

Reporting committee **RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE**
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE

FREEBOARD POINTS PHOTOS

PROPOSAL

To require photos of freeboard measurement positions and to make these photos available both in the offset file and when consulting a certificate in the database.

RATIONALE

There are many offset files without any photo and, in some cases, this makes it very difficult to understand where they are located, especially when the sheer lines are not clear.

The ability to display the photos when consulting the database will help measurers when conducting a flotation measurement, but also to those owners who would like to check their boat but cannot do it now because they don't know where these points are located.

Reporting committee **MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**

MEASUREMENT PROTEST

PROPOSAL

To delete the last sentence of the ORC 305.2(a) rule:

- a) If the difference is less than or equal to 0.1%, the original certificate will be maintained, the protest will be dismissed, and the protestor will have to cover any cost involved. RRS 60.5(d)(1) will apply ~~“... but no corrections are needed.”.~~

RATIONALE

As recently happened, a boat was found with a spinnaker 4 m² larger than shown on the certificate and, since the difference was less than 0.1%, the boat continued to race with no adjustment in rating, which was unpopular with the rest of the fleet. We agree with the principle that a 0.1% is a very small change, but we think the boat should not be allowed to keep using the item found to be in error until the difference in rating is recognized and amended.

Reporting committee **ITC**

STAYSAIL

PROPOSAL

To better evaluate the influence of inner Headsails Set Flying in VPP calculations.

RATIONALE

There are boats that have been fitted with HSF marked as “inner” with an area slightly smaller than the maximum jib but with a larger HLP. It would be appropriate to evaluate whether any change is needed to the VPP to consider the performance potential of this kind of sail, especially in light winds and reaching.

Reporting committee **ITC**
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE

TL MEASUREMENT

PROPOSAL

To review the TL measurement definition and to enforce all measurers to follow the rule as it is written.

RATIONALE

There are many carbon spars that are not cylindrical all the way up to the point where they are clearly tapered. The way most people measure this may have an influence on rating.

These differences may be no larger than 0.1% so no change is actually required, yet accuracy and consistency of this measurement should be required in the certificate data.

Reporting committee **ITC**
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE

NUMBER OF SECTIONS IN OFFSET FILE

PROPOSAL

To increase the number of “minimum sections” indicated in the rule.

RATIONALE

The use of scanners to measure the hulls has allowed for an increase in the number of sections in new offset files, which are thus more accurate. Measurers in countries that still use the Total Station (any others that may still be using HMI) are creating offset files with fewer stations than those created from point clouds.

In order to standardize offset file quality and consistency, an increase in the minimum number of stations should be required in the rules.

FREEBOARD POINTS ON CENTERLINE

PROPOSAL

To delete “(eg, the transom end)” in the rule:

The aft freeboard station shall normally be placed at the aftermost section at which the hull could be girthed without crossing the transom, but it may also be placed in another easily recognized distance from the stem ~~(eg, the transom end).~~

RATIONALE

The appearance of “interceptors” is becoming more common on many boats. This can be a problem if the hull was scanned before the interceptor was later installed because the “y” measurement can change and have a significant effect on displacement. This can also introduce displacement errors if sisterships with interceptors already installed are then scanned.

Also, placing freeboard measurement points on centerline may create problems on the bow when placing these points below the bowsprit recess. The recess / hole for the bowsprit is normally finished by hand, so the dimension of it may vary from one boat to another in the same class.

We should forbid the practice of placing freeboard points on centerline, unless the boat is a one-off design and has permanently installed screws in place.

SAIL AGE, MATERIAL AND WEIGHT IN ORC CLUB

PROPOSAL

Introduce sail age, construction and weight allowance for ORC Club certificates. The system would be based on owner-declared information, consistent with the simplified and accessible nature of ORC Club certification. For each sail included in the rated inventory, the owner would declare:

- Sail type and identification
- Year of manufacture
- Principal construction and material category
- Actual sail weight

The declared information would be entered in the ORC Club certificate application and shown on the certificate's sail inventory. Sail weight could be established using a sufficiently accurate scale by the owner, sailmaker, club measurer or rating office. ORC should establish simple and transparent factors that recognize the expected performance differences resulting from:

- The deterioration of sail shape and structural properties with age
- Differences between durable woven or laminated materials and high-performance composite constructions
- Differences in sail weight, where a lighter construction provides a performance advantage through reduced weight aloft or easier handling

The allowance should be calculated according to standardized categories rather than an individual assessment of each sail's condition. It should be moderate, capped and structured so that keeping an older sail remains a reasonable choice without making artificial ageing an optimisation strategy.

The age allowance should increase only up to a defined maximum age. The material and weight factors should similarly remain within defined limits.

The owner would be responsible for the accuracy of the declaration. When a sail is replaced, materially modified or removed from the declared inventory, the owner must inform the rating office and obtain an updated certificate.

National rating offices and event organisers could conduct spot checks. Incorrect declarations could be handled under the existing rules governing certificate validity and competitor responsibility. An organiser could also require sails to be weighed or supporting information to be provided where there is reasonable doubt.

RATIONALE

ORC Club is intended to provide an accessible entry point to fair handicap racing. However, the current system largely treats sails of the same measured dimensions as having equivalent performance, regardless of their age, construction or weight.

In practice, these factors matter. A new, lightweight composite sail designed to retain its optimal shape does not have the same performance as an older woven or laminated sail with identical dimensions. Ageing, repeated loading, material stretch and structural fatigue progressively reduce a sail's ability to hold its designed shape.

Sail weight can also reflect a meaningful performance difference. Lightweight constructions reduce weight aloft and improve acceleration, stability and handling. Heavier and more durable sails may be more economical and remain serviceable for longer, but they can carry a performance disadvantage that is not currently recognized.

The present approach encourages owners to replace sails more frequently to remain competitive. This increases the cost of participation and makes ORC racing less attractive to ordinary boat owners, particularly at club and national level.

ORC Club already relies on owner-supplied information for parts of the certificate, while the owner remains responsible for the accuracy of the data. Introducing sail age, material and weight factors in ORC Club would:

- Extend the competitive life of existing sails.
- Reduce one of the largest recurring costs of handicap racing.
- Make obtaining and maintaining an ORC Club certificate more relevant to ordinary boat owners.
- Recognise the performance advantage of new, lightweight and high-performance sail constructions.
- Encourage the use of durable and more affordable sails.
- Lower the threshold for entering ORC racing.
- Reduce the environmental impact of frequent sail production and disposal.

Provide ORC with practical data and experience before considering whether a more formally controlled system could later be introduced to ORC International.

The proposal would not prevent owners from purchasing new high-performance sails. It would recognise that these sails provide an actual performance advantage and give owners of older, heavier or more durable sails a reasonable way to remain competitive at club level.

The objective is not to rate the exact condition of every sail. It is to introduce a simple, proportionate and owner-declared adjustment that makes ORC Club racing more accessible, economical and sustainable.

WRS FALLBACK METHOD

PROPOSAL

When Weather Routing Scoring is used, the Notice of Race or Sailing Instructions shall specify a fallback ORC scoring method. ORC, together with the Organizing Authority, shall validate WRS before, during and after the race. Before the WRS factors are published, it shall be confirmed that:

- Routing has been completed successfully and consistently for the entire fleet
- The calculated routes comply with the course, marks, boundaries and exclusion zones
- Routing resolution and segment lengths are sufficiently consistent
- No material technical anomaly or unexplained outlier exists
- The forecast, starting time and course used in the calculation correspond to the race as intended

During and after the race, ORC and the Organizing Authority shall analyze the fleet's actual performance against the routing model, including elapsed times, routes sailed and conditions experienced. This analysis shall determine whether the model remained sufficiently representative of the race as sailed. The pre-declared fallback method shall be used when:

- A start delay materially affects the forecast or routing calculation
- The course is shortened or materially changed
- Valid and consistent WRS factors cannot be produced for the entire fleet
- A material technical, weather-data or calculation error is identified
- Fleet-wide analysis demonstrates that the routing model was not sufficiently representative of the race as sailed

The decision shall be based on the pre-declared validation procedure and fleet-wide evidence, not on provisional results or which boats would benefit from either method.

ORC shall provide the Organizing Authority with sufficient technical support, guidance and timely access to WRS expertise to implement, validate and, where necessary, correct WRS successfully at the event. Suggested wording for the Standard Notice of Race and Sailing Instructions:

"Results are determined using Weather Routing Scoring. The fallback scoring method shall be [insert ORC scoring method]."

WRS shall be validated before, during and after the race. The fallback method shall be used if a start delay or course change materially affects the routing calculation, if valid and consistent WRS factors cannot be produced for the entire fleet, if a material technical or weather-data error is identified, or if fleet-wide analysis demonstrates that the model was not sufficiently representative of the race as sailed.

Any decision to apply the fallback method shall be based on the pre-declared validation procedure and shall not be influenced by provisional results."

RATIONALE

WRS has the potential to improve offshore scoring, but it depends on weather data, routing assumptions and complex calculations. Its validity cannot always be confirmed before the start; some problems become apparent only when the model is compared with the fleet's actual performance.

Recent analysis has shown that inconsistent routing resolution and segment lengths may produce materially different ratings even between similar boats. In the analyzed Færder race, nearly identical X-41s received different WRS ratings because their predicted routes were divided into different numbers and lengths of segments. One segment exceeded 18 nautical miles on an 88-nautical-mile course. In changing conditions, this may allow the routing process, not the boat's predicted performance, to influence the rating.

Start delays and course changes may also make the original forecast and routing calculation unrepresentative. A defined validation and fallback procedure would prevent improvised decisions, protect the integrity of the results and give competitors certainty before the race.

Organizing Authorities should not be expected to resolve complex WRS issues without adequate assistance. Where ORC requires or recommends WRS, it should provide sufficient technical support for its successful implementation and validation.

This proposal provides the safeguards, support and transparency required for WRS credible use at ORC events.

WEATHER MODEL SELECTED FOR WRS

PROPOSAL

When Weather Routing Scoring is used, the weather model or defined combination of models used for the WRS calculation shall be published sufficiently before the start of an offshore race using WRS. For ORC World and Continental Championships:

- The selected weather model or model combination shall be published no later than 24 hours before the scheduled race start
- ORC or the organizer shall provide a brief explanation of why the model is considered appropriate for the geographical area and time of year
- The model's relevant resolution and the forecast run intended for the final calculation shall be identified

Any subsequent change of model shall be communicated promptly to all competitors, together with the reason for the change.

Publishing the selected model in advance shall not change the procedure of using the most recent available forecast run from that model for the final WRS calculation.

Suggested wording for publishing the WRS information:

"Weather Routing Scoring will use [weather model/model combination]. The most recent available forecast run from the selected model will be used for the final WRS calculation. Information about the selected model, its resolution and the reason for its selection is published at [location]. Any subsequent change will be communicated to competitors together with the reason for the change."

RATIONALE

The weather model is a fundamental input to Weather Routing Scoring. Different models may predict materially different wind strength, direction, timing and development, particularly around coastlines, islands, frontal passages and local weather systems. The selection therefore affects the rating of every boat and the outcome of the race. Despite this, competitors do not know in advance which model will be used or why it has been selected.

Publishing this information no later than 24 hours before the scheduled start would allow skippers and navigators to:

- Understand one of the principal inputs to the scoring method.
- Study the model's characteristics and known limitations in the race area.
- Understand how the final WRS factors will be produced.
- Have confidence that model selection is transparent and consistent.

The advance announcement concerns the selected weather model or model combination, while the most recent available forecast run from that model would still be used for the race.

The purpose is simply to make a material input to the scoring calculation known to competitors before the start, improving transparency and confidence in WRS.

LIFERAFT IN MEASUREMENT CONDITION

PROPOSAL

Amend IMS B4 to allow an owner to elect to include a liferaft in the boat's measurement condition, provided that its weight and position are controlled. Suggested rule wording:

Add to IMS B4.1:

- t) A liferaft may be included in measurement condition when it is secured in a declared position. Its identification, weight and longitudinal and vertical position shall be recorded in the measurement inventory. When racing under a certificate issued with the liferaft included, the boat shall carry the liferaft in the recorded position. A replacement liferaft shall have a weight not less than the recorded weight unless the certificate is amended.*

Amend IMS B4.2(e) to read:

- e) All portable safety gear, including fire extinguishers and liferafts, except for a liferaft included in measurement condition in accordance with B4.1(t).

Add to IMS B4.4(c):

- iii) A liferaft included under B4.1(t): manufacturer, model or other identification, weight, distance from the foremost point of LOA and height from the waterline.

The liferaft and its position may be identified by a measurer's label, seal or other approved control method.

RATIONALE

A liferaft is a substantial safety equipment item in many offshore races. Excluding it from measurement creates a disproportionate effect on smaller and lighter boats and discourages boats from carrying a liferaft in races where it is not expressly required. Allowing an owner to include a liferaft would:

- Encourage boats to carry this important safety equipment consistently.
- Recognise the actual sailing configuration of boats regularly competing offshore.
- Ensure that the weight and position are transparent and controlled.
- Remove a disproportionate penalty affecting smaller and lighter boats.
- Align the treatment of a securely positioned liferaft with other significant equipment recorded in the measurement inventory.

The proposal is optional. A boat choosing to include the liferaft would be required to carry it in the declared position whenever racing under that certificate. This prevents the rule from being used merely to add favourable measured displacement without carrying the corresponding equipment.

Reporting committee **RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

SAIL NUMBERS

PROPOSAL

Add a new paragraph to ORC Rule 206.5 regarding sail numbers and national identification:

"Boats shall carry sail numbers complying with RRS G1.2 and G1.3. The Race Committee may exempt boats from this requirement."

RATIONALE

Rule RRS 77 requires boats to comply with the requirements of Appendix G governing class insignia, national letters, and sail numbers. However, the ORC Rating System is not a World Sailing Class as meant in RRS Appendix G1.1; therefore, RRS G1.1 does not apply, but RRS G2 applies instead.

Currently, the 2026 ORC Rating System rules do not address requirements for sail numbers and identification. Consequently, if the Notice of Race does not separately require sail numbering, boats may enter and race without any sail numbers.

This complicates the work of the Race Committee and makes it difficult for other competitors to identify boats while racing.

Reporting committee **RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE**
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE

OWNER'S RESPONSIBILITY

PROPOSAL

Modify ORC Rating Rule 304 to:

304.1 The owner or his representative shall be responsible for:

b) Declaring any required data to the measurer and rating office.

RATIONALE

The owner or his representative shall be responsible for declaring the required data to the rating office as well.

WRS COURSE PLANNING TOOL

PROPOSAL

Public release of the course planning interface/tool used for Weather Routing Scoring (WRS), allowing registered users (e.g. race organizers, measurers, rating offices, and interested sailors) to:

- Upload proposed offshore race courses with waypoints, exclusions, and class start times.
- Upload GRIB-data (minimum wind, current – can be in different files) to use specific local forecasts in special sea areas
- Download GRIB-data (minimum wind, current – can be in different files) used for the PET routing/calculation
- Option to replay the race (to get a comparison for the forecast and the real race, maybe also with measured data).
- Preview routing assumptions and predicted elapsed times (PETs) using standard ORC polar data and forecast models.
- Estimate expected Time-on-Time (ToT) or Time-on-Distance (ToD) coefficients in advance.
- Generate exportable data for race planning, communication, or simulation purposes.

The interface may be provided under a "view-only" or "planning mode" access tier separate from the official scoring.

RATIONALE

Currently, the Weather Routing Scoring (WRS) system provides highly valuable and accurate scoring for offshore races based on pre-race forecast modeling. However, access to the WRS setup and tools — including course submission and PET estimation — is restricted to internal ORC staff or selected individuals. This limits organizers' ability to understand, explain, or optimize the scoring process before an event.

With the growing adoption of WRS and increasing transparency demands from competitors, a publicly available Course Planning Tool would:

- Improve race organizers' ability to prepare and validate courses under realistic routing assumptions.
- Enhance transparency and competitor confidence in WRS-based scoring.
- Support training and simulation use for national authorities and clubs seeking to adopt WRS.
- Align with ORC's mission to promote fair, science-based racing through accessible technology.

The tool could be made available via the ORC Sailor Services platform with appropriate limitations (e.g. no official rating generation or scoring submission) to preserve data integrity while expanding educational and preparatory access.

CLARIFICATION OF USING WRS OR APH

PROPOSAL

Insert a new subsection in Section 3 of the ORC Race Management Guide as follows:

For long offshore or coastal races where boats are expected to experience varying weather conditions along the course, race organizers may elect to use a simplified single-number Time-on-Time (ToT) scoring method derived from one of the following:

1. Weather Routing Scoring (WRS) as calculated by the ORC using polar performance data and forecast weather conditions prior to the start; or
2. If WRS is deemed unreliable or unavailable, a fallback to Single Number Time-on-Time scoring using the All-Purpose Handicap (APH) may be applied.

Conditions and Limitations:

- The choice of scoring method, as well as any related scoring parameters, shall be at the sole discretion of the Race Committee.
- Course length, course direction, wind direction, and wind speed shall not be grounds for a request for redress, in accordance with the current rules of World Sailing.

RATIONALE

Long-distance offshore races often feature variable wind conditions that can disproportionately affect boats of different speeds. Traditional single-number scoring methods based on assumed average conditions may result in unfair or misleading results. This proposal formalizes the already-used method of allowing pre-race weather-based ToT coefficients, while providing a fallback to APH when routing data is not reliable.

By explicitly including this option in the Race Management Guide, organizers are empowered to apply fairer, more realistic scoring in a consistent and transparent manner, especially in complex offshore race environments.

Reporting committee **ITC**
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE

LCFD FOR POLES INCLINING

PROPOSAL

LCFD introduction for inclination using poles.

RATIONALE

1. The LCF before the measurement is unknown.
2. It is not always possible to fix the poles in LCFcl/sh, even when its approximate value is known.
3. The use of LCFD will increase the repeatability of the measurements.
4. Not all boats are measured using the boom. Even high-level boats are sometimes measured using poles, such as some XR41s, without proper knowledge of LCFcl/sh.

Reporting committee **RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE**
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE

STORM SAILS IN IMS EDITOR

PROPOSAL

Add a dedicated Storm Sails section to the IMS Editor/ORC Manager and to the certificate.

RATIONALE

The World Sailing Offshore Special Regulations (OSR) use different definitions for storm sail areas than the general sail area formulas used by ORC. Including a storm sails section in the IMS Editor and on the certificate would help owners determine the area of their storm sails according to the OSR formula.

It would also eliminate misunderstandings arising from differences between sail areas calculated using the ORC and OSR formulas.

Reporting committee **MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**

HULL SCANNING

PROPOSAL

Make it mandatory to include photographs of the free edges, otherwise the point cloud - and consequently the resulting offset - will be rejected as unacceptable.

RATIONALE

In many cases the position of the freeboards measurement points is not clear and simple to understand, so having good photos available could solve this problem.

Reporting committee **MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**

AFT FREEBOARD POINT

PROPOSAL

Prohibit positioning the freeboard measurement mark at the extreme stern on centerline.

RATIONALE

The widespread use of interceptors makes the positioning of the measurement point for the aft freeboard—aligned with the centerline of the transom—a source of uncertainty in freeboard measurements.

Reporting committee **MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**
RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ORC SCORER

PROPOSAL

To propose the ORC Scorer as official scoring software for all ORC regattas.

RATIONALE

In our view ORC Scorer is the most powerful scoring software available; however, it does have some shortcomings—such as a not-entirely user-friendly interface, and there is room for improvements that would undoubtedly make it the market leader.

This submission therefore requires the allocation of financial and human resources for this purpose.

Reporting committee **MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE

STATION SPACING

PROPOSAL

Reduce the minimum station spacing to have the same standard for files measured with Total Station and the files measured with a 3D scan.

RATIONALE

New offset files created from point clouds acquired with a 3D scan are prepared using a larger number of stations and with a smaller station distance compared to what is required by the rules.

It would be logical to reduce the minimum station distance to keep the same standard for files derived from Total Station data and those derived from a 3D scan.

Reporting committee **OFFSHORE CLASSES AND EVENTS COMMITTEE**

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

PROPOSAL

Amend Rule 4.2 of the ORC Green Book to specify that the Technical Committee must be chaired by a technical expert selected in agreement with the National Authority of the host nation.

RATIONALE

In nations with well-structured federations and a significant number of measurers, it is advisable for the Technical Committee Chair to be a measurer from the host nation. This approach would foster an overall improvement in technical standards at both the local and broader levels.

Reporting committee **MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE

IN HOUSE CERTIFICATION

PROPOSAL

Clarify the rules about the In-House Certification (IHC).

RATIONALE

Often, we encounter sails that are measured by a sail loft and is not clear if they are IHC-compliant or not. For example, on all sails measure in Italy by a sail loft that are certified IHC, there is affixed a World Sailing sticker. However, many sails measured in a North Sails loft are without that sticker so it is not clear if that sail may have been officially measured or not.

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

WEATHER ROUTING SCORING BACKUP

PROPOSAL

To modify Standard Sailing Instructions in the Green Book as follows:

15 Scoring

- 15.1 The decision on the scoring method and scoring parameters used will be at the sole discretion of the race committee and together with any course and wind data as well as wind model used for the Weather Routing Scoring shall not be grounds for request for redress by a boat. This changes RRS 61.1(a).
- 15.2 If the Race Committee determines that the prevailing or forecast weather conditions are unsuitable for the Weather Routing Scoring, Single number All-purpose scoring will be used instead. A This shall not be shall not be grounds for request for redress by a boat. This changes RRS 61.1(a).
- 15.3 In the event that, due to technical difficulties or other reasons beyond the reasonable control of the Race Committee, it becomes impossible or impracticable to score a race using Weather Routing Scoring, results will be determined using one of the scoring options available on the certificates in use for the race, as decided in the sole discretion of the Race Committee. A decision of the Race Committee shall not be grounds for request for redress by a boat. This changes RRS 61.1(a).

RATIONALE

Weather Routing Scoring (WRS) shall remain as preferred scoring method for offshore races where it may be expected that boats will sail in different wind conditions. However, use of WRS may have some limitations for which a backup solution should be provided as described in the proposed text.

Reporting committee **ITC**
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

OFFSHORE SCORING SINGLE NUMBERS

PROPOSAL

To add to ORC International certificates the following scoring options to the existing APH:

- PREDOMINANT UPWIND (Offshore predominant upwind race)
- PREDOMINANT DOWNWIND (Offshore predominant downwind race)
- PREDOMINANT REACHING (Offshore predominant reaching race)

RATIONALE

Weather Routing Scoring (WRS) shall remain as the preferred scoring method for offshore races where it may be expected that boats will sail in different wind conditions.

However, use of WRS may have some limitations for which a backup solution should be provided through a selection of Single Number Offshore Scoring options as described above in addition to APH.

Reporting committee **MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE

ORC OFFSET FILE SERVICES

PROPOSAL

To introduce a fee structure for the expedited creation or modification of offset files, as well as for one-off boats performed by ORC dedicated staff. The proposal is to implement the following price list for the post-processing of offset files:

- **Standard processing** – delivery time of at least 3 weeks
- **Expedited processing** – delivery time in less than 7 working days

Service	Fee
New scan – standard production boat – standard processing	Free (no change)
New scan – standard production boat – expedited processing	€200
New scan – one-off boat – standard processing	€300
New scan – one-off boat – expedited processing	€500
New scan – standard production boat with custom appendages – standard processing	€50 per keel / €50 per rudder / 100€ for both
New scan – standard production boat with custom appendages – expedited processing	€250 one appendage only / 300 both appendages
New validation of appendage(s) on an existing offset file – standard processing	€50 per keel / €50 per rudder
New validation of appendage(s) on an existing offset file – expedited processing	€100 per keel / €100 per rudder

RATIONALE

Historically, the ORC staff has provided complimentary support for modifying existing offset files and properly post-processing point clouds. However, over the past couple of years the volume of these modifications and the number of post-processed clouds has increased significantly, frequently accompanied by demands for expedited post-processing.

To sustainably manage this growing workload and maintain the high standards provided so far, it is necessary to secure dedicated resources.

Reporting committee **MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE
RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ORC STANDARD PENALTIES

PROPOSAL

To review penalties for infringements of the ORC Rules and make it easier to understand and apply. ORC Rating systems shall define standard penalties for different ORC Rules infringements and these penalties shall not be changed by the SI or NOR in accordance with RRS 87.

RATIONALE

While ORC Rule 305.2 clearly defines penalties for certificate non-compliance there are other rules for which appropriate penalty should be defined and clarified.

The rule may be clarified to clearly define that penalty for infringement of any rule based on an owner's declaration, such as the declared crew weight or use of an asymmetric spinnaker tacked on the centerline, and this penalty shall only be disqualification.

There are also other rules of part 3 that may require different penalties. This submission is asking for a complete review and proposal for new standard penalty definitions.

USE OF STORM JIBS

PROPOSAL

Adopt a clear rule in ORC(IRC) concerning the use of a storm jib. A storm jib has the sole purpose of being used so long as

- a) you remain in compliance with the OSR category specified by the Race organizer
- b) the storm jib is declared and counted as a headsail in the certificate and is also measured as such in which case it shall not count as a storm jib for OSR
- c) the storm jib may not be set in conjunction with any other sail forward of the forward-most spar.

RATIONALE

As storm jibs developed to become an extra sail (usually as a staysail), a rule was introduced in the Offshore Special Regulations to prevent this. The implementation of this rule, however, was not very strong (4.27.1e).

If a race organizer does not clearly state that OSR Category xx is enforced, it becomes unclear.

The current solution makes it also very hard for a jury to judge and decide what the penalty should be as it currently is not a breach of the certificate rules.

Both IRC and ORC wanted to stop the “misuse” of storm jibs by making this clear it is not in compliance with your certificate.

** ** ** ** **	4.27.1 Design a) the material of the body of a storm sail purchased after 2013 shall have a highly visible colour (e.g. dayglo pink, orange or yellow), b) aromatic polyamides, carbon and similar fibres shall not be used in a trysail or storm jib, but <u>HMPE</u> and similar materials are permitted, c) sheeting positions on deck for each storm and heavy-weather sail, d) sheeting positions for the trysail independent of the boom, and e) A storm jib may not be set in conjunction with any other sail set forwards of the forward mast spar.
---	--



Reporting committee **ITC**
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE

ADJUSTABLE FORESTAY

PROPOSAL

Change the table of penalty values in IMS 103.3 to make an adjustable forestay a neutral factor and default on all certificates and to have clear guidelines when a forestay is not considered adjustable.

RATIONALE

With the introduction of the table of “Cake” values in IMS 103.3 a new variable was introduced - “adjustable forestay” - with a negative rating effect which we had clearly stated should be neutral.

The effect of this now means that fleets are no longer rated properly nor are racing fairly because many owners have no idea or do not respond to requests of the MNA to confirm their compliance with this rule.

Moreover, in practice this is difficult to enforce compliance because with the introduction of this change a principle was adopted that if you can change headstay tension with a turnbuckle this therefore meets the definition of being “adjustable” whether or not you actually could or would do so.

An example of this is that almost every boat has a headstay turnbuckle of some sort, and a significant number of boats also have a furler drum. For many it is not easy to adjust the turnbuckle, while for others there are systems where with the removal of 2 bolts you can slide the system up and easily adjust the turnbuckle.

Therefore we propose to make the presence of a turnbuckle the default configuration with no penalty and to only give a small rating credit to boats who really cannot adjust their headstay.

If this submission is accepted it will be upon the owner to show proof of the system onboard in order to apply for the credit.

Consideration should also be given for boats declaring one furling headsail and if they also need extra credit or not.

Reporting committee **ITC**
RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

WRS – BLENDED TCF

PROPOSAL

To create the possibility of a blended TCF of WRS and APH or single number coastal rating option.

RATIONALE

Weather Routing Scoring in principle is or can be the most precise way of scoring a race. However, when the weather forecast is for very light winds (or very heavy winds) the TCF's can become rather extreme. And if the actual weather is different than what was forecasted then the scoring could by some considered to be unfair.

The same applies in tidal waters where the performance can be influenced strongly if you can get slotted with running with the tides or against it and where WRS thought you were going to be. Denying the tides is not the solution.

“Mellowing” WRS or somehow balancing WRS with APH can become a much fairer and better accepted solution. A possibility, for example, could be to introduce to WRS the ability to adjust performance percentages to the routing outputs to better match anticipated actual performance.

Reporting committee **ITC**
RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

WRS – RETROACTIVE ROUTING

PROPOSAL

A Race Organizer should be able to re-run (using the exact same weather and tidal inputs) at a later time.

RATIONALE

Currently WRS is run on the routing engine of PredictWind. ORC does not have the tools to re-run during or after the race if an error was found. This is unacceptable. Correcting the error and being able to rerun with all the exact same pre-race inputs is a must-have.

Reporting committee **ITC**
RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

WRS – POST-RACE SCORING

PROPOSAL

Can we design a way where a pre-race calculation is made but where post-race is scored based on what actually happened on the water?

RATIONALE

With PCS we are used to scoring based on what actually happened. WRS does the same but for what is predicted.

There are grib files available of the winds that actually occurred. This also applies for the tides. If we can (re)run the scoring based on what actually happened on the water we can come very close to the best ORC can deliver “scoring a race based on each boats individual capabilities in the actual circumstances”.

Reporting committee **ITC**
RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

WRS – FALL BACK SCORING OPTION

PROPOSAL

To express in the ORC Rating Rules that if WRS is the scoring method of choice but circumstances were different, that the RO can always fall back on APH or another ORC scoring method and that the RO decision should not be grounds for redress.

RATIONALE

It was the clear advice of the Race Management Committee that all rules and choices concerning Weather Routing should be in the NoR as early as possible. This also included the possibility for a fallback scenario.

In several cases this was not written in the NoR or SI or subsequent Amendments leaving no room for escape. By adding clearly in the ORC Rating Rules that the RO can always fall back on other ORC scoring solutions it gives the RO the means to correct, even when it was not in the NoR.

Reporting committee **ITC**

ASYMMETRIC SPINNAKER TO WINDWARD

PROPOSAL

Delete 2nd sentence from ORC 209.4.

RATIONALE

Purpose of this submission is to allow sheeting to windward of asymmetric spinnakers. This is common and practiced in other classes (J70, Melges 24, IRC).

This restriction in the ORC rules is an ORC-specific deviation of the World Sailing RRS, and as a general rule deviations from the RRS should be avoided as much as possible.

Sailors hopping between classes should not be bothered by rule differences between the classes, and they see no real reason why sheeting an asymmetric spinnaker to windward should be forbidden in ORC.

SPINNAKER RETRIEVER SYSTEM AND PEDESTAL

PROPOSAL

Modify IMS G6.6 to distinguish between conventional manually powered spinnaker retrieval systems, manually powered systems using a pedestal or equivalent mechanical power-transfer arrangement, and systems using non-manual power. Proposed wording:

G6.6 If there is a spinnaker retriever system, it shall be recorded as one of the following:

- a) “YES” - where the spinnaker retrieval system is powered manually and is operated without the use of a pedestal or equivalent mechanical power-transfer system
- b) “YES PEDESTAL” - where the spinnaker retrieval system is powered manually and is operated through a pedestal or equivalent system that enables continuous and/or multi-crew mechanical power input
- c) “YES NMP” - where the spinnaker retrieval system may be operated using non-manual power.

The appropriate rating assessment shall be applied to each configuration in accordance with ORC Rating Systems 103.3.

RATIONALE

The introduction of spinnaker retrieval systems into the ORC rating framework is a positive development. However, the current binary distinction between manual and non-manual power does not adequately reflect the performance differences between the various manually powered systems now in use.

A pedestal-driven retrieval system can deliver substantially greater and more continuous power than a conventional manually operated retrieval system. It may enable simultaneous input from multiple crew members and allow the retrieval line to be driven at higher speed and under higher sustained load. This can materially affect the execution of a spinnaker drop.

In particular, a high-capacity pedestal retrieval system can:

- retrieve a spinnaker significantly faster;
- maintain retrieval speed under higher loads;
- reduce the number of crew required to perform the manoeuvre;
- allow the retrieval to commence later in the manoeuvre;
- reduce the period during which the spinnaker is partially deployed or uncontrolled; and
- reduce the overall performance loss associated with a spinnaker drop.

These effects are particularly relevant on high-performance yachts, where manoeuvre efficiency is a significant component of overall race performance. The relevant distinction is therefore not solely whether the energy source is manual or non-manual, but also how manually generated power is transmitted and multiplied within the system. Different mechanical arrangements can result in materially different performance outcomes.

Under the current wording, a simple manually operated retrieval system and a purpose-designed pedestal-driven system are both recorded as “YES”, despite their significantly different capabilities. Introducing a separate recorded category for pedestal-driven or functionally equivalent high-capacity manually powered systems would allow ORC to assess these performance differences independently, while preserving the fundamental distinction between manual and non-manual power.

This proposal does not seek to restrict the use of pedestal-driven retrieval systems. Its purpose is solely to ensure that materially different spinnaker handling capabilities are properly identified and appropriately reflected within the ORC rating system.

Reporting committee **MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**
PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

ORC FORECAST TCF

PROPOSAL

Rename "Weather Routing Scoring (WRS)" to "ORC Forecast TCF."

RATIONALE

WRS produces a single Time Correction Factor (TCF) for each boat, calculated from a weather forecast for that specific race combined with the boat's individual ORC Rating Certificate (polar performance data).

The current name, "Weather Routing Scoring," suggests active route-planning navigation software, which is not what this scoring does, and gives sailors no indication of how the result is actually derived.

Renaming it to "ORC Forecast TCF" makes the name consistent with the terminology ORC already uses for the calculation itself and will help sailors and race organizers understand at a glance that the output is a forecast-based correction factor - comparable to other ORC TCF-based scoring options - rather than a routing tool.

Reporting committee **OFFSHORE CLASSES AND EVENTS COMMITTEE**

CLASS DIVISION AT DH CHAMPIONSHIPS

PROPOSAL

Allow the organizer to continue to set the class boundaries for Continental and World Championships for DH. This was the conclusion of the very good discussion from AGM 2024 which should have been discussed further in OCEC committee in September 2025 and then been brought forward to another AGM vote in 2025 which was never materialized.

RATIONALE

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

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

LONG OFFSHORE RACE PARAMETERS

PROPOSAL

1. When setting courses for coastal and offshore races these should feature varied 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.

RATIONALE

Courses set with all wind angles of similar amounts calculate more correctly under the APH single or triple numbers should the constructed course not be feasible to do. In addition they will also complement the W/L races which are mainly sailed as VMG sailing.

If coastal or offshore races are 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.

Reporting committee **PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**
RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

LONG TERM AVAILABILITY OF RACE RESULTS

PROPOSAL

We propose that the ORC HQ establishes a standardized policy for maintaining race results on official platforms. Specifically, we suggest that all sanctioned race results remain publicly accessible as open data for a mandatory minimum period, such as the last three (3) consecutive years.

Furthermore, to improve user experience and data analysis, these results should be organized into an easily navigable archive. Users should be able to filter the comprehensive list of races by both Year/Date and Country/Host Nation.

RATIONALE

It is essential for the growth and transparency of our sport that official race results are easily accessible to the public, sailors, and organizers worldwide. Access to past race results become difficult to find after a short period.

To enhance sports transparency, provide a reliable public data archive for sailors and handicap analysts, and ensure that historic race data remains accessible and structured.

CERTIFICATE RENEWAL ELECTRONIC FORM

PROPOSAL

To modernize the certificate management process, minimize the administrative workload on National Rating Offices, reduce human error in data transmission, and provide boat owners with a seamless, secure, and user-friendly self-service experience.

We propose that ORC HQ develops and implements a standardized, centralized Electronic Request Form (e-form) on the ORC platform. This portal would allow boat owners to directly submit administrative or minor technical revisions to their respective National Rating Offices.

Examples of requests that could be streamlined through this electronic form include:

- Crew weight revisions (updating the declared crew weight limitation)
- Sail inventory updates (adding a new spinnaker or removing an existing sail from the certificate)
- Standard certificate renewals with no structural or measurement changes.

RATIONALE

Currently, when a boat owner requests a certificate renewal or minor modifications that do not strictly require an official measurer, the communication with National Rating Offices relies heavily on fragmented channels such as emails or instant messaging apps (e.g., WhatsApp).

This decentralized approach is highly inefficient, difficult to track, and prone to communication errors or data entry mistakes.

Reporting committee **RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE**
RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

SECONDARY CERTIFICATE

PROPOSAL

Many boats in our national fleets participate in various regattas across different geographical locations, often racing with different crew configurations and sailing setups within a very short timeframe. For instance, a boat may need a symmetric spinnaker configuration for one offshore race and then switch to an asymmetric-only setup for an inshore regatta just two weeks later.

Currently, this requires boat owners to request certificate revisions 2 or 3 times within a single month. This constant updating creates a heavy financial burden due to repeated revision fees, and it also increases the administrative workload for National Rating Offices.

To address this issue, we propose that ORC HQ introduces a **"Secondary Certificate"** option. This policy would allow a boat owner to hold two active certificates simultaneously for different predefined configurations (e.g., Setup A: Symmetric / Setup B: Asymmetric) during the same racing season.

RATIONALE

To provide a cost-effective and flexible solution for active racing programs, reduce repetitive administrative work for Rating Offices, and encourage greater participation in diverse styles of racing without presenting a financial burden to owners.

Reporting committee **ITC**
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE
PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

CRUISER DIVISION

PROPOSAL

The current ORC regulations strictly categorize boats into two main divisions: Cruiser/Racer and Performance. While this structure serves dedicated racing programs well, it does not fully accommodate a substantial and growing segment of the sailing community: pure cruising yachts and charter boats.

To boost regatta participation and expand the sport, it is vital to bring these recreational sailors into the game. True cruising boats and charter fleets represent a high volume of potential entries, but owners are often discouraged from competing because they feel penalized when grouped with highly optimized Cruiser/Racers.

Therefore, we propose amending the current regulations to introduce a third, distinct "Cruiser" division alongside the existing Performance and Cruiser/Racer categories. This dedicated division would feature tailored regulations and VPP calculations specifically optimized for standard, non-modified cruising and charter yachts.

RATIONALE

To lower the barrier to entry for recreational and charter sailors, significantly increase overall fleet sizes at local and national events, and foster a more inclusive racing environment without compromising the competitiveness of the existing divisions.

PERFORMANCE INDEX FOR CRUISER DIVISION

PROPOSAL

When recreational cruising and charter boats race on the same course as highly experienced racing crews, standard scoring models often produce disproportionate and unfair time corrections. This issue becomes especially severe in extreme weather conditions—such as very light wind or heavy air.

While elite crews can keep a boat moving efficiently through shifting winds, cruising crews often suffer significant delays due to standard handling limitations. Currently, the Velocity Prediction Program (VPP) calculates results based solely on the boat's theoretical polar data. This setup penalizes cruising entries heavily during wind drops, leading to massive, unrealistic gaps in the final corrected times and creating a sense of injustice among participants.

While some local organizers try to fix this by grouping boats manually or calculating combined scoring sheets, this is not always feasible or mathematically sound.

Therefore, we propose that ORC HQ develops a specific, simplified scoring methodology for the newly proposed "Cruiser" division. This system should incorporate:

1. A Simplified Scoring/Wind Model: An alternative scoring coefficient option that reduces the extreme impact of wind speed variations on corrected times for this specific group.
2. A Crew/Performance Factor Index: A calculated adjustment within the VPP framework that accounts for the operational baseline of standard cruising and charter setups, preventing mathematical "runaways" in corrected times.

RATIONALE

To ensure fair and realistic scoring for recreational sailors, eliminate discouraging time gaps caused by weather fluctuations, and provide a scientifically backed, standardized scoring tool for local event organizers.

DECLINED SAIL INVENTORY

PROPOSAL

The current ORC VPP and certificate regulations calculate a boat's handicap based on its maximum measured sail dimensions and the maximum allowed number of sails. While this ensures equity at the elite level, it creates a significant financial barrier and technical penalty for club-level racers and budget-conscious boat owners.

Many owners cannot afford to purchase or maintain a full inventory of specialized sails (such as multiple asymmetric spinnakers for different wind angles, or code zeros). Under the strict current rules, a boat carrying fewer sails than its maximum class limit is mathematically penalized as if it possessed the full, optimized inventory. Furthermore, owners are discouraged from using older, heavier, or "delivery" sails for heavy weather protection because every sail change requires a costly certificate revision.

To promote sustainability and reduce the cost of racing, we propose that ORC HQ introduces a "Declined Sail Inventory" (DSI) option in the certificate application. This would allow an owner to officially declare and lock a reduced sail inventory for the season (e.g., declaring a maximum of only 1 spinnaker instead of 3, or opting out of lightweight headsails). The VPP should be updated to credit the boat fairly for the performance loss of operating with a restricted inventory.

RATIONALE

To significantly lower the financial barrier to entry for club racers, encourage the sustainable use of existing sail inventories, and prevent budget-limited boats from being unfairly penalized by theoretical VPP maximums.

Reporting committee **ITC**
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

AGE ALLOWANCE

PROPOSAL

Change the old age allowance start date to Series date + 5 years.

RATIONALE

Modern boats do not need old allowance credits in their first 5 years.

Reporting committee **ITC**
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

AGE ALLOWANCE FOR HULLS AND APPENDAGES

PROPOSAL

Determine an appropriate split for old age credit values separately for hulls and appendages.

RATIONALE

Many older boats get new appendages which substantially improve performance yet are still carrying the full old age allowance of the series date.

Reporting committee **MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE

WASTEWATER TANKS

PROPOSAL

Add a dropdown in the tanks section of IMS Editor and Manager software for “water(potable)” and “water(non-potable)”.

RATIONALE

Wastewater tanks are currently counted as potable water for Cruiser/Racer requirements.

Reporting committee **MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE**
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE

WATER BALLAST INPUT

PROPOSAL

If water ballast is input as a volume, then compute weight from the SG of the water. If there is no SG listed then use standard value for sea water.

RATIONALE

A measurer can measure tank volume with a flowmeter, and many manufacturers publish their tank volumes.

Reporting committee **ITC**
MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE
RATING OFFICERS COMMITTEE

CREW EXTENSION (CEXT)

PROPOSAL

Make CEXT expressed in 3 options:

- (1) No lifelines;
- (2) Normal OSR approved lifelines; or
- (3) Loose lifelines or hiking aids.

Add checkbox for Dyneema lifelines, not for rating impact but a matter for any applicable safety rule compliance

RATIONALE

Presently loose and no lifelines are treated as the same and result in a faster rating than a boat with lifelines even though crew on boats without lifelines cannot position themselves as far outboard and do not therefore have an advantage.

Reporting committee **ITC**

INTERCEPTORS

PROPOSAL

Define and study the rating effect of hull interceptors.

RATIONALE

The addition of hull interceptors has become popular in some fleets. These do improve performance on numerous boat types, and their measurement is required for ORCi offset file standards, but it is currently unclear what if any rating effect they have.

Reporting committee **RACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

GUIDANCE ON WRS AND SCORING MODELS

PROPOSAL

Update the ORC Race Management Guidebook to include more clear guidance on use of Weather Routed Scoring (eg, use of the RaceFlow web app) and discuss other possible scoring model options other than APH and PCS.

RATIONALE

The power of the ORC VPP can be implemented to produce fair racing in numerous scoring methods beyond just APH and PCS, and a broader discussion of these methods in the Race Management Guidebook may help grow acceptance of the system in new fleets.

Reporting committee **ITC**

OUTRIGGERS

PROPOSAL

Define and study the rating effect of outriggers.

RATIONALE

Outriggers attached at the deck are being used in numerous high-speed offshore boats and are legal in other rating systems. ORC should make their use legal as well after an assessment of their effect on rated performance.