Opening of the Meeting

The Chairman welcomed members and observers to the meeting.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

(a) Minutes

The minutes were noted of the Special Regulations Sub-committee meeting of 7th November 2011.

(b) Minutes Matters Arising

It was noted that on the 20 January 2012, an amendment was made to OSR 5.02.5(b) – Safety Harnesses, prior to the publication of the OSR Booklet. The amendment was to delete the recommendation: “Crotch straps or thigh straps together with related fittings and fixtures should be strong enough to lift the wearer from the water.” The reason for the change was that as recorded in the minutes of the meeting of 7 November 2011, the same wording had been deleted in SR41-11, 5.01.1(b) Lifejackets. Ken Kershaw had presented SR42-11 (Safety Harnesses) to the meeting with a powerpoint presentation which specified to delete the quoted text, however the version of SR42-11 previously circulated to the committee had omitted to strike out the quoted text.
3. **Deferred Special Regulations Submissions**

(a) Deferred Submission SR22-11 was noted from the IRC Rating System and Royal Yachting Association to limit the maximum static heel angle when variable and moveable ballast are used. (Categories Monohull 0,1,2,3,4)

Mike Urwin (IRC Rating Office) reported that data of IRC rated yachts showed that only 2 or 3 might be affected by the maximum static heel angle of 35 degrees. As an observer, James Dadd noted that a Volvo 70 with a keel canted at 40 degrees would have a static heel angle of around 15 degrees.

Abraham Rosemberg suggested that the inventory of the boat in an ISO standard measurement condition should be similar to that used by the ORC stability assessment.

On a proposal by Abraham Rosemberg, seconded by Sten Edholm, it was unanimously agreed:

*Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee:*

*Approve with the following amendments: delete: ‘Minimum Operating Mass’, insert: ‘Light Craft Condition’*

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved as amended

(b) Deferred Submission SR27-11 was noted from US Sailing to change the definition of ‘taut’ from an optional guideline to a mandatory requirement.

Renee Mehl presented a report and recommendations for revised measurements:

OSR 3.14.2 be amended to read:

“Lifelines required by the OSR shall be tensioned to limit deflection as follows:

a) Upper Lifelines: When a 4kg weight is suspended from the center of any single span, deflection shall not exceed 70mm from a straight line between the stantions.

b) Intermediate Lifelines: When 4kg weights are suspended from the center of all spans simultaneously, deflection shall not exceed 80mm from a straight line between the stantions. Only lifeline spans with more than 1.5m of their length aft of the mast shall be weighted for this test.

c) No feature of the lifeline system or anything contacting it shall be capable of stretching or adjusting under load to induce additional deflection in the lifeline, such as foredeck netting, or elastic cords or material wherever located.”

James Dadd as the second member of the working party felt that the submission should be deferred.

On a proposal by Renee Mehl, seconded by Will Apold, to adopt the working party recommendations, there was a vote of 2 in favour 7 against.

On a proposal by Sten Edholm, seconded by Abraham Rosemberg, to adopt SR27-11 there was a vote of 6 in favour and 4 against, it was agreed:


Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Deferred
4. **Special Regulation Submissions**

(a) **OSR 3.03 and Appendix M – Hull Construction Standards, Keel Inspections**

Submission SR01-12 was received from the Chairman of the Special Regulation Subcommittee regarding keel inspection. (Categories Monohull 0,1,2,3,4)

Members expressed concern that the proposed wording was just adding text to the OSR, and that similar warnings should then be added in respect of each of the other structural features.

On a proposal by Ken Kershaw, seconded by Abraham Rosemberg there was a vote of 6 in favour, 1 abstention and 1 against.

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

“Regular inspections of the keel and keel/hull attachment structures are strongly recommended.”

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved as amended

(b) **OSR 3.06 and 3.07 – Emergency Escape Hatches on Monohulls**

Submission SR02-12 was received from the Chairman regarding emergency escape hatches in the transom of monohulls with movable ballast. It proposed a mandatory requirement for Category 0 and as a recommendation for Category 1,2 and 3.

Submission SR12-12 was received from Sten Edholm requiring an emergency escape hatch in the transom of all monohulls launched after January 2015 in Category 0.

Submissions SR02-12 and SR12-12 were discussed together, and both originated from recommendations following the capsize of Rambler 100. The Irish Marine Casualty Investigation Board (MCIB) recommendation is to modify Appendix K (Moveable and Variable Ballast) to include a requirement for emergency escape from an inverted hull.

There was concern that trapped air keeping an upturned hull afloat could be lost through an open transom escape hatch. In some situations an inverted monohull may float with the transom immersed. As an observer, Rob Weiland felt that a chain saw inside the hull would be the best solution. Sten Edholm accepted that other solutions such as ‘mini-air’ scuba bottles could be considered.

Submissions SR02-12 and SR12-12 were withdrawn.

(c) **OSR 3.29(l) – Radar Specification**

Submission SR03-12 was received from the Chairman, (on behalf of International Regulations Commission Chairman) to permit Broadband™ radar. (Category MoMu0)

Some members struggled with the current wording of : “…the radar antenna unit shall have a maximum dimension not less than 533mm.”

[Secretariat note: To align with the wording used in the Equipment Rules of Sailing G.8.8, delete ‘maximum’, insert: ‘greatest’.]

On a proposal by Patrick Lindqvist, seconded by Sten Edholm it was unanimously agreed:

*Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve*

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved
(d) OSR 4.02 – Hull Marking (colour blaze)

Submission SR04-12 was received from the Chairman to require highly visible hull markings on canting keel monohulls and that the recommendation for an area of high visibility on all appendages be extended to Category 2.

Submission SR13-12 was received from Sten Edholm to require highly visible markings of not less than 4m² on the underside of all monohulls in Categories 0 and 1.

Submissions SR04-12 and SR13-12 were considered together, they both originated from recommendations following the capsize of Rambler 100 including those made by the Irish Marine Casualty Investigation Board (MCIB).

David Lyons questioned whether the requirement was for the markings to be on the ‘topsides’ of the hull between the waterline and the deck edge, and that for smaller yachts 4m² per side should be reduced to 2m² per side.

As an observer, Dan Nowlan felt that requiring high visibility marks on keels was an ‘oxymoron’ as a conventional monohull would probably only remain inverted if the keel had fallen off.

It was noted that fluorescent orange antifouling paint is available on the market, such as ‘Nautix A9T.speed’.

As an observer, James Dadd noted that the yachts in the Volvo Ocean Race were required to have orange rudders and an area of 5m² placed symmetrically about the yacht’s centreline.

It was agreed to defer both SR04-12 and SR13-12.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Defer
Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Defer

(e) OSR 4.20.3 – Deployment of Liferaft from an inverted canting keel monohull

Submission SR05-12 was received from the Chairman to modify the liferaft stowage arrangement on a canting keel monohull.

The submission originated from the Irish Marine Casualty Investigation Board (MCIB) recommendations following the capsize of Rambler 100 which had concluded: “There were two liferafts stored in a box at the after most part of the cockpit. Despite attempts to launch them, it proved impossible with the hull inverted. “

As an observer, Stan Honey considered the fundamental issue was the structure of the keel fin and that the Sub-committee should resist a further screw up of the fleet with lots of proposed fixes. He noted that there were several submissions based on recommendations in a US Sailing Safety Review into the capsize of Rambler 100 conducted by Ron Trossbach. These recommendations were not submissions from US Sailing.

Haluk Suntay felt that ‘Titanic-like’ incidents will happen; nobody thought the Titanic would sink, we need to help people to be rescued. In Turkey there have been a couple of capsize incidents due to keel failure and the crews had no chance to deploy the liferafts.

As an observer, Mike Urwin was concerned that there are 300 boats competing in the Fastnet Race, the majority are production cruiser/racers with enclosed cockpits. The Chairman noted that submission related to yachts with moveable ballast (canting keels).
Abraham Rosemberg suggested that the intention of the submission could be incorporated into the current text of the OSR 4.20.3 (v) by inserting after ‘multihull’ : ‘and a monohull with moveable ballast’. (Category amended to MoMu0,1,2)

On a proposal by Abraham Rosemberg, seconded by Sten Edholm and a vote of 9 in favour it was agreed to amend (v) instead of the proposed (vi) text in SR05-12.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve as amended

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approve as amended

(f) OSR 4.21 – Distress Signalling Grab Bag

Submission SR06-12 was received from the Chairman to require a variable ballast monohull to have basic distress signalling equipment available in the case of a capsize, for Race Categories 0-3.

Submission SR14-12 was received from Sten Edholm to require a grab bag with basic distress signalling equipment available in the case of a capsize for all monohulls in Category 3.

The submissions originated from the Irish Marine Casualty Investigation Board (MCIB) recommendations following the capsize of Rambler 100 and were considered together.

There was a view that the requirement should also apply to variable ballast monohulls in Category 4. It was questioned whether a grab bag under the navigation table would be readily accessible.

It was agreed to defer SR06-12 and SR14-12.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Defer

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Not considered

(g) OSR 5.01.1 – Personal Locator Beacon (PLB) Registration Requirements

Submission SR07-12 was received from the Chairman to amend 5.01.1 to require registration of PLBs in 5.01.1 by deleting ‘should’ and inserting ‘shall’.

Submission SR15-12 was received from Sten Edholm regarding registration of PLBs to a yacht and supply of this information to a race organiser.

The submissions originated from the Irish Marine Casualty Investigation Board (MCIB) recommendations following the capsize of Rambler 100 and were considered together.

It was noted that a PLB on a lifejacket is only a requirement for Category 0.

As an observer, Rob Weiland reported that a boat captain of a maxi yacht had strongly recommended that the PLBs should just be registered as ‘Boat Name 1’, ‘Boat Name 2’ etc.

Ken Kershaw was concerned that PLBs are referred to in several different parts of the OSR.

It was agreed to create a Working Party to review and make recommendations regarding distress alerting and registration of EPIRBs and PLBs. Richard Besse (Ocean Safety), Stuart Carruthers, Sten Edholm, Eddie Warden-Owen and Will Apold.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Defer

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Defer
(h) OSR 5.01 and 5.02 – Lifejacket and Safety Harness Standards / Crotchstraps

Submission SR08-12 was received from the Norwegian Sailing Federation to prevent a lifejacket or safety harness being lost over the head.

As an observer, Nils Nordenstrom noted that ISO12401-Safety Harness does not include a requirement that the crotch straps should be strong enough to lift the wearer out of the water.

Ken Kershaw advised that testing for ISO compliance is done without crotch straps as the product has to work without the straps. Ken Kershaw noted that the lifejacket specified in OSR (ISO 12402-3) features a lifting loop, the D-ring attachment for a tether line is not designed for lifting a person back on board.

As an observer Richard Besse (Ocean Safety) commented that the lifejacket manufacturers are aiming to produce easier to don and more comfortable to wear lifejackets. A full fall-arrest harness is not the way the manufacturers are aiming, these are used in mountaineering and scaffolding in highly-trained regimes.

Abraham Rosemberg asked if there was any harm in adopting the submission?

Richard Besse’s view was that yes, there would be harm in specifying an OSR requirement as there is no ISO 12402 lifejacket testing requirement for crotch strap strength.

As an observer, Mike Urwin expressed the concern that the equipment would not be available on the market. Hans Zuiderbaan stressed that the required equipment has to be in the shops.

Paddy Boyd noted that the UK Marine Accident Investigation Branch (MAIB) report into the Lion incident had recommended MOB recovery training with a weighted dummy. (and that OSR Appendix G should stress the value of this training.)

Ken Kershaw considered that another route to getting a MOB aboard should be promoted such as a lifting sling.

It was recommended that the 2013-16 OSR committee should create a ‘Recovery back on board’ Working Party.

On a proposal by Patrick Lindqvist, seconded by Abraham Rosemberg there was vote of 8 in favour to defer:

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Defer

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Defer

(i) OSR 3.14.7 – Pulpits, Stanchions and Lifelines

Submission SR09-12 was received from Yachting Australia to repeal the prohibition of carbon fibre in pulpits, stanchions and lifelines on boats with age or series dates after January 1987. The committee also noted a 28-page report.

David Lyons circulated two carbon fibre stanchions, one of which had been tested to breakage. He noted that ISO 15085 – Man Overboard Prevention and Recovery does not prohibit carbon fibre.

As an observer, James Dadd felt that stanchions should bend before they break such as ones made of stainless steel.

Rob Weiland (observer) felt that if stainless steel stanchions were wanted, then stainless steel should be specified, rather than the current OSR which is just focussed on prohibiting carbon fibre.
On a proposal by David Lyons, seconded by Sten Edholm there was a vote of 6 in favour and 2 against:

**Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve effective 1 January 2014**

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Defer

(j) **OSR 3.29 – Communication Equipment**

Submission SR10-12 was received from Yachting Australia to update the communication equipment required on board. A 71 page supporting report was also received.

The Committee was not in favour of amending 3.29 (b) (ii) and (iii) to remove the guidance regarding VHF aerial feeder cable, and to replace it with a requirement for a radio transmission check specified in the Notice of Race.

The Committee did support proposed (vii) and decided to make it mandatory rather than a recommendation.

On a proposal by David Lyons seconded by Sten Edholm it was agreed:

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

No changes to existing 3.29 except add:

“vi VHF transceivers installed after 31 December 2015 shall be DSC capable.
MoMu1,2,3,4

vii DSC capable VHF transceivers shall be programmed with an assigned MMSI (unique to the boat), be connected to a GPS receiver and be capable of making distress alert calls as well as sending and receiving a DSC position report with another DSC equipped station. MoMu1,2,3,4 “

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved as amended

(k) **OSR 3.04 – Stability – Monohulls**

Submission SR11-12 was received from Sten Edholm to specify mandatory stability requirements. Sten Edholm noted that the submission was prompted by the ‘WingNuts’ fatalities in the 2011 Chicago-Mackinac Race.

As an observer, Mike Urwin considered that the principle of the submission was correct. He had two concerns: whether Category 4 races should be included and whether the OSR should refer to data from different Rating Systems.

Dan Nowlan (observer) advised that US Sailing use for Category 1 races, the ORC Stability Index of 115 and he finds that these boats can generally meet ISO Category A stability requirements. He noted that a J/24 has a limit of positive stability of 101 degrees and based on the submission would not meet the requirements for Category 4 races.

Amendments were proposed, including alignment with the revised ISO standard relating to righting energy assessment.

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

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Defer
OSR 3.28.3 (c) – Fuel Systems

Submission SR16-12 was received from Sten Edholm to require an engine stop switch in the cockpit. Sten Edholm noted that this was proposed in a US Sailing Safety Review into the capsize of Rambler 100 conducted by Ron Trossbach.

As an observer, Stan Honey noted that Rambler 100 was unusual in having an engine running to power hydraulics. He was not aware of any circumstance in a race where the inability to stop an engine had caused a safety issue.

Withdrawn

New OSR 3.28.5 – Emergency Lighting Below Deck

Submission SR17-12 was received from Sten Edholm to require emergency facilities for lighting below deck.

Renee Mehl considered that crew members typically use head torches and that this should be sufficient. As an observer, Dan Nowlan felt that evidence was needed that it was an issue. Will Apold felt that it was not a good direction for the OSR to take.

It was agreed to amend the submission from a requirement, to a recommendation.

On a proposal by Sten Edholm and a vote of 4 in favour, 2 abstain, 2 against:

**Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approved as amended:**

Delete: ‘shall’, insert: ‘should’ in both sentences. Change paragraph text to italic (recommendation).

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Rejected

OSR 3.29.1(e) – Communications Equipment, Electronic Position Fixing, AIS

Submission SR18-12 was received from Sten Edholm to recommend Digital Selective Calling (DSC) on the handheld VHF transceiver. Sten Edholm noted that this was proposed in a US Sailing Safety Review into the capsize of Rambler 100 conducted by Ron Trossbach. (Categories MoMu 1,2,3,4)

Stuart Carruthers (Chairman, International Regulations Commission) noted that from a regulatory point of view, a UK-licensed VHF DSC handheld radio is only licensed for use in UK territorial waters. The registration details are not shared internationally and therefore the benefit of a DSC handheld is questionable.

On a proposal by Sten Edholm, seconded by Paddy Boyd there was a unanimous vote in favour.

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

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved

OSR 3.29.1(e) – Communications Equipment, Electronic Position Fixing, AIS

Submission SR19-12 was received from Sten Edholm to require a masthead AIS antenna and for the AIS to be active at all times when racing. Sten Edholm noted that this was based on proposals in a US Sailing Safety Review into the capsize of Rambler 100 conducted by Ron Trossbach.

As an observer, Stan Honey noted that the proposed requirement for AIS transponder to be ‘active at all times when racing’, was a fundamental change to the sport. This would mean that the specifications would have to be a lot more prescriptive, as there may be a competitive advantage in having a poorly transmitting system. He noted that there were benefits of having the AIS aerial as high as possible, particularly for location of AIS Personal Location Beacons.
It was agreed to delete the proposal for AIS to be active at all times when racing. It was noted that an AIS Transponder is required in Categories 0-2.

On a proposal by Sten Edholm, seconded by Abraham Rosemberg and a vote of 7 in favour and 1 against:

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve with the following amendment:

“An AIS antenna shall be mounted on top of the main mast.”

Effective 1\textsuperscript{st} January 2014

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved as amended.

(p) New OSR 3.30 – Re-boarding an Inverted Yacht

Submission SR20-12 was received from Sten Edholm to require facilities to enable the crew to re-board an inverted yacht.

It was considered that the requirement could be satisfied for instance, by a two metre rope across the transom.

On a proposal by Sten Edholm, seconded by Abraham Rosemberg and a vote of 7 in favour and 1 abstention:

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve as amended:

“A yacht shall have means to enable the crew to re-board the yacht in case of capsize. MoMu0,1,2 ”

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Rejected

(q) OSR 4.19.1 – EPIRB

Submission SR21-12 was received from Sten Edholm to achieve better access to EPIRBs on deck. Sten Edholm noted that this was based on proposals in a US Sailing Safety Review into the capsize of Rambler 100 conducted by Ron Trossbach.

On a proposal by Sten Edholm, seconded by Paddy Boyd it was unanimously agreed:

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve as amended:

In both paragraphs, Delete: “topside” and insert: “on deck”

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Deferred

(r) New OSR 4.30 – Safety Equipment Access when capsized

Submission SR22-12 was received from Sten Edholm recommending access to safety equipment when capsized. Sten Edholm noted that this was based on proposals in a US Sailing Safety Review into the capsize of Rambler 100 conducted by Ron Trossbach.

Withdrawn

(s) OSR 5.03 – Personal Location Lights

Submission SR23-12 was received from Sten Edholm recommending a rescue laser flare as personal crew equipment.

As an observer, Dan Nowlan understood that some helicopter pilots were advised to land if they had a laser beam light directed at them.

It was noted that different types of Laser flares/Laser pointer lights were available. Some types are omni-directional strobes. There was a view that pyrotechnics
could be considered an out of date solution and that more effort should be put into alternatives to pyrotechnics.

Stuart Carruthers noted that at International Maritime Organisation (IMO) there was nothing yet to believe there was a move to replace SOLAS distress flares. Currently no laser flares were endorsed by rescue organisations.

As an observer, James Dadd said that Volvo Ocean Race and Richard Besse at Ocean Safety were working at developing a standard for laser flares for their next race.

It was agreed to defer the submission and await information from James Dadd and Richard Besse on progress with developments for the next Volvo Ocean Race.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Defer
Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Defer

5. Special Regulation - Training
(a) A verbal report was received from Simon Jinks, author of the newly launched 168-page book: “ISAF Guide to Offshore Personal Safety”.

Simon Jinks explained that the principle of the book was that safety does not just begin when the yacht is sinking. The most effective safety measure is preparation and a well-trained skipper and crew. On-going work is to produce a Model Powerpoint Presentation (complementary to the book) to assist MNAs in running ISAF Offshore Personal Survival Training Courses. Another idea would be to organise a Training Seminar for MNA Chief Instructors.

Boris Hepp questioned whether the Chief Instructor Seminar would be mandatory, and the Secretariat confirmed no, it was to help and facilitate.

Paddy Boyd considered the book an excellent publication. He was concerned at how MNAs can market the book. If they have to pay a royalty fee to ISAF, this is a new departure for ISAF. MNAs send volunteers to ISAF meetings and they contribute to publications and he expected publications to be, like the Racing Rules of Sailing, freely available to MNAs to publish.

As an observer James Dadd (GBR) said that Ken Kershaw (who was not able to be present for this item) had asked for his concerns to be raised. James said that Ken considered that the advice regarding donning of a lifejacket and information on liferafts available were wrong and that the book is not fit for purpose. The book refers to checking that a lifejacket is fitted correctly by ‘adjusting the waist belt so that your fist is tight when placed between the strap and your chest.’ [Secretariat note: This guidance is the same as currently published by the UK Royal National Lifeboat Institution and in the RYA Sea Survival Handbook reprinted September 2011.]

Abraham Rosemberg felt that the book was a very good step forward and wished to congratulate all involved in producing it. Corrections can be made, mistakes can be dealt with. He proposed that the book should be able to be purchased and downloaded through iTunes and Android formats to avoid shipping costs. Going forward it would be great to translate through the MNAs.

Will Apold noted that when you attend a training session, you want more information, this book, you can take home and it goes into more detail than can be covered during the course.

Renee Mehl consider the possibility to download the book would be a good option for disseminating the information.
(b) There was a general discussion on how the course delivery could be developed further internationally and how ISAF could help facilitate this.

Boris Hepp noted that Germany run a lot of these training courses and that more cruising sailors than racers attend. Some sailors say “I am a professional in the German Navy or I have a STCW (Standards of Training, Certification and Watch Keeping) certificate – do I really need to do the course.”

Sten Edholm noted that there are some aspects of the ISAF course that are different from a safety course that he would do as a Navy helicopter pilot. Issues such as leadership, handling sails, watch routines, special issues for racing and sailing.

6. Submissions

(a) Submission 041-12 was noted from Chairman, Development and Youth Committee proposing that the use of the ISAF Guide to Offshore Personal Safety book is an accompanying requirement for candidates to complete the training course in OSR Appendix G.

Mike Urwin (GBR) as an observer, commented that the IRC Congress considered the book was inappropriate as a mandatory requirement as it was un-reviewed and unproven and he had not had a chance to read it.

Paddy Boyd was concerned that the submission implied a directive from the Development and Youth Committee (through a submission to Council) to specify details in the OSR Book when he considered that authority should remain with the Oceanic and Offshore Committee and OSR Sub-committee.

On a proposal to reject by Paddy Boyd, seconded by Rene Mehl, 041-12 was unanimously rejected.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Reject

Subsequent to the meeting, 041-12 was withdrawn.

7. Working Party Reports

(a) Cockpit Volume and Downflooding

David Lyons reported no developments. ISO 11812 – ‘ Watertight cockpits and quick draining cockpits’ suggests that the cockpit volume is zero when the water retention height is zero, as in the case of an open transom. He proposed that the working party be wound-up as there was no pressing need for it.

Rob Weiland as an observer noted that OSR 3.09.7 is different from ISO 11812. He said the TP52 Class assess the OSR cockpit volume to the nearest litre. Mark Mills(observer) noted that race organisers for Transpac and Newport-Bermuda races are particularly vigilant in assessing yachts for compliance with OSR Cockpit Volume limitations.

Clarification should be given to the meaning of: “..’lowest coamings’ shall not include any aft of the FA station…”.

It was agreed that OSR 3.09 and ISO 11812 should be reviewed and a submission prepared for 2013 meetings.

(b) Crotch Strap

Ken Kershaw proposed that the 2013-16 Committee create a new working party to look at the whole subject of recovery of a man overboard back on board. (see Item 4(h)).
(c) Radar Reflector
Will Apold reported from the working party formed as a result of deferred submissions SR15-11 and 38-11. The suggested wording is attached as Appendix 1 and will be a submission for 2013.

(d) Lifelines Tautness
Renee Mehl reported on the working party proposal under Item 3(b), deferred submissions.

(e) Stability
Sten Edholm reported on the working party proposal under item 4(k).

8. Race Incident Reports

(a) A report was received from the Secretariat highlighting known incidents that have occurred during races in the past year.

(b) Reports published since the last meeting were noted:
   (i) 2011 RORC Morgan Cup Race ‘Lion’ (GBR) from the British Marine Accident Investigation Branch
   (ii) 2011 RORC Fastnet Race - ‘Rambler 100’
      - Gavin Stillman introduced the Irish Maritime Casualty Investigation Board (MCIB) www.mcib.ie report that examined the events that happened during the incident and the subsequent rescue. The investigation did not examine the cause of the keel failure.
      
      He explained that Rambler had been modified to have the liferafts enclosed in a stowage box in the cockpit floor to protect them from the water washing across the cockpit. The stowage had made it impractical to release the liferafts when the yacht was inverted.

      - Crew training prior to the race certainly helped the survival situation. Although personal safety kits had been issued, these were not worn by the crew at the time of the incident.

   (iii) 2012 Farallones Race (Full Crew), San Francisco(USA)
      ‘Low Speed Chase’

      Sally Honey, gave a brief summary of the US Sailing report (see: http://media.ussailing.org/AssetFactory.aspx?vid=18674)

      Sally Honey, Chairman of the US Sailing Review Panel Inquiry summarised an incident in the Full Crew Farallones race in which five sailors died. The Sydney 38 ‘Low Speed Chase’ with eight crew aboard encountered breaking waves when rounding the northwest point of SE Farallon Island. Less than 0.2nm from the point, crossing a 4-fathom (7.3m) shoal at near low-tide in a 25 knot NW wind. The morning forecast predicted wind waves 3 to 7 feet, NW swell 12 to 15 ft at 13 seconds. A set of larger than average waves capsized the boat and drove it onto the rocky shore. Seven of the eight crew members were thrown into the water. Two of those in the water made it to the shore and survived, but five did not. One of the survivors rode the boat to the shore. The conclusion was poor seamanship was the cause, increased training regarding the development of breaking waves on a lee shore is to be promoted. Some of the crew were wearing inadequate
personal buoyancy due to local OSR prescriptions.

(iv) Newport-Ensenada Race

Sally Honey noted that the yacht ‘Aegean’ a Hunter 376 ran into North Coronado Island resulting in the loss of four lives. There were no survivors, a key element of the accident was likely an inadequate lookout, and that it is likely that Aegean inadvertently motored beyond a waypoint set before North Coronado Island. Three of the crew died from blunt force trauma, the fourth from drowning due to traumatic injuries.

9. International Regulations Commission

Stuart Carruthers, Chairman of the International Regulation Commission, gave a verbal report.

The Commission’s Terms of Reference require it to monitor the submissions and work of the International Maritime Organisation (IMO). During the last year these have included safety guidance for non-regulated craft.

IMO are working on modernizing the GMDSS (Global Maritime Distress Safety System). COMSAR, (Sub-Committee on Radio Communications and Search and Rescue) are looking at Man Overboard Search and Rescue Transponders guidelines and the best ways of displaying symbols on electronic chart displays. Also under consideration is the use of AIS (Automatic Indentification System) virtual aids to navigation to replace physical navigation marks.

From a big ship point of view, there is pressure on what are considered obsolescent terrestrial analogue aids to navigation and a move to digital. The move to electronic charting as the primary navigation method will have an effect on the future availability of paper charts.

Stuart felt that the Offshore Special Regulations Sub committee need to have an overall review of distress alerting, AIS, Satellite AIS, Virtual Aids, EPIRBs with AIS.

On the subject of Piracy off Somalia and the Horn of Africa, the few recent incidents are thought to be due to the Monsoon season and increasing use of armed guards on commercial ships, which may make recreational craft more attractive targets. The Naval Force advice remains to avoid the region.

The work of the International Standards Organisation (ISO) continues to be monitored and ISO 12217-Stability and Buoyancy Parts 1,2,3 is just closing the vote on amendments at the moment. ISO 8666 Principal Data is being updated.

There is an amendment regarding a computer software program to ISO 12215-5 Hull construction and scantlings -- Part 5: Design pressures for monohulls, design stresses, scantlings determination. Part 9 Appendages was approved in March, Part 10 Rig Loads and Attachments will be at committee draft stage at a meeting in November at METS Marine Trade Show(NED). Part 7 – Multihull Scantlings is at an early draft stage.

ISO 15085 Man Overboard Prevention and Recovery, under TC 188, Working Group 3, has re-started work looking at recovery from the water by boats sailed solo.

An ISO standard has been developed for the placement of Navigation Lights on small craft and a standard is also under development for LED Navigation lights, with a final vote due by the end of 2013.

Regarding the EU Recreational Craft Directive, new proposals grind through the European Parliament system, in its 10th format and 58 amendments. The geographical definitions used in the RCD Design Categories will no longer be used, instead reference will be made
to wind strength and significant wave height.
Stan Honey, as an observer, commented on Virtual Aids to Navigation, which have been used successfully for the America’s Cup World Series, the Chief Race Officer sets control of the course limits and all spectator boats with chart plotters can see this virtual boundary. Stuart Carruthers noted that chart plotters vary in how they can display virtual markers.

10. Any Other Business

Renee Mehl noted that US Sailing had issued two prescriptions to the OSR:

(a) Liferaft inspection – 4.20.5(e)
   Amended 4.20.5(e) on the basis that liferaft ‘inspection’ is not a defined term.
(b) Storm sails – High visibility 4.26.2 (a)
   Amended 4.26.2(a) to a recommendation until January 2014.

There being no further business, proceedings were terminated at 1725 with the presentation of certificates to committee members in recognition of 4 years service.

Attachment:
Appendix 1 – Working Party recommendation regarding Radar Reflectors
4.10 Radar Reflector

4.10.1 A passive Radar Reflector (that is, a Radar Reflector without any power) shall be carried on board

a) Suggested passive reflectors include:
   
i octahedral with triangular plates making up each pocket it must have a minimum diagonal measurement of 456 mm (18in).
   
ii octahedral with circular sector plates making up each pocket it must have a minimum diameter of 304mm (12in).
   
iii reflectors meeting ISO 8729-1:2010 which requires passive reflectors to have a documented RCS (radar cross-section) of not less than 10 m² at 0° elevation and be capable of performance around 360° in azimuth. At present, there are no practical reflectors available to meet this standard for racing yachts.

When deployed, the passive radar reflector shall be set a minimum of 4 m above the water when deployed.

b) The passive and active devices referred to in these notes and in 4.10.1 and 4.10.2 above are primarily intended for use in the X (9GHz) band.

4.10.2 The most effective radar response from a yacht may be provided by an RTE (Radar Target Enhancer) which may be on board in addition to the required passive reflector. An RTE should conform to ISO 8729-2:2009. An RTE is strongly recommended.

a) An RTE shall be provided in compliance with ISO8729-2:2009 or ITU-R 1176

b) The display of a passive reflector or the operation of an RTE is for the person in charge to decide according to prevailing conditions.

4.10.3 S (3GHz) band radar is often used by ships in bad weather to complement X (9GHz) band radar. On S (3GHz) band a passive reflector offers about 1/10 the response obtained on the X (9GHz) band. Unless
specifically designed to operate in the S(3GHz) band, an RTE will provide no response at all.