



Royal Ocean Racing Club Rating Office

Minutes Of The Inaugural Meeting Of The IRC Congress Held At The Royal Ocean Racing Club On Friday 1st October 2004

Present

Members:	Marta Eroles	RANC, Spain
	Eric Fries	UNCL Vice President, France
	Chris Frost	South African IRC Owners' Association, South Africa
	Pierre Hamon	UVAI, Italy
	Mark Houghton	HKYA, Hong Kong
	Denis Kiely	Irish Sailing Association
	Paul King	GBR IRC Owners' Association, GBR
	Lucien Lejeune	FRBY, Belgium
	Godwin Zammatt	Royal Malta Yacht Club, Malta
RORC/UNCL	Mike Urwin	RORC Rating Office Technical Director
	Peter Wykeham-Martin	RORC General Manager
	Ludovic Abollivier	UNCL Centre de Calcul Executive
	Didier Dardot	UNCL President
Observers:	Jenny Howells	RORC IRC Manager
	Ricardo Provini	UVAI, Italy
	Dave Quinn	ISA Racing Manager, Ireland

1. Introduction and welcome from the RORC Technical Director in the Chair.

The RORC Technical Director welcomed all those present, particularly those who had travelled long distances. He advised those present that he would chair the meeting until a Chairman had been formally elected under agenda item 5 and would then stand aside.

2. Apologies for absence and proxy votes.

Apologies for absence had been received from Ronnie Barmatz (Israel), John Ferguson (Malaysia), Carme Ferreira (Portugal), Bill Gasson (Thailand), Dan Nowlan (USA), Joaquim Marques da Silva (Portugal), Cahit Uren (Turkey), and Yachting Australia.

Bill Gasson (Thailand) had advised that he wished the Chairman of the meeting to hold his proxy vote.

3. To formally note the recognition in November 2003 of IRC as an International Rating System by ISAF.

Noting particularly that with the current restructuring of the ISAF Offshore Committee, that IRC would in future have direct representation on this Committee, the Congress took note of the ISAF recognition.

4. To formally note and adopt the International IRC Owners' Association Constitution.

The Congress noted and approved the adoption of the International IRC Owners' Association Constitution.



5. To elect a Chairman and 2 Vice Chairmen.

Proposed by Mark Houghton and seconded by Denis Kiely, Paul King was unanimously elected as Chairman of the International IRC Owners' Association.

Paul King took the Chair.

Chris Frost (South Africa), proposed by Mike Urwin and seconded by Mark Houghton, and Didier Dardot (France), proposed by Paul King and seconded by Peter Wykeham-Martin, were unanimously elected as Vice Chairmen of the International IRC Owners' Association.

In accordance with the Constitution, the two Vice Chairmen are from different continents.

6. To receive reports from National IRC Representatives.

Written National reports had been received from Australia, GBR, Malta, South Africa, and Spain.

It was noted the Australian report touched on the issue of measurement. The Technical Director noted that his recent visit showed very good and competitive IRC racing. Measurement was an issue because of the geographic spread of racing throughout the country.

Verbal reports were received from those present.

Lucien Lejeune noted that Belgium had been one of the first users of CHS and then IRC. This had for a period been replaced by ORC Club, but following a referendum, IRC had been reinstated. Fleets were now re-building and had reached c100 boats. It was also noted that rather than requiring mandatory measurement for all boats as in some other countries, a regatta check measurement service was provided. This was much appreciated by owners.

Ludovic Abollivier noted that IRC numbers in France were increasing. Two problems had arisen during 2004. The first of these was crew number which following a poll in 2003 had been made mandatory for most races in 2004. This had revealed a possible problem with the calculation of IRC crew number which was being addressed by the IRC Technical Committee.

In discussion, it was noted that the requirement was for an absolute number of crew, ie it was not possible to race with less than IRC crew number. The RORC Technical Director noted that this policy was not supported by the RORC. Denis Kiely advised that for the IRL IRC National Championship, crew number had been used for smaller boats and crew number plus 1 or 2 for larger boats. In Malta, no crew number limitations at all were imposed. Agreeing that the real issue was crew weight, the RORC Technical Director advised that this issue was wholly a matter for race organisers.

The second UNCL problem related to the use of IRC rated parameters to define sportsboats. The Chairman welcomed UNCL's initiative in exploring the use of the RYA/RORC Sportsboat Rule for 2005.

Paul King highlighted the data in the written GBR report that GBR IRC numbers had essentially plateaued and that with only a handful of IMS rated boats, could only grow in future at the expense of local handicap rules. In wider discussion on the division of boats into classes other than by TCC it was noted that DLR limitations could be helpful but that the limitations should be specific to classes rather than fleets. Additionally, sailing instructions should require that sisterships sailed in the same class.

Mark Houghton noted that in Hong Kong the choice was either IRC or local handicap. Some new larger boats had been seen recently. Most owners were broadly happy, particularly noting that sportsboats tended to race separately. Responding to a question from the Chairman, Mark noted that while some interest was being seen, it was as yet somewhat early to be expecting significant growth from China.

Godwin Zammit noted that some 40 boats held IRC certificates in Malta with most also holding either an IMS or ORC Club certificate. While owners were generally happy, the issue of sportsboats racing



alongside cruiser/racers was causing some disquiet. The RMYC are proactive in measuring and controlling IRC rated data.

Denis Kiely noted that the 400 boat Irish IRC fleet represented some 90% of active Irish cruiser/racers. IRC is very settled in Ireland with few major issues. All IRL boats required an endorsed certificate which the RORC Technical Director explained was in essence an audit by the Rating Office of a boat's rated data. Continuing Denis expressed some concern as to whether IRC properly differentiated between 'cruisers' and 'racers'. In response to a question from Eric Fries, the RORC Technical Director agreed that the recent trend towards narrow boats should not be allowed to dominate IRC fleets. In similar vein, Denis noted that sportsboats were also a concern and were specifically excluded from the IRL IRC National Championship.

IRL policy, supported by GBR, was that as far as possible, all races should be dual scored under both IRC and the local handicap system [Echo in Ireland]. Local handicap systems were seen by the Congress as very important to the growth of fleets generally, particularly in that they were a minimal cost to owners. Godwin Zammit noted the potential for growth in Malta by also offering races to the more cruising oriented under a local handicap system.

Ricardo Provini noted that as well as IRC, Italy also had a large IMS fleet with UVAI also issuing these certificates. Choice of which system to use was left to individual clubs with generally high level events being raced under IMS and mid level under IRC. ORC Club was cheaper than IRC which posed a problem for IRC. There were c600 IRC rated boats, c600 full IMS, and c750 ORC Club. Discussions were underway for a possible high level IRC event to be run from Capri. There was little discontent with IRC, although cost might become an issue. The IRC Congress was very important to UVAI and FIV.

Marta Eroles suggested that IRC races between Spain and Italy should be considered. Continuing, Marta noted that approximately 50% of Spanish racing was under IRC with the remainder under IMS and that IRC was growing at the expense of IMS. High IRC growth was being seen in Spain with an anticipated 800 boats rated by the end of 2004. Particular growth centres were the Canaries and the Basque area. Marta expressed some concern with the secrecy of IRC which on occasion left her unable to answer questions. Certificates in Spain were 'verified' which required official weighing and measuring.

Addressing other issues raised by RANC, Marta Eroles requested that the English language EXCEL input spreadsheet should also be made available in other languages. The Rating Authority would progress this. Marta also asked for certificates to be translated into other languages, such as Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish. UNCL agreed to look into this. Detail on the SSSN System, including 'Adjustment Value' was available from the RORC Rating Office website at www.rorcrating.com. The Rating Authority will publish agreed IRC Rule changes as soon as these have been confirmed.

Chris Frost advised that in South Africa IRC was used for high level events with a local 'golf' handicap used for others. There was significant potential for IRC growth in South Africa with a general revival of interest, the South African America's Cup campaign, and the revival of major races all being contributory factors. Originally IRC data was derived from either IMS data or was owner supplied. This had however created significant accuracy problems and it was now a requirement that all boats were measured. Paul King noted that this policy was at the discretion of each country.

7. To receive a report from the RORC Director of Rating

The RORC Technical Director highlighted that his report showed c3% compound growth in worldwide IRC rated boats over the last few years. This was likely to at least continue with the interest now seen from the USA. A significant issue was the need to protect the general fleets from the perception that with its use at events such as Admiral's Cup, IRC was becoming a grand prix rule.

In response to a question from Denis Kiely, Peter Wykeham-Martin advised the Congress that work continued on the new grand prix rule with publication scheduled for 2005. Demand for the rule had been confirmed. The TP52 Class would be a good fit into the new rule. The RORC would like to say more publicly, but needed to be factual. Responding, Denis noted that for the good of IRC, the new rule



could not come soon enough. Responding to a question from Eric Fries, the RORC Technical Director noted that 'IRC Grand Prix' was really IRM.

8. To note IRC Notice #1 2004 - Headsails and Spinnakers, 13 April 2004 (attached)

The Congress took note.

9. Proposed 2005 IRC Rule Changes:

9.1 GBR Submissions, paper 'GBR IRC Committee IRC Rules 2005' (attached)

The Congress approved the proposed changes 1 to 3.

Proposal 4 was also accepted, but noting that experience elsewhere (eg Nautor Swan Rating Rule) had demonstrated that RRS 52 could be deleted entirely without adverse effect, the Congress agreed that RRS 52 should be deleted entirely for the adjustment and operation of sails and movable appendages for all boats. It was also agreed that the right of a Notice of Race to amend this Class Rule should be retained. The Technical Committee would carry out the required re-drafting.

Proposal 5 was also accepted, but the Congress agreed that the Technical Committee should further investigate the necessity for sub clause a) relating to full length battens.

After some discussion and noting that the GBR IRC Committee had not approved proposal 6, that the possibility of loopholes could not be immediately excluded, and that the immediate problem was related to primarily Wally Class boats only, the Congress agreed to defer the proposal for one year to allow time for further research. The Congress however recognised that Organising Authorities could amend the IRC Rule in this respect if they wished to.

9.2 South African Sailing Submission and RORC Rating Office amendment (attached)

The Congress agreed with the purpose and intent of the South African IRC Owners' Association submission and accepted the proposed re-wording by the RORC Rating Office.

9.3 GBR IRC Chairman's Submission (attached)

The Congress agreed with the proposal from the Chairman of the GBR IRC Committee to amend Rule 4.1 of the Constitution. The RORC Rating Office would carry out the necessary re-drafting.

9.4 RANC Submissions (attached)

Submissions 1 and 2 were accepted. LL would in future be printed on all certificates and the wording relating to keel bulbs and wings clarified.

The Technical Committee would investigate the First 35s5 keel issue raised in submission 3.

As requested by submission 4, noting IRC Rule 2.7, the Rating Authority would nevertheless in future use actual measured overhang data unless it had good grounds to do otherwise.

Submission 5 was not accepted. It was noted that the rule administrators were very experienced in reviewing submitted weight data and that boats, even of the same LOA, varied very substantially in weight. RANC would forward the data they had generated to the Technical Committee.

It was noted that ISAF Special Regulations already require internal ballast to be securely fastened to a boat's structure. Additionally in some cases internal ballast was in the form of water. Submission 6 was therefore not accepted.



A paper (available separately) from the RORC Technical Director on the subject of weighing boats in travel lifts was tabled in response to the RANC paper on the subject. It was agreed by RANC that the process was difficult and was subject to potentially significant errors. Summarising after some discussion, Paul King noted that use of this process was a matter for a Rule Authority, that it was clearly not as reliable or accurate as a single point lift, but in the absence of any other option was better than nothing.

10. To appoint the IRC Technical Committee.

The Congress appointed Mike Urwin, nominated by the RORC, and Jean Sans, nominated by UNCL, as the IRC Technical Committee.

11. To nominate the IRC representative to the ISAF Offshore Committee.

Noting Paul King's previous experience as a member of the ISAF Offshore Committee, and his role in the current re-structuring, the Congress were unanimous that Paul should represent IRC at ISAF.

12. AOB.

It was noted that the ORC had made a submission to ISAF requesting confirmation of ORC Club's status as an International Rating System. No information was available to the Congress on ORC Club's compliance with ISAF regulations in this respect.

It was noted that the 2005 IRC Congress meeting would probably be held in France at a similar time of year.

Paul King closed the meeting by again thanking all the delegates for attending. He hoped they would agree that the inaugural meeting of the Congress had been successful and worthwhile and he looked forward to meeting with everyone again next year.



IRC Notice #1 2004 - Headsails and Spinnakers

A problem with compliance with the definitions for headsails and spinnakers has recently come to light. Current IRC Rule 26.3.4, last amended at the beginning of 2001, says:

26.3.4 RRS 50.4 shall not apply.

A headsail is defined as a sail tacked down forward of the foremost mast with half width (measured as a headsail) not exceeding 75% of LP. Any other sail set forward of the foremost mast is a spinnaker and shall have half width (measured as a spinnaker) greater than 75% of foot.

This has been amplified by a published interpretation dated 20th November 2002, the substance of which is:

The rule applies in the order it is written. Therefore:

- *If the sail satisfies the definition of a headsail (ie. HHW not exceeding 75% of LP) then it rates as a HEADSAIL.*
- *If the sail does NOT satisfy the definition of a headsail then it rates as a SPINNAKER, and then the SHW must be at least 75% of SF.*

While this IRC rule has been unchanged since 1991 without apparent problem, during that period, the design of asymmetric spinnakers has advanced significantly. They are also now more commonly used as standard heavy airs spinnakers. Recent information from measurers and sailmakers now leads us to conclude that there are a significant number of 'spinnakers' in use which if fully measured in accordance with the above should in practice be rated under IRC as headsails. It is accepted that this is inadvertent and that there has been no attempt to manipulate IRC Rules.

The IRC Technical Committee has therefore reviewed IRC Rule 26.3.4 and concluded that a change will be required for 2005. The proposed (***unconfirmed***) change is:

26.3.4 RRS 50.4 shall not apply.

A spinnaker is defined as a sail set forward of the foremost mast with half width (measured as a spinnaker) greater than 75% of foot. Any other sail tacked down forward of the foremost mast is a headsail.

Additionally, in the interests firstly of gathering as much information as possible prior to confirming this change for 2005 and secondly to ensure as much equity as possible for the remainder of this year, **boats carrying sails rated as headsails under the current rule which under the proposed revised rule will be rated as spinnakers are invited to apply through their local Rule Authority for dispensation for those sails to be rated as spinnakers for the remainder of 2004. Dispensations granted will not be back-dated to before the date of application.**

For further information, please contact Mike Urwin at mikeurwin@rorcrating.com or Jenny Howells at jenny@rorcrating.com

Mike Urwin
RORC Rating Office Technical Director
13 April 2004
IRC Notice #1 2004.DOC



IRC CONGRESS - RORC RATING OFFICE REPORT 2004

Firstly, to express my personal welcome to all members of this new body, formed as a result of last year's recognition by ISAF of IRC as an International Rating System. The ISAF recognition is welcome and recognises the de facto international standing that IRC already had. A side benefit is that from 2004, IRC will be represented on the ISAF Offshore Committee, giving us a direct voice in the governance and development of our sport.

Internationally, 2003 saw a further increase in the number of boats rated by the RORC Rating Office under IRC to 3255 (2002: 3155). Internationally, including both the RORC Rating Office and UNCL Centre de Calcul, a total of 5845 boats were issued with IRC certificates, an increase of 1.7% over 2002's 5747. At the end of August 2004, Rating Office issued IRC certificates totalled 2984 compared with 2002's 2893, further growth of a little over 3%.

The total number of countries represented among these was 31 with 15 countries on 4 continents having fleets of 25 or more boats. Serious American interest in IRC was first expressed in 2003. This has continued in 2004 with the first ever IRC regatta in the USA: the Big Boat Series in San Francisco. Early in 2004, we signed an agreement with US Sailing to administer IRC in the US. With Peter Wykeham-Martin, RORC General Manager, I also attended a seminar in July 2004 sponsored by the Storm Trysail Club at which a number of East Coast US clubs were represented. The day went very well and further discussions continue with US Sailing and their clubs. We view all of this as extremely positive for IRC and its continued growth into the future.

Internationally, IRC continues to be used successfully for a huge number of races and regattas. To mention just a couple that I was fortunate enough to attend: the RORC Rating Office was represented at Cork Week by Jenny Howells and Katherine Harker, as well as myself. Inevitably perhaps, the presence of the two canting keel MaxZ86s rather tended to dominate attention at the top end of the fleet. In the smaller boat classes however, there was the usual wide range of winners with the best sailed boats coming out on top. Boat of the week was TARKA, a First 40.7 originally designed in 1997. I also travelled to Australia and attended Hamilton Island Race Week as Chairman of the International Jury. The winner in the IRC racing class here was the maxi ZANA, very closely followed by a Beneteau First 44.7.

With this spread of winning boats, not just at these regattas, but everywhere else around the world, we do not foresee major changes affecting the main body of the fleet for 2005. There are of course many items on the research agenda; canting keels and water ballast again for instance. We are also in course of re-visiting the treatment of bowsprits as opposed to spinnaker poles. This latter has been commented on by a number of IRC representatives. Our own observations also suggest to us that in some specific cases, technology has moved forward. For the great majority of boats however, changes for 2005 are likely to be of small effect. Rule text changes will be covered in detail during the meeting. One point to note is the change to the definition of spinnakers. This was the subject of a Notice in 2004 and has been caused by developments in both spinnaker and boat design. There is also the related issue of 'code zero' headsails, again covered in other meeting papers.

The RORC has again announced that Admirals Cup 2005 will use IRC for the big boat class. It had been hoped that the new 'grand prix' rule would be in place for this but with progress on this front being somewhat slower than anticipated, IRC will again be used. Exact details are as yet not announced, but similar size and design restrictions to those used in 2003 will be in place. It is hoped that the new rule will be properly in place for future years, hopefully alleviating some of the top end pressure on IRC. As commented last year, the ethos remains that IRC is for all: from the wholly cruising to the wholly racing. We must however ensure that events such as Admiral's Cup do not compromise the bulk of the fleets.

Mike Urwin, Technical Director



GBR IRC Committee

IRC Rules 2005

1. Headsails and Spinnakers

Reason for change: While this IRC rule has been unchanged since 1991 without apparent problem, during that period, the design of asymmetric spinnakers has advanced significantly. They are also now more commonly used as standard heavy airs spinnakers. Recent information from measurers and sailmakers now leads us to conclude that there are a significant number of 'spinnakers' in use which if fully measured in accordance with the above should in practice be rated under IRC as headsails. It is accepted that this is inadvertent and that there has been no attempt to manipulate IRC Rules.

Change: 26.3.4 RRS 50.4 shall not apply.
A spinnaker is defined as a sail set forward of the foremost mast with half width (measured as a spinnaker) greater than 75% of foot. Any other sail tacked down forward of the foremost mast is a headsail.

Effect of change: Recognition of current practice.

2. 'Carry' and 'Use'

Reason for change: It has come to light during 2004 that the words 'carry' and 'use' are used inconsistently through the IRC rules. For instance, Rule 26.3.8 uses 'carry' when in practice it means 'use'. A review will be carried out of the whole rule text.

Change: Various.

Effect of change: None. Consistency.

3. Calculation of Corrected Times

Reason for change: It is unclear in Rule 12.2 how corrected times are to be rounded.

Change: 12.2 The IRC rating is calculated as a Time Corrector (TCC) to three places of decimals. Corrected Times shall be calculated from the TCC to an accuracy of the nearest second with 0.5 seconds rounding upwards.

Effect of change: Consistency in the calculation of results.



4. Stored Power

Reason for change: Increasingly, cruising designs are being fitted with powered sail handling equipment for the convenience of short handed crews rather than any handling advantage. It is becoming common for Race Committees to modify Rule 14.1 to reduce the lower limit of LOA at which this Rule applies.

Change: 14.1 Except as permitted by Rule 27.3, RRS 52, Manual Power, shall apply to the adjustment and operation of sails and movable appendages for boats of LOA less than ~~24~~ 18 metres. For larger boats RRS 52 shall not apply. This Rule may be amended by notice of race.

Effect of change: Recognition of current practice.

5. Mainsail Upper Width

Reason for change: We have seen a number of instances during 2004 of boats with full length mainsail battens above the Mainsail Top Width point accompanied by significant increase in mainsail roach in this area of the sail. During 2004, this has been dealt with on an individual basis.

Proposed change: MUW The seven eighth width of the mainsail measured as the shortest distance between the seven eighth point and the luff, bridging any hollows.

26.5.5 MUW shall be declared for any mainsail with either:
a) any full length battens intersecting the leech above the seven eighth leech point, or:
b) MUW in excess of $0.26 * E$

Effect of change: Prevention of abuse.



6. 'Code Zero' Headsails

Reason for change: We cannot bury our heads in the sand that code zeros do not exist. They do! Currently, 'code zeros' are penalty treated under IRC because they are just rated as a large headsail. In reality, they are of use only in light airs (upwind and down) and close reaching or heavy weather reaching when a spinnaker cannot be set. They are invariably set free flying (ie not attached to the forestay).

The following is a proposal only and has as yet not been agreed by the IRC Technical Committee.

Proposed change:

26.7 Headsails
Headsail area (HSA) shall be calculated from:
$$HSA = LL * ((0.25 * LP) + (1.5 * HHW)) * 0.5$$

In the calculation of HSA, HHW shall not be taken as less than 50% of LP.

26.7.1 Except as permitted by Rule 26.7.3, the following shall be declared:
(a) The luff length (LL), luff perpendicular (LP), and half width (HHW) of the largest area headsail carried.
(b) The longest luff length (LLmax) of any headsail carried.

26.7.2 HSA, LP, and HHW of the largest area headsail, and LLmax will be shown on the boat's certificate. HSA and LLmax are the maximum permitted values.

26.7.3 In addition, a boat may carry and use one headsail which may only be set free flying, ie not attached to the forestay. LL (which may exceed LLmax), LP, and HHW of any such headsail shall be declared. HSA of a code zero headsail may exceed rated HSA with any excess resulting in an increase in TCC.

Effect of change: Equitable treatment of sails in increasingly common usage.

Mike Urwin
RORC Rating Office Technical Director



IRC COUNCIL MEETING: 1 OCTOBER 2004-09-28

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY SOUTH AFRICA

2. Fundamental Policy:

Change 1:

Reason for change:

A number of countries, for example South Africa and Australia have adopted policies of not allowing self-measurement in order to ensure the integrity of the rating. Neither the year book nor rating office website make specific provision for this decision to be implemented by national authorities, although de facto it is an accepted principle, and enquiries and rating requests are in practise referred back to the county of origin.

Change:

Rule 2.7: IRC ratings **may** rely solely on owner submitted data (but see Rules 9.4 and 19), **but National Authorities may insist on boats being weighed and measured by an appointed measurer for certificates issued in their jurisdictions.**

Effect of change:

Recognition of current practise.

Change 2:

Reason for new addition:

To prevent boats registered in one country, but permanently based in another to circumvent local policies in respect of IRC measurement.

New rule:

Rule 2.10: Irrespective of where a yacht is registered, she shall apply to the appointed IRC national authority in the country that she is predominantly moored in for her IRC certificate and subsequent revalidations.

Effect of change:

To close potential loopholes in respect of national authority local policies.



IRC COUNCIL MEETING: 1 OCTOBER 2004

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY SOUTH AFRICA

Accepting that the proposed changes have merit, the RORC Rating Office proposes re-wording the submissions to retain the original purpose and intent, but to comply more closely with existing IRC Rule terminology.

Original Proposed Change 1:

Rule 2.7: IRC ratings **may** rely solely on owner submitted data (but see Rules 9.4 and 19), **but National Authorities may insist on boats being weighed and measured by an appointed measurer for certificates issued in their jurisdictions.**

Proposed re-phrased Change 1:

Rule 2.7: IRC ratings **may** rely solely on owner submitted data (but see Rules 9.4 and 19), **but a Rule Authority (see Rule 5.1) may require that boats are weighed and measured by an appointed measurer for certificates issued under their jurisdiction.**

Original Proposed Change 2:

Rule 2.10: Irrespective of where a yacht is registered, she shall apply to the appointed IRC national authority in the country that she is predominantly moored in for her IRC certificate and subsequent revalidations.

Proposed re-phrased Change 2:

Rule 2.10: Irrespective of where a boat is registered, she shall apply to the appointed IRC Rule Authority (see Rule 5.1) in the country that she predominantly races in for her IRC certificates. Exceptionally, with the agreement of the Rating Authority, she may apply through another Rule Authority.

Mike Urwin
RORC Rating Office Technical Director
29 September 2004
Sub SAS1 Mod.DOC



Proposal from the Chairman of the GBR IRC Committee to amend Rule 4.1 of the draft constitution.

After “Southern Hemisphere)” insert “or by 31 August of the current year”

Reason:

We should recognise as quickly as possible any countries whose IRC numbers are growing. If they reach 25 boats by 31 August they should be entitled to a seat at the meeting of the IRC Congress in the same year. We should not simply replace “31 Dec of the previous year (30 June of the current year in the southern hemisphere)” by 31 August of the current year because there may be countries which reach 25 in a full year but do not reach 25 by 31 August.

If the above is agreed then the number of votes specified in rule 4.4 would be determined by the larger of the number of boats at 31 Dec of the previous year or 31 August of the current year.

This does not require an amendment to rule 4.4.

Paul King
27 September 2004



MODIFICATIONS TO IRC RULES FOR 2005 FROM RANC

- 1) LL measurement has to appear on the certificate. If LL and LL max are not the same you can not check how HSA has been calculated, and there is no way to know LL of the bigger headsail either.
- 2) Don't use the definition "Bulb/aillettes" when the boat has a keel with Bulb and doesn't have "aillettes". The "aillettes" description must be on the certificate just for this kind of keels. And, because of the same reason, don't use "Bulb" on the certificate when the yacht has a keel with "aillettes".
- 3) To decrease the penalty for Keel with Bulb. Considering that a keel with bulb is a keel that inferior part is wider than upper part. In this case RANC studied the two versions of First 35S5 (depending on the keel): Lead deep single keel with draft 1.9 metres and fusing Iron keel with draft 1.8 metres. RANC found that Lead Simple Keel was in advantage. In other words...lead simple keel was more advantageous. Everybody knows that the Lead simple keel version is faster than Bulb Iron Keel so we can not give them facilities to win giving them a "bonus".
- 4) To measure Overhangs when boat is weighted. Weight and overhangs are connected so if weight changes, overhangs must change also. This is not reflected on the certificate because overhangs are always the same even if weight is changed. We propose not to issue a certificate if boat has only been weighted, modifying only weight. In this case overhangs must be measured also.
- 5) About prototype or unknown yachts its very difficult to check the weight the owner has been declared. We don't have STD dates so we should have a list with a maximum weight accepted depending on the LOA. We have studied LOA and weights of 50 boats. This maximum weight accepted is the result of adding 10% at the average of 50 boat's weight depending on LOA.
- 6) About Internal Ballast, according IRC Rules we would add on point 22 the follow:

22.1.6. If Boat is carrying internal ballast, these have to be pig iron, lead, steel, etc...., they have to be fixed and his description, weight and the distance from de bow must be declared on the certificate.