The Oceanic and Offshore Committee met at 09:30 – 18:00 hours on 11 November 2009 at the Paradise Hotel, Busan, Korea

Please refer to the ISAF website www.sailing.org for the details of the submissions referred to in these minutes.

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
3. Chairman’s Report
4. Reports from Working Parties
5. ISAF Recognized Rating Systems
6. Reports from Handicap Systems
7. Advertising Code – Regulation 20
8. Class Applications for ISAF Status
9. Offshore Special Regulations
10. Reports and Opinions of Sub-committees
11. ISAF Sailor Classification Code
12. ISAF Offshore Team World Championship
13. Oceanic Concordat
14. World Sailing Speed Record Council
15. International Regulations Commission
16. Review of Offshore Classes
17. Any other Business

Present:
Jacques Lehn – Chairman
Hans Zuiderbaan – Vice Chairman
Will Apold
Paddy Boyd
Pierre Fehlmann
Bruno Finzi
Alan Green
Janet Grosvenor

Eva Holmsten
Noboru Kobayashi
Patrick Lindqvist
Nils Nordenstrom
Maximo Rivero Kelly
Abraham Rosemberg
Wolfgang Schaefer

David Irish – (Vice-President)

Apologies:
Emigdio Bedia Fernandez
Adrienne Cahalan
Stan Honey

Ioannis Maragoudakis
Antony Matusch

Also in Attendance:
Jason Smithwick
Simon Forbes

Rob Taylor
Henry Thorpe

1. Opening of the Meeting

The Chairman opened the meeting by asking the Committee Members to each give a short introduction.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

(a) Minutes

The minutes of the Offshore Committee meeting of 12 November 2008 were noted.

(b) Minutes Matters Arising

Janet Grosvenor noted that the minutes indicated that she should produce a report on tracking devices. In consultation with the Chairman it had been agreed that there was already sufficient information in the public domain and that a report was not required.
3. Chairman’s Report

The Chairman reported on activity during the year. The first actions following the November 2008 meetings were to consult the new Committee on the representation on other committees. During the year the Chairman had been in touch with both main Rating Systems (ORC and IRC) and attended meetings with RORC, UNCL and the IRC Owners Association in Paris.

In December the Chairman held talks with the Class 40 and encouraged them to apply to be an ISAF Recognised Class.

In April after the Vendee Globe race, the Chairman attended the General Assembly of the IMOCA 60 Class in Barcelona where the experiences from the race were evaluated.

On the subject of Offshore Special Regulations, the November 2008 decision to implement in January 2010 a reduction in maximum sizes of storm jibs and storm trysails met with a strong lobbying to change this decision. In March the Chairman met with the Chairman of Special Regulations Sub-committee and working party members at the ISAF Offices in Southampton where plans were discussed to re-draft the Special Regulations, the issue of storm sails and other developments. In June an email vote was conducted of the Special Regulations and the Oceanic and Offshore Committee and it was agreed to ‘grandfather’ all existing storm sails from the proposed 2010 size requirements.

During the year the Chairman implemented the concept of an ‘Oceanic Concordat’ whereby ISAF and major Oceanic Event organisers enter into a signed agreement to co-ordinate the calendar of events and share experiences, currently agreement has been reached with the organisers Route du Rhum, The Transat and Vendee Globe, with discussions ongoing with Volvo Ocean Race.

The Chairman had also been in communication with the organisers of the Velux 5 Oceans Race regarding their approval by the FFV to start from La Rochelle and issues with the ECO 60 class.

4. Reports from Working Parties

(a) Standard Parameters and Notation / Measurement Platform

Nils Nordenstrom advised that this project originated in the Empirical Handicap Sub-committee. The various empirical handicap systems wished to exchange data and need a common format and definitions to ensure comparable data was being used. He felt that the users of this system would be the ORC and IRC Rating Systems, all Empirical Handicap Systems, Designers, Builders, Class Associations and Sailors.

It was the intention of the Working Party to strictly adhere to the Equipment Rules of Sailing, and that where possible abbreviations are in line with ERS terminology. He felt that the criticism from IRC and ORC has been that they want to continue using what they are currently doing. There is a need for more abbreviations particularly for items not yet covered by the ERS. The proposed system was not mandatory and he planned to keep the Chairman of the Equipment Control Sub-committee updated so as not to conflict with ERS development.

It was noted that the working party members from the ORC and IRC were not very supportive of the direction that the working party was heading in. Mike Urwin (observer) as the IRC Rating representative advised that he wished to withdraw from the Working Party.
The Chairman summarised that a lot of work had been done on the project, more time was needed but work should continue with a long-term vision aiming for a final document. Some proposals might be adopted into the ERS, to cover definitions relevant to offshore boats. In the long-term some work might even be the basis for a new rating rule one day! The previous working party chairman Kjell Borking, whilst not on this Committee any more, was willing to continue and the working party should seek new members to encourage a wider participation with the work in the hope that some organisations will like to use it.

(b) Offshore Special Regulations re-draft

The Chairman of the Special Regulations Sub-committee reported that a Working party meeting had concluded that the vast majority of users were in Category 4 and that a draft should be produced of Category 4 regulations relevant to owners with the design/building issues in a separate appendix. Category 3 could then be presented as a step up process of the additional requirements. One of the objectives given had been to clearly separate the recommendations from the regulations and the proposed draft does this using hyperlinks in a pdf document. The Special Regulations Sub-committee had recommended that the document should be restyled with input from a graphic designer and would benefit from extensive use of graphics and that a budget for this should be requested. It was proposed that the focus should be on the electronic version of the document, which should be formatted for easy printing and that a checklist for each Category be incorporated.

Vice President Dave Irish advised that he would seek financial support from the Executive Committee for a document designer for this project and that it should move forward quickly.

5. ISAF Recognized Rating Systems

(a) Empirical Handicap Sub-committee Terms of Reference

Submission 007-09 was received from the Norwegian Sailing Federation proposing the incorporation of Rating systems into the Sub-committee Terms of Reference. It was noted that the Empirical Handicap Sub-committee had on a vote of 2 in favour and one against recommended approval of the submission, as amended by the EHSC (which was to delete point (b)).

Nils Nordenstrom, Chairman of the Empirical Handicap Sub-committee observed that the distinction between rating systems and empirical handicap systems was arbitrary, that empirical handicap systems had many more users and that it would be beneficial to get all parties together in one forum.

Bruno Finzi suggested that a good solution would be to ask the Empirical Handicap Sub-committee to come back with a revised submission for exchange of information between IRC and ORC rating systems.

Mike Urwin (observer) on behalf of IRC said that the matter had been discussed at the IRC Congress and that they were happy with the current situation of reporting through the Oceanic and Offshore Committee.

The Chairman noted that the submission did not address how Representatives of rating systems were to become members of the Sub-committee.

The Committee voted on the proposal as amended by EHSC:

On a vote of 1 in favour, 12 against and 1 abstention the submission was rejected.

Opinion: Reject
No need for this item. It would also require a change of membership which is not included in the submission.

Council Decision: Reject

(b) Oceanic and Offshore Committee Terms of Reference

Submission 107-09 was received from the IRC Owners Association proposing the reinstatement of two committee seats for ISAF Recognised Rating systems into the Oceanic and Offshore Committee Terms of Reference.

Janet Grosvenor noted that for the period 2005-2008, representatives from IRC and ORC Rating Systems had specific positions on the Offshore Committee. The intention of the submission was to reinstate the previous situation with one member from each of ORC and IRC.

It was suggested that 15.17.2 would need to be modified to clarify that these two representatives were clearly in addition to the other members listed. Some felt that the regulation should enable future rating systems to also be represented. There was a suggestion to just adopt the second part of the submission relating to 6.1.1, the nomination of candidates for membership of the committee. Mike Urwin (observer) on behalf of IRC confirmed that this second part of the submission was not the main thrust of the submission.

On the basis that majority of the committee expressed views in favour of the submission, but that the proposed wording needed further work, Janet Grosvenor on behalf of the IRC Owners Association withdrew the submission.

(c) IRC World Championship, Offshore Rating World Championships, ORC

Submissions 108-09, 109-09 and 110-09 were received and discussed together.

108-09 from the IRC Owners Association proposing the addition of a World Championship for IRC Rating Rule, 109-09 from the Executive Committee on amendments to Regulation 18 and 28.3 regarding World Championships and 110-09 from the Executive Committee regarding the recognition of ORC under Regulations 18.7 and 29.

Vice-President Dave Irish spoke for submission 109-09 which was based on the principle that all ISAF-recognised Rating systems should be treated in the same manner. That ISAF should not make judgements of value or quality between ISAF recognized rating systems and that World Championships should be applicable to all such systems.

Bruno Finzi recalled that in 2002 a working party chaired by Jack Caldwell had produced the current regulation 28.3 which ensures that qualification for a rating system to hold a world championship is that it is based on measurement and scientific formulation available to all certificate holders. Bruno felt that this was important so that all competitors understand who they are racing against and noted that the IRC GBR National Championships are raced in five divisions which could imply five world championship titles. Deleting Regulation 28.3 could also imply that other empirical handicap systems could be able to apply to hold world championships. He questioned whether ISAF really wanted world championships to be granted on subjective empirical handicaps. His conclusion was that a rating system cannot simply be considered a class.

Will Apold spoke in support of the submissions, IRC is a rating system recognised by ISAF, it has different origins from ORC but he felt it was reasonable to support the submission.
Wolfgang Schaefer felt the whole matter should be referred to a working party to explore the matter very carefully including the distinction between a class and a group of different boats competing under a handicap rule.

Paddy Boyd felt that the large number of boats rated under IRC needed to be embraced.

Patrick Lindqvist felt that opening up world championship titles under rating systems would lead to manufacturer-based worlds such as Beneteau or X-yachts and that a working party to review problem and come up with a plan was needed.

Nils Nordenstrom observed that it was not merely a question of large numbers of boats with certificates and that the difference between rating systems and empirical handicap systems is hard to distinguish.

Abe Rosemberg felt that some submissions were not coming from the sailors but from the Executive downwards.

Janet Grosvenor clarified that submission 108-09 comes from the sailors, the International IRC Owners Association, who are requesting IRC be granted a World Championship.

Mike Urwin (observer) advised that IRC Rule requires the dimensions of the boat and that it does not apply performance adjustments, therefore IRC is a rating system and not an empirical handicap system. He also noted that the submission for an IRC World Championship originated from a request from the IRC Owners in Greece and that the IRC Technical Committee had no position on the matter.

Ken Kershaw (observer) highlighted that confidentiality of detailed measurements is found in Metre boats and the building specifications of manufacturer-controlled classes. Bruno Finzi felt that this was a different matter from a ‘secret box’ in a rating system.

Hans Zuiderbaan noted that he had been involved during 2002-2004 in creating the International and Recognised Rating systems which included world championships for ‘transparent’ systems. He felt that IRC does contain measurements but the calculations are secret and it is unclear to the certificate holder how the rating number is generated; the designer cannot calculate the difference an alteration to the boat will make to the rating. At the time IRC applied to be an ISAF Rating system they said they had no ambition to hold a World Championship. He felt that the proposed working party should look at the deeper causes of the problem – that a handicap rule is not a class – and that a world championship should bring boats together at the highest level.

Bruno Finzi proposed that the matters be deferred to a working party to propose new ideas and that it has always been in the ORC’s ‘DNA’ to join rating systems together.

Dave Irish felt that the debate was the beginning of a very good discussion and that the aim should be to establish principles with a longer life that would allow ISAF to write down standards and then welcome into the family those that meet them. He would discuss the proposals with the Executive Committee on the basis of a working party to be established to work on the deferred submissions with a report showing some progress by February.

The Chairman summarised the discussion and indicated that in consultation with the ISAF Executive and the parties involved there was support for deferring the submissions to the proposed working party meeting which would be over two days and consider the three deferred submissions as a first step and then as second step expand into overall future strategy.
On a proposal by the Chairman, seconded by Patrick Lindqvist on a vote of 14 in favour, 0 against and one abstention it was agreed to defer submissions 108-09, 109-09 and 110-09.

Recommendation to Council: Defer

Subject to a group being formed to consider the matters raised to meet in February, chaired by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Offshore Committee, and consisting of David Irish, another ISAF Executive Member and two representatives from IRC and two from ORC.

Council Decision: Defer

(d) Regulation 1.1, deletion of Regulation 28.4

Submission 057-09 was received from the Chairman of the Constitution Committee. This ‘house-keeping’ amendment is to clearly place the right of ISAF Rating Systems to make submissions prominently in Regulation 1.1 rather than in Regulation 28.4.

On a vote of 13 in favour, 0 against and 2 abstentions the submission was approved.

Opinion: Approve

Council Decision: Approved

6. Reports from Handicap Systems

(a) ORC International and ORC Club

A report was received from the ORC highlighting that ORC International and ORC Club so far this year have 7200 certificates. The complete documentation of the ORC VPP and ORC Rating Systems is now available for download from the ORC website.

The 2009 ORCi World Championship was held in Brindisi, Italy, with 77 entries from 7 countries making it the best-attended Worlds in nearly a decade. The ORC 670 Class held their fifth Championship in Galicia at La Coruna, attracting 16 entries from 4 countries.

(b) IRC Rating Rule

A report was received from the International IRC Owners Association. The total number of IRC certificated boats at the end of 2008 was 7740 with 26 countries having fleets of 25 boats or more on 6 continents. An annual congress had been held in Paris in October with representatives of 25 IRC National fleets.

It was highlighted that the IRC Rating Rule had adopted the ISAF Equipment Rules of Sailing in their entirety.

7. Advertising Code – Regulation 20

(a) Submission 011-09 was received from the Executive Committee regarding (Part 1) the removal of redundant definitions and a proposed amended Regulation 20 Advertising Code (Part 2). It was noted that submission proposal 2 had been withdrawn with the exception of 20.6.5 relating to the wearing of bibs which was not considered relevant to this committee.

On a vote of 12 in favour, 0 against and 3 abstentions the submission was approved as amended:

Opinion: Approve with the following amendment:
Approve proposal 1 under the understanding proposal 2 is withdrawn with the exception of 20.6.5 which the committee have no opinion on.

**Council Decision: Approved with an amendment to 20.6.5**

(b) Submission 013-09 was received from the Executive Committee regarding the addition of Regulation 20.5.8 to include the responsibilities of a National Class Association when entering into a sponsorship contract.

On a vote of 1 in favour, 3 against and 10 abstentions the submission was rejected.

**Opinion: Reject**

**Council Decision: Approved with amendment**

(c) Submission 015-09 was received from the Executive Committee regarding the addition of 20.8.3 to limit the variation in entry fees for boats carrying advertising.

Some members felt that variable entry fees were a disincentive to boats carrying low level sponsorship.

Event organisers advised that the suggestion that no variation should be permitted would have a significant impact on their budgets. Charging an additional entry fee for boats carrying advertising does in fact subsidise the entry fees of non-sponsored boats. Concern was expressed at the suggestion that the word 'only' in 20.8.2 could be interpreted to prohibit variable entry fees.

On a proposal by Bruno Finzi, seconded by Max Kelly the submission as amended was approved on a vote of 13 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention.

**Opinion: Approve with the following amendment**

delete "only" from 20.8.2 and in 20.8.3 replace "should" with "shall"

**Council Decision: Withdrawn**

8. **Class Applications for ISAF Status**

(a) ISAF status applications for Offshore Classes

The Committee noted that since their last meeting in November 2008, two offshore classes had been approved at the mid-year meeting with Provisional Status.

**Recommendation not based on submissions**

*No Offshore Class should be granted ISAF Status without full prior consultation with the Oceanic and Offshore Committee.*

(b) Maxi Class ISAF status Application

It was noted that at the Mid-year Meeting the Equipment Committee made a recommendation to the Council which was approved, to grant the Mini Maxi Racing Division of the Maxi Class Provisional ISAF Class status. At the September meeting of the Executive Committee an additional World Championship for the Maxi division of the International Maxi Association (IMA) was approved.

The Committee noted a letter from IMA specifying that all mini maxis will race together and that the worlds title will be awarded to the best scored boat of the series. The same will apply to the maxi fleet where there will be only one maxi champion for the best scored boat of the fleet, independently if she is considered a racing/cruising, super-maxi or racing boat.
Bruno Finzi expressed concern at the small number of boats racing in each division and in particular the ‘Maxi-Maxi’ Division. Paddy Boyd felt that a World Championship effectively under the IRC Rating system had been granted and was not in the spirit of how the ISAF Regulations are supposed to work.

It was proposed that the Oceanic and Offshore Committee’s terms of reference should be clarified to have the same status in relation to the Equipment Committee regarding the granting of ISAF class status to offshore boats. A submission could be made for the next year’s meeting.

**Recommendation not based on submissions**

*Last year the Offshore Committee made a recommendation on the ISAF status of the Maxi Class and is unhappy that this recommendation was not followed. The Committee is unsure if this application was in compliance with ISAF Regulations and ask the Executive to review the matter.*

(c) **Class 40**

The Committee noted that the Class 40 had been granted provisional class status at the Mid-Year Council meeting following a recommendation from the Equipment Committee Mid-Year meeting. A recommendation for full status was subject to the class adopting the ISAF Standard Class Rules format.

### 9. Offshore Special Regulations

In accordance with ISAF Regulation 15.17.6(c) the Oceanic and Offshore Committee is responsible for approving the Special Regulations on behalf of Council and the submissions are numbered ‘SR’.

The Committee received the Offshore Special Regulations Sub-committee agenda and supporting papers. Patrick Lindqvist as Chairman presented his Committee’s recommendations:

(a) **Submission SR01-09 from US Sailing - OSR 3.08.3 – Hatches / Downflooding**

It was noted that the Special Regulations Sub-committee had unanimously agreed to defer the submission.

*Recommendation from SRSC:* Defer – and appoint a working party of: David Lyons, (Chairman), Renee Mehl and Ken Kershaw to rework submission.

The Committee on a unanimous vote agreed to defer the submission.

**Decision: Defer**

(b) **Submission SR02-09 from the ORC - OSR 3.14.6 – Dyneema Guard Rails**

It was noted that the SRSC voted 7 in favour and 2 against to support the submission with amendments.

*Recommendation from SRSC:* Approve as amended by SRSC.

The Committee held a unanimous vote to approve.

**Decision: Approved as amended by SRSC**

(c) **Submission SR03-09 from the Royal Yachting Association - OSR 5.01 – Lifejackets**

*Recommendation from SRSC:* Approve as amended:

Move asterisk note from end to (a). and add:
5.01.4: “The person in charge shall personally check each lifejacket at least once annually.”

The Committee held a unanimous vote to approve.

**Decision: Approved as amended by SRSC**

(d) Submission SR04-09 from RYA - OSR 5.02 - Safety Harness and Safety Lines (Tethers)

Recommendation from SRSC: Approve as amended:
The Committee held a unanimous vote to approve.

**Decision: Approved as amended by SRSC**

(e) Submission SR05-09 regarding Hull Construction Standards.

On a unanimous vote it was agreed to support the submission.

Recommendation from SRSC: Approve

The Committee held a unanimous vote to approve.

**Decision: Approved**

(f) Submission SR06-09 from the RYA regarding Storm Sail Area

It was noted that submission SR06-09 was withdrawn.

(g) Submission SR10-09 from IRC – Storm Sail Area

In response to the 2009 decision to decrease maximum storm sail size effective 1 January 2010, Submission SR10-09 proposed that the maximum storm sail sizes in 2008-2009 OSR be retained until such time as the working party have had sufficient time to make their report and give any recommendations.

The SRSC unanimously approved the submission and agreed that the working party should comprise an independent Chairman, GBR and NOR representatives, David Lyons and a sailmaker.

*Recommendation from SRSC: Approve*

Nils Nordenstrom expressed concern that his detailed analysis of the reason why the maximum storm sail sizes should be reduced had not been fully considered by the working party established after the electronic vote in July. He also felt that it was breach of procedure that his work had not been presented to the Special Regulations Sub-committee meeting.

The Chairman of the SRSC did not agree that there had been a breach of procedure. There had already been an email vote of the SRSC. The working party appointed after the email vote could not reach agreement and it was not his intention to re-open the debate in detail at the Sub-Committee meeting.

The Chairman agreed that there had not been a breach of procedure and noted that ISAF regulation 10 states the Chairman’s decision is final as to what items shall be included on the agenda.

Alan Green congratulated Nils on the thorough job he had made of his presentation and that it would be very valuable to the new Working Party.

On a vote of 14 in favour and 1 against the submission was approved and that a new working party be formed as proposed by SRSC.

**Decision: Approved**
(h) Submission SR08-09 from IRC – Storm Trysails
It was noted that submission SR08-09 was withdrawn.

(i) Submission SR07-09 from Swedish Sailing Federation – Training Revalidation
Submission SR07-09 was received about a reduced one day syllabus for people needing to revalidate their training after the expiry of their five years certificate.

Recommendation from SRSC: Approve with Item 6 amended to state: “Medical and/or Fire-fighting training as appropriate regarding national regulations.”

Decision: Approved as amended by SRSC

(j) Submission SR02-08 from US Sailing OSR 3.14 – Pulpits, Stanchions, Lifelines
Deferred Submission SR02-08 was received regarding the definition of working deck.

Recommendation from SRSC: Defer for advice from ERS Working Party

Decision: Defer

(k) Deferred Submission SR06-08 was received from Norwegian Sailing Federation proposing mandatory crotch straps for safety harnesses.
It was noted that following the 2008 meeting the SRSC had formed a Working Party which had considered the issues raised and presented a report.

Recommendation from SRSC:
Reject SR06-08 and :

i) that OSR 5.02 be amended from 1/10 to give advanced notice that harnesses shall be fitted with crotch or thigh straps as from 1/11

ii) that OSRs 5.01 and 5.02 be amended from 1/10 by adding the recommendation that: “Crotch straps or thigh straps together with related fittings and fixtures should be strong enough to lift the wearer from the water.” Minimum strengths and relevant material specifications should be identified by the Working Party and published before end 3/10 to be effective for new equipment purchased from 1/11 (retro fitting to be encouraged)

iii) that ISAF supports research proposed by the ISO Crotch Strap Task Force. The ISO Crotch Strap Task Force to be encouraged to study other types of harness (eg climbing) to ensure that all available knowledge on harnesses is consulted and developments in the field are kept under review to be reported on a regular basis to ISAF

iv) that ISAF through the yachting media with support from its MNAs and life-saving organizations, and by example of well-known sailors, promotes the value of crotch or thigh straps. At the same time we recommend that ISAF promotes the value and use of a combined harness/lifejacket.

On a vote of 15 in favour and none against the recommendation of the SRSC was approved.

Decision: Approve Recommendation from SRSC

10. Reports and Opinions of Sub-committees

(a) Special Regulations Sub-committee
The Chairman of the Special Regulations Sub-committee gave a brief report on issues not based on submissions. It was noted that it was useful to receive reports on race incidents.

Sten Edholm (observer) advised the Committee that he was proposing to make a submission in 2010 to require in Category 3 races at least one member of the crew to have undertaken training. He asked the Committee if they would in principle support such a submission. Bruno Finzi responded that theoretically he could support the principle but it would significantly increase the need for available training courses.

(b) Empirical Handicap Sub-committee

The Chairman of the Empirical Handicap Sub-committee gave a report not based on submissions.

He noted that unfortunately only two members of his Sub-committee were able to join him for the meeting. He requested permission to hold a Mid-Year meeting of his Sub-committee so that they could continue their work of facilitating the exchange of data between Empirical Handicap Systems.

He was advised that the application for a mid-Year Meeting should be passed to the ISAF Executive Committee for consideration.

11. ISAF Sailor Classification Code

(a) A report was received from the Chairman of the Classification Commission. Regarding the proposed deletion of Group 2 it was noted that there are 453 Group 2 sailors of which 169 are in USA, all of whom will be written to and advised of the change. They will be invited to reapply for re-classification on April 1st once the FAQs are available in early January.

The programme of attendance at key regattas has proved to be very valuable and appreciated by nearly all the Classes and Events. The Commission has concluded that this work is now an essential part of its role that is not dissimilar to Measurement. 12 events were attended, 6 with a full interview process. Through these visits and other information approximately 30 sailors have been moved out of Group 1 this year.

It has been important throughout to stress to Classes and Events that they too have a major role in keeping Classification ‘clean’ and, in particular, to stress to the owners the obligations they have in complying with the Code.

(b) ISAF Sailor Classification Code – Deletion of Group 2

Submission 019-09 was noted from the Executive Committee regarding elimination of Group 2.

In general there was support for the submission. Paddy Boyd was concerned at the definition of ‘marine business’ in 22.2.2(c) which might include a Merchant Navy watch-keeper or a fisherman. It was noted that this could be covered in FAQs on the ISAF website.

Opinion: Approve with the following amendment:
Subject to clarification of ‘marine business’

Council Decision: Approved

(c) ISAF Sailor Classification Code – Deletion of Group 2
To note submission 020-09 from the Executive Committee regarding qualification period to change from Group 1 to Group 3

**Opinion: Approve**

**Council Decision: Approved**

(d) ISAF Sailor Classification Code – Deletion of Group 2

To note submission 021-09 from the Executive Committee regarding 22.3.5 relating to the deletion of Group 2.

**Opinion: Approve**

**Council Decision: Approved**

(e) ISAF Sailor Classification Code – Advertising Code

To note submission 022-09 from the Executive Committee to align with the ISAF Advertising Code

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

**Council Decision: Approved**

(f) ISAF Sailor Classification Code – Definition of Personal Expenses

To note submission 023-09 from the Executive Committee regarding ‘per diem’ payments. It was noted that Part 1 of the submission had been withdrawn.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

**Council Decision: Approved**

(g) ISAF Sailor Classification Code – 22.3.6 Procedures

To note submission 024-09 from the Executive Committee regarding adding a 60 day time limit for an appeal to be made.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

**Council Decision: Approved**

(h) ISAF Sailor Classification Code – 22.3.10 – Event Classification Committee

To note submission 025-09 from the Executive Committee regarding deletion of the term ‘Event Classification Committee’.

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

**Council Decision: Approved**

(i) ISAF Sailor Classification Code – 22.5.2 - Protests

To note submission 026-09 from the Executive Committee regarding the addition to 22.5.2 of a reference to 22.5.6

**Opinion: No Recommendation**

**Council Decision: Approved**

12. ISAF Offshore Team World Championship
Bruno Finzi reported from the ORC regarding plans for the 2010 event which is proposed to be for two boat teams using Farr 40 and Melges 32. Dates proposed are 29 June to 3 July 2010 at Porto Cervo, Sardinia, Italy.

13. Oceanic Concordat

The Chairman reported that he had progressed the concept of an Oceanic Concordat which had been signed by the organisers of the Vendee Globe, Route du Rhum and ‘The Transat’. The agreement was also under discussion with the Volvo Ocean Race. The principle being that event organisers participate in an Oceanic Forum where they can discuss matters of mutual interest and in particular a protocol for agreeing the calendar of events.

Alan Green proposed that a future document could include in Part 1 – “having due regard for safety and care for the environment”. He further suggested that the document be refined to require that:

- event organizers would undertake to specifically acknowledge in the Notice of Race that their Special Regulations were based on ISAF Offshore Special Regulations and that a report should be made to ISAF after the event describing any variations made to the OSRs, and
- in the case of an accident involving significant damage or gear failure, or injury or death or similar occurrence the organisers should submit a report to ISAF to include any lessons learnt

He also suggested that it would be helpful in oceanic races to establish a common tracker database which would enable different events sailing in the same waters at the same time to see their fleet positions on the same plot, to assist in distress management and also enable Race HQ teams (and if necessary the boats themselves) to have a good overview. The Geovoile service could be consulted initially as they handle tracking reports for several races.

Alan Green requested that before the concordat is progressed further, thought should be given to the length of agreement being entered into with each party, and what should happen at the end of the term – noting, for example, that a ‘fallback renewal’ could result in a monopoly or monopolies being established.

Pierre Fehlmann suggested an additional clause relating to the jurisdiction of the agreement and whether it might refer to the Court of Arbitration for Sport.

Alan Green was in favour of a dispute being first directed to arbitration but did not support a requirement that it necessarily had to be the Court for Arbitration of Sport.

The Chairman concluded that the document already covered some of the issues raised and the other issues should be considered at the first meeting with the organisers. This was just a beginning to the project and that he hoped to include other major oceanic event organisers in the project. The Committee congratulated him on the progress so far.

Pierre Fehlmann noted that Regulation 15.17.4 states that the Chairman shall appoint a group of the Committee’s members to work with the secretariat as the Oceanic Panel. If this was the correct situation he would like to volunteer to be a member of the Oceanic Panel.

14. World Sailing Speed Record Council

A report was received from the World Sailing Speed Record Council, with a postscript added regarding the recently ratified outright 500m record set by the hydrofoil trimaran ‘Hydroptere’ at 51.36 knots. Regarding recent publicity of attempts by a 16 year old Australian girl and a younger Dutch girl to be the youngest person to sail around the world, it was also noted that the WSSRC no longer ratifies records based on ‘human conditions’ such as ‘youngest’.
15. **International Regulations Commission**

The Chairman of the International Regulations Commission gave a verbal summary of issues considered by the Commission. He thanked the team of volunteers who attended the International Maritime Organisation meetings in London as observers and noted that ISAF was likely to succeed in avoiding unnecessary legislation if we could show, for example, that the sailing community promoted its own competency and safety training in an effective manner. Bearing in mind that the IMO meetings are focused on shipping, he was delighted to report that an annual IMO award for Exceptional Bravery at Sea was to be presented to a yacht’s crew, Maurice and Sophie Conti, for a rescue of a crew of three from another yacht which grounded off Fiji. This rescue was done in the absence of maritime or aviation Search and Rescue assets.

The meeting of the Commission earlier in the week had noted the imprisonment of a boat builder in the Australian Excalibur case and the call in some circles for in-build survey as an extension of plan approval. Also in Australia an anomaly had been highlighted regarding State law (except in New South Wales) where between yachts racing, the Racing Rules of Sailing have been held not to take precedence over COLREGS. The Commission plan to assist Yachting Australia with legal precedent.

The recent publicity relating to young sailors attempting to be the youngest to sail around the world had been discussed and the position of the WSSRC noted. Guidelines had been published for Prevention of Piracy. Work continues at IMO with Bio-fouling guidelines.

The Commission planned in the next 12 months to:

- acquire more statistics from MNAs on recreational craft in their regions (12.7 million registered boats were reported in the US in 2008)
- encourage MNAs to confirm a commitment to promote (at least) basic competency training
- encourage the wearing of lifejackets as standard practice, and to
- assist Vice President Teresa Lara in the ISAF objective to promote environmental awareness and good practice

16. **Review of Offshore Classes**

It was noted that class reports can be found on the website www.sailing.org/classes

17. **Any other Business**

There being no further business the Chairman concluded the meeting at 18:12.

Attachment:

Appendix 1 – Oceanic Concordat
OCEANIC CONCORDAT

AGREEMENT ISAF - XXX EVENT MANAGEMENT

Between:
(1) International Sailing Federation Ltd a company registered in the Isle of Man under number 79772C, ("ISAF") located at 69 Athol Street, Douglas, IM1 1JE Isle of Man.

And
(2) XXX Event Management , a company registered in the .... under number .... ("the Organiser") located at ........,organiser of the XXXX Ocean Race.

1 Governing Body:
ISAF is the official international authority governing the sport of sailing throughout the world. It sets down applicable rules and regulations and seeks to develop and promote sailboat racing in all its forms.

2 Recognition of the XXX Ocean Race as an ISAF Major Oceanic Event:
By signing the present agreement, ISAF recognises the XXXXX Ocean Race as an ISAF Major Oceanic Event and XXXXX Event Management as the owner of the XXXXX Ocean Race and the event organiser. The Organiser is deemed to meet the qualification criteria as defined in 3:2.

3 Qualification criteria and termination:

3.1 An ISAF Major Oceanic Event is defined by ISAF as a race or event that has or is likely to have the ability to attract sufficient competitor, media and public interest so as to be regarded as a major or elite race or event.

3.2 To qualify as an ISAF Major Oceanic Event organiser, the Organiser must:
(a) have the competence and necessary resources and ability to organise and manage an ISAF Major Oceanic Event;
(b) have a marketing strategy to promote an ISAF Major Oceanic Event, both in advance of, during and after such an event.
(c) run the races under the ISAF Rules of sailing and the ISAF Regulations, unless specifically agreed otherwise.

3.3 Should:
(a) the Organiser cease to organise and manage the XXXXXXX Ocean Race;
or
(b) the XXXXXXX Ocean Race no longer be recognised by ISAF as an ISAF Major Oceanic Event; or
(c) the Organiser’s ISAF recognition be revoked; or
(d) the Organiser go into receivership or be declared bankrupt;
The Organiser shall no longer be recognised as an ISAF Major Oceanic Event organiser and as such termination of the respective rights and obligations of the parties under the present agreement shall be automatic.

4 Discussion forum and meetings:
4.1 ISAF and the Organiser agree to establish, with the other organisers of an ISAF Major Oceanic Event, a forum to discuss and agree:
(a) matters of mutual interest;
(b) issues relating notably to safety and rules of racing which are governed and controlled by ISAF, but which may require specific regulation suited to ISAF Major Oceanic Events;

4.2 ISAF, the Organiser, together with all other organisers of ISAF Major Oceanic Events, agree to meet twice a year under the Chairmanship of ISAF to discuss matters of mutual interest in accordance with an agenda as may be proposed at any time by any of the concerned parties and determined by ISAF.

5 Calendar:
ISAF, XXXXX Event Management, together with all other organisers of ISAF Major Oceanic Events agree to propose and agree the dates of their future events on a rolling four-year programme. Once they have agreed upon the start date for a particular event, ISAF shall recognise and publish the date thereof. The event organisers shall thereafter be bound to adhere to that date. Any such date may not be amended within the four years preceding an event without the prior agreement of the majority of the organisers of all ISAF Major Oceanic Events. Should there be any conflict as to proposed dates for any event, the organisers shall use their best efforts to resolve that conflict, failing which the matter shall be examined and decided upon by ISAF taking into account any comments submitted to it by all race organisers concerned.

6 ISAF's Obligations:
ISAF:
(a) will not recognise any other event as a Major Oceanic Event which might be in conflict with any of the previously recognised ISAF Major Oceanic Events, and in particular, the XXXXX Ocean Race;
(b) will promote the XXXXX Ocean Race through the ISAF Website; www.sailing.org as an ISAF Major Oceanic Event;
(c) will use reasonable endeavours to manage the calendar of sailing events which are likely to have in impact on the marketing of the XXXXX Ocean Race, and minimise timing conflicts for competitors and organisers. ISAF shall also keep the Organiser advised of the proposed dates of any such events as soon as ISAF is made aware of them.
(d) will draft, if necessary, a specific version of its Offshore Special Regulations for ISAF Major Oceanic Events after consultation with, and taking due note of any proposals from the Organiser.
(e) will publish, if necessary, an addendum to its racing rules for all ISAF Major Oceanic Events.
(f) will represent the Organiser’s interests at meetings or before organisations governing international regulations at sea such as the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) and shall keep the Organiser informed of the outcome of all such meetings.
(g) will monitor and review the role of all other organisations of which it may be aware that may be either administering maritime matters or organising events that may have an effect or influence on the ISAF Major Oceanic Events.

7 Other Activities:
ISAF and the Organiser, together with all other organisers of ISAF Major Oceanic Events shall review and develop proposals and guidelines to assist organisers of Major Oceanic Events and competitors, for example possibility to establish rankings, co-ordination of course routing or trackings, issues involving
air/sea rescue and any other matters, which they believe, will be to their mutual advantage.

8 Co-operation:
ISAF and the Organiser agree that they will co-operate with each other with a view to achieving the best marketing of the XXXXX Ocean Race. The Organiser shall be entitled to use the ISAF logo, according to ISAF’s regulations, for all marketing purposes (website, village, logo on boat, etc...)

9 Duration:
This present agreement shall come into force for an initial period of five years from the date hereof and thereafter be tacitly renewed for further consecutive periods of five years. Each party wishing not to renew the present agreement should give a six months notice.

Signed on behalf of the International Sailing Federation:
Name/Title: Jerome Pels, Secretary General
Date:

Signed on behalf of XXXXX Event Management:
Name/Title: XXX
Date: