Special Regulations Sub-committee Minutes

Special Regulations Sub-committee met at 09:30 – 16:00 hours on 12th November 2013 at the El Bandar Hotel, Muscat, Sultanate of Oman.

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

1. Opening of the Meeting
   The Chairman welcomed members and observers to the meeting.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
   (a) Minutes
      The minutes were noted of the Special Regulations Sub-committee meeting of 5th November 2012.
   (b) Minutes Matters Arising
      There were no matters arising that were not covered on the agenda.

3. Deferred Special Regulations Submissions
   (a) OSR 3.14.2 – Mandatory Requirement for Lifeline to be “taut”
      Deferred Submission SR27-11 was noted from US Sailing to change the definition of ‘taut’ from an optional guideline to a mandatory requirement.
The working party chaired by Roy van Aller presented a report at the meeting, and proposed the following wording:

```
3.14.2
a) When a deflecting force of 4 kg is applied to a lifeline midway between supports of an upper or single lifeline, the lifeline shall not deflect more than 50mm. This measurement shall be taken at the widest span between supports that are aft of the mast.

b) When a deflecting force of 4 kg is applied midway between supports of an intermediate lifeline of all spans that are aft of the mast simultaneously, deflection shall not exceed 80mm from a straight line between the stanchions.
```

The reason for the proposal is it is generally agreed that the requirement for a taut upper or single lifeline should be both mandatory and measurable. Stan Honey noted that the aim of the proposal was to ensure that the upper lifeline was tight, whilst permitting an intermediate lifeline to be at a lower tension compatible with crew positioning comfort. The working party recommended that the measurement method should in future be defined in the Equipment Rules of Sailing.

The Committee decided to:

- delete the word ‘simultaneously’ in paragraph ‘b’.
- delete: ‘80’ and insert: ‘120’ in paragraph ‘b’.
- in (a) and (b) insert after ‘4kg’ , '/f (39.2N)'

Renee Mehl withdrew submission SR27-11 in favour of the working party proposal as amended by the Sub-committee.

On a proposal by Roy van Allan seconded by Renee Mehl and a vote of 5 in favour and 2 abstentions it was agreed:

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

Amend 3.14.2 to read:

```
Lifeline deflection shall not exceed the following:

a) When a deflecting force of 4kg/f (39.2N) is applied to a lifeline midway between supports of an upper or single lifeline, the lifeline shall not deflect more than 50mm. This measurement shall be taken at the widest span between supports that are aft of the mast.

b) When a deflecting force of 4kg/f (39.2N) is applied midway between supports of an intermediate lifeline of all spans that are aft of the mast, deflection shall not exceed 120mm from a straight line between the stanchions.
```

**Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved**

Note: Subsequent to the meeting, it was also agreed to remove the word ‘taut’ from Table 7.

(b) **OSR 4.02 Hull Marking (Colour Blaze)**

1) Deferred submission SR04-12 was withdrawn by Patrick Lindqvist.

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

2) Deferred submission SR13-12 was withdrawn by Sten Edholm.

   **Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Withdrawn**
(c) OSR 4.21 – Distress Signalling Grab Bag
   i) Deferred submission SR06-12 was withdrawn by Patrick Lindqvist.
      \textit{Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Withdrawn}
   
   ii) Deferred submission SR14-12 was withdrawn by Sten Edholm.
      \textit{Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Withdrawn}

(d) OSR 5.01.1 – Personal Locator Beacon (PLB) Registration and OSR 4.19.1 - EPIRB
   i. Deferred submission SR07-12 was withdrawn by Patrick Lindqvist in favour of the
      working party recommendations. See 3(d(iv)).
   
   ii. Deferred submission SR15-12 was withdrawn by Sten Edholm in favour of the
      working party recommendations. See 3(d(iv)).
   
   iii. Deferred submission SR21-12 was withdrawn by Sten Edholm in favour of the
      working party recommendations. See 3(d(iv)).
   
   iv. A report from the working party was received: Stuart Carruthers(Chairman), Richard
      Besse (Ocean Safety), Sten Edholm, Mike Broughton(GBR), Christophe Gaumont, Ron
      Trossbach(USA), Adam Manders (AUS).
      
      It was noted that where national authorities do not provide a registration facility and that
      national authority has allowed it, beacons can be registered on-line with the Cospas-
      Sarsat International Beacon Registration Database (IBRD). IBRD Registration
      permissions by Country Code and Beacon Type are available at:
      
      Stuart Carruthers noted that the country associated with a specific beacon can be
      determined by entering the 15 Hex ID into the Cospas-Sarsat website 406 MHz decode
      program: \url{www.cospas-sarsat.org/en/component/beacondecode/?task=showBeacon}
      
      \textit{Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve:}
      
      The following Working Party proposals were recommended on a unanimous vote:
      
      - Withdraw SR07-12, SR15-12, SR21-12 (see d(i)-(iii) above)
      - Delete all reference to ‘PLB’ in 5.01.1. i) and k)
      - Amend 5.07.1.e) to read: “Where possible every All PLB units as well as with other
         types of EPIRB should shall be properly registered with the appropriate
         authority associated with the country code in the hexadecimal identification
         (15 Hex ID) of the beacon. A beacon can be registered online with the
         Cospas-Sarsat IBRD if the country does not provide a registration facility and
         the country has allowed direct registration in the IBRD.”
      - Amend 4.19.1(c) to read: “Every 406 MHz EPIRB shall be properly
         registered with the appropriate authority associated with the country code in
         the hexadecimal identification (15 Hex ID) of the beacon. A beacon can be
         registered online with the Cospas-Sarsat IBRD if the country does not
         provide a registration facility and the country has allowed direct registration
         in the IBRD.”
      - Delete 4.19.1(e)
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- Delete 4.19.1(h)
- Amend 4.21.3 d) to read: "a combined 406MHz/121.5MHz or type ‘E’ EPIRB registered to the boat (see OSR 4.19.1.b) carried by the yacht."
- Delete 4.21.3 aa)

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved

(e) OSR 5.01 and 5.02 – Lifejacket and Safety Harness Standards / Crotchstraps
   i. Deferred submission SR08-12 was withdrawn by Thomas Nilsson from the Norwegian Sailing Federation.
   ii. A report and presentation was received from the ‘Recovery Back on Board’ working party Sten Edholm(Chairman), Stuart Carruthers, Christophe Gaumont, Patrick Lindqvist, John Rousmaniere (USA)
       Sten noted that OSR Appendix D – ‘Man Overboard – Quick Stop and Lifesling’ should be updated. He had submitted Submission SR06-13 to ensure that the different functions of a lifebuoy and lifesling are noted. He noted that greater prominence needs to be given to the lifting loop required on a Level 150 ISO Lifejacket. It was noted that ISO 15085 – ‘Man overboard and recovery’ was under review, and that the requirement for a solo sailor to be able to recover back on board without outside assistance was proposed (see also SR07-13). Sten proposed that the working party continue and that they prepare submissions for incorporation in 2016.

(f) OSR 3.14.7 – Pulpits, Stanchions and Lifelines
   i) Deferred 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 submission included a 28-page report.
   ii) A report was received dated August 2013 from Yachting Australia
       David Lyons highlighted the report and that there was no evidence of shattering in the tests conducted. Patrick Lindqvist noted that some of the carbon fibre stanchions broke cleanly at deck level. James Dadd considered that the issue was that when overloaded, a metal stanchion would yield and bend and would still be in some way supporting the lifeline on the boat. Carbon fibre would fail and break. Stiffer stanchions could make the deck a weak link. He highlighted that the OSR do not specify what materials can be used for stanchions (only that carbon fibre is prohibited). In the long-term he felt that stanchion material should be reviewed.

       On a proposal by David Lyons, seconded by Patrick Lindqvist there was a unanimous vote to approve Submission SR09-12.

       Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve

       Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved

(g) OSR 3.04 – Stability – Monohulls
   Deferred Submission SR11-12 was withdrawn by Sten Edholm in favour of submission SR03-13.

       Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Withdrawn
(h) OSR 5.03 – Personal Location Lights
Deferred submission SR23-12 was withdrawn by Sten Edholm in favour of the creation of a Distress Alerting and Location Working Party.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Withdrawn

4. Special Regulation Submissions

(a) OSR 4.20.5 Liferaft servicing and inspection
Submission SR01-13 was received from the Royal Yachting Association proposing to simplify the wording regarding liferaft servicing and remove the term 'inspection'.

In view of the work in-progress of the Liferaft working party (Item 6(b)), who are conducting an overall review, it was agreed to defer Submission SR01-13.

On a proposal to defer by James Dadd, seconded by Patrick Lindqvist there was vote of 6 in favour to defer.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Defer

(b) OSR 4.28 Man Overboard Alarm
Submission SR02-13 was received from the Royal Yachting Association.

James Dadd explained that the submission proposed changes to focus on the capability of quickly logging the position of a man overboard.

As an observer, Stan Honey as the original author of the current regulation, agreed that the proposed amendment was an improvement. He had thought that the OSRs could have influenced manufacturers to produce suitable products but this had proved difficult.

On a proposal by James Dadd seconded by Renee Mehl, there was a unanimous vote to approve.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved

(c) OSR 3.04 – Stability – Monohulls
Submission SR03-13 was received from the OSR Monohull Stability Working Party

It was noted that the submission's purpose was to introduce specific stability requirements, in place of the current recommendations. As an observer Dan Nowlan noted that he wanted the submission to be effective 1 January 2014, but proposed that the table be amended in relation to Category 3 ORC Stability Index.

On a proposal by Sten Edholm seconded by James Dadd there was a unanimous vote to approve Submission SR03-13 with the table in 3.04.4 amended to read:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSR Category</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORC Stability Index min</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS Base Value min.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was further agreed to permit the working party to finalise before 1 January 2014 editing regarding sailing weight and sailing righting energy.

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

(d) OSR 3.14.6 Lifeline Minimum Diameters, Required Materials, Specifications
Submission SR04-13 was received from the Chairman.

It was noted that the submission proposed to increase the diameter of dyneema / high-modulus polyethylene (HMPE) lifelines and to recognise that braid on braid construction is recommended by rope manufacturers.

It was noted the Royal Ocean Racing Club (RORC) will continue their prescription to prohibit dyneema lifelines. As an observer Thomas Nilsson, explained his experiences with dyneema lifelines on a TP52. These included having to shorten the lifeline 4 times to account for stretch and creep, while preventing chafe on stanchions remained the biggest issue.

It was agreed to appoint a working party to review lifeline materials (see Item 7(c)).

On a proposal by Will Apold seconded by Sten Edholm there was a unanimous vote to approve Submission SR04-13 with the table in 3.14.6 amended to read:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOA</th>
<th>wire</th>
<th>HMPE rope (Single braid)</th>
<th>HMPE Core (Braid on braid)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 8.5m(28ft)</td>
<td>3mm(1/8 in)</td>
<td>4mm(5/32 in)</td>
<td>4mm(5/32 in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5m-13m</td>
<td>4mm(5/32 in)</td>
<td>5mm(3/16 in)</td>
<td>5mm(3/16 in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 13m (43ft)</td>
<td>5mm(3/16in)</td>
<td>5mm(3/16in)</td>
<td>5mm(3/16in)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(e) OSR 4.10 Radar Reflector
Submission SR05-13 was received from the Chairman on behalf of Radar Reflector Working Party
As an observer, Stan Honey recommended that the current wording regarding the size of radar reflectors with circular sector plates be retained.

On a proposal by Will Apold seconded by Renee Mehl there was a unanimous vote to approve Submission SR05-13 amended to read:

“An octahedral passive radar reflector with circular sector plates of minimum diameter 30 cm (12”) or a reflector with a documented minimum Radar Cross Section (RCS) of area of 2 m².”

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve as amended

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved

(f) OSR 4.22 Lifebuoys 4.24 Heaving Line

Submission SR06-13 was received from Sten Edholm to specify the requirement for a lifesling to be carried in Categories 0-3 and for this to be separated from the requirement for a lifebuoy.

On a proposal by Sten Edholm, seconded by James Dadd there was a unanimous vote to approve.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Approve

Oceanic and Offshore Committee Decision: Approved

(g) New OSR 3.30 – Provision for Re-boarding

Submission SR07-13 from Sten Edholm was withdrawn in favour of further work by the Recovery Back on Board working party.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Withdrawn

5. Submissions

Submission 085-13 was received from the Real Federacion Espanola de Vela. The submission proposes requiring AIS transceivers to be switched on when racing, and for lifejacket and harness to include an AIS transmitter for oceanic races.

It was noted that this submission should have been directed as a submission to amend the Offshore Special Regulations, and not as a general submission to ISAF Council.

The Sub-committee noted that it had previously twice rejected including an OSR requirement for an AIS transponder to be transmitting at all times whilst racing. The preference is that the organising authority should specify this issue in the Notice of Race.

As an observer, Stan Honey noted that the specification of the AIS equipment, the loss in the cabling and the size of the antenna all have an effect on providing a more level playing field from the sporting point of view.

On a motion to reject by Will Apold, there was a unanimous vote to reject.

Subsequent to the meeting, the submission was withdrawn.

Recommendation to the Oceanic and Offshore Committee: Withdrawn
6. **Working Party Reports**

(a) Cockpit Volume and Downflooding

No report was available yet from the working party chaired by Boris Hepp.

(b) Liferafts

A report was received from the working party chaired by Janet Grosvenor.

It was noted that the Working Party strongly felt that the regulations should not make prescriptions that are inconsistent with a recognised International Standard. By doing so this introduces a level of complexity which is confusing to both race organisers and sailors. The natural deduction is that the regulation should only specify liferafts that are in compliance with either ISO9650 Part 1 Group A or where racing takes place in extreme zones or where abnormal weather conditions might be experienced, a SOLAS compliant liferaft.

‘Inspection v Servicing’ - Inspection is not part of manufacturer’s requirements and is therefore inconsistent and causes confusion. The word ‘inspection’ should be removed. Servicing requirements would not be changed.

Renee Mehl agreed that ‘inspection’ should be removed.

Stuart Carruthers noted that ISO were reviewing 9650-Part 3 regarding Liferaft materials this year.

The working party were thanked for their work and requested to produce draft submissions for review in April 2014.

(c) OSR Re-write

A report was received from the working party chaired by Will Apold.

Conceptually, (the Vision):

i. The OSR will be regulations only with a simplified but complete checklist for owners, inspectors;

ii. ISAF Offshore Personal Survival (Safety at Sea) training has been well received and ISAF is starting the first ‘Train the Trainers Course’ in April 2014

iii. The “Guide to Personal Offshore Safety” will be a seamanship/safety training manual for the training courses and owners. This manual is available in English and Chinese at present and the format will allow others to translate it into other languages. It would be reviewed and modified on a 2 year basis in line with the publishing of the OSR;

iv. Interpretation Question and Answer system to aid inspectors and owners with common questions without complicating the regulations.

v. The versions above will be designed for electronic presentation on computers and smart phones.

A re-drafted Section 4 was noted and a proposed timetable of implementation noted:

- 2014 January 30 – Stage 1 circulated to WP
- 2014 March 30 – Stage 2 circulated to WP
- 2014 April – Working Party conference calls to finalise draft
- 2014 July 20- circulate re-draft to Special Regulations Sub-committee
- 2014 November –meeting to review complete re-draft
As an observer, Ken Kershaw questioned what were the plans regarding Category 5 and 6?

Renee Mehl proposed that the checklist be arranged taking account of the process of checking all items below deck and then all above deck. She also proposed that an appendix be retained with all International Standards Organisation (ISO) references, which should provide an explanation of each referenced standard.

James Dadd considered that the sub-committee should have a formal review of all items that are currently recommendations and confirm whether the item should be upgraded to a requirement (and retained) or removed as a recommendation (to the guide). Perhaps the criteria could be: does a recommendation have an effect on placing a person's life at stake.

Mike Urwin highlighted the need to review terminology and defined terms in relation to the Equipment Rules of Sailing such as 'height of foretriangle' and 'foretriangle height'.

The Chairman considered that as the revised draft is progressed, documents should be available on-line, perhaps through Dropbox.

The Sub-committee gave their blessing to continuing the project.

7. Race Incident Reports

(a) Renee Mehl reported on US Sailing's report into a fatality involving the yacht 'Uncontrollable Urge' near San Francisco. The incident occurred on 8 March 2013. During the 2013 Islands Race, Uncontrollable Urge, a Columbia Carbon 32 sailboat, lost its rudder, and drifted onto San Clemente Island 2 ½ hours later. One crew member was drowned when the drifting boat was rolled and the crew was forced to abandon the vessel. The United States Coast Guard and other boats participating in the race offered assistance, but were initially told by Uncontrollable Urge that assistance was not needed. This report addresses issues regarding rudder failures, communication, other boats offering assistance, and safety gear.

(b) A report from the Secretariat was received highlighting some other incidents that have occurred during the past year.

(c) Dyneema Lifeline failure

A dyneema lifeline failure was noted on an X-332 in Kiel, Germany. It was agreed to form a working party to review lifeline materials. James Dadd(Chairman), Thomas Nilsson and others to be confirmed. (see Appendix 1).

8. Construction Standards

A paper was received listing 72 known keel failures over the last 30 years. 55% of the failures were un-defined. Of the 32 defined incidents, 11 incidents involved welded fin failures. David Lyons noted that a keel design could be compliant with the standard, but without an independent as-built survey, there was no way of knowing if the keel had been constructed in accordance with the plans.

James Dadd agreed that the design was only one part of the issue. In the Volvo Ocean 65 one design project a comprehensive program of quality control has been implemented including ultra-sound inspection. He noted that 4 of 6 keel billets had to
be rejected due to not meeting the set standards. The cost of these full inspections per boat was €9,000, whilst the cost of each boat is around €4.5million.

As an observer, Jacques Lehn noted that the IMOCA 60 Class have adopted one design forged-steel keels.

Jason Smithwick noted a proposal that ISAF could include in the ISAF Plan Review process a requirement that in the event of a keel failure the boat owner agrees to use his best endeavours to report the incident and the facts found.

The Sub-committee agreed to:

- continue monitoring keel failures
- include within the ISAF Plan Review an owner’s declaration regarding disclosure of information regarding keel failures.

(b) The Sub-committee considered whether OSR 3.03 should be extended to Category 3 Races.

Sten Edholm, considered that the current pyramid system, where lower Category races are not so stringent is correct.

As an observer Mike Urwin agreed that Category 3 and 4 races are relatively short, close to a safe haven, with a probability of more accurate weather forecasting.

It was agreed not to pursue adding a requirement in Category 3 for Plan Review.

9. **International Regulations Commission**

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

Regarding representation at the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), it had been a relatively quiet year. The IMO Committees are being re-structured.

IMO is not intending to develop the Automatic Identification System (AIS) specifications as a distress alerting system.

NAV 59 received a report of an Inter-sessional Correspondence Group which presented several new symbols for AIS Aids to Navigation. The UK representation to International Association of Marine Aids to Navigation and Lighthouse Authorities (IALA) was that Virtual Navigation Marks should not be used to mark physical hazards. In the UK, where there is a physical hazard, a physical navigation mark will be used, including marking wrecks. Virtual Navigation Marks would be used for instance to mark Traffic Separation Schemes.

SOLAS regulations V/27 (Nautical charts and nautical publications) states: “Nautical charts and nautical publications, such as sailing directions, lists of lights, notices to mariners, tide tables and all other nautical publications necessary for the intended voyage, shall be adequate and up to date.” An explanatory footnote aims to clarify what is meant by the regulation when Electronic Chart Display and Information System (ECDIS) is used to meet the carriage requirements for nautical charts, especially the terms “adequate” and “up to date”. The conclusion is that IMO have accepted that the back-up to an ECDIS system, can be a second independent ECDIS system.

- The Chairman noted that there was economic pressure on the production of paper charts, in the UK the Hydrographic Office is pulling out of production of paper charts aimed at the recreational market. In USA, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) have stated that as of 13 April 2014, the US government will stop printing traditional paper marine charts, NOAA will continue to allow commercial vendors to make and sell NOAA-sourced paper charts.
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Other IMO work is relevant to offshore wind-farms and the free passage of craft through them.

On the European Recreational Craft Directive, the RCD has gone into a new legal framework as it has passed through the European Parliament approval process.

33 of the small craft ISO standard standards will be up for review. ISO 15085 - Man Overboard Prevention and Recovery and ISO 9650 Inflatable Liferafts will be reviewed by the end of 2014. There is a meeting regarding ISO12402 Personal Flotation Devices in Paris in February 2014. A new ISO 19009 Electric Navigation Lights performance standard will now cover LED lights.

10. Distress Alerting and Location

An email was noted from the UK Maritime and Coastguard Agency asking for ISAF’s views on the carriage of pyrotechnics/flares for distress alerting and location.

As an observer, Stuart Carruthers considered that the issue raised was really whether there is anything better than flares for distress alerting. He had already responded to the MCA and it was agreed to circulate his response to the Committee.

11. Race Officials and OSR

A letter was received from Yachting Australia regarding Race Officials and OSR.

It was noted that: “Yachting Australia ask Race Officials to execute their responsibility in helping clubs observe the Special Regulations and meeting their obligations to safety. When regulatory non-compliance comes to your attention, we ask you to address the matter.

We would direct you to not accept officiating roles at events that decline to comply with the Special Regulations, and instead seek the assistance from your state association in addressing the matter…”

David Lyons, noted that this correspondence stemmed from Yachting Australia’s concern that stability requirements for Category 2 races were not being enforced.

12. Discussion Points
(a) OSR Question and Answers

The adoption of an OSR Question and Answers System was considered. It was noted that currently the Racing Rules (Reg 28.3.6.) and the Equipment Rules of Sailing (Reg 29.3.5) have systems enacted by ISAF Regulations.

(b) Shorthanded Racing

It was noted that races organisers make changes to the OSR in the Notice of Race to cater for two-handed racing consideration was given to addressing these issues in the OSR.

13. Any Other Business
(a) Summary of Working Parties

The working parties and their terms of reference and timetables are detailed in Appendix 1.

(b) US Sailing Safety Equipment Requirements 2014

Bjorn Johnson was invited to explain the development of the US Sailing Safety Equipment Requirements:
Following the ‘Low Speed Chase’ incident in 2012, the US Coastguard in San Francisco suspended Bay Area coastal yacht racing while it studied safety procedures with the offshore racing community. Whilst the incident was primarily due to poor seamanship, it was noted that seven organising authorities run races in a variety of formats. The seven organising authorities had each developed their own requirements, and so any given boat would need to be equipped differently from one event to the next. There was also no inspection system to verify that the equipment was on board the boat and a lot of boats didn’t have all the required equipment.

The US Safety Equipment Regulations Sub-committee developed a checklist based on three race categories relating to distance from rescue: Near-shore, Coastal and Ocean.

1. The requirements are easier for yacht owners and pre-race inspectors to understand.
2. The requirements are self-contained and do not refer to external documents.
3. The number of race categories has been reduced from seven to three: Nearshore, Coastal, and Ocean. Race organizers can then add or delete gear requirements based on the nature of their individual races.
4. The requirements are more specific about certain pieces of gear that lacked definition in the OSRs.
5. The OSRs contained both recommendations and requirements which proved confusing to users, and which increased the size of the document. The recommendations have been removed from the new version.
6. The requirements are far more compact, and can easily be included in their entirety in a Notice of Race or on a yacht club website.

As an observer, Stan Honey noted that a lot of organising authorities in the USA were not using the OSR Categories 3 and 4 and had developed their own requirements. The US Coastguard and common sense does not support this approach. As an observer, Dan Nowlan noted that US Sailing will continue to publish the ISAF OSRs, and that the Transpac would continue to use the ISAF OSRs.

Bjorn Johnson was invited, and accepted, to join the ISAF OSR Re-draft working party.

(c) ISAF Offshore Personal Safety Courses

Henry Thorpe highlighted an initiative to promote ISAF Offshore Personal Safety training. ISAF are running a ‘Training Workshop’ for Course Providers to be held on 10-12 March 2014 at the Royal National Lifeboat Institution (RNLI) Training College, Poole, United Kingdom. The workshop is intended for national training managers or lead-instructor trainers to share best practices. Immediately following, on 13-15 March there will be an Instructor Training Seminar for Course Providers, priority will be given to MNAs who are establishing an ISAF OPS Course in their country.

(d) America’s Cup Safety Developments

Stan Honey highlighted developments made following the Artemis tragedy in May 2013.

He was tasked with developing a system to quickly locate a crew member trapped under water. The solution developed was an intensely bright light, powered by a lithium metal battery. The battery duration is very short, only about six minutes, but the light is so intense that it is painful to look at even in direct sunlight. The conditions in San Francisco Bay with the strong tides meant that there was normally only about 8 inches...
of visibility underwater. The crews were equipped with two of these lights on their shoulders. The loom of the lights flashing so brightly underwater was very compelling to all involved. A sensor would trigger the light on if it was continuously underwater for 10 seconds.

In the event of an incident the rapid head count of those recovered to different rescue boats was resolved using waterproof key fobs which activated a light on a control panel.

Virtual AIS Aids to Navigation were used to define the course and boundary. Race Marshalls, spectators, Coastguard were able to monitor any changes on their boats.

There being no further business the meeting was closed at 1600.

Appendix 1 – Working Parties for 2014

1. **Cockpit volume and flooding**
   Designers have been enquiring on how open cockpits should be considered for flooding and trim considerations.
   
   Chair: Boris Hepp, (GER) Members: Nicola Sironi (ORC) Rob Wieland (TP52 class)
   
   Report by January 31 2014

2. **Recovery Back on Board**
   Recovering persons on board is a difficult operation even in calm conditions. In stormy seas, high winds, cold waters and darkness, the task is much more difficult. This Working Party is to look at the possible ways and to determine if there are one or more preferred methods which then can be incorporated into our OSR and Safety at Sea training.
   
   Chair: Sten Edholm (SWE) Members: Stuart Carruthers (GBR), John Rousmaniere (USA), Patrick Lindquist (FIN), Christophe Gaumont (FRA), Staff: Henry Thorpe
   
   Terms of Reference:
   i) Review various methods that can be used to recovery persons in the water to various types of boats.
   ii) Determine which method(s) can be satisfactorily applied for recovery given the range of boats that are used in our Categories and the weather conditions likely to be encountered.
   iii) Determine what changes to the OSR and/or the Safety at Sea training should be considered.
   iv) Prepare a draft report by 1 April.
   v) Prepare a final report and Submissions by 22 September.

3. **Life rafts**
   Life rafts generate the most questions to race organizers from race participants. Yet the life raft section is one of the largest in the OSR. The life raft section also contains many grandfathered units. The purpose of this WP is to gather the latest current information of life rafts and re-write this section of the OSR with the purpose to clarify the options, ensure that the specifications are correct for each Category and to reduce the confusion that participants are obviously encountering.
   
   Chair: Janet Grosvenor (GBR) Members: Bruce Brown (USA) Genevieve White (AUS) Christophe Gaumont (FRA), Sten Edholm (SWE), Richard Besse (GBR) Staff: Henry Thorpe
   
   Terms of Reference:
   i) To review the current offerings (specifications) in suitable life rafts from industry.
   ii) To review the existing section of life rafts (OSR 4.20) to determine:
   iii) Are the OSR specifications for each category (Cat 0 to 3) suitably safe for the category?
   iv) Remove redundant grandfathered items.
v) Review the service lengths for hard shell and valise units with the hopeful result that manufacturer’s recommendations are suitable or one standard date (OSR 4.20.5)

vi) Review the stowage and launching regulations for OSR 4.20.3 and 4.20.4) to see if they are suitable and practical for each category

vii) Make additional comments as the WP feels is necessary

viii) Submit an interim report by 1 April 2014

ix) Submit a final report by 22 September 2014 along with Submissions the WP believes are warranted

4. Distress alerting and location

Pyrotechnic flares has been the standard for short range alerting and location standard for more than 100 years. The use of this technology for distress alerting and location has been dropping recently and being replaced by cell phones, sat phones, VHF and augmented by GPS and radar for location. Most national marine safety organizations are reviewing the carriage of the pyrotechnic devices and are looking at other methods for alerting and notification. For the yachtsman, there have always been issues of safety in the carriage and use of these items as well as the costs to purchase and dispose of them.

Chair: Stuart Carruthers (GBR), Members: David Sutcliffe (CAN), Martin Silk (AUS)
Haluk Suntay (TUR), US Sailing Rep, Staff: Simon Forbes

Terms of Reference:

i) To provide information from the national and international marine safety organizations on the present status and proposed future status of distress alerting and location using pyrotechnics (OSR 4.23)

ii) What are the current plans to reduce the quantity or type of pyrotechnics currently specified by major sailing countries?

iii) Are there plans to introduce required training or certification for use of pyrotechnics?

iv) To provide information on what, if any, studies or investigations are being undertaken on products to replace these pyrotechnics indicating what devices are being considered, what is the timing of a possible introduction

v) To prepare a summary of the above with recommendations on present and future actions that the OSR sub committee should consider

vi) To submit an interim report by 1 April 2014 and a final report by 22 September 2014

vii) To prepare any Submissions by 22 September following from the report

5. Life jacket, harness and safety line review

Life jackets are the first line of defence once a sailor is outside of the life lines. Life jackets come in many formats and there are continually changes. All nations specify standards for life vests. Often they refer to an international standard and often to a national specification. This is a confusing area for sailors. Also from the Recovery of Persons in the Water WP, they would like to see a life vest that can be used to hoist sailors from the water to the safety of the boat. This WP is an information gathering WP to blueprint what is happening at present, what may come down the pipe in the near
future and to give direction to the OSR Sub-committee on life jackets in regard to our
regulations, submissions we may want to make to international bodies, manufacturers’
associations, etc

Chair: Stuart Caruthers (GBR), Members: Guy Perrin (CAN), Patrick Lindquist (FIN),
Renee Mehl (USA), ?? New Zealand/Australia ??, Andor Serra (ESP) Staff: Henry
Thorpe

Terms of Reference:

viii) The focus of this review is on life jackets (OSR 5.01), and Harnesses and Safety
Lines (OSR 5.02) to be used in Category 0 to 5. The WP should review if there is
any reason to have a reduced standard for Cat 4 and 5

ix) To investigate what changes are being considered by international and national
organizations for life jackets

x) To investigate what manufacturers are proposing for future changes to life jackets
in relation to jackets suitable for oceanic and offshore racing

xi) To identify what short comings sailors have in the existing life jackets, harnesses
and safety lines

xii) Should the OSR specify a crotch strap or leg straps or either?

xiii) Can sailors depend upon using the loops on life jackets with harnesses to lift them
from the water? What is the weight lifting specification for these loops? If not what
changes are required?

xiv) To review the life jacket and harness and safety line section of the OSR to identify
any changes that should be considered

xv) Should the OSR Sub-committee consider relaxing the specification on life jackets
in Cat 4 (lights, spray hood, etc)

xvi) To submit an interim report by 1 April 2014 and a final report by 22 September
2014

xvii) Prepare any Submissions by 22 September 2014

6. Re-drafting of the OSR

Chair: Will Apold (CAN), Members: Sten Edholm ORC, Janet Grosvenor (GBR),
Christophe Gaumont (FRA), Richard Hinterholder (CAN), David Lyons (AUS), Bjorn
Johnson (USA), Staff: Simon Forbes, Jason Smithwick, Henry Thorpe

Terms of Reference:

OSR Redraft Concepts and Principles
i) Make no change to the mandatory requirement of the existing OSR.

ii) Make no change to the race categories of the current OSR.

iii) Standardize and simplify the layout and numbering with specific focus on the
electronic format

iv) Clarify the English for consistency and ease of translation by persons not
having English as their first language such as using ‘shall’ instead of a mixture
of ‘shall’ and ‘must’.

v) Remove the majority of recommendations and make sure they are covered in
the Guide to Offshore Personal Safety (GTOPS).

vii) Shorten the text to be more concise, eliminating modifying and tutoring statements.

viii) Remove all grandfathering for items pre-1995 except for structural design.

ix) Structure the OSR such that Categories are more intuitive and are targeted towards the majority of the users.

x) Prepare an improved inspection checklist

Timetable:

2014 January 30 – Stage 1 circulated to WP
2014 March 30 – Stage 2 circulated to WP
2014 April – Working Party conference calls to finalize draft
2014 July 20- circulate re-draft to Special Regulations Sub-committee
2014 November –meeting to review complete re-draft
2014 November – Redraft to be ratified by Oceanic and Offshore Committee
2015 July 31 – Deadline for submissions to amend re-draft
2016 January 1 – New version effective

7. Electric Propulsion Review

Racing yachts with electric engines are just starting to show up on the race course. At present, there is a Class 40 currently racing with an electric propulsion system. Currently the OSRs do not consider electric propulsion. The purpose of the WP is to prepare an information report on the status of electric propulsion and how this technological change could impact the OSR. The purpose is not to create Submissions.

Chair: Boris Hepp, Members: Staff: Simon Forbes

Terms of Reference:

i) What is the status of electric propulsion in offshore type sailboats?

ii) The review should be focused on boats that would sail in Category 0 to 4;

iii) What classes and sizes are electric propulsion systems currently being built?

iv) What design and safety standards are currently used in the design and construction of these boats?

v) What types, if any, should the OSR Sub-committee consider for construction or safety issues?

vi) To submit to the OSR Sub-committee an interim report by 1 April 2014 and a final report by 22 September 2014.

8. Short-handed Racing

Double-handed racing is becoming more popular in Category 2 to 4. The OSR do not have any regulations specifically for double handed racing. The WP has been authorized during the 2013 AGM to review the current OSRs to inform the OSR sub-committee of special safety needs of single-handed racers versus crewed boats and to determine if the OSR sub-committee should consider additions or modifications to the OSRs.
Special Regulations Sub-committee Minutes (cont.)

Chair: Roy van Aller (NED), Members: Christophe Gaumont (FRA), Guy Perrin(CAN), US Sailing rep (from Newport Bermuda race?), Other??, Staff: Simon Forbes

Terms of Reference:

i) To undertake a review of the OSR in Cat 1 to 4 to determine if there are safety issues specific to this form of racing versus crewed boats;

ii) To review the Offshore Special Regulations to recommend any modifications or new regulations specifically for double-handed racing for Categories 1 to 4.

iii) To submit to the OSR sub-committee an interim report by 1 April 2014 and a final report by 22 September 2014

iv) To submit any Submissions by 22 September 2014

9. Life Line Materials

In 2010, the OSR sub committee passed a Submission to permit lifeline construction from UHMWPE (dyneema/spectra materials) for life line construction. In 2013, the size of the diameter was increased and lines braid and braid or double braid lines were allowed. There have been failures and reports of maintenance issues. The WP has been organized to review life line failures (all materials) and to look at these materials in life lines in regard to failures, maintenance issues and installation issues. The primary focus is to gather more information on UHMWPE and to understand its proper use, installation and maintenance with the goal of reviewing the current regulation and making recommendations to any changes following the WP’s review.

Chair: James Dadd, Members: Tom Rinda(USA), Thomas Nilsson(NOR). Staff: Simon Forbes

Terms of Reference:

i) To undertake a review of typical failures of life lines both stainless steel and UHMWPE investigating the primary reasons for failure of these materials as life lines;

ii) Identify methods to reduce or eliminate the reasons for failure for all materials studied

iii) To review the OSRs to determine if changes to the life line section should be undertaken

iv) To submit an interim report to the Sub-committee on the progress and work to date, additional work and a timetable. Submit a final report by 22 September with work undertaken, analysis and recommendations

v) To submit any Submissions by 22 September 2014

10. Review of Event Categories 4 and 5

Category 4 races are sailed in daylight and within close proximity to shore. It has been suggested that the regulations prescribed in the OSRs are excessive for the conditions that are likely to be encountered. Therefore a review of the regulations is reasonable.

Chair: Mike Urwin (RORC) Members: Alp Doguoglu (TUR), David Lyons (AUS)?? US Sailing ??, Roy van Aller (NED), Staff: Henry Thorpe

Terms of Reference:

i) To review the regulations for category 4 and 5 in consideration of the likely weather and sea conditions to be encountered and to recommend elimination or modification of these regulations that the WP considers prudent
ii) To submit an interim report by 1 April and a final report by 22 September
iii) To submit any Submissions by 22 September

11. Stability

With changes to the ISO standard on stability and the desire to assist Race Organizers in ensuring that vessels with insufficient stability are restricted from racing. The Working Party has reported at the 2013 meeting, however additional work remains.

Chair: Sten Edholm (SWE), Members: Stuart Carruthers (GBR) Nicola Sironi (ORC), Dan Nowlan (USA), Staff: Jason Smithwick.