



IRC Congress 2011

IRC Technical Committee
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

From The

IRC Technical Committee

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

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

Proposed additions are printed in blue.

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

Original version : 2.

Version: 3.

Changes: Inclusion as 2. of proposed amendment to Rule 10.6. Re-number as appropriate
Replacement in 7. of **waterline** with **waterplane** twice.
Inclusion of h in 7.



IRC Congress 2011

IRC Technical Committee
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

1. Rules 9.6 and 9.7

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

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

Effect of change: None. Clarification only.



IRC Congress 2011

IRC Technical Committee
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

2. Rule 10.6

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

The problem as the rule is written is that pedantically, unless the TCC increases by at least 0.010, the Rating Authority may not act. It is therefore proposed that the requirement for a minimum increase in TCC should be deleted thus giving the Rating Authority complete freedom to act as and if it sees fit.

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

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



IRC Congress 2011

IRC Technical Committee
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

3. Rule 21.5.3

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

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

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



IRC Congress 2011

IRC Technical Committee
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

4. Rule 21.7

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

Amend

21.7.1 Headsail area (HSA) shall be calculated from:

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

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

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

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

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

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



IRC Congress 2011

IRC Technical Committee
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

5. Rule 22.3.3

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

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

Effect of change: Improved rule compliance.



IRC Congress 2011

IRC Technical Committee
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

6. Definition of LP

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

Amend: LP The **luff perpendicular** of the largest area headsail on board and which may be used while racing. For a **cutter rig**, LP is measured as the shortest distance from the 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. Improved clarity.



IRC Congress 2011

IRC Technical Committee
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

7. Definitions of y and h

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

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

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

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

Amend: h The vertical distance between the **waterline** **waterplane** and the lowest point on the stem at a tangent of 45⁰ to the longitudinal axis.

Effect of change: Correction of errors and improved clarity.



IRC Congress 2011

IRC Technical Committee
Proposed IRC Rule Changes For 2012

8. Corrections

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

- 8.1 In Rule 9.6, replace ~~8.6~~ with **8.9**.
- 8.2 In Rule 25.1 replace ~~18~~ with **16**.
- 8.3 In Rule 26.1 add **Competitors'** as first word and replace ~~20.9~~ with **20.7**.
- 8.4 In the definition of LH, replace ~~Length of Hull~~ with **Hull Length**.