

**Submission: ESP 1**

**Reporting committee: ITC**

---

### ***STORED ENERGY***

#### **PROPOSAL**

To clarify the use of the “electric winch handles.”

#### **RATIONALE**

The use of products such as the “electric winch handles” is becoming increasingly popular, especially among the solo and double-handed sailors. IMS F9.11 is quite clear, but most sailors only connect the term “non-manual power” with the use of electric or hydraulic winches, not with the use of this type of winch handle.

---

**Submission: ESP 2**

**Reporting committee: MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**

---

### ***FLOTATION TRIM***

#### **PROPOSAL**

To change the wording “measurement trim” to “flotation trim.”

#### **RATIONALE**

To be in line with The Equipment Rules of Sailing H.7.1 “Conditions for Weight and Flotation Measurement.” The term “measurement trim” refers to a specific levelling of the boat. However, for keel boats that are measured while afloat, achieving this precise levelling is not feasible. The rule's intent is to define the boat's condition and its interior setup during measurement. What we achieve when measuring a boat is a flotation trim (also defined on ERS C.6.3.c) for that specific boat in the “measurement condition.”

---

**Submission: ESP 3**

**Reporting committee: ITC  
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE**

---

### ***MAST JACK PUMP ON BOARD***

#### **PROPOSAL**

To penalize boats with the mast jack pump on board.

#### **RATIONALE**

Having the mast jack pump on board gives the crew the ability to adjust the rig while racing. The rule, as it is currently written, mentions only the “possibility” to adjust the base of the mast, but it does not address having the chance to carry the pump on board because an owner can declare that they do not use it while racing, only between races.

Having no means to control use of the pump while racing gives the opportunity for a team to use it against their declaration, and thus against the rule.

In order to avoid this situation it should be clear that carrying the mast jack pump on board should be associated with a proper penalty.

---

**Submission: ESP 4**

**Reporting committee: ITC  
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**

---

### ***MHB MEASUREMENT***

#### **PROPOSAL**

To delete IMS G2.2.

#### **RATIONALE**

IMS G2.2 specifies the way to measure MHB when the centerline of a batten pocket is situated above the seven-eighths leech point. It's usual to find certified mainsails with this situation, but with the MHB incorrectly measured on the sail instead of following the rule. This is a clear measurer's mistake.

The difference in percentage of APH between a sail correctly measured and a sail incorrectly measured is usually less than the 0.1 %, so ORC rule 305.2 a) shall be applied to that boat.

Having no effect (or little effect) on the rating calculation, and according to the above-mentioned rule, if a protest is filed it will be dismissed, the boat would not be penalized, and it will continue racing without any modification.

All this process is a waste of time and effort that can be easily avoided by deleting the IMS G2.2 rule.

---

**Submission: ESP 5**

**Reporting committee: ITC  
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**

---

### ***HHB MEASUREMENT***

#### **PROPOSAL**

If ESP 4 is not supported, and thus IMS G2.2 is not deleted, then to apply the same concept of measuring MHB, or in the case of a batten over MUW, to measure HHB.

#### **RATIONALE**

It is not very common, but we can find this sometimes on an HSF (Headsail Set Flying). If we apply this rule to mainsails, why not also to apply this to headsails?

---

## Submission: EST 1

Reporting committee: **ITC**

---

### MINIMUM AWA

#### PROPOSAL

Establish a minimum AWA for 24 knots of windspeed for windward/leeward courses in the 2025 VPP. For 35–40-foot boats this minimum AWA could be 130-135° or for high performance planning boats it could be smaller.

#### RATIONALE

In 2024 ORC introduced 24 knots in the time allowance table. Adding a new time allowance turned many *displacement boats* with asymmetric downwind sails to be *high performance planing boats*.

According to figures from the 2024 Speed Guide, a displacement boat should sail 110 AWA and 15-17 degrees heel angles in downwind VMG mode, which is too optimistic. In reality these boats are sailing in 20+ knots of wind (as observed in the 2023 ORC Worlds in Kiel) at deep angles, approximately TWA 155-160, with an AWA 135-140. However, the new 2024 VPP, there should be minimum AWA 130-135 in 24 knots to avoid VPP to assume excessive true wind angles and VMG boat speeds in downwind run.

Table 1 provides an example for 4 boats. According to the 2024 speed guide in TWS of 20 knots of wind, SUGAR 3 (Italia 11.98) has the fastest VMG speed (8,13 Kts). If we look at best performance in 24 knots of wind speed, the Italia 11.98 has the lowest VMG speed on a downwind run, 0,52 slower than the similar sized boat J-112. If we look at the boat's performance in 24 kts at 150 TWA (more realistic in windward/leeward races), the fastest boat is the Italia 11.98, 0,09 knots faster than the J-112.

| Boat                 | Sail     | TWS | Condition | TWA    | BTV   | VMG  | AWS   | AWA    | Heel  | Reef | Flat |
|----------------------|----------|-----|-----------|--------|-------|------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|
| Sugar 3 EST-792      | BestPerf | 20  | run       | 175,70 | 8,16  | 8,13 | 11,88 | 172,75 | 10,14 | 1    | 1    |
| Sugar 3 EST-792      | BestPerf | 24  | run       | 140,19 | 12,21 | 9,38 | 16,58 | 112,05 | 17,10 | 1    | 1    |
| Shadow EST-113       | BestPerf | 20  | run       | 175,48 | 8,02  | 7,99 | 12,02 | 172,46 | 7,05  | 1    | 1    |
| Shadow EST-113       | BestPerf | 24  | run       | 140,53 | 12,82 | 9,90 | 16,29 | 110,50 | 15,31 | 1    | 1    |
| Katariina II EST-646 | BestPerf | 20  | run       | 175,48 | 7,84  | 7,82 | 12,20 | 172,57 | 9,91  | 1    | 1    |
| Katariina II EST-646 | BestPerf | 24  | run       | 139,74 | 12,76 | 9,74 | 16,47 | 109,69 | 15,90 | 1    | 1    |
| Sugar EST774         | BestPerf | 20  | run       | 175,70 | 7,81  | 7,79 | 12,23 | 172,95 | 13,95 | 1    | 1    |
| Sugar EST774         | BestPerf | 24  | run       | 139,74 | 12,42 | 9,47 | 16,59 | 110,82 | 15,43 | 1    | 1    |

1. Speed Guide of best performance with the 2024 VPP

| Boat                 | Sail     | TWS | Condition | TWA    | BTV  | VMG  | AWS   | AWA    | Heel  | Reef | Flat |
|----------------------|----------|-----|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|
| Sugar 3 EST-792      | BestPerf | 20  | run       | 175,70 | 8,16 | 8,13 | 11,88 | 172,75 | 10,14 | 1    | 1    |
| Sugar 3 EST-792      | BP 150   | 24  | reach     | 150,00 | 9,98 | 8,64 | 16,15 | 132,00 | 4,86  | 1    | 1    |
| Shadow EST-113       | BestPerf | 20  | run       | 175,48 | 8,02 | 7,99 | 12,02 | 172,46 | 7,05  | 1    | 1    |
| Shadow EST-113       | BP 150   | 24  | reach     | 150,00 | 9,95 | 8,61 | 16,17 | 132,09 | 2,36  | 1    | 1    |
| Katariina II EST-646 | BestPerf | 20  | run       | 175,48 | 7,84 | 7,82 | 12,20 | 172,57 | 9,91  | 1    | 1    |
| Katariina II EST-646 | BP 150   | 24  | reach     | 150,00 | 9,65 | 8,36 | 16,37 | 132,85 | 4,56  | 1    | 1    |
| Sugar EST774         | BestPerf | 20  | run       | 175,70 | 7,81 | 7,79 | 12,23 | 172,95 | 13,95 | 1    | 1    |
| Sugar EST774         | BP 150   | 24  | reach     | 150,00 | 9,67 | 8,37 | 16,36 | 132,81 | 1,45  | 1    | 1    |

2. Speed Guide, where in 24 knots the TWA is set 150

Table 2 shows the differences in speed on a VPP run with the 2024 VPP. If we compare data from the 2023 Kiel Worlds Race 4, where the Race Committee measured wind speeds at 22-25 knots over a distance of 5 nm, Sugar 3 won the race when scored with the 2023 VPP.

However, with new 2024 VPP the margin in corrected time would be even larger over the J-112's, such as in Race 5, where the wind was measured at 20-24 knots over a distance of 5,8 nm. SUGAR 3 also won this race by 55 seconds over two J-112's, with the 2024 VPP scoring margin even larger.

There are other odd figures, such as when comparing the downwind VMG ratings of the Italia 11.98 SUGAR 3 EST-792 vs those of the Italia 9.98 SUGAR EST-774. In 20 knots TWS the Italia 11.98 is rated be faster than the Italia 9.98 by 19,7 sec/mile, but in 24 knots the results are vice-versa, with the smaller 9.98 faster than the 11.98 by 3.8 s/NM.

| Downwind run         |       |       |       |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Boat                 | 20 kt | 24 kt | Delta |
| Sugar 3 EST-792      | 442,6 | 383,8 | -58,8 |
| Shadow EST-113       | 450,5 | 363,7 | -86,7 |
| Katariina II EST-646 | 460,5 | 369,7 | -90,8 |
| Sugar EST-774        | 462,3 | 380,0 | -82,3 |

1. Downwind run comparison of best performance.

---

**Submission: EST 2**

**Reporting committee: ITC  
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE**

---

### **ADJUSTABLE MAST FOOT**

#### **PROPOSAL**

If there is a mast pump on board while racing then the Adjustable Mast Foot switch should be "on" for Adjustable Mast Foot.

#### **RATIONALE**

There are many boats measured with a mast pump on board in measurement trim and recorded under "Measurement inventory" but on the certificate "Adjustable Mast Foot" is recorded as "No".

Therefore the 2023 ESP 2 submission rationale is still valid and the problem has not been corrected. The current practice is not according to the 2023 ITC Minutes if the Adjustable Forestay is in use while racing and not declared by the owner. If registered during measurement then the mast pump should also be treated accordingly.

---

**Submission: FIN 1**

**Reporting committee: OFFSHORE CLASSES AND EVENTS COMMITTEE  
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

---

## ***EVENT SUSTAINIBILITY***

### **PROPOSAL**

Adding event sustainability and evaluation to applications for Hosting Championships in ORC Championship Regulations as follows:

3.2 The application shall include:

- f) A plan of how the event organization supports and will drive sustainability standards through its events.

4.2 9 months before the event:

The OA shall provide an event sustainability plan that includes:

- A plan on how to communicate sustainably throughout the event process
- A plan on catering the event sustainably
- A plan on lowering the event's energy, transit and fossil fuels footprint
- A plan on managing materials & waste sustainably

In a best-case scenario ORC should provide a Sustainable Event Self Certification sheet for the OA to use as a checklist on providing a sustainable event.

### **RATIONALE**

These actions support the World Sailing sustainability agenda 2030 (Recommendation Two: Deliver Sustainability through Events).

---

**Submission: FIN 2**

**Reporting committee: ITC  
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**

---

## ***LIFERAFT***

### **PROPOSAL**

Allow boats to be measured with a liferaft on board and included in the inventory.

### **RATIONALE**

Modern boats designed for offshore sailing are often designed to be equipped with liferafts. With ORC measurement rules not allowing the liferaft to be onboard during freeboard measurements and an inclining test, this may result in sailors compromising on safety by leaving the liferaft on shore unless required by the NoR.

A liferaft mounted in a fixed position should be weighted, added to the inventory and marked with an inspection sticker by the measurer like sails are done now. The weight penalty of carrying a liferaft especially in lighter boats is not in line with other factors considered to make the sport safe.

**Submission: MANCOM 1**

**Reporting committee: OFFSHORE CLASSES AND EVENTS COMMITTEE**

---

### ***DIVISIONS AT DOUBLE HANDED CHAMPIONSHIPS***

#### **PROPOSAL**

Replace the Corinthian Division in each class with Men, Women and Mixed crew divisions at the ORC DH Championships. Championship titles are to be kept within the class, while Men, Women and Mixed divisions will receive additional prizes from the organizer.

#### **RATIONALE**

DH racing is a different type of sailing and there may be amateurs that are better prepared for DH racing than some professional trying DH racing for the first time. This was shown in DH championships held so far where many crews were not aware of Corinthian regulations and requirements and therefore the importance of a Corinthian division had been diminished.

Instead, for DH racing it is more appropriate to have Men, Women and Mixed crew divisions. This will help promote the inclusion of more women in sailing and also achieve better gender equality that is also a strong WS policy. At the last ORC DH Worlds in Oslo there were 11 Mixed gender crews that deserved more recognition.

---

**Submission: MANCOM 2**

**Reporting committee: OFFSHORE CLASSES AND EVENTS COMMITTEE**

---

### ***CLASSES AT DOUBLE HANDED CHAMPIONSHIPS***

#### **PROPOSAL**

Set up fixed class limits for the DH Championships just as it is for the fully-crewed championships except that APH should be used to define the classes instead of CDL as follows:

Class A: APH from 430.0 – 519.9 s/NM

Class B: APH from 520.0 – 559.9 s/NM

Class C: APH from 560.0 – 630.0 s/NM

with the additional requirement of having a minimum of 10 entries for the number of boats plus the number of countries in each class.

#### **RATIONALE**

ORC DH Championships have now been held for 3 years in 3 countries, and as this was a new type of racing the classes were not defined by the Notices of Race. Instead classes were determined after the close of entries. A result of this approach was that the same boat could race in different classes in different championships.

Having defined fixed limits is also easier for the sailors to prepare the boat knowing which class they would like to enter.

After 3 years of DH championship events there is enough data of the boats participating from which a study was made to develop the proposed class limits shown above. Use of APH is more appropriate for DH events since CDL is based on rated upwind speed and more appropriate for windward/leeward racing.

**Submission: MANCOM 3**

**Reporting committee: OFFSHORE CLASSES AND EVENTS COMMITTEE**

---

### ***ORC INTERNATIONAL FOR SPORTBOAT CHAMPIONSHIPS***

#### **PROPOSAL**

Require ORC International Certificates for ORC Sportboat Championships

#### **RATIONALE**

The ORC Sportboat Class Rule accepts both ORC International and ORC Club certificates, but for the class championship events only ORC International certificates should be accepted. Sportboats are relatively small and easy to have freeboards and stability measured and using ORC Club at the championships diminishes the accuracy of the VPP and measurement process.

Getting all boats fully measured is also better for the sailors as they will have more accurate ratings.

---

**Submission: NED 1**

**Reporting committee: MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE  
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE**

---

### ***STERN HEIGHT AS A DEFINITION FOR ORC CLUB PURPOSES***

#### **PROPOSAL**

Additionally define the aftmost point of the hull (stern) in the offset file. Extend the LPP to facilitate boat trim calculations based on displacement/stern height.

#### **RATIONALE**

The ultimate intention of this submission is to provide an alternate to the LPP routine which calculates freeboards from a club displacement input (ORC Club). This so-called "pessimisation" routine requires even today over 10 minutes computing time and is in practice circumvented by workarounds.

Boat trim can also be calculated from boat weight (displacement entered directly) and stern height, and this is the essence of the proposal. A strong point of this method is that stern height is easy to measure because a layman cannot measure freeboards. Displacement entered directly can be either declared (ORC Club) or measured (crane weight). This proposal anticipates a growing interest in ORC if crane weighing is used to measure displacement.

Please bear in mind that this is for Club certificate purposes only. This proposal supports an alternate method to process Club certificates when freeboards are not measured. Freeboard points might not be validated in the Club offset or data may be simply owner-declared.

There are quite a number of offsets around where the underwater body is pretty accurate but freeboards are discussable. In these cases the proposed option can be of help especially when boat weight is known, for instance with an IRC endorsed certificate

---

Submission: NED 2

Reporting committee: **MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**

## WASH BASIN DEFINITION FOR CRUISER/RACERS

### PROPOSAL

Change the wording of IMS Appendix 1 Rule 208.2 - Wash Basin to be permanently installed and connected to the water system. For boats with an overall length of less than 8.5 (or 9?) meters 208.2 does not apply.

### RATIONALE

We have had a couple of discussions with owners trying to have their boats in the cruiser/racer category when they do not meet the requirements. You then run into a discussion that other countries are putting these boats in the cruiser/racer category. This applies especially to the J/99 which is a popular boat in the Netherlands.

Owners then come up with the most creative solutions which potentially could meet the specific requirements but certainly not in the spirit of the rule.

By the same token a lot of older small boats - for example quarter tonners - never had a wash basin near the toilet nor is there any space for this.

**BOXIO**

PRODUCTS ▾ SAVING PACKAGES ABOUT BOXIO ▾ English ▾

Your portable camping sink

### BOXIO Wash

159,90 € ~~189,90 €~~ ★★★★★ 4,65

Whether it's for washing your hands after using the toilet, washing up in between or brushing your teeth in the evening - make sure you get our portable camping sink!

In stock - estimated delivery time in checkout

ADD TO CART

- ✓ Thanks to the hand pump, the sink is always ready for use, no dead battery or forgotten charging
- ✓ Ready to use; you don't have to run water pipes or cables across your van
- ✓ Everything included: pump, faucet, tank, seals. Everything you need for your camping sink is already included in the scope of delivery



**Submission: NED 3**

**Reporting committee: MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE  
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

---

### ***GALLEY AREA DEFINITION FOR CRUISER/RACERS***

#### **PROPOSAL**

Change the wording of IMS Appendix 1 – Rules 206 and 207 in such a way that it clarifies that a 10-meter boat with 2 cabins and sleeping bunks in the salon can (or cannot) qualify as a cruiser/racer.

#### **RATIONALE**

The wording in rule 207 is that “A galley area is not permitted in a space counted as a Sleeping Area and shall include...”

Discussions can be made whether a galley in the salon with bunks is a disqualifier. The rule should be clear in what is intended, since now a Dehler 36 with 2 cabins (or many equivalent boats) cannot be a Cruiser/Racer when it is clearly intended to be this kind of boat.

Our opinion is that the wording used must be explicitly clear whether or not it meets the criteria.

---

**Submission: NOR 1**

**Reporting committee: ITC**

---

### ***SPLIT RUNNERS AND CHECKSTAYS IN VPP CALCULATIONS***

#### **PROPOSAL**

Change the Runners calculation to runners or checkstays.

#### **RATIONALE**

Some boats have no runners but only checkstays to support the mast. Today, ticking of 1 runner/checkstays treats this as a running backstay at IM and not a checkstays far below IM.

The checkstays on J/120's is one example.

---

**Submission: SLO 1**

**Reporting committee: ITC**

---

### **HEADSAIL FURLER**

#### **PROPOSAL**

To delete in IMS rule F9.8 the sentence ..." which has HLP greater than 110% of J."

#### **RATIONALE**

IMS rule F9.8 already limits the credit for the headsail furler to one headsail only. More and more boats have headsail furler with jibs smaller than 110% of LPG and some of them have only self-tacking jibs. The rating credit for having a headsail furler should be the same for all sizes of furling headsails (from small self-tacking jibs to large 130 or 150% genoas).

---

**Submission: SWE 1**

**Reporting committee: ITC**

---

### **VMG DOWNWIND SPEEDS FOR ASYMMETRIC VS SYMMETRIC SAILS**

#### **PROPOSAL**

Revise the VMG downwind speeds for asymmetric set-up vs. symmetric to stop type-forming the fleet and to make the playing field level regardless of which sail type is used.

#### **RATIONALE**

The development of asymmetric downwind sails the last 20 years has been significant in terms of VMG ability and stability at high apparent wind angles so the rating coefficient between a symmetric set on a pole and asymmetric set on a sprit is not anymore correct and needs to be revised.

The current fleet is becoming more and more prone to racing with asymmetric sails which in itself is not a bad thing but there should not be a built-in bias in the VPP.

---

**Submission: SWE 2**

**Reporting committee: ITC**

---

### **ALLOCATION OF REACHING SAILS**

#### **PROPOSAL**

Revise the VPP to allow boats with a symmetric spinnaker set up as well as an asymmetric set up to have a level playing field regarding a reaching sail.

#### **RATIONALE**

A boat with an asymmetric set-up (A2, A3, A4...) automatically get a free reaching sail (>85% SHW). The same sail set on a boat with a symmetric set-up is given a rating hike, even if the sail is smaller than the biggest S sail and >85% SHW.

**Submission: SWE 3**

**Reporting committee: OFFSHORE CLASSES AND EVENTS COMMITTEE**

---

### **CLASS SPLITS AT DH CHAMPIONSHIPS**

#### **PROPOSAL**

Allow the organizer to continue to set the class boundaries for DH Continental and World Championships.

#### **RATIONALE**

The fleets in different parts of the world look different and to get good championships and discourage owners to build to specific measurements the classes should be able to be set freely by the organizer of a championship.

The Doublehanded class already adopts this approach and the numbers of participants are encouraging as well as the “go with what you have” approach that encourages participation.

---

**Submission: SWE 4**

**Reporting committee: RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

---

### **QUALITY PARAMETERS FOR DIFFERENT RACE TYPES**

#### **PROPOSAL**

Set general guidelines to improve overall quality of the races and help Racing Officers and participants to decide and expect more fair racing. Examples include:

1. When setting courses for coastal and offshore races these should carry all wind angles in similar amounts. Starts should be upwind starts.
2. When setting courses for coastal and offshore races these should be held in open water allowing for an open playing field.
3. Coastal and offshore as well as W/L races should be sailed in mean winds above 6 kts to uphold the fairness and the equal chance to win.
4. Course lengths for W/L races should be that all classes have an elapsed time of 1.0-1.5 hrs for the slowest boat in the class. This will mean course lengths of between 5-8 miles.

#### **RATIONALE**

Coastal and offshore courses set with all wind angles of similar amounts calculates more correctly under the APH single or triple numbers should the constructed course not be feasible to set. In addition they will also complement the W/L races which are mainly VMG sailing. If a coastal or offshore race is sailed in a confined and narrow course area the significance of being a larger versus a smaller boat is exaggerated in terms of free wind and ability to make a good race despite the size of the boat.

When scoring a fleet where no boat reaches the lower wind limit of the ORC PCS matrix the advantage in terms of relative corrected times lies increasingly at lower wind speeds with the faster boats. Thus races where no boat reaches the 6 knots polar wind speed should be avoided. Courses that are too short in distance and time emphasize the starting advantage that often lies with the larger boats in a fleet. The course lengths should allow for fair and uncrowded roundings and a balance in time between the starting session, manoeuvring and straight-line sailing.

**Submission: SWE 5**

**Reporting committee: RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

---

### ***VALIDATING WRS NUMBERS***

#### **PROPOSAL**

When using WRS there is a scenario that the expected weather didn't arrive or turned out significantly different than predicted. Allow a way to retroactively invalidate the WRS TCF's and change to another scoring method to back out of WRS scoring because more than half of the boats did not meet the expected sailed times within a 10% margin.

#### **RATIONALE**

WRS scoring is a fantastically correct and a fair scoring method as long as the predicted weather appears during the race. If or when that does not happen and results become a hot topic after the race WRS will look unpredictable and difficult to understand for the participants, thus inhibiting organizers from using it or sailors refraining from participating at all if the WRS gets a less than robust reputation.

---

**Submission: SWE 6**

**Reporting committee: OFFSHORE CLASSES AND EVENTS COMMITTEE**

---

### ***GROUPING OF BOATS OF DIFFERENT CLASSES AT ORC CHAMPIONSHIPS***

#### **PROPOSAL**

Disallow the organizer to group classes that are under-subscribed to a fully crewed Continental or World Championship.

#### **RATIONALE**

The experiences from this year's European Championships in Mariehamn after the Class 0 boat Beau Geste was grouped with the remaining Class A boats were less than positive with the exception of the winners.

---

**Submission: TUR 1**

**Reporting committee: ITC**

---

### ***KEEL WIDTH EFFECT***

#### **PROPOSAL**

Review the effect of keel width on windward performance.

#### **RATIONALE**

We feel that there is still an unwanted rating advantage of Folkboat type of boat (see 2023 ITC Minutes – Item 9) and previous submissions on this matter.

**Submission: TUR 2**

**Reporting committee: ITC**

---

### **LONGITUDINAL CREW POSITION**

#### **PROPOSAL**

To add an optimization of speed using a longitudinal movement of a crew. For this purpose, the center of gravity of the crew shall be calculated as follows:

- 1) Maximum crew trimming moment ( $MT_{crew}$ ) is calculated considering maximum forward crew position aft of the mast and area  $0.5 \times 0.5 \text{ m}^2$  for each crew member:  
$$X_{crew} = (J + SFJ) + (0.5 \times 0.5 \times CrewNumber) / (2 \times MB)$$
- 2) For any given wind condition (TWS, TWA) the sailing trim and boat speed ( $V_s$  default) in sailing trim is calculated, as usual.
- 3) If transom height is less than zero ( $Y < 0$ ) then longitudinal trimming moment (MT) needed to get  $Y=0$  is calculated using Moment Unit Trim (MUT).
- 4) If  $MT > MT_{crew}$  then sailing trim and corresponding speed ( $V_s$  trimmed) with maximum forward crew position is calculated.
- 5) If  $MT < MT_{crew}$  then sailing trim and corresponding speed ( $V_s$  trimmed) with  $Y=0$  is calculated.
- 6) Maximum of ( $V_s$  default;  $V_s$  trimmed) is used for further calculations

#### **RATIONALE**

For light boats with flat bottom in the aft part the optimization of trim has great importance. Currently, VPP does not consider such possibility.

---

**Submission: USA 1**

**Reporting committee: MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE**

---

### **NON-SPINNAKER CERTIFICATES**

#### **PROPOSAL**

Change name of Non-Spinnaker certificates to Non-Flying Sails.

#### **RATIONALE**

ORC Rating rule 301.4 specifies that boats without a Spinnaker nor Headsail set Flying (HSF) may have issued a Non-Spinnaker certificate. However, the label "Non-Spinnaker" suggests this limitation applies only to this sail type. This often creates confusion for owners and organizing authorities who wish to promote races using this certificate type because they are unaware of the additional restriction on HSF's, that also includes staysails. Typically this confusion arises because both the owners and organizers are both new and casual users of ORC Club-level certificates and simple scoring systems. We ask for two changes to the current rules:

- (1) Change 301.4 to allow use of Inner flying headsails, and
- (2) We suggest that if the HSF restriction continues to be an intended product for ORC that its designation be changed to “Non-Flying Sails.” This will reduce confusion and help to grow ORC acceptance and use among casual fleets.

Furthermore, for Rating Officers issuing Non-Flying Sail certificates we suggest the Manager software automatically disables all Flying Sails (non-Inner HSF’s and Spinnakers) on the certificate.

---

**Submission: USA 2**

**Reporting committee: MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**

---

### **CRUISER/RACER COMPLIANCE STANDARDS**

#### **PROPOSAL**

Achieve better compliance and conformity to C/R standards.

#### **RATIONALE**

IMS Appendix A describes what is needed for compliance to Cruiser/Racer standards, with one requirement being cockpit seating size based on crew size. This is not quantified and thus is subject to inconsistent interpretation by Measurers and Rating Offices.

For consistency we therefore suggest a standard for seat length to be integral values based on each crew being 0.5 m wide.

Furthermore, we suggest for unmeasured Club certificates that photos be required when needed to confirm to the rating office that the boat complies with C/R standards.

---

**Submission: USA 3**

**Reporting committee: ITC**

---

### **APPENDAGES SHAPE ON HIGH PERFORMANCE BOATS**

#### **PROPOSAL**

Review rated performance effect of varied appendage shapes on high-performance boats.

#### **RATIONALE**

There is a recent trend in TP 52 appendage designs towards favoring keel and rudder blades with more area than in previous generations. These new shapes are proving to have a significant and noticeable advantage in lower speed conditions on the race course, such as when hitting wave chop or through downspeed maneuvers. This design trend is also noticeable in the current 52SuperSeries fleet. Since most TP 52’s competing in ORC events are unmodified from their original designs of a few generations ago, those teams that can re-configure to the latest trend have a significant unrated advantage in performance, and this threatens to de-stabilize the fleet’s current balance of fair and competitive racing.

For example, the GL 52’s in the US are considering imposing unilateral rating penalties to offset this problem. We ask ITC to re-evaluate the formulations in appendix leeway, lift and drag to examine if this observed performance difference can be more accurately defined in the VPP.

**Submission: USA 4**

**Reporting committee: ITC**

---

### ***NON-MANUAL POWER SYSTEMS***

#### **PROPOSAL**

Re-evaluate the rating penalties assessed on boats equipped with non-manual power systems.

#### **RATIONALE**

In recent years the technology for powered systems has continued to improve with features such as remote buttons and improved line speeds in both trim and reverse directions. Battery technology has also improved to where these systems are more powerful and durable at lighter and lighter weight footprints.

The result is that these systems are growing in popularity because a crew can now actively and remotely trim sails in windy conditions without any change in windward crew weight position. This tool is particularly powerful for boats with high SA/DSPL ratios, with observed performance gains of up to several sec/mile compared to sisterships without these systems.

Currently the rating assessments do not seem accurate, especially since they result in less penalty with more wind, and it should have the opposite effect.

We therefore ask that a re-evaluation be made of the rating assessments made in VPP Documentation 3.7 to reflect these observed performance advantages, and more appropriate definitions of these systems in ORC rule 204. For example, now the certificate designations for Non-Manual Power are just Rig, Rig & Sheets, and None. It would be useful to more clearly specify which control lines fit in these categories.

Also, while the equation 3.16 correctly minimizes the penalty for boats with less crew weight, we feel the pw coefficients should be re-examined: why should Cruiser/Racers get more penalty than Performance division boats when they are more likely to have these systems installed? should this not be reversed?

---

**Submission: USA 5**

**Reporting committee: OFFSHORE CLASSES AND EVENTS COMMITTEE  
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

---

### ***FLEXIBILITY FOR ORC CONTINENTAL CHAMPIONSHIP EVENTS***

#### **PROPOSAL**

Allow more flexibility to current guidelines and policies for ORC Continental Championship events.

#### **RATIONALE**

The current Green Book rules and standards have been developed, refined and proven successful over the past few decades for the sailing cultures in Europe. However, the details of these standards cannot easily be met nor are appropriate for other sailing cultures outside this region. The distribution of boat sizes and types, racing format preferences, and geographies can be quite different, yet the levels of competency in competition and race and event management can still be achieved at championship levels.

For example, the current standard CDL splits may not produce the most fair racing in events outside of EUR, and the NOR 4.3 a) and b) in its current wording can never be achieved for any event outside of EUR.

We therefore ask for a thorough review of these standards so that there is greater flexibility available for non-EUR organizers to receive ORC approval for Continental championships in all categories: General, Double Handed and Sportboat events.

---

**Submission: USA 6**

**Reporting committee: RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

---

### ***GUIDANCE FOR WEATHER ROUTING SCORING***

#### **PROPOSAL**

Provide clear guidance on the access and suggest use of Weather Routing Scoring for race managers.

#### **RATIONALE**

The advent of Weather Routing Scoring (WRS) has this year shown tremendous promise as a new tool for more accurate and fair rating and scoring of coastal and offshore races. With broad application this may help replace not only APH as a scoring method but many current course models for numerous ORC-scored races as well.

However, since race managers often are not weather experts, we ask for the WRS system software to be designed for easy use and clear guidance on its applicability, such as when an existing course model option may be preferable to WRS, what data inputs and timelines are needed, if there is a fee structure involved, etc.

Additionally, WRS should be implemented in a way to allow race organizers who have the knowledge and experience to do so, to select from a menu of widely available wind models (GFS, Euro, NAM, IKON, Arpege, etc) and widely-available current and tidal models (Mercator, TideTech, Hycom, RTOFS) as well as proprietary PredictWind models for wind and current if the partnership with PredictWind continues.

---

**Submission: USA 7**

**Reporting committee: ITC  
RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

---

### ***VPP WITH TWS OF 4 KNOTS***

#### **PROPOSAL**

To expand the range of the VPP to 4 knots TWS.

#### **RATIONALE**

There are numerous circumstances when the true wind speed during a race falls below the current threshold of 6 knots and it is impractical to abandon the race and restart due to the conditions falling below this lower range in the VPP. In some regions this is a very common scenario and there has been feedback from owners asking if the ORC VPP is fair if it does not include these wind ranges which are common in their area.



If the VPP can provide ratings for this lower range it will allow for more accurate scoring, do a better job of fairly rating boats - particularly with a typical broad mix of boat types that are common in local fleets - and thus contribute to a broader acceptance of use of the ORC system.