MINUTES - OFFSHORE SPECIAL REGULATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE

A Session of the Offshore Special Regulations Sub-Committee of the International Sailing Federation was held at 1430 on Monday 8 November 2004 at the Marriott Hotel, Copenhagen, Denmark

CONTENTS

Present:

Alan Green (Chairman)
Tony Mooney (Vice Chairman)
Bruce Eissner
Patrick Lindquist
Abraham Rosenberg
Jean Sans

Apologies:

Giovanni Iannucci
Peter Taylor

*Please refer to the ISAF Council minutes of 12-13 November 2004 for the **final Council** decision on all recommendations and opinions contained within these minutes.*

1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes were signed of the Offshore Special Regulations Sub-Committee meeting of 10 November 2003. There were no matters arising not covered elsewhere on this agenda.

2. OFFSHORE SPECIAL REGULATIONS

It should be noted that all adopted submissions approved by Council will be effective 1 January 2006, with the exception of Appendix K – effective 1 February 2005.

(a) Submission 024-04 – Sub Committee terms of Reference to be Printed

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission.

(b) Submission 025-04 – Committee Names and Addresses

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission.

(c) Submission 032-04 – Category Zero review

Opinion to Offshore Committee

The Special Regulation Committee supports submission 032-04 from the Chairman of the Offshore Committee
The Special Regulations Sub Committee has appointed a Working Party to review the Category Zero Regulations, whose members are Jean Sans (FRA), Jean Louis Conti (FRA)(to represent IMOCA, if IMOCA agrees – otherwise an IMOCA representative to be added) with Stan Honey (USA) and Brian Thompson (GBR) also to be approached to join. The Chairman will prepare Terms of Reference.

(d) Submission 033-04 – Canting Keels Working Party

The Special Regulations Sub-Committee received a paper from the Chairman of the Working Party, Mike Urwin, on Canting Keels. Noted that regulations on this subject were urgently awaited and should be implemented as soon as possible. It was decided that this paper should be implemented as Appendix K in the Special Regulations and be in force from 02/05
The applicable ISO Standard is ISO 12217-2 (Small craft -- Stability and buoyancy assessment and categorization -- Part 2: Sailing boats of hull length greater than or equal to 6 m)
With respect to *Knock Down Recovery*, WP definition and IMS definitions differ – WP definition to remain, IMS may change to follow. The WP will define values for Cat 3 & 4.
The Special Regulations Sub-Committee thanked the Working Party for their thorough work on this submission
There are some wording changes throughout the paper, the re-written (after the meeting) Appendix K is attached as Appendix 1 to these minutes.
Note: At the Offshore Committee further editing was made.
Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission as Appendix K in the Special Regulations effective 02/05.

(e) Submission 034-04 – Definitions/Abbreviations

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission

(f) Submission 036-04 – SR 3.03.1(b) Hull Construction Standards (Scantlings)

It was noted that the RYA does not support this submission and suggest a deferral. It was also mentioned that there should be a better way of publishing the ISO Standards, keeping in mind the costs of purchasing such standards.

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission

(g) Submission 035-04 – SR 3.04 Stability – Monohulls

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission

(h) Submission 037-04 – SR 3.07.1 Exits - Multihulls

It was noted that in multihulls undertaking Category 4 races, the crew will be spending a minimum time below decks.

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission with the following amendment: -

*3.07.1a) In multihulls of **8**m (**26.2** ft) LOA and greater, each hull, which contains accommodation, shall have at least two exits. Mu0,1,2,3,4*
*3.07.1b) In multihulls of less than **8**m (**26.2** ft) LOA each hull which contains accommodation shall have at least two exits Mu0,1,2,3*

(i) Submission – 038-04 – SR 3.08.2 Hatches and Companionways

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission

(j) Submission – 039-04 – SR 3.14.3 - supports outside lifeline enclosure

Both the RYA and AYF expressed concerns, with regards to the RCD in the case of the RYA.

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to reject the submission

(k) Submission – 040-04 – SR 3.14.6(a) – Lifeline materials

It was noted that due to the cost implications the Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Norway, Finland and Denmark) will opt out of the proposed revision to this regulation

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission.

(l) Submission – 041-04 – SR 3.15 (c) – Multihull net material

There was discussion in the committee but no consensus could be reached. It could be beneficial (both to the person and the fixing points) that a net stretched to absorb shock if a crew fell on it. However low-stretch net was thought by some to be desirable on very large multihulls to avoid it sagging too much.

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to defer the submission for further discussion.

(m) Submission – 042-04 – SR 4.02 – Hull Marking

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission amended to read as follows:

'4.02.2 Multihulls shall show on their underside, where it can be seen when inverted, a concentrated area on each hull of highly visible colour (e.g. Day-Glo pink, orange, or yellow) of at least one square meter. Mu0, 1,2,3,4'

(n) Submission – 043-04 – SR 4.04.1 – Jackstay Materials

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission

(o) Submission – 044-04 – SR 4.10.4 – Automated Information System (AIS)

The committee heard a short presentation by Michael Devonshire (Chairman of the International Regulations Commission) on the AIS system, which has been implemented on merchant shipping. Broadcast data from vessels can be displayed on either the radar screen or repeater display on other vessels. Class B (under development) is a simpler system that would transmit only a small amount of data. The Committee would like the system to be as simple as possible, so as to reduce cost and complexity. It was reported that the system had been used in the previous Figaro Race by the race escort guard-boat to track shipping.

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to support the submission that for Category 0 a Class A system be required. It was agreed to recommend to defer the rest of the submission as the system is in its infancy and that its further inclusion in the Special Regulations is premature.

(p) Submission 031-04 – 4.22.1(a) Lifesling - Appendix D

There were concerns about commercial implications and patent rights but it was accepted that the Seattle Safety at Sea Foundation is a non-profit organisation devoted to lifesaving which will not commercially exploit their patent rights.

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission

(q) Submission – 045-04 – SR 6 – Training for Category 2 races

In Australia, Brazil, France and UK the requirement for Sea Survival courses, including practical liferaft tests, was increasingly the norm. Often the stipulation of having such qualifications increased interest in the race. Concerns were raised that some Category 2 races may try to reduce their status to Category 3 to avoid doing the training, which may have safety consequences but this fear should not put us off extending the training requirement if we thought it right to do so.

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to adopt the submission.

.

3. SPECIAL REGULATION – CATEGORY 5

It was noted that some sports boat classes have chosen to use Category 5 in their racing.

4. TRAINING

It was recommended that a page be established on the ISAF website showing which MNA's are currently running ISAF approved courses. It is also noted that the ISAF logo should be used on certificates from ISAF approved courses.

Abraham Rosenberg commented that in Brazil, the courses have been run for three years and are steadily becoming more popular, with more power boaters also joining the courses. Also, the French Sailing Federation has set-up training courses through two approved centres. The Vendee Globe Notice of Race specified that the skippers had to pass training courses in order to compete. Tony Mooney commented that the Australian courses are more onerous than the standard ISAF approved courses.

5. CLASS RULES – SPECIAL REGULATIONS

(a) IMOCA Class Submissions – 211-04 – 294-04

It was noted that the inclusion of the Special Regulations within class rules is bad practice and should be avoided. The Chairman recommended that IMOCA should undertake to assist the Special Regulations Sub-Committee in the reviewing of the Category 0 regulations

Opinion to the Offshore Committee

The opinion of the Special Regulations Sub-Committee is to defer the submission

6. MARINE ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION

The chairman apologized that reports from the UK Marine Accident Investigation Branch had not yet been circulated. They will be circulated shortly. Also mentioned was the web site of the Nautical Institute, www.nautinst.org which had many relevant cases. Bruce Eissner mentioned a medal for bravery

was awarded in the USA, and that reports on the web site of US Sailing were generated on the incidents from eyewitness accounts etc.

The chairman asked for a volunteer to locate and collate as much of this data as possible and make it available to the sailing public via the ISAF web site.

7. PRESENTATIONS

(a) INMARSAT L- Band EPIRB service (INMARSAT-E)

Michael Devonshire gave a presentation on the Inmarsat System E. Some users of the 'E' system were calling for a continuation of the service past the proposed cancellation date of the end of 2006. The following points were noted:

- Only approx 1300 registered users – mainly in Germany
- Technically the best, though very expensive
- Only two current manufacturers in the World
- Not commercially viable to maintain required infrastructure
- Immarsat will replace the 'E' system hardware with '406' beacons free of charge to the owners.

After careful consideration of the arguments including those presented by the Deutscher Segler Verband, the virtually unanimous conclusions were:

(i) to express appreciation to INMARSAT for its dedication to safety of life at sea, and to those agencies who support INMARSAT in the development of its services including the Type E EPIRB.

(ii) to express regret that the technically superior Type E service will be withdrawn.

(iii) to concur with the stated reasons for the withdrawal.

(b) Mobilert – Man Overboard Alert System

The Committee received a presentation from Mobilert on a new Man overboard alert system from Australia. It is a simple, low cost system, which has been trialled in Australian Offshore racing.
The committee thanked Mobilert for their presentation and wish them all the successes in the future. Website: www.mobilert.com

8. LIFERAFTS

The committee noted that ISO Standard 9650 has been published in its final draft and is very similar to the ISAF regulations on life rafts. It was proposed that these two standards be equally acceptable under Special Regulations, as there was very little difference between the two.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS NOT BASED ON SUBMISSIONS

(a) ISAF Regulation 21 – Anti-doping Code

Although the proposed changes to ISAF regulation 21 – Anti-Doping Code – were rejected, the Special Regulations Sub-Committee were concerned at the changes and suggest that Working Party for Regulation 21 work with the Special Regulations Sub-Committee, the Oceanic Sub Committee and other suitable committees to minimise the possible effects on offshore sailors who should not be burdened with onerous and impractical rules.

10. ANNUAL REPORT

The Committee noted that the Chairman would prepare a report covering the period 1 January 2004 to 31 December 2004.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Abraham Rosenberg asked if the Special Regulations were to be translated into any other languages? The answer was that several countries already do this via their national authorities. He also suggested that for non-English speaking countries there should be diagrams to help illustrate points. He offered to send to the Chairman the CD ROMs he had developed for his Lecture courses in Brazil and suggested that they be placed on the ISAF website. This will be considered by the Chairman and the ISAF webmaster. The chairman will welcome the provision of suitable diagrams from any source.

There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1830.

Appendix 1
Proposed Appendix K – Variable Ballast

Note: Subsequent to the Special Regulations meeting further amendments were made to this draft – see Offshore Committee meeting minutes.

ISAF Special Regulations

DRAFT APPENDIX K

Moveable and Variable Ballast

Effective From 1st February 2005

This Appendix invokes International Standard ISO 12217-2, Small craft - Stability and buoyancy assessment and categorization - Part 2: Sailing boats of hull length greater than or equal to 6m. The functions FKR (Knockdown Recovery Factor) and FIR (Inversion Recovery Factor) are as defined in ISO 12217-2, except as modified by this Appendix.

This Appendix applies to Monohull Yachts only. Unless specifically stated, a requirement applies to Special Regulations Categories 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4. This Appendix does not apply to boats racing under Category 5.

1. Definitions

Static Ballast:	Lead or other material including water which has no practical function in the boat other than to increase weight and/or to influence stability and/or trim and which may not be moved or varied in weight while a boat is racing.
Moveable Ballast:	Lead or other material including water which has no practical function in the boat other than to increase weight and/or to influence stability and/or trim and which may be moved but not varied in weight while a boat is racing.
Variable Ballast:	Water carried for the sole purpose of influencing stability and/or trim and which may be varied in weight and/or moved while a boat is racing..

2. Stability

2.1 Boat Condition

In the calculation of stability data:

a) deck and other enclosed volume above the sheerline may be taken into account, in which case offsetting cockpit volume shall also be taken into account.

b) mass shall be taken as Minimum Operating Mass as defined by ISO 12217-2, paragraph 3.5.3.

2.2 General Standards

In the assessment of ISO category for yachts fitted with moveable and/or variable ballast, ISO 12217-2, paragraph 6.1.4 b) shall not apply. Boats shall comply with the requirements of ISO 12217-2 paragraphs 6.2.3, 6.3 (if appropriate) and 6.4. Calculations shall be made for the ballast condition that results in the most adverse result when considering each individual stability requirement.

2.2 Knockdown Recovery

Boats with moveable/variable ballast shall comply with the following minimum values of Knockdown Recovery Factor (FKR) calculated in accordance with ISO 12217-2 paragraph 6.4.4 with the lesser of FKR_{90} and FKR_{-90} used:

SR Category	0	1,2	3	4
FKR	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7

2.3 Inversion Recovery

For boats racing under Special Regulations Category 0, Regulation 3.04.1 is modified to read:

> 3.04.1 Either with, or without, reasonable intervention from the crew, a yacht shall be capable of self-righting from an inverted position. Self righting shall be achievable whether or not the rig is intact. Boats with moveable/variable ballast shall comply with this requirement in flat water using manual power only and shall demonstrate that any equipment to be used in re-righting the boat is ready for use at all times and will function and is useable by the crew with the boat inverted. Re-righting the boat shall not require flooding any part of the boat.
>
> Boats with moveable/variable ballast shall comply with the following minimum values of Inversion Recovery Factor (FIR) calculated in accordance with ISO 12217-2:
>
> | SR Category | 0 |
> |---|---|
> | FIR | 0.9 |

3. Structure

3.1 Keel 'Wet Box'

A canting keel pivot and associated keel actuator/control mechanism shall be completely

contained within a watertight enclosure which shall comply with SR 3.02.2.

3.2 Ballast Tanks, Valves and Sea Cocks

Ballast tanks for variable ballast shall be securely and permanently fixed to a boat's structure and shall be cross connected through an appropriate system of isolating valves and pump(s) capable of manual operation. A plan of the plumbing system shall be kept aboard the boat.

4. Control Systems, Actuators

4.1 Manual Power

Moveable and variable ballast systems shall be fitted with permanently installed manual control and actuation systems which are immediately operable by a boat's crew with the boat at any angle of heel.

4.2 Keel Locking

Moveable ballast systems shall be fitted with a method of locking the keel on the centreline. The system shall be designed to be capable of withstanding the maximum designed keel sailing loads including appropriate factors of safety and shall remain operable even if the keel actuation system has failed.