The Special Regulations Sub-committee met at 09:00 – 17:30 hours on the 8th November 2010 at the Divani Caravel Hotel, Athens, Greece

Please refer to the ISAF website www.sailing.org for the details of the submissions and supporting papers on this minutes.

1. Opening of the Meeting 1 8. Working Party – Downflooding 10
2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting 1 9. Draft Submissions by the Chairman 11
3. Offshore Special Regulations 1 10. Race Incident Reports 12
4. OSR Structural Design Requirements 7 11. OSR Redraft 12
5. Training 7 12. International Regulation Commission 13
7. Working Party - Storm & Heavy Weather Sails 9

Present:
Patrick LINDQVIST (FIN) – Chairman  Abraham ROSEMBERG (BRA) – Vice Chairman
Will APOLD (CAN) Paddy BOYD (IRL)
Sten EDHOLM (SWE) – ORC Representative  Ken KERSHAW (GBR) (AM Only)
David LYONS (AUS) Renee MEHL (USA)
Haluk SUNTAY (TUR) (AM Only)  Boris HEPP (GER)

Others Present:
Simon FORBES (Technical Manager)  Henry THORPE (Technical Co-ordinator)
Jacques LEHN (FRA) Chairman Oceanic and Offshore  Alan GREEN (GBR) Chairman International Regs
Jason SMITHWICK (Head of Technical) in part

In regard to submissions with the prefix ‘SR’ these minutes include the decisions of the Oceanic and Offshore Committee held on the 10 November 2010 who on behalf of Council, approve changes to the Offshore Special Regulations (OSR’s).

1. Opening of the Meeting

The Chairman welcomed members and observers to the meeting.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

(a) Minutes

The minutes of the Special Regulation Sub-committee meeting of 9th November 2009 were noted and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

(b) Minutes Matters Arising

It was noted that following the November 2009 amendments to OSR 3.14.6 to permit lifelines of dyneema rope, a Race Officials Q&A No. 2010-002 had been issued regarding RRS 49.2 and the term ‘lifelines of wire’. The Race Official Q & A would not permit a competitor on a boat with dyneema lifelines to sit on the deck facing outboard with his waist inside the lower lifeline and the upper part of his body outside the upper lifeline.

In December 2009, Royal Ocean Racing Club had prohibited dyneema lifelines in their events awaiting further research to be conducted on the issue of chafe and other issues.
Newport to Bermuda Race 2010 had also prohibited dyneema lifelines. US Sailing had issued guidance on issues such as splicing dyneema which is available at [http://offshore.ussailing.org/SAS.htm](http://offshore.ussailing.org/SAS.htm)

It was noted that RRS 49 may be changed by class rules, Notice of Race and Sailing Instructions.

Sten Edholm requested that major international events such as the Fastnet Race with any national prescriptions prohibiting dyneema lifelines should publicise them well in advance in the Notice of Race.

It was noted that to delete the reference to ‘wire’ in 2009-2012 RRS49 would require a 75% approval vote at Council. The deadline for a submission to amend RRS for 2013-2016 is 31 July 2011.

Alan Green felt that the Racing Rules should not be so specific and that offshore equipment issues should be dealt with under the authority of the Oceanic and Offshore Committee.

### 3. Offshore Special Regulations

(a) **OSR 4.03 – Material of Plugs for Through Hull Openings**

Submission SR01-10 was received from US Sailing to permit polyurethane foam plugs as an alternative to soft wood plugs.

Renee Mehl presented a sample ‘Truplug’ tapered polyurethane foam plug and a demonstration video. Details at: [www.truplug.com](http://www.truplug.com)

Sten Edholm asked whether the effect of temperature on the material was known.

Paddy Boyd felt that the cone height (230mm approx) of the sample would make it difficult to plug some holes which have limited access.

Jacques Lehn asked whether the cone was available in different sizes

Renee Mehl believed that the cone sample was available in one size, (maximum diameter approx 130mm), was flexible and could be cut to size.

As an observer, Hans Zuiderbaan noted that the submission SR 01-10 would require for instance a ‘Trueplug’ or wood plug to be attached or stowed adjacent to every through hull opening. He felt it was time to amend the OSR to permit plugs to be stowed in an accessible location away from the through hull fittings.

**Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee:** Reject in favour of a revised submission for 2011 to address the issue of plug stowage.

**Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision:** Reject

(b) **OSR 4.07 – Flashlights / Searchlights**

Submission SR02-10 was received from the Royal Yachting Association (GBR) to make it clear that the flashlight’s primary function is as a searchlight.

On a proposal by Patrick Lindqvist, seconded by Renee Mehl with a vote of 9 in favour, 0 against 1 abstention it was agreed to recommend approval of the submission to be effective 1 January 2012.

**Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee:** Approve

**Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision:** Approve (effective 1 January 2012)
(c) **OSR 4.19 - EPIRBs**

Submission SR03-10 was received from the Royal Yachting Association (GBR) to make OSR 4.19 specifically require a ship’s EPIRB, not a personal EPIRB.

Alan Green highlighted that an International Telecommunications Union / International Maritime Organisation (ITU/IMO) joint working group had decided that since handheld DSC radios could be moved from vessel to vessel, further consideration should be given to the issuance of an MMSI to entity other than a ship.

Boris Hepp noted that some EPIRBs are registered to rental companies.

Reservations were expressed regarding ‘water-activation’ as on some boats everything gets soaked on a routine basis. It was also important that there is no confusion with hydrostatic release units – the currently proposed wording does not address them.

Alan Green felt that grandfathering would be essential.

It was agreed to amend new 4.19.1 (d) to state:

“Every ship’s 406 MHz EPIRB shall be water-and manually-activated”

**Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve submission as amended to be effective 1 January 2012 and during 2011 to review if grandfathering is required.**

**Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approve (effective 1 January 2012)**

(d) **OSR 5.01 – Lifejackets**

Submission SR04-10 was received from Ken Kershaw (Sub-committee Member) to clarify the position of EN 396 and to make the ISO standard the default option for lifejackets purchased after 1 January 2011.

Ken Kershaw made a presentation of lifejacket testing in waves.

Ken Kershaw explained that EN 396 is not equivalent to ISO 12402. ISO 12402 is better than EN396 including more sophisticated requirements for materials, water entry testing and body angle and face plane angle in water. Additionally if a lifejacket is fitted with a D-ring for a harness, ISO 12402 now requires that it be tested in line with the ISO harness standard whereas the EN standard did not require this.

Since making the submission in July, Ken Kershaw advised that in some countries ISO 12402 lifejackets would not be approved under national legislation before 1 January 2011 and accepted to change the proposed date to ‘2012’.

Will Apold proposed that ‘UL 1180’ be added after ‘EN 396’.

Boris Hepp noted that a sprayhood would become mandatory on all new lifejackets for all categories and doubted that there were sufficient numbers on the market.

Sten Edholm felt that manufacturers needed as much warning of the requirements as possible, and that a sprayhood was important when a man overboard was lifted by rescue helicopter due to the 50 knot down-draught.

Stan Honey as an observer advised that his experience from ‘ABN Amro’ Volvo Ocean Race and ‘Groupama’ Round the World record was that any crew member who had practical training in a pool with a wave machine knew that in rough conditions a man overboard without a spray hood and crotch straps would not have time and energy to do any other tasks to help others.

Abe Rosemberg proposed to delete: “and any additional national, government, prescriptions thereto and “, as the OSR are minimum requirements.
On a proposed by Ken Kershaw, seconded by Sten Edholm, the submission was recommended for approval as amended on a vote of 9 in favour 1 against.

**Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve with the following amendments:**

5.01.1 (a)(i) add at end : ‘and UL 1180’

(a)(ii) change date to ‘2012’ and delete: “and any additional national, government, prescriptions thereto and ”

**Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approve (effective 1 January 2012)**

(e) **OSR 5.02 – Safety Harness and Safety Lines (Tethers)**

i) Submission SR05-10 was received from US Sailing regarding grandfathering of Safety Harnesses and Safety Lines.

Renee Mehl presented the submission which proposed to delete: “Harnesses and safety lines manufactured prior to Jan 2001 are not permitted.”, the reason being the cost of replacing this equipment every ten years.

Ken Kershaw advised that the reason the requirement was added in November 2009 was from a recommendation in the Coroner’s Report resulting from the Sydney Hobart Race. The report recommended a cut-off date on the age of tethers, following a loss of life due to a tether failure.

On a proposal by Renee Mehl, seconded by Sten Edholm there was a vote of 3 in favour and 6 against with 1 abstention.

**Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Reject**

**Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Reject**

ii) A report was received from Alan Green as Chairman of the Crotch Strap Working Party. He also demonstrated the wearing of a climbing harness at the same time as a lifejacket incorporating a deck harness.

The report noted that:

2009 OSR Sub committee minute 7 (b) (ii) stated that recommended minimum breaking strains for crotch or thigh straps would be published by ISAF before the end of 03/10. Unfortunately this target has not been reached and the interim advice remains without qualification:-

“5.02 5(b) Crotch straps or thigh straps together with related fittings and fixtures should be strong enough to lift the wearer from the water”.

On consultation within the industry it was found that two manufacturers, believed to be representative, agreed with the above advice but in the absence of an ISO requirement stated that they would not manufacture equipment to a breaking strain just because it was recommended by ISAF.

Manufacturer A said the plastic buckles on crotch straps had a breaking strain of about 50kg each. Due to the configuration of the straps the loading on each buckle would be 25% of the total. If it is assumed that the weight to be lifted by the device is 100kg then each buckle would be required to carry 25kg but this does not include any shockload.

Manufacturer B said their plastic buckles had an initial breaking strain of 90kg but after weathering, 54kg each.
However it became increasingly clear to the working party chairman that the pursuit of a breaking strain for crotch straps was not going to produce a good practical piece of equipment – and that what was needed was a new and comprehensive approach.

Interviews were conducted with an experienced designer of climbing harnesses (himself also a climber) as well as a marine equipment testing laboratory that routinely tests lifejackets, harnesses and other gear.

It was incidentally discovered that not only Manufacturer A but also the testing laboratory in an undefined test with the drop test dummy, had “popped” or shattered the plastic buckles on crotch straps.

It was recalled that a skipper had been lost overboard in 2009 when she had gone aloft to clear a sail jam but had apparently not donned an appropriate harness because one was not readily available.

The next step was to encourage sailors to adopt a combined unit which integrates a climbing harness with a deck harness, lifejacket, and splashguard.

Here are some suggested basic requirements for a combined deck and climbing (fall arrest) harness:-

- Ease of donning and comfort in wearing around a boat
- No worse risk of snagging of leg loops than with crotch straps
- Obvious connection point on the front of the unit by which to secure the wearer to a line if lifting the person inboard, or to a halyard if going aloft, or to a harness tether
- The lift position in a climbing harness brings the person into a sitting position, (to reduce the adverse physiological effects present in a vertical lift)
- The lift position is actually comfortable because the wide webbing spreads load around the buttocks compared with a narrow webbing strap through the crotch
- Ziplock stainless steel tensioning buckles with short, captive webbing tails to allow the wearer to easily adjust them and not lose them, not to have to re-thread them, and to easily remove them (eg or a toilet break) and replace them
- Readiness of any crew member to immediately be hoisted up the rig to deal with a problem, knowing that the harness is correct for the job
- Ability for the harness to safely remain connected to a person overboard who cannot slip or slither out of the harness regardless of the shockloads or strains
- An excellent holding-down system due to the buoyancy load being taken ultimately by the comfortable leg loops and not by uncomfortable crotch straps
- Incorporation of a 150N inflatable lifejacket and accessories including a splashguard

The working part chairman met with and explained the general concept to two of the UK’s top authorities in survival techniques, Admiral Frank Golden and Prof Michael Tipton. Letters from both commending the development of a combined unit as described above, have been passed to the ISAF Secretariat.
Alan Green therefore recommend that a re-constituted working party should carry out a programme of development trials in as disciplined a manner as possible (rather than ad hoc) to (a) verify that the concept is valid and (b) highlight the basic essential requirements in measurable terms such as can form an ISAF Special Regulations recommendation which may ultimately lead to the creation of a new deck safety unit incorporating the above features, as an ISO standard.

With regard to the work of the ISAF Crotch Strap working party, Alan Green said he believed that this would be best continued under the chairmanship of Ken Kershaw who is already chairman of a Task Force under the auspices of the ISO.

Sten Edholm proposed that Ken Kershaw be the new Chairman.

*Secretariat Note: Subsequent to the meeting Ken Kershaw agreed to chair the working party.*

Based on the Working Party report it was agreed to delete with immediate effect the note at the end of 5.02.5:

**Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee not based on a submission:**

Delete:

"Note: Before the end of 03/10 ISAF will publish recommended minimum breaking strains which for equipment purchased on or after 01/11 will be mandatory."

*Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approve effective 1 January 2011*

(f) **OSR 4.20 Liferafts**

Submission SR06-10 was received from the Chairman of the Special Regulations Subcommittee regarding a revised introduction regarding liferaft standards.

The submission was on behalf of Alan Green who highlighted that sub-standard liferafts were on the market. Photographs were shown of liferafts which did not incorporate required items such as ballast pockets. He wished to highlight the importance when a yacht owner is purchasing a liferaft, that they check that a recognised and qualified third party has independently vetted the manufacturer regarding the production of the liferaft type in question.

Ken Kershaw noted that sale of non-SOLAS liferafts is not linked to any legislation and in his view was that there was no hope of incorporating liferafts under the EU Personal Protective Equipment Directive.

Boris Hepp felt that more clarity was needed as a customer would not understand who the ‘third party’ should be. Perhaps a form of plan approval should be introduced by ISAF.

Renee Mehl agreed that ISAF should specify who is a qualified third party.

Alan Green noted that manufacturers of SOLAS liferafts were required to undergo 3rd party inspection.

Paddy Boyd proposed that an ISAF news article should be written for circulation to Scuttlebutt etc to highlight the non-compliance issues. Sea Survival course operators should also be targeted to pass the message onwards. It was agreed that the ISAF Secretariat would list on the ISAF website manufacturers and models of known liferafts which do have third party verification.

On a proposal by Paddy Boyd it was agreed to reject the submission and to highlight the issue by the means agreed.
Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Reject – However the concerns raised are valid and it is suggested to produce a news article to alert potential consumers to the potential problems with liferafts which have been produced by manufacturers which have not been subject to third party verification. It was also agreed to maintain a list on the ISAF website of liferaft manufacturers whose production is subject to third party verification.

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Reject

(g) Appendix H – Telemedical Advice Service

Submission SR7-10 was received from the Chairman on behalf of Alan Green proposing an addition to Appendix H – ISAF Code for the Organisation of Oceanic Races to cover an IMO published paper ‘IMO MSC.1 Circ/1366 24 May 2010’ relating to Telemedical advice and yacht races.

Paddy Boyd had concern over the term ‘offshore and oceanic’ races, as although oceanic races were defined in the ISAF regulations and Appendix H related to oceanic races, the requirement seemed too onerous for ‘offshore races’.

Alan Green said he was well aware of the ISAF definition of ‘oceanic’ and at the IMO working party had explained this clearly. He had been unable to convince the IMO WP to simplify much of the proposed circular. However, and against his advice, the use of the word ‘offshore’ persisted.

Sten Edholm had concerns that Appendix H was very minimalist and that dominating the Appendix with the proposed additions regarding Tele-Medical Advice would be inappropriate. He proposed an expanded Appendix H be developed. (Minuted under Any Other Business).

The submission was withdrawn by Alan Green on the basis that the IMO Circular is promulgated by the ISAF Office to relevant parties including oceanic concordat members. Appendix H further minuted under item 13(b).

4. OSR Structural Design Requirements

(a) OSR Building Plan Review

Jason Smithwick reported that since 1 January 2010, the ISAF Certificate of Building Plan Review Scheme had been gathering momentum. In association with the Notified Bodies, Germanischer Lloyd, RYA and IMCI, certificates had been issued to the following one-off designs: Team Origin TP52, a Humphreys IRC 54, and a Reichel/Pugh IRC 42. For series production runs on the J/111 and a Farr designed Class 40 – Kiwi 40 FC. More details at: www.sailing.org/sailors/plan-review-procedure.php.

As an observer, Rob Weiland (TP52 Class Manager) spoke as a ‘victim’ of the scheme. He felt the scheme should be expanded to cover Category 3, otherwise there is a danger of disadvantaging boats wishing to race both offshore and inshore.

David Lyons noted that there has never been a requirement for plan review in Category 3.

5. Training

(a) ISAF Offshore Personal Sea Survival Course

The results were received of the annual questionnaire regarding the availability and take up of sea survival course from participating MNA’s.
Data from Finland, France and Canada had been recently received and would be added to the summary which would be circulated to the committee.

(b) **Appendix G – Man Overboard Search Patterns**

Submission SR08-10 was received from the Sten Edholm (Sub-committee Member) to introduce into the model training course search patterns for use in a man overboard situation.

On a proposal by Sten Edholm the submission was recommended for approval effective 1 January 2012.

*Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve*

*Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approve (effective 1 January 2012).*

(c) **OSR – 6.05 & New Appendix N**

Submission SR09-10 was received from Sten Edholm (Sub-committee Member) to clarify the required first aid course requirements and to establish some minimum criteria for first aid training.

Boris Hepp felt it was important to get rid of the term ‘senior first aid certificate’ as this raised lot of questions and was not defined.

On a proposal by Will Apold and seconded by Sten Edholm on a vote of 6 in favour 0 against, the submission as amended was recommended for approval.

*Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve but reworded to read as follows;*

**SECTION 6 – TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.05</th>
<th>Medical Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.05.1</td>
<td>At least one member of the crew shall have a valid STCW 95 A-VI/4-2 (Proficiency In Medical Care) certificate or equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.05.2</td>
<td>At least two members of the crew shall have a first aid certificate completed within the last five years meeting any of the following requirements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) A certificate listed on the ISAF website <a href="http://www.sailing.org/specialregs">www.sailing.org/specialregs</a> of MNA recognised courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) STCW 95 First Aid Training complying with A-VI/1-3 – Elementary First Aid or higher STCW level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.05.3</td>
<td>At least one member of the crew shall be familiar with First Aid procedures, hypothermia, drowning, cardio-pulmonary resuscitation and relevant communications systems (see OSR 6.02.7 and 6.03.4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.05.4</td>
<td>An example model first aid training course is included in Appendix N.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition a slight amendment will be made to the introduction of Appendix N to reflect this change.

**Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision**: Approve with SRSC amendments (effective 1 January 2012)

6. **Deferred Submissions**
   
   (a) **OSR 3.14 – Pulpits, Stanchions, Lifelines**
   
   Deferred submission SR02-08 from US Sailing was received regarding definition of working deck and the placement of stanchions.
   
   The committee noted that the submission had been twice deferred awaiting input from the Equipment Control Sub-Committee. As no proposal had been received it was considered that a new submission would be needed.
   
   On a proposal by Paddy Boyd and seconded by Sten Edholm on a vote 8 in favour 0 against 0 abstentions the submission was rejected.
   
   **Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee**: Reject

   **Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision**: Reject

7. **Working Party - Storm & Heavy Weather Sails**
   
   (a) **General Discussion**
   
   Alan Green, Chairman of the Storm Sails working party presented a report.
   
   The summary of the recommendations were:
   
   1. Retain current maximum Storm & Heavy Weather sail sizes
   2. Make available on ISAF web site results of research into optimum S&HW sail sizes
   3. Consider ERS terminology but do not abandon established terms without good reason
   4. Encourage use and demonstration of properly accessible trysail track or alternative system
   5. Encourage use and demonstration of inner forestay for storm jib
   6. Allow boats to have without penalty more than one storm jib
   7. Encourage race managers to require storm sail demonstration before boats start in significant offshore races
   8. Encourage boats to equip, as far as possible, with fully coloured storm sails for improved SAR location
   10. Remove Category 4 from OSR 4.26.4(g)

   There was another point that could be called ‘9A’ – New measurement methods for storm sails to more accurately determine area and in particular to take account of roach and leech curve.
David Lyons noted regarding point 2 the complexity of a boat’s ability to carry sail and that ISAF had commissioned Andy Clauhton to prepare a report to be made available on the website.

As an observer, Nils Nordenstrom agreed to the report with the exception of point 1.

On a proposal by Patrick Lindqvist seconded by Ken Kershaw it was agreed to accept the report in principle and for submissions on this basis to be prepared for November 2011. 10 votes in favour, 0 against.

**Recommendation to Oceanic and Offshore Committee: accept the report in principle and for submissions on this basis to be prepared for November 2011.**

**Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approve**

Alan and the working party were thanked for their work on the matter.

8. **Working Party – Downflooding**

(a) **Working Party Report**

A report was received from the working party chaired by David Lyons looking at submission SR01-09 and OSR 3.08.3 relating to hatches and down-flooding.

David Lyons explained his research in producing a flow diagram of the current regulation and noted that the ISO standards referred to deck hatches as ‘Appliances’ and presented the recommendation.

Renee Mehl did not consider that the term ‘Appliance’ would be well understood.

It was noted that that the term ‘appliance’ would need to be incorporated into the list of OSR definitions.

David was thanked for his report.

3.08 Hatches & Companionways

(Delete current 3.08.1, .2 & .3 and insert new 3.08.1)

3.08.1 Attention is drawn to ISO 12216-2002 wherein the term Appliance is a defined term:

*Appliance* device made of a plate and possibly a framing system, used to cover an opening in the hull or superstructure of a boat EXAMPLE Windows, portlights, hatches, deadlights, doors, sliding appliances, escape hatches.

No Appliance other than in the side of a coachroof, shall open in such a way that the cover opens towards the interior of the hull.

**An Appliance shall be:**

a) so arranged as to be above the water when the hull is heeled 90 degrees. Appliances over lockers that open to the interior of the vessel shall be included in this requirement. A yacht may have a maximum of four (two on each side of centerline). Appliances that do not conform to this requirement, provided that the opening of each is less than 0.071 sq m (110 sq in).

Boats of series date after January 1, 2009 shall:

- Have a downflooding analysis signed by the designer or other qualified person who performed the analysis on board. For this purposes the vessel’s displacement condition for the analysis shall be the Light Craft Condition LCC (in conformity with 6.3 of the EN ISO 8666 standard and 3.5.1 of the EN ISO12217-2 standard).

OR

- All Appliances less than 0.071 sq.m in area and numbering more than two either side of the yacht shall be labelled “NOT TO BE OPENED AT SEA” and additionally if greater than 0.071 sq.m in size shall comply with ISO12216 design category A.

Mo0,1,2,3,4
b) permanently attached

c) capable of being firmly shut immediately and remaining firmly shut in a 180 degree capsize (inversion)

(b) **OSR 3.08.3 – Hatches / Downflooding**
Deferred submission SR01-09 from US Sailing was noted.

*Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Reject in favour of a new submission to be based on the working party report above (8(a)).*

**Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Reject**

9. **Draft Submissions by the Chairman**

The following are items the Chairman plans to submit for final consideration in November 2011, feedback was requested from the committee at the November 2010 meeting:

(a) **Revision schedule for the OSR after 2012**

A draft submission by the Chairman regarding ISAF Regulation 36.2 was received.

It was noted that Regulation 36.2 will need updating as the current text specifically mentions ‘2012’. The intention is to publish the next OSR edition effective 1 January 2012.

There was a discussion regarding:

i) Publishing the OSR every two or four years.

ii) Aligning the effective date with the Racing Rules of Sailing

iii) Last date for submissions that will be included in a new edition

It was agreed to accept in principle the submission and expand using similar wording to the Racing Rules Administration 31.2.

(b) **Aft Watertight Bulkheads – OSR 3.13**

A draft submission by the Chairman / Secretariat was received regarding an Aft Watertight Bulkhead to prevent sinking in the situation of rudder loss.

Mike Urwin as an observer felt that the proposed recommendation for all categories was an over-reaction to a few yachts sinking. In particular it would seriously diminish accommodation in small yachts.

The proposed submission was withdrawn.

(c) **Calculating Cockpit Volumes – OSR 3.09.7**

A supporting paper on cockpit volumes by the Chairman / Secretariat was received.

It was noted that there were differing views on what constituted the lowest coamings and cockpit volume of a yacht with a transom open aft to the sea.

As an observer, Rob Weiland (TP52 Class Manager) advised that he did check the cockpit volume of each boat in accordance with OSR 3.09.7, Table 5 and that it controlled the internal volume below decks.
David Lyons was of the view that the cockpit volume was zero for a yacht with a transom open aft to the sea. The length of cockpits has become up to 45% of the overall boat length, but they are wide and shallow and seem to be good.

David Lyons and Rob Weiland were asked to form a Working Party to clarify the situation and make a proposal for the next meeting.

(d) RRS Appendix J, K and L

A draft submission was received by the Chairman to incorporate references to Safety and the Special Regulations into the standard notice of race and sailing instructions template published in the Racing Rules of Sailing.

Discussion focused on proposed paragraphs to be added to RRS Appendix J – Notice of Race, in particular:

“(2) if the Notice of Race invokes the Offshore Special Regulations it shall state the category to which boats are to comply with and any additional requirements. This is of particular relevance to handicap racing where boats of different designs may compete and the design requirements contained within the Offshore Special Regulations may affect a boat’s eligibility to compete. “

Alan Green proposed at the end of the first sentence to delete ‘additional requirements’ and insert ‘variations’.

Boris Hepp questioned whether Offshore Special Regulations should be included in the RRS standard Notice of Race as countries have their own national safety prescriptions.

The consensus was not in favour of proposed paragraph (3) in particular reference to cost of equipment.

The conclusion was that the Chairman should discuss the proposal with the Racing Rules Committee Chairman in order to progress a submission for the next meetings submission deadline for RRS.

(e) Companionway Sill Height

It was noted that the companionway sill height requirement is higher in Category 5 than it is for Category 0 to 4.

It was agreed that a submission be made for November 2011 to align Category 5 with the other categories.

10. Race Incident Reports

A report was received on some issues highlighted from incidents that have occurred during races in the past year.

Alan Green recommended that the ISAF website include documents or indexed links to major race incident reports, such as Fastnet ’79, Sydney-Hobart ’98.

11. OSR Redraft

Jason Smithwick made a presentation of developments to the Offshore Special Regulations Generator file which improves website presentation of the OSR and in particular the different categories. New features included switching recommendations ‘on or off’, and creating a list of additional requirements when
upgrading a boat to a higher category. The new software was fully compatible with translations made in the OSR generator file. Detailed OSR checklists would also be developed for approval by the Special Regulations Sub-committee. The option of switching design requirements off would also be incorporated in the software.

12. International Regulation Commission

Alan Green reported on the work of the International Regulation Commission.

Over 50-man days had been spent representing ISAF at the International Maritime Organisation.

i) Bio-fouling – work had been on going on the IMO correspondence group preparing guidance documents regarding measures to control the transfer of invasive aquatic species in biofouling (hull fouling). ISAF was trying to keep the document to a simplified format of three pages for recreational craft.

ii) Safety zones around wind farms – consideration had been given at IMO to the creation of standard criteria for very large safety zones (the impetus had come from a need to protect an FPSO – a Fixed Point Storage and Offloading unit – which needed a very large clear area). On behalf of ISAF, Alan Green was concerned that such criteria could be used to exclude recreational from wind farms and had succeeded in the inclusion in the final IMO document of a recommendation that all stakeholders should be consulted before a very large safety zone was approved.

iii) Piracy – the dangers of piracy off the ‘Horn of Africa’, the Gulf of Aden (GoA) and the northern Indian Ocean had been publicised on the ISAF website with links from the Ocean Cruising Club website, also ‘Noonsite’ and a number of other cruising websites. The RCC(Royal Cruising Club) and CA(Cruising Association) had also been fully involved. A one page ‘flyer’ had been distributed to a large number of ports and marinas in the area surrounding the GoA through which cruising yachts were known to pass. An estimated 200-250 cruising yachts passed this area each year. The ISAF/MSCHOA Guidelines continued to strongly recommend avoidance of the area. For those yachts which did make a passage, advice was given about how to contact the authorities etc. An ISAF meeting had been held at the Maritime Security Centre, Northwood, UK on 19th October, which representatives of cruising yachtmen and Jack Lloyd of the Volvo Ocean Race had attended.

iv) Single handed records by juveniles – following agreement by WSSRC not to recognise records depending on a human condition (e.g age) the Commission had secured an agreement with Guinness World Records whereby GWR would not recognise an oceanic single-handed record unless the sailor was at least 18 years of age and possessed an oceanic yachtmaster certificate or equivalent.

13. Any Other Business

(a) Formation of an Appendix H Working Party

It was acknowledged that appendix H needs developing. It is understood that ISAF Race Management Sub-committee including Christophe Gaumont are
working on an Oceanic section to their manual. Sten Edholm circulated a
detailed paper and was encouraged to develop his draft proposal particularly
with input from FFV representatives and RORC.

(b) Environmental Code
On the request of the ISAF Executive, Alan Green presented an Environmental
Code to be included in the OSR. Attached as Appendix 1.

(c) La Route du Rhum
As an observer, Jean Bertrand Mothes-Masse gave a brief report of OSR
scrutineering for La Route du Rhum. Two issues were highlighted:

i) Photos were shown of Pulpit legs at the bow which are attached to the hull
below the sheerline. (OSR 3.14.3 (h))

ii) Regarding OSR 3.28.1 (c) and the minimum speed required under power, it
was noted that in the case of 100ft boats this required a speed of 10 knots
which could be achieved in no wind. In the case of 100ft multihulls which
have considerable windage a more useful requirement might be sufficient
propulsion to achieve a lower boat speed but in a stronger head wind.

There being no further business the meeting concluded at 1720.
ISAF is committed to the promotion of care for the environment. In offshore racing we will

- use holding tanks where fitted and empty at a pump-out station or more than 3 miles offshore
- in the bilges use oil collection pads and dispose properly ashore
- use environmentally-friendly cleaning products suitable for the marine environment
- retain garbage on board for recycling or disposal ashore except on a long voyage when biodegradable waste may be discharged overboard
- avoid the use of 2-stroke engines (except advanced models with pollution control)
- use solar, water power or wind charging when appropriate
- use shore toilets when in port
- observe IMO guidelines on biofouling
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