



IRC Congress 2011

National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

Submissions

From National IRC Owners Associations

And IRC Rule Authorities

For 2012

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

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

Proposed additions are printed in blue.

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



IRC Congress 2011

National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

1. France. Overlapping Headsails

- Current Position:** Over the past few years, it can be noticed that the number of new designs made to perform with an overlapping jib is close to zero. Rating treatment of overlapping headsails is surely not the only reason explaining this change. Nevertheless, looking at the results of older boats designed to use overlapping headsails, it is felt that it becomes very difficult to be able to win races, particularly when doing windward –leeward.
- Reason for change:** The development of sails design has led to very efficient sail plans using non overlapping headsails. These sails plans are working upwind even in light winds. Adapting this type of sail plans to older designs is not easy and implies important costs or may be unmanageable due to the involvement of too many changing parameters. Therefore, it is strongly felt that overlapping headsails are believed more efficient than they really are by the IRC formula.
- This issue has been raised by the French fleet in general.
- Reviewing the treatment of overlapping headsail may therefore help older designs to remain competitive under IRC
- Proposal:** [The change is of course left to the IRC Technical Committee.](#)
- Effect of change:** Decrease the TCC of yachts using overlapping headsails to improve the fairness of competition between old designs (not IRC optimised at the beginning of their life) and newer designs.
- IRC Technical Committee Comment:** The Technical Committee is currently undertaking a review of different styles of rig. Additionally, the proposed deletion of Rule 21.7.1 (a) will also have an effect.



IRC Congress 2011

National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

2. Great Britain. Submission 1: Innovative Features.

Reason for change:	The GBR IRC Committee is generally supportive of innovation within IRC. The Committee is however concerned that innovative features should be conservatively treated, ie they should not be encouraged. It is understood that currently that is the position. The Committee wishes that policy to continue and to be reinforced.
Proposal:	That innovative features in the design of boats should continue to be accepted by IRC but should continue to be conservatively treated in terms of the calculation of TCC.
Effect of Change:	None. Confirmation of existing policy.
IRC Technical Committee Comment:	The Technical Committee supports the submission.



IRC Congress 2011

National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

3. Great Britain. Submission 2: Bowsprits and Spinnaker Poles.

Reason for change:

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

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

Proposal:

The GBR IRC Committee proposes that IRC should revert to rating a boat equipped with both a spinnaker pole and a bowsprit higher than a boat equipped with just a spinnaker pole.

Effect of change:

Closure of an unrated loophole

IRC Technical
Committee Comment:

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

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

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

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



IRC Congress 2011

National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

4. Ireland. Submission 1: Spinnakers.

- Reason for change: It has been noted this season that in windy events many yachts did not have a suitable heavy airs spinnaker, leading to pressure to fly sails inappropriate for the conditions. Currently in most conditions a yacht choosing to rate with a suitable spinnaker against the eventuality of heavier winds is disadvantaging itself against its peers who do not dedicate one of their rated spinnakers against this eventuality. Rule 21.6.1 (b) partially addresses this contingency only for those events of Category 3 and above.
- Proposal: **To allow to be carried without rating adjustment one extra spinnaker appropriate solely for use in heavy airs, in addition to the current rated spinnaker inventory.**
- To ensure the extra spinnaker is not suitable for use in other conditions consideration was given to a limiting criteria based on cloth weight. However in order to avoid increased measurement burden and ensure easy policing, limits on the measurements of the spinnaker to a % of the maximum measured values are suggested. After preliminary discussions with Sailmakers a suggested value of 80% of the SLU, SLE, SMG, and SF used to produce the rated SPA might be considered sufficient to limit the potential value of a sail in light airs due to short luff length while producing a spinnaker of small area appropriate for use in heavy airs. An additional limitation requiring it to be flown on the lowest suitable halyard might further limit the sails value to heavy airs.**
- Effect of change: Allows a yacht to carry a smaller spinnaker appropriate for downwind sailing in heavier airs without an additional rating adjustment, encouraging a more wide-ranging and seamanlike inventory.
- IRC Technical Committee Comment: While the Technical Committee has sympathy with the intent of the submission, it would be difficult to police and could have unintended consequences. It would for instance potentially offer a boat the option of carrying a 'code zero' as this additional spinnaker. Any limiting size would need to be based on SPA, not linear dimensions which are not rated parameters. The Technical Committee does not support the submission.



IRC Congress 2011

National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

5. Ireland. Submission 2: Rule 22.4, Crew Number/Weight

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

Delete::

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

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

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

Replace:

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

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

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

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

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



IRC Congress 2011

National IRC Owners Associations and IRC Rule Authorities
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

[22.4.6 Rule 22.4 may be amended by Notice of Race.](#)

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

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