

Offshore Special Regulations

Submission: **SR03-20**

OSR 4.26.2 – Heavy Weather Sails

A submission from Offshore Racing Congress

Purpose or Objective

To harmonise with the IMS Rating Rule.

Proposal

Amend the regulation as follows:

MoMu0,1,2,3 a) 4.26.2 A heavy-weather jib (or heavy weather sail in a boat with no forestay) with:
** Area of 13.5% height of the foretriangle ~~(IG)~~ squared
** Readily available means, independent of a luff groove, to attach to the stay

Current Position

As above

Reasons

Question on calculation of the heavy weather jib on OSR where it is defined as:

MoMu0,1,2,3 4.26.2 a) A heavy-weather jib (or heavy-weather sail in a boat with no forestay) with:
** 4.26.2 a) i area of 13.5% height of the foretriangle (IG) squared
** 4.26.2 a) readily available means, independent of a luff groove, to attach to the stay

There is reference to IG in this rule that is defined in IMS (not sure about other rating system) as ERS definition of forestay (not foretriangle) height as:

F3.1 IG shall be the forestay height.

While foretriangle height is calculated in ORC Rules as:

108.4 Foretriangle height IM shall be calculated as follows:

$$IM = \left(IG + \frac{IG \cdot (GO - MW)}{J - GO + MW} \right)$$

Submission: **SR03-20**

Basically foretriangle height is the height to the intersection of the forestay with the mast, while IG (forestay height) is measured up to the rigging point that is slightly modified by IMS rules.

Anyway, ORC is showing on the certificate heavy weather jib area calculated with IM (as foretriangle height) but the question is why IG is references in OSR rule? Would it be more appropriate to have there 'IM' or just 'I' that may work for other rating systems, or simply omit any abbreviation and keep only „foretriangle height“?