used.
- 3.2 69% of countries consider that IRC Crew Number is about right.
- 3.3 15% of countries consider that IRC Crew Number/Weight should be increased by 10%.
- 3.4 8% of countries consider that IRC Crew Number/Weight should be decreased by 10% and 8% by 20%.
- 3.5 69% of countries consider that IRC certificates should show crew limitations based on Crew Number.
- 3.6 62% of countries consider that IRC crew limitations should change to default out.

### 4. IRC Technical Committee Recommendations

- 4.1 The calculation of IRC Crew Number should remain unchanged.
- 4.2 IRC certificates should continue to show crew limitations based on IRC Crew Number.
- 4.3 It is proposed that existing IRC Rule 22.4 is deleted and replaced with:



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### 22.4 Crew Number/Weight

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), or for one designs. Attention is drawn to Rule 3.4.

22.4.2 **Boats** rated as one-designs, as noted on the **boat's** certificate, shall conform to 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 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.

22.4.4 Race committees may invoke **crew** limitations, by number or by weight, in a Notice of Race. It is recommended that when a Notice of Race invokes crew limitations that one of the following limitations is used:

The crew weight shall not exceed 85kg multiplied by the Crew Number printed on the certificate. This rule does not apply to short-handed certificates issued under rule 8.2.1.

Or:

The Crew Number printed on each **boat's** certificates shall not be exceeded. This rule does not apply to short-handed certificates issued under rule 8.2.1.

22.4.5 Rule 22.4 may be amended by Notice of Race.

Note: The above reflects previous 'default out' IRC Rules on crew limitations except that a) the historic requirement for boats in a race requiring Endorsed certificates to comply with IRC Crew Number has been removed, and b) the rule now includes recommendations on crew limitations.

\* \* \*





## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### Appendix 1: Questionnaire Responses

Name/Country		Q1 Do events in your country generally enforce crew limits?	Q2 If you answered 'Yes' to Q1, how?	Q3 In your sailing area, is IRC Crew Number generally considered too low, correct, or too high?	Q4 If you answered 'Too low' to Q3, by how much should it increase?	Q5 If you answered 'Too high' to Q3, by how much should it decrease?	Q6 Should IRC certificates show crew limitations based on Crew Number or Crew Weight?	Q7 Should IRC Crew Number/Weight limitations remain as 'default in' (see left) or change to 'default out'?
John van der Starre	NED	1	3	1	1	0	1	2
Hylton Hale	RSA	1	1	1	1	0	2	1
Carl Sabbe	BEL	1	3	2	0	0	1	2
Riccardo Provini	ITA	1	2	2	0	0	2	2
Jim Farmer	NZL	1	1	2	0	0	2	2
Yachting Australia	AUS	1	2	2	0	0	2	1
Nicolas Raffray	MAU	1	1	2	0	0	1	2
US Sailing	USA	1	3	2	0	0	1	2
Hellenic Offshore Committee/	GRE	1	2	2	0	0	1	2
Haruhiko Kaku	JPN	2	0	2	0	0	1	2
Andy Hill	GBR	1	3	2	0	0	1	1
Pierre JOULLIÉ	BRA	1	5	3	0	1	1	1
Jean-Philippe CAU	FRA	1	5	3	0	2	1	1

Yes: 12	No answer: 1	Too Low: 2	Not Applicable: 11	Not Applicable: 11	Crew Number: 9	Stay as Default in: 5
No: 1	IRC Crew Number: 3	Correct: 9	10%: 2	10%: 1	Crew Weight: 4	Change to default out: 8
	Modified IRC Crew Number: 4	Too High: 2	20%: 0	20%: 1		
	Modified IRC Crew Weight: 0		More than 20%: 0	More than 20%: 0		
	Other: 2					

Total Responses                      13                      13                      13                      13                      13                      13                      13



## IRC Congress Meeting 2013

### Appendix 2: Comments Received

Country	Additional Comments
NED	For Shorthanded Certificates there should be no default crew weight, so it has not to be amended by every NoR.
RSA	
BEL	The pressure for higher crew numbers/crew weight comes mostly from over powered boats, who hope to solve their "problem" with more crew than sometimes allowed by the CE certificate of the boat. In the Belgian ONZK we apply a crew number of certificate+1, but that is purely to be conform with the situation in Holland. We believe that a limitation of crew number of the certificate is OK. We also believe that crew weight makes the things too complex, although we understand that the weight is the real physical factor.
ITA	
NZL	
AUS	If a crew weight were used instead of a crew number, would it be possible for owner's to amend it to a declared weight? This is permitted in ORC and is accompanied by a change in rating
MAU	Crew weight puts too much pressure on skippers and crews. Sailing must remain a pleasure activity for non-professionals.
USA	In general it is not an issue in the US. Only in the SF Bay area do a few boats want more crew. I'm not aware of events holding weigh ins.
GRE	Crew Number with Default Out (with a default number on case the owner does not declare anything): It's difficult to find crew to race, so we would like the Crew Number (the crew is not always the same, so the total weight is unknown), with the Default Out option (for not penalize the boat in case of non-sufficient actual crew number for racing).
JPN	Reason for "default out" is, TCC is not based on Crew weight so that this number should be treated as reference only.
GBR	Not all events control crew numbers in GBR. GBR IRC Committee voted unanimously for certificates to show Crew Number.
BRA	Up to now, boats have competed in both IRC and ORC together. Crew limitations complied to ORC limits since it is more restrict.
FRA	Not all events control crew numbers in FRA FRA IRC Committee voted unanimously for certificates to show Crew Number.

\* \* \*