The Events Committee met at 09:30 – 18:00 hours on Wednesday 7 November 2012 at the Royal Marine Hotel, Dun Laoghaire, Ireland

1. Welcome & Introductions
   The Chairman opened the meeting and welcomed everyone to the final Events Committee meeting of the current quadrennium in Dun Laoghaire, Ireland.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
   (a) Minutes
       The Committee noted the minutes of the Events Committee meeting of 3 May 2012. The minutes can be downloaded at www.sailing.org/meetings.
   (b) Minutes Matters Arising
       There were no other matters arising not covered elsewhere on this agenda.
3. **Conflicts of Interest**

The current Statements of Interests were noted and updated by the Committee. Takao Otani declared an interest in the Laser and 49er class for the voting on Core Equipment. Corinne Rolland-McKenzie declared she would abstain from all Olympic Events and Equipment voting.

4. **Executive Committee Update**

(a) The Committee noted the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting held in September and the items that related to this Events Committee meeting agenda.

5. **Events Strategy Implementation**

(a) The Committee received a progress report from the Chairman of the Events Committee. The Committee had over the last four years addressed all items within its Terms of Reference, and the day’s agenda included all items that needed deciding at this final meeting. Those items that were to be handed over for decision or recommendation by the next Events Committee would be identified at the end of the meeting.

The Committee would also consider continental place allocation for qualification to the 2016 Olympic Sailing Competition at this meeting. However this was being introduced for the first time, and as there were still very differing opinions within the Working Party and Committee, and as the IOC had not yet published its qualification guidelines, final decisions would not be made at this meeting.

In making its decisions, the Chairman asked that the committee should always consider the four priorities it established before its first meeting:

i) longer term Olympic decisions, consistent with ISAF’s overall strategy;

ii) showing leadership in simplifying the sport’s structure, clarifying pathways and reducing costs;

iii) building the ISAF brand by ensuring ISAF events are world-class, strengthening the ISAF Sailing World Cup, and making ISAF a valued partner to event organisers;

iv) promoting and developing the sport and its heroes, with simpler formats and better media coverage, and appealing to spectators, sponsors and the youth.

The Chairman noted that sailing is at its heart a leisure and participation sport, and therefore needs to retain its appeal to all cultures, ages, physiques and abilities. He asked that the committee’s decisions should ensure the sport continues to reflect this diversity, and should support MNAs, clubs and classes in their activities that bring sailors into the sport and grow participation.

6. **2012 Olympic Sailing Competition**

(a) Review the 2012 Olympic Sailing Competition

i) The Committee received a report from the ISAF Head of Competitions on the 2012 Olympic Sailing Competition. See attached Appendix.

ii) The Committee received and discussed the Review of the 2012 Olympic Sailing Competition. See attached Appendix.

(b) Conclusions of the Review

The Events Committee agreed to adopt the recommendations of the Review and agreed that ISAF, and the Technical Delegates in particular, work as appropriate to implement the various recommendations contained to further enhance the Olympic Sailing
Competition. With the success of the live spectator facility at Weymouth, the committee agreed that particular focus for 2016 should be placed on improving the quality of the worldwide television coverage for the remote viewer.

7. **2016 Olympic Sailing Competition**

(a) The Committee received a report from the ISAF Head of Competitions on the 2016 Olympic Sailing Competition, including expected weather conditions, venue and course areas. See attached Appendix.

(b) The Committee received a progress report from the ISAF Head of Technical and Offshore on the distribution and availability of the new Olympic Equipment chosen by ISAF in May 2012. See attached Appendix.

(c) Submissions to change earlier decisions on 2016 Events and Equipment.
   i) The Committee considered all submissions in a single discussion, and recommended to Council that:

   - Council should consider change to the first two lines of Regulation 23.1.4 for the 2016 Olympic Sailing Competition (i.e. the Men Kiteboarding and Women’s Kiteboarding Events).
     **Vote: 18 in favour, 6 against, 2 abstain**
   - Council should not consider change in any other area of Regulation 23.1.4 for the 2016 Olympic Sailing Competition.
     **Vote: Unanimous**
   - If Council does decide to consider change to Regulation 23.1.4 for the 2016 Olympic Sailing Competition, the revised Regulation 23.1.4 should be:
     - Men’s Windsurfer – RS:X
     - Women’s Windsurfer – RS:X
     - Men’s One Person Dinghy – Laser
     - Women’s One Person Dinghy – Laser Radial
     - Men’s 2nd One Person Dinghy – Finn
     - Men’s Skiff – 49er
     - Women’s Skiff – 49erFX
     - Men’s Two Person Dinghy – 470
     - Women’s Two Person Dinghy – 470
     - Mixed Two Person Multihull – Nacra 17
     **Votes – see submission 055-12 below**

   ii) Submission 050-12

   The Committee considered submission 050-12 from the International RX:X Class Association,: Belarus Sailing Federation, China Yachting Association, Colombia Sailing Federation, Cuban Sailing Federation, Cyprus Sailing Federation, Czech Sailing Association, Egypt Sailing & Water Ski Federation, Royal Spanish Sailing Federation, French Sailing Federation, Hellenic Sailing Federation, Hong Kong Sailing Federation, Yachting Association of India, Israel Yachting Association, Italian Sailing Federation, Japan Sailing Federation, Korea Sailing Federation, Malaysia Yachting Association, Federacion Mexicana de Vela, Macedonia Sailing Association, Myanmar Yachting Federation, Oman Water Sports Committee, Pakistan Sailing Federation, Federacion Peruana de Vela International, Singapore Sailing Federation,
Chinese Taipei Sailing Association, Sailing Federation of Ukraine and Venezuelan Sailing Federation about Regulation 23.1.4.

Recommendations to Council: Reject

iii) Submission 051-12
The Committee considered submission 051-12 from the Belarus Sailing Federation, Italian Sailing Federation, Yachting Union of Latvia, Polish Yachting Association, Royal Spanish Sailing Federation about Regulation 23.1.4.

Recommendation to Council: Reject

iv) Submission 052-12
The Committee considered submission 052-12 from the Belarus Sailing Federation, Italian Sailing Federation, Yachting Union of Latvia, Polish Yachting Association, Royal Spanish Sailing Federation about Regulation 23.1.4.

Recommendation to Council: Reject

v) Submission 053-12
The Committee considered submission 053-12 from the Internal Formula Windsurfing Class about Regulation 23.1.4.

Recommendation to Council: Reject

vi) Submission 054-12
The Committee considered submission 054-12 from Yachting New Zealand about Delete Kiteboarding and insert RS:X – Regulation 23.1.4.

Recommendation to Council: Reject

ISAF should encourage Sailing World Cup regatta organisers to run promotional events to demonstrate new events where appropriate, equipment or formats.

vii) Submission 055-12
The Committee considered submission 055-12 from the International Raceboard Class Association about Regulation 23.1.4.

Recommendation to Council: Approve

Following its recommendation to consider change to the first two lines of Regulation 23.1.4, the Events Committee considered the current slate of Events, and all other complete slates of 10 Events listed in all submissions.

The following submissions were proposed and seconded as required by regulation 23.1.9: 050-12, 051-12, 052-12, 055-12, 062-12. They, and the current slate of Events, were then voted on in accordance with regulation 23.1.9.

The voting was as follows:
The current slate of Events received 20.8% of the votes. 050-12 received 37.5% of the votes. 055-12 received 41.7% of the votes. The other submissions received 0 votes.

There was a run-off vote between 050-12 and 055-12. 050-12 received 10 votes. 055-12 received 12 votes. There were 4 abstentions.

viii) Submission 056-12
The Committee considered submission 056-12 from the International RS:One Class Association about Regulation 23.1.4.

Recommendation to Council: Reject
ix) Submission 057-12
The Committee considered submission 057-12 from the International RS:X Class Association, Belarus Sailing Federation, Colombia Sailing Federation, Cuban Sailing Federation, Cyprus Sailing Federation, Czech Sailing Association, Egyptian Sailing & Water Ski Federation, French Sailing Federation, Hellenic Sailing Federation, Hong Kong Sailing Federation, Yachting Association of India, Israel Yachting Association, Japan Sailing Federation, Korea Sailing Federation, Malaysia Yachting Association, Federacion Mexicana de Vela, Moldovian Yachting Federation, Myanmar Yachting Federation, Federacion Peruana de Vela, Singapore Sailing Federation, Sailing Federation of Ukraine and Venezuelan Sailing Federation about Regulation 23.1.4.
Recommendation to Council: Reject.

x) Submission 058-12
The Committee considered submission 058-12 from the Cyprus Sailing Federation, Royal British Islands Yacht Club, Macedonia Sailing Association, Oman Water Sports Committee, Pakistan Sailing Federation about Regulation 23.1.4.
Recommendation to Council: Reject

xi) Submission 059-12
The Committee considered submission 059-12 from the Cyprus Sailing Federation and the Royal British Virgin Islands Yacht Club about Regulation 23.1.4.
Recommendation to Council: Reject

xii) Submission 060-12
The Committee considered submission 060-12 from the International Formula Windsurfing Class about the Windsurfing Events about Regulation 23.1.4.
Recommendation to Council: Reject

xiii) Submission 062-12
The Committee considered submission 062-12 from the Chairman of the Windsurfing and Kiteboarding Committee about Regulation 23.1.4.
Recommendation to Council: Reject

xiv) Submission 063-12
The Committee considered submission 063-12 from the International Speed Windsurfing Class about Regulation 23.1.4.
Recommendation to Council: Reject

xv) Submission 064-12
The Committee considered submission 064-12 from the International Formula Windsurfing Class about Regulation 23.1.4.
Recommendation to Council: Reject

xvi) Submission 065-12
The Committee considered submission 065-12 from the Chairman of the Match Racing Committee about Regulation 23.1.4.
Recommendation to Council: Reject

(d) Submissions on 2016 Events and Equipment (considered as part of item (c) above)
i) Submission 020-12
The Committee considered submission 020-12 from the Executive Committee about Regulation 23.1.4.

*Recommendation to Council: Approve*

*Vote: 18 in favour, 6 against, 2 abstain*

ii) Submission 021-12

The Committee considered submission 021-12 from the Executive Committee about Regulation 23.1.4.

*Recommendation to Council: Reject*

iii) Submission 022-12

The Committee considered submission 022-12 from the Executive Committee about Regulation 23.1.4.

*Recommendation to Council: Reject*

iv) Submission 023-12

To consider submission 023-12 from the Executive Committee about Regulation 23.1.4.

*Recommendation to Council: Reject*

v) Submission 024-12

The Committee considered submission 024-12 from the Executive Committee about Regulation 23.1.4.

*Recommendation to Council: Reject*

vi) Submission 025-12

The Committee considered submission 025-12 from the Executive Committee about Regulation 23.1.4.

*Recommendation to Council: Reject*

vii) Submission 026-12

The Committee considered submission 026-12 from the Executive Committee about Regulation 23.1.4.

*Recommendation to Council: Reject*

viii) Submission 027-12

The Committee considered submission 027-12 from the Executive Committee about Regulation 23.1.4.

*Recommendation to Council: Reject*

ix) Submission 071-12

The Committee considered submission 071-12 from the International Finn Association about Change the Men's 2nd One Person Dinghy Event Name - Regulation 23.1.4.

*Recommendation to Council: Reject*
x) Submission 072-12
   See minutes of item 8(d)(iii).

xi) Submission 075-12

   The Committee considered submission 075-12 from the International Finn
   Association about Make Men's 2nd and One Person Dinghy (Men's One Person
   Dinghy Heavyweight) Priority Event for Unused Quota.

   Recommendation to Council: Defer

xii) Submission 094-12

   The Committee considered submission 094-12 from the International Funboard
   Class Association about Regulation 23.1.4.

   Recommendation to Council: Reject

(e) 2016 Kiteboarding Event Equipment Evaluation

i) The Committee received the report and recommendations on the Equipment
   Evaluation for the 2016 Kiteboarding Event from the Equipment Committee.

   See attached Appendix.

ii) Submission 048-12

   The Committee considered submission 048-12 from the International Kiteboarding
   Association about Selection of Equipment – IKA Formula Kite Regulation 23.1.4.

   Recommendation to Council: Approve

   Vote: 18 in favour, 2 against, 6 abstain

iii) Submission 049-12

   The Committee considered submission 049-12 from the Royal Yachting Association
   about Cost Control – New Regulation.

   Recommendation to Council: Reject

   Accepted Submission 048-12.

(f) The Committee received the final report and recommendations from the Format Working
   Party. The Committee approved sections A, B & C of the report, and agreed that final
   recommendations on the specific formats for each Event should be made in November
   2013 after the Olympic Classes have had the opportunity to trial their preferred formats
   during 2013. It was agreed that fleet quotas should be finally agreed in 2013, as the
   Olympic Events still have to be finally confirmed at this Conference, but that the revised
   numbers shown in section D should be used as the basis of current planning by ISAF
   and ROCOG, and by other Working Parties, when considering their recommendations.

   See attached Appendix.

   Vote: 25 in favour, 1 abstain

(g) The Committee received a report from the ISAF Head of Competitions on
   implementation of the Olympic Classes contracts. It was noted that all Classes had
   signed the Agreement.

(h) Qualification Regattas

i) The Committee received a report from the ISAF Head of Competitions on the 2012
   qualification system.

ii) Submission 073-12
The Committee considered submission 073-12 from the Chairman of the Events Committee about Continental Qualification regattas.

**Recommendation to Council:** Approve with the following amendment

"The Continental Qualification Regatta shall be that continent’s ISAF Sailing World Cup regatta with its starting date between 1st January 2015 and 31st December 2015. However when a continent’s Sailing World Cup regatta starts between 1st January and 31st March, ISAF may choose to use the 2016 regatta instead.

Where a continent does not have a Sailing World Cup regatta for a particular Event, ISAF shall choose a Class continental regatta or a Regional Games regatta. The chosen regatta may not be the same for all Olympic Events.

Where a continent has more than one such regatta, ISAF shall decide which regatta, or which combination of regattas, shall be used to determine qualification. This may not be the same for all Olympic Events."

**Vote:** 19 in favour, 2 against, 3 abstain

**Post Meeting Note:**

Council passed 073-12 but with the wording further amended, and 074 was withdrawn. As a result, ISAF policy on COQs is as follows:

"Where a continent does not have a Sailing World Cup regatta for a particular Event, ISAF shall choose another regatta. This may be a Class Continental regatta, a Regional Games regatta or a neighbouring continent’s Sailing World Cup regatta. ISAF may choose different regattas for different Events."

iii) Submission 074-12

The Committee considered submission 074-14 from the Indonesia Sailing Federation, UAE Sailing and Rowing Federation about Regulation 23.2.1.

**Recommendation to Council:** Approve with the following amendment

"23.2.1 should read: Entries for the Olympic Qualification Events shall only be accepted from Full or Associate Members. Olympic entries may be decided by a qualification in Olympic regional games regatta such as the Asian Games Olympic Sailing Regatta. Such qualifications shall be decided by ISAF based on competition levels in the Olympic Classes competing in the event."

**Vote:** 14 in favour, 8 Against, 3 abstain

(i) Continental quotas

The Committee deferred discussion of the report from the Regions Working Party to its first meeting in 2013.

8. **2020 Olympic Sailing Competition**

(a) The Committee received a report from the ISAF Head of Competitions on the IOC 2020 questionnaire and sport selection timetable. See Appendix

The Committee recommended that the latest IOC questionnaire should be reviewed by the next Events Committee to assess whether any changes should be made to ISAF’s Olympic strategy.

(b) Core Events and Equipment for the 2020 Olympic Sailing Competition

The Committee discussed Core Events and Equipment for the 2020 Olympic Sailing Competition and voted in accordance with Regulation 23.1.5.
Recommendation to Council:

The following Events and Equipment should be Core Events and Equipment for the 2020 Olympic Sailing Competition (the numbers in parentheses represent the percentage of votes cast in favour):

**Men’s One Person Dinghy (95.8%) – Laser (73%)**

**Women's One Person Dinghy (95.8%) - Laser Radial (72%)**

**Men's Skiff (70.8%) - 49er (95%)**

**Women’s Skiff (66.7%) - 49er FX (72%)**

The other Events listed in Regulation 23.1.4 received the following votes and were therefore not recommended to Council as Core Events for the 2020 Olympic Sailing Competition:

**Men's Kiteboard (4.2%)**

**Women's Kiteboard (4.2%)**

**Men's 2nd One Person Dinghy (41.7%)**

**Men's Two Person Dinghy (33.3%)**

**Women's Two Person Dinghy (41.7%)**

**Mixed Multihull (16.7%)**

(c) Submissions

As a result of the above decisions, the Events Committee made the following recommendations on submissions on Core Events and Equipment:

i) Submission 076-12 from the International Laser Class Association about Men's One Person Dinghy.

*Recommendation to Council: Approve*

ii) Submission 077-12 from the International Laser Class Association about Women's One Person Dinghy.

*Recommendation to Council: Approve*

iii) Submission 078-12 from the International Laser Class Association about Laser Dinghy.

*Recommendation to Council: Approve*

iv) Submission 079-12 from the International Finn Association, Bulgarian Sailing Federation, Czech Sailing Association, Danish Sailing Association, Finnish Sailing and Boating Federation and the Serbian Sailing Association about Men's One Person Dinghy and Men's 2nd One Person Dinghy - Regulation 23.1.5.

*Recommendation to Council: Reject*

v) Submission 080-12 from the Czech Sailing Association, Danish Sailing Association, Finnish Sailing and Boating Federation, Hungarian Yachting Association, Russian Yachting Federation and South Africa Sailing about Finn – Regulation 23.1.5.

*Recommendation to Council: Reject*

vi) Submission 081-12 from the Czech Sailing Association, Danish Sailing Association and Finnish Sailing and Boating Federation, Hungarian Yachting Association and Russian Yachting Federation about Men's 2nd One Person Dinghy as Core Event – Regulation 23.1.5.
Recommendation to Council: Reject

vii) Submission 082-12 from the International Laser Class Association and Laser Radial Dinghy about Laser Radial Dinghy.

Recommendation to Council: Approve

viii) Submission 083-12 from the Italian Sailing Federation, Japan Sailing Federation, Romanian Yachting Association, Russian Yachting Federation and South Africa Sailing about 470 for Men's Two Person Dinghy and Women's Two Person Dinghy - Regulations 23.1.4 and 23.5.

Recommendation to Council: Reject

ix) Submission 084-12 from the International RS:X Class Association about Men's Board [Windsurfing] and Women's Board [Windsurfing] - Regulation 23.1.5.

Recommendation to Council: Reject

(d) Olympic Event and Equipment Regulations


The Committee agreed to support making a submission in 2013 clarifying Regulation 24.1.7 to confirm that once Equipment has been chosen by Council and identified in Regulation 23.1.4, a 75% vote is required to change that decision.

ii) The Committee considered submission 070-12 from the International Funboard Class Association – Olympic Equipment Regulations – Regulations 23.1.7.

Recommendation to Council: Reject

Vote: 3 in favour, 19 against, 5 abstain

iii) The Committee considered submission 072-12 from the International Kiteboarding Association and Definition of Sailing Discipline – New Regulation 23.1.2

Recommended to Council: Reject

Vote: 0 in favour, 22 against, 4 abstain

9. ISAF Sailing World Cup

(a) The Committee received a report from the ISAF Sailing World Cup Manager on the 2012 ISAF Sailing World Cup.

(b) The Committee received a report from the ISAF Sailing World Cup Manager on the implementation of the 2013 – 2016 ISAF Sailing World Cup including the ISAF resources, services and the daily management of the ISAF Sailing World Cup. See attached Appendix.

(c) Supporting continental circuits

The Committee noted the implementation of the European continental circuit in support of the ISAF Sailing World Cup. It was also noted that the Americas are working towards establishing an American continental circuit in support of Miami OCR

(d) Submission 066-12

The Committee considered submission 066-12 from the Norwegian Sailing Federation about ISAF Sailing World Cup Events - Add Windsurfing as an ISAF SWC Event - Regulation 24.3.1.

Recommendation Council: Reject

Vote: 1 in favour, 21 against, 4 abstain
(e) Submission 067-12
The Committee considered submission 067-12 from the International RS:X Class Association about ISAF Sailing World Cup and 2014 ISAF World Championships – Retain Windsurfing RS:X as Events/Equipment – Regulation 24.3.1.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

*ISAF should encourage Sailing World Cup regatta organisers to run promotional events to demonstrate new events where appropriate, equipment or formats.*

**Vote:** 1 in favour, 21 against, 4 abstain

(f) Submission 068-12
The Committee considered submission 068-12 from the Chairman of the Windsurfing and Kiteboarding Committee about 2013 – 2016 ISAF Sailing World Championships and ISAF Sailing World Cup about Selection of Kiteboarding and Windsurfing Events and Equipment – Regulations 24.2.2 and 24.3.1.

**Recommendations to Council: Reject**

**Vote:** 1 in favour, 21 against, 4 abstain

10. **2014 ISAF Sailing World Championship**

   (a) The Committee received a progress report from the ISAF Head of Competitions. See attached Appendix.

   (b) The Committee received a report from the Events WP and made the following recommendation to Council:

   The qualification system: Add QS as Appendix.

   **Vote:** Unanimous

   The Fleet Quotas

   **Recommendation to Council:**

   *The quotas for the Santander 2014 ISAF Sailing World Championships shall be the same as were in place for the Perth 2011 ISAF Sailing World Championships. The Technical Delegate should liaise with the new Classes and the Event Organisers to finalise quotas for the new Classes.*

   **Vote:** 20 in favour, 4 against, 2 abstain

11. **ISAF Events**

   (a) Nation Flags on sails

   Submission 086-12

   The Committee considered submission 086-12 from the Chairman of the Events Committee about ISAF Events and Class Rules of Olympic Classes about Nation Flags at ISAF Events.

   **Recommendation to Council:** Approve

   **Vote:** Unanimous

   (b) Bibs and competitor advertising.

   i) Submission 015-12

   The Committee considered submission 015-12 from the Chairman of the Events
Committee and ISAF Advertising Code – Bibs at ISAF Events – Regulation 20.3.

Recommendation to Council: Approve with the following amendment

A working party should be set up by the new Executive Committee with the interested parties being duly represented (Olympic Classes, athletes, team leaders etc).

Vote: 24 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstain

ii) Submission 016-12

The Committee considered submission 015-12 from US SAILING about ISAF Advertising Code - Advertising on Rear of Competitor Supplied Bibs at ISAF Events - Regulation 20.3.

Recommendation to Council: Reject

See Submission 015-12

Vote: 1 in favour, 23 against, 2 abstain

12. New Rankings system

(a) The Committee received a progress report from the ISAF Head of Competitions including the status of new Events and Equipment and the continental dates of windows. See attached Appendix.

(b) The Committee received and supported the following recommendations from the ISAF Rankings Sub-committee:

Recommendations to Council

The SRSC recommends that the 2013 World Rankings should be evaluated and recommendations on introducing any minimum event criteria should be made at the 2013 ISAF Annual Conference.

Recommendations to Council

The SRSC recommends that all of finishers of ranked events should receive ranking points. Currently, only the top 85% of finishers receive ranking points.

13. 2012 ISAF Youth Worlds

(a) The Committee received a progress report from the Chairman of the Youth Worlds Sub-committee on the 2012 ISAF Youth Worlds. See attached Appendix.

(b) The Committee received a progress report on future ISAF Youth World Championship’s from the Chairman of the Youth Worlds Sub-committee and made the following recommendations to Council:

Recommendation to Council

To approve the SL16 as the equipment for the Open Multi-hull event at the 2014 ISAF Youth World Championship.

Recommendation to Council

To approve the following equipment for the 2015 ISAF Youth Worlds:

Boy’s One Person Dinghy - Laser Radial
Girl's One Person Dinghy - Laser Radial
Boy’s Two Person Dinghy - 420
Girl's Two Person Dinghy - 420
Boy’s Windsurfer - RS:X: with 8.5m sail
Girl’s Windsurfer - RS:X with 8.5m sail
Open Skiff - 29er
Open Multihull - Hobie 16 with spinnaker, subject to the outcome of Submission 090-12.

Recommendation to Council

To approve Oman as the host of the 2016 Youth World Championship in December 2016 and January 2017, subject to a successful site visit and satisfactory contractual arrangements.

(c) The ISAF Youth Worlds Sub-committee recommended that the recommendations in the report of the strategy Working Party regarding size, structure and fleets at the Championships be taken forward by the next sub-committee.

(d) Submission 069-12

The Committee considered submission 069-12 from the International RS: X Class Association about ISAF Youth World Championships – retain Windsurfing RS: X as Selected Events / Equipment – Regulation 25.13.5.

Recommendation to Council: No Recommendation
Submission Withdrawn.

(e) Submission 088-12

The Committee considered submission 088-12 from the International 29er Class Association and Danish Sailing Federation about Events for the ISAF Youth Sailing World Championship - Regulation 24.4.3.

Recommendation to Council: Defer
The current championship has eight events. In order to add a boys and girls skiff events, the Sub-committee needs to investigate the structure and entry requirements further and to study if this can occur in the future.

Vote: Unanimous

(f) Submission 089-12

The Committee considered submission 089-12 from the International 29er Class Association and Danish Sailing Federation about Classes for the ISAF Youth Sailing World Championship – Regulation 24.4.9.

Recommendation to Council: Defer for consideration as part of the discussion on event size and structure.

Vote: Unanimous

(g) Submission 090-12

The Committee considered submission 090-12 from the SL16 Class Association about Classes for the ISAF Youth Sailing World Championship – Delete Hobie 16 - Regulation 24.4.9.

Recommendation to Council: Reject
Distribution levels of the SL 16 are currently not worldwide. As a result, keeping the Hobie 16 with spinnaker as possible equipment for the Open Multihull event allows flexibility for organizers in the future.

Vote: 0 in favour, 25 against, 1 abstain
(h) Submission 091-12

The Committee considered submission 091-12 from the Chairman of the Events Committee about ISAF Youth Sailing World Championship – Regulation 24.4.4.

Recommendation to Council: Approve

The Sub-committee approves 091-12 and recommends that it is to come into effect in 2013, subject to any contractual arrangements with ISAF and the organizers.

Vote: 23 in favour, 3 abstain

(i) Submission 092-12

The Committee considered submission 092-12 from the Techno 293 Class Association about Classes for the ISAF Youth Sailing World Championship – Techno 293 Class to be Added to list of Equipment Regulation 24.4.9.

Recommendation to Council: Reject

The 8.5 rig is not used in class events and needs further study before adopting it for the ISAF Youth Worlds.

Vote: 7 in favour, 17 against, 3 abstain

14.

15. 2014 Youth Olympic Games

The Committee receive a progress report from the ISAF Head of Competitions. See attached Appendix.

16. Team Racing

(a) The Committee received a report from the Chairman of the ISAF Team Racing Sub-committee. It was noted that there would be no ISAF Team Racing Worlds Championship in 2013 as no suitable bids had been received.

(b) The Committee received the following recommendation from the ISAF Team Racing Sub-committee on future Team Racing World Championships:

Recommendations to Council

The Team Racing Sub-committee recommends that Team Racing should be considered as an event in the Youth World Sailing Championship as soon as practically possible.

17. ISAF Classes’ World Championships

The Committee received a report from the Events Administrator on ISAF Class World Championships in 2012 and associated reports from ISAF Classes. The Committee recommended the data should be studied at the next meeting of the Events Committee, by which time all classes should have made their reports.

18. Sports Presentation

The Committee received a progress report from the Communications Co-ordinator regarding sports presentation matters not covered elsewhere in this agenda. See Appendix.

19. Other submissions

(a) Submission 008-12
The Committee considered submission from the Canadian Yachting Association about ISAF Committee Appointments – Nomination and Appointments Process – Regulation 5.

**Recommendation to Council: No Recommendation**
No Opinion.

(b) Submission 017-12
The Committee considered submission from the Executive Committee about ISAF Advertising Code – Appendix 1, Regulation - 20 Table 1- Events Advertising.

**Recommendation to Council: No Recommendation**
No opinion.

(c) Submission 085-12
The Committee considered submission 085-12 from the Swedish Sailing Federation and Reduce Costs for the Olympic Sailing Campaigns

**Recommendation to Council: Defer**
*The Committee believed that there were many opportunities to review costs, and that the next Events Committee should consider the submission in more details before making its recommendation to Council.*

**Vote: Unanimous**

(d) Submission 087-12
The Committee considered submission 087-12 from the Executive Committee about Introduction of XRR – New Regulation 25.7.6.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve with the following amendment**
*For Olympic Class ranked events only. Other ISAF Classes should be encouraged to use the system, but it should not be compulsory.*

**Vote: 24 in favour, 2 abstain**

(e) Submission 093-12
The Committee considered submission 093-12 from the Chairman of the Regional Games Committee about Equipment for the Regional Games – Regulation 25.13.5.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve**

**Vote: 25 in favour, 2 abstain**

(f) Submission 099-12
The Committee considered submission 099-12 from the Chairman of the Match Racing Committee about ISAF Women’s World Match Racing Championship - Allowing Crews of Mixed Nationalities - Regulation 24.5.3.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve**

(g) Submission 100-12
The Committee considered submission 100-12 from the ISAF Events – Establish Youth World Match Racing Championship – Regulation 25.8.10 and 25.8.13.

**Recommendation to Council: No Recommendation**

20. **Annual Report**

The Committee noted the Chairman’s report to the Council meeting of 8 November 2012 on
the activities of the Events Committee for the period 1 January 2012 to date. See attached Appendix.

21. **Hand-over to the Events Committee 2013 - 2016**

The Committee agreed the following matters should be handed over to the Events Committee 2013 – 2016 for its consideration:

**In May 2013**

Finalise 2016 Olympic fleet sizes at first meeting. Use current section D as the basis for planning.

Consider 2016 Olympic continental place allocation and process.

Consider Continental Olympic Qualification Events: in Europe, chose or allocate between Palma and Hyeres; in continents without SWC: consider alternate regattas.

Review IOC 2012 criteria and questionnaire and reflect in future Olympic recommendations.

Consider minimum and maximum numbers for ISAF Worlds 2018 and beyond in time for 2018 bidding process.

Consider appropriateness of Working Party to look at Olympic costs. See submission 085-12.

Review Class Worlds numbers (in May of each year).

**In November 2013**

Finalise 2016 Olympic format decisions on the basis of trialling in 2013.

Amend 23.1.7 so once equipment is chosen it requires 75% to make a change.

Establish greater clarity and consistency of view on purpose of the SWC.

Consider inclusion of Team Racing in ISAF Youth Worlds.

The Committee supported the need for a May Mid-Year meeting at a convenient and economical location for air transport.

22. **Any other Business**

There being no further business, the meeting was closed.
1 OVERVIEW

380 sailors from 63 nations competed at the London 2012 Olympic Games. The Olympic Sailing Competition was organised by LOCOG and ISAF. The London 2012 Olympic Games official slogan was ‘Inspire a generation’. The Olympic Games ran from 27 July – 12 August with the sailing competition running from 28 July – 11 August.

The ISAF President said after the Games:

"For the first time in Olympic sailing our athletes were able to hear the enthusiastic cheers from the crowds on The Nothe spectator area which inspired them to greater feats of sportsmanship. We were able to witness moments of heroism intermingled with heartbreak as the variety of weather conditions tested both light and heavy weather sailors. The Games has certainly given ISAF an incredible opportunity to showcase the sport of Olympic Sailing to a global audience."

2 IOC HIGHLIGHTS

The IOC has prepared the following brief highlights on the impact and reach of the London 2012 Olympic Games:

(a) Lasting benefits for sport, Olympic Movement, host city and nation.
(b) First time that digital media exceeded traditional broadcast coverage.
(c) Games were available to record audience of 4.8 billion people.
(d) 4 million fans on social media platforms.
(e) 100,000 hours of Games coverage (vs 61,000 in Beijing).
(f) Over 300 hours of new 3D coverage.
(g) Approximately 8.2 million tickets sold.
(h) 10,567 athletes participated in London.
(i) Medal winners from 80 NOCs.
(j) 128 Olympic records, including 46 world records.
(k) 3 countries won first ever medals (Cyprus, Grenada, Guatemala).
(l) Record women’s participation (44%).
(m) 94% of spectators said the Games met/exceeded expectations.

3 KEY POSITIVES

(a) The Athlete experience both on the water and on shore.
(b) The LOCOG Sailing Competition Manager and management team were excellent.
(c) World class Field of Play (FoP) management and race management teams delivering excellent racing for the competitors.
(d) LOCOG Volunteers and the ISAF Race Officials team.
(e) The introduction of the Nothe spectator venue and the spectator experience.
(f) The quality of the Olympic Broadcast Service (OBS) broadcast and the on venue production team.
(g) Swiss Timing developing a fully automatic scoring system.
(h) The quality of the branding.
(i) The use of social media and blogs.

4 KEY NEGATIVES
(a) Not having the victory ceremonies at the Nothe spectator venue.
(b) Not being able to make the Swiss Timing 2d tracking viewer publically available.
(c) Not enough input or influence over key OBS decisions in the lead up to the Olympic Games. ISAF would like to have much more interaction with OBS in the future and more input in to the key decisions.

5 SITE VISITS
ISAF carried out a total of 10 site visits. The visits are an essential part of ensuring a successful Olympic Games. In addition to the official site visits it was helpful to have a number of additional technical meetings with LOCOG at ISAF conferences and also at the Weymouth and Portland (WAP) venue. It was very easy to arrange additional meetings at WAP due to the location of the ISAF Secretariat in Southampton. This will not be so easy for future Olympic Games.

6 TEST EVENTS
Sailing had two test events, one from 9 - 14 August 2010 and one from 31 July - 13 August 2011. The first test event allowed ISAF and LOCOG to work on the management structure, race management policies & equipment and the venue layout. The event was an ISAF Sailing World Cup event so had a much larger event quotas than at the Olympic Games and was an ideal event to use - in particular for the NOCs who were able to learn more about the venue and allow their sailors an opportunity to race on the FoP. The second test event was set up to be as similar as possible to the Olympic Sailing Competition with similar event quotas. This test event was invaluable for testing most components of the sailing events including the volunteers, FoP management and results system. This test event was also essential for developing the Nothe medal race course and the plans for the Nothe spectator venue. However, at future test events it would be extremely helpful to have more input from OBS, other IOC partners and the media.

7 TRAINING
Although there were very good opportunities or sailors and MNAs to gain experience of the venue during the annual Sail for Gold Regatta and the test events on the whole training at the venue was expensive for MNAs. ISAF should work proactively with organising committees at the bid stage to ensure that good access to the venue is available and that the costs are controlled.

8 QUALIFICATION SYSTEM
The qualification system for the London 2012 Olympic Games worked well. The following events were used as Olympic Qualification Events:

3-18 December 2011 Perth 2011 ISAF Sailing World Championships (Perth, AUS)
1-5 February 2012 Elliott 6m Qualification Event (Key Biscayne, USA)
20 - 28 March 2012 RS X World Championships (Cadiz, ESP)
2 - 11 May 2012  Star World Championships (Hyeres, FRA)
4 - 7 May 2012  Laser World Championships (Boltenhagen, GER)
4 - 13 May 2012  49er World Championships (Zadar, CRO)
10 - 19 May 2012  470 World Championships (Barcelona, ESP)
11 - 18 May 2012  Finn Gold Cup (Falmouth, GBR)
15 - 20 May 2012  Laser Radial World Championships (Boltenhagen, GER)

ISAF, LOCOG and the IOC worked closely to ensure the confirmation of places allocated to NOCs but there did seem to be a great deal of duplication of lists and work. There was some delay in reallocating unused quota places as ISAF had to wait until the Tripartite Commission places had been awarded. ISAF also had to further clarify the late athlete replacement policy because traditionally ISAF does not have one technical meeting but instead has daily technical meetings with the OCOG and NOCs. In the future ISAF should work closer with the IOC Tripartite Commission.

9 OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

A Documents Working Party was created to produce the documents for the Olympic Games. The Working Party was made up of:

John Doerr, IJ representative
Jan Stage, IU representative
Charley Cook, IRO representative
Jason Smithwick ISAF Head of Technical
Sandra Robinson, LOCOG Deputy Field of Play Manager
Alastair Fox, ISAF Technical Delegate

The Documents Working Party was led by John Doerr and reported to Alastair Fox. The Working Party produced the following documents:

(a) Notice of Race
(b) Sailing Instructions (including Addendum Q for Medal Races)
(c) Equipment Inspection Regulations
(d) Coach Boat Regulations
(e) Competition Area Regulations
(f) Athletes Media Guide
(g) GPS and On-board Camera mounting instructions

The Working Party also worked on the following documents:

(a) Race Management policies for fleet and match racing
(b) International Jury Information for Athletes
(c) Guidance for the application of Discretionary Penalties
(d) The application of Standard Penalties
(e) International Jury Internal Guidance
(f) Equipment Inspection Policies
(g) Information to Athletes for Medal Races
It is strongly recommended that a similar group is put together for the 2016 Olympic Games. As well as these documents LOCOG also worked closely with ISAF to produce comprehensive FoP documents including:

(a) Media, Marshall & Support Boat Regulations
(b) Olympic Field of Play Safety Procedures
(c) Olympic Sailing Field of Play Safety Plan and Risk Assessment

10 WEYMOUTH AND PORTLAND VENUE

The Weymouth and Portland venue worked very well, both on shore and on the water. LOCOG worked closely with ISAF to ensure that the facilities worked well. The Weymouth and Portland venue was the first London 2012 venue to be completed and had held a number of major international events prior to the Olympic Games – in particular the annual ISAF Sailing World Cup event – Sail for Gold.

11 NOTHE SPECTATOR VENUE

ISAF was extremely impressed by the hard work of LOCOG and the spectator venue team to deliver a truly unique experience. The Nothe spectator area acted as a natural grandstand for the medal race course and with the use of TV screens and commentators the spectators were very well informed and entertained. The Nothe venue was sold out every single day of the competition with a capacity of around 5,000 people. The spectator area also had a very successful boat park where spectators could see the different boats used for the sailing events. It was also enormously helpful for the spectators to be able to hear on water interviews and television commentaries within the spectator area and this is something that ISAF believes should be possible at future Olympic Games at all sports venues. It was unfortunate that it was not possible to hold the Victory Ceremonies on the Nothe, instead they were held in the main Weymouth and Portland venue. In the future it is essential that the Victory Ceremonies take place in front of the spectators. The day after the medal races the medallists went to the spectator venue to be interviewed in front of the spectators which again added real value to the experience. At future Olympic Games the spectator venue should have access to score boards, video boards and the 2d/3d tracking viewer. The Nothe spectator venue was managed by a third party and not by LOCOG. This was hugely beneficial in most cases as the management team had a great deal of freedom to present the sport in the best possible way, irrespective of LOCOG or IOC policies and rules. The venue was fully licensed and had a greater variety of on-site catering. One issue was no accredited seating or access for the Olympic Family, ISAF or athletes without official tickets. However, LOCOG managed to secure a quota of tickets to issue to athletes on a daily basis and ISAF was able to secure tickets through the IOC grant in order to ensure that members of the Olympic Family and ISAF could go to the spectator area. In the future ISAF would like to ensure that the spectator venue has access for accredited Olympic Family, ISAF and athletes.

12 SAILING

Field of Play

ISAF and LOCOG worked closely to develop the FoP and in particular the Nothe medal race course. A great deal of testing was carried out to ensure fair racing. The LOCOG FoP management was fantastic and the co-operation with both the police and the navy with regards to access and security was very good. In the future ISAF needs to evaluate FoP boundary rules with regards to the competition and athletes.

The following course areas were used:
Nothe Course – the smallest course area used for all medal races, some opening series races and the Women’s Match Racing event.

Portland Harbour
Weymouth Bay West
Weymouth Bay South
Weymouth Best East – a reserve course area.

Competition Format

For the fleet racing events there as an opening series of 10 races followed by a final double points Medal Race for the top 10 nations. With the exception of the Star fleet each of the fleets raced at least one opening series race on the Nothe Course. Both the RS X and 49er fleets sailed a number of opening series races on the Nothe Course. All medal races were raced on the Nothe Course. All races were completed with only the Men’s 470 medal race having to be postponed to the following day.

For the match racing events a full round robin was scheduled before the knock out rounds. All stages of the competition were completed except for the 5-8 sail off that was cancelled and the semi-finals that were terminated at 1730 on Friday 10 August.

In order to showcase the sailing events on the Nothe Course ISAF developed new course formats and reduced target times for the races. In the future ISAF should keep format changes to a minimum in the lead up to the Olympic Games.

Competition schedule

The competition schedule worked well but ISAF should look at ways to reduce the overall length of the sailing competition in the future. ISAF has a very clear process for handling delays and postponements and it is important that the OCOG and the IOC understand this process as it is different to most other sports.

Weather Services

The UK Met Office provided very accurate and very detailed daily reports for ISAF and LOCOG and gave daily briefings to the team leaders.

Branding

The London 2012 Look of the Games was very strong and LOCOG did a fantastic job with Grapefruit Graphics branding the boats and sails. The nation flags, use of the Olympic Rings and the LOCOG font and colours all contributed to a very strong look for the sailing events and ISAF should continue to build on this look for future Olympic Games.

Official Boats

The Media, Marshall & Support Boat Regulations sought to minimise both wash and wind shadow interference from these boats. With the exception of three live OBS boats, media boats were not allowed on the course area. They were required to be stationary when racing boats were nearby, and they were restricted in where they could be at marks. In addition, to avoid the build-up of wash on the Harbour and Nothe courses, they were required either to be to leeward, or to windward of the course for the whole duration of a race; they were not permitted to transit from one area to another. It is not thought that the quality of media photography or reporting were materially worse as a result of these restrictions, and the restrictions eliminated both any interference with competitors, and the sight of media boats in the TV footage of a race.

In general spectator boats were not allowed in the field of play; the only exceptions being a small number of VIP, ISAF and Olympic Family boats.
It is recommended similar restrictions are applied at future Olympic Sailing Competitions and at the ISAF Sailing World Championships.

**Doping**

The location of the doping station, the facilities, the volunteers and the policies they followed were all excellent.

**13 TELEVISION PRODUCTION**

The onshore and chase boat camera positions were excellent and there was very good cooperation between ISAF, OBS and the LOCOG FoP management team. The on-board cameras used on the competitor boats were of a very high quality but had not been tested prior to the competition starting despite considerable efforts from ISAF and LOCOG to arrange tests with OBS. The on-board cameras are heavy and all athletes would like the opportunity to sail with them long before the Olympic Games start. During the competition ISAF took the decision to remove the on-board cameras from both the Stars and the 49ers – this was very disappointing. It should be stressed that the overall coverage and production was excellent and the OBS production team did a fantastic job broadcasting the sailing events. However, ISAF would like the opportunity to work much closer with the IOC and OBS in the planning stages of broadcast production at the Olympic Games. In addition ISAF would like much greater responsibility within broadcast planning including greater control over the live schedule, on-board cameras and graphics used.

**14 MEDIA & PRESS OPERATIONS**

There was outstanding management of the press centre and photo operations. The downside of the location was no line of sight to the boat park and boat ramps. At times the press centre had to put out additional workstations because so many journalists came to cover the sailing events - this was a good problem to have. The mixed zone was in an excellent position and was well controlled. It worked very well for the athletes and the media. The mixed zone was designed to incorporate the pre-medal race quarantine zone which gave the media great access to the athletes before the medal races.

**15 SWISS TIMING / OMEGA**

The timing and scoring operations were a great success. Swiss Timing switched to a fully automatic GPS tracking system to produce the results and this system could be further developed for future Olympic Games. The second test event proved to be invaluable in developing the system as well as providing an opportunity for the ITOS, NTOs, SSVs & volunteers to understand the system and for ISAF, LOCOG and Swiss Timing to understand each other’s needs and requirements better. Swiss Timing developed a very user friendly 2d and 3d tracking viewer that allowed the competition management and media to follow every single race live or in replay mode. This system was successfully trialled during the second test event on the ISAF website and ISAF would like to work with the IOC to ensure that this system can be made publicly available at future Olympic Games. The 2d and 3d tracking system would then be able to replace the RTDS results system and would be an invaluable tool for commentators, the media, competition management and the general public. There were no score boards or video boards at the Weymouth and Portland venue and ISAF should work with the IOC to ensure that they are provided in the future.

**16 ISAF COMMUNICATIONS DEPARTMENT**

The media output and sports presentation from the 2012 Olympic Sailing Competition was very successful. ISAF increased the level of resources dedicated to communicating results and news through the website, photography, social media and blogging. The high level of
interaction with fans and open communication must be continued at ISAF events. Feedback, particularly through social media, indicates there is still much work to be done in getting rights holding broadcasters to include sailing in their core programming, even in countries where sailing is a strong medal winning sport.

onEdition were appointed to make images available to all MNAs and Olympic Class Associations and particularly communicated with those nations without media resources onsite. Images were published on the front page of national papers in Cyprus and Trinidad & Tobago.

A 2012 Olympic Sailing Competition DVD has been produced. The DVD includes a 30 minute documentary style summary plus Medal Race footage from all 10 events.

The ISAF Communications team worked with the contractors for the Nothe spectator venue to provide background information, advice and footage. The boat cradles used at the ‘boat park’ at the Nothe are now owned by ISAF and will be available for other events to use in the future. The spectator experience at the Nothe was a huge success, reported as “exceeding expectations” on a daily basis. The format including refreshments, explanatory films, competitions, interviews and commentary should be repeated at other events. The proximity to the competition was well received by athletes and fans alike with the ‘check in’ and ‘check out’ process offering a real opportunity for engagement.

The Athlete Media Guide and Mixed Zone structure were extremely successful in helping athletes understand the media expectations and ensuring the media have good access to the athletes in a controlled environment.

The prohibited use of 2D tracking on the ISAF website caused some negative feedback and an explanation was permanently present on the blog to try and minimize debate on the subject. Over 100 logins were issued to accredited broadcasters (TV and Radio), written press and photographers to follow the tracking and this was very well received. There were many requests to use the data in broadcast or online which were denied. The 2D tracking is now freely available on the ISAF website.

Stats 27 July-12 August 2012

Olympic Website – 223,981 unique users, 1,807,025 page views
Blog – 47,000 unique users, 80,000 page views
Photography (through onEdition) – 2,500 images shot and over 10,000 downloads
Facebook – Increased from 19,500 on 1 July to 43,021 on 1 September 2012

17 LOCOG SAILING TEAM

Rob Andrews  Sailing/Venue General Manager
Pete Allam  Deputy Sailing Manager
Kate Mardel-Ferreira  Sailing Services Manager
Tessa Bartlett  Sailing Operations Manager
Sally Kilpatrick  Sailing Athlete Services Group Leader
Mike Hart  Sailing Beach Group Leader
Rod Carr  Sailing Field of Play Manager
Sandra Robinson  Sailing Deputy Field of Play Manager
Viv Nanopoulou  Sailing Sport Information Group Leader
18 INTERNATIONAL OFFICIALS

The following ISAF Officials were appointed:

**Technical Delegates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Kellett</td>
<td>AUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alastair Fox</td>
<td>GBR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Race Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charley Cook (PRO)</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilker Bayinder</td>
<td>TUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinus Blickman</td>
<td>NED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christophe Gaumont</td>
<td>FRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio González de la Madrid</td>
<td>ESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jorgensen</td>
<td>DEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manel Llige</td>
<td>ESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Navarro</td>
<td>BRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanasios Papantoniou</td>
<td>GRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Parrish</td>
<td>NZL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathalie Peberel</td>
<td>FRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Psychogiou</td>
<td>GRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ramke</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Reggio</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Roy</td>
<td>IRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nino Shmueli</td>
<td>ISR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Torrijo Moll</td>
<td>ESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Wilson</td>
<td>AUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jury**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Tillett (Chairman)</td>
<td>AUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Allen *</td>
<td>POR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luca Babini</td>
<td>ITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Baglin *</td>
<td>AUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neven Baran</td>
<td>CRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Beal</td>
<td>CAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mats Bjorklund *</td>
<td>FIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Bonneau</td>
<td>FRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Borrell *</td>
<td>NZL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Burger</td>
<td>RSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Burnett *</td>
<td>GBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Capron</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ISAF ITO team were very experienced and put in long hours on the water to ensure a successful event but also worked closely with ISAF and LOCOG to develop the relevant policies and rules for the event. LOCOG and the RYA worked closely to identify and train the NTOs. The on water race management delivered by the ITO and NTO team was of an exceptionally high quality.
The travel policy for the ITOs worked well on the whole but required flights to be booked very early which did cause some problems. There was also some resistance from LOCOG when ISAF requested that some officials should be allowed to arrive earlier than the policy allowed for in order for those officials to carry out essential tasks.

See the separate Jury, Race Management and Equipment Inspection reports for more detailed information on the role of the ITOs, the venue, activities and any issues that arose.

19 MEDAL TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>China, PR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alastair Fox, ISAF Technical Delegate  
31 October 2012
Events Committee Meeting
Item 6(a)ii - Review of the 2012 Olympic Sailing Competition

1. Introduction

1.1. Events Committee terms of reference state that:

“Events Committee shall, every four years, at the meeting immediately after the Olympic Games, provide to Council a review of the Olympic Sailing Competition, and identify possible opportunities for change to ISAF’s Olympic strategy, or to Olympic Sailing Events or Equipment”.

1.2. The Events Committee agreed the process for the development of this report at their meeting in May 2012, with Chris Atkins, Chairman of Events Committee, Henri van der Aat (HVA) and Phil Jones (PJ), as members of the Events Committee, invited to coordinate activities and any members of the Events Committee involved in the Olympic Regatta invited to contribute.

1.3. Accreditation providing full access to all areas could not be facilitated for HVA or PJ, meaning that access to key areas and personnel was limited. HVA could not attend the event due to a late business obligation, and PJ only had guest access, with very restricted access, for the second week. Some comments in the following report are inevitably limited as a result.

1.4. As well as the items to be considered, which form the headings of this report, the Events Committee agreed the following:

- The group should seek out and include the views of sailors, coaches, ISAF TDs and Race Officials, MNA representatives, spectators, IOC, OBS, other media, LOCOG and ROCOG in its review.
- The review should identify options for change to ISAF’s Olympic strategy, Events and Equipment for 2020, as well as identifying areas for “no change” including possible Core Events and Equipment for 2020.
- The review should also include where appropriate comments on any outstanding Equipment, format and sports presentation decisions for 2016.

2. Summary

2.1. Overall the 2012 Olympic Sailing Competition (2012 OSC) was an outstanding success. It met ISAF’s strategy, specified in Regulation 23.1.1, of showcasing extremely well the competitive sport of sailing, and elite sailors, to the global media and live and television audiences, and Rob Andrews and his team from LOCOG are to be congratulated on a great event. The look of the boats, and the flags on the sails, were a major step forward from previous Olympics.

2.2. The 10 Gold Medals were shared across 7 nations from 3 continents. Overall 15 nations from 4 continents won medals, with Cyprus winning its first Olympic medal in any sport since independence. Ticketed areas were sold out, and sailors enjoyed for the first time competing and celebrating in front of live, cheering spectators. Gold medals in the Finn and the Star were only decided in the last minute of the Medal Race. Winds were generally good. The weather only caused the loss of one day’s racing, delaying the 470 Men Medal Race by a day and causing the cancellation of the Women’s Match Racing 5th to 8th sail-off.
2.3. This report, by definition, looks at areas where improvement can be made. This is not to detract in any way from the delivery of the 2012 OSC, which was probably the best held to date.

3. Quality of competition for sailors

3.1. Objective feedback from the athletes and coaches was difficult to obtain. The prevailing conditions were generally good for sailing during the 2012 OSC and the competition appeared fair, especially on the courses in the Portland Harbour and in Weymouth Bay. The waves and tide made for challenging conditions that seemed to be appreciated by the athletes.

3.2. The prevailing moderate to fresh west to south-westerly air flow dominated for the majority of the 2012 OSC and meant the racing conditions on the Nothe Course were generally good, albeit shifty. The situation could have been very different had the wind blown from the other directions. Other than at venues where conditions are very predictable, this is likely to remain an issue when establishing a suitable ‘stadium’ course at future Olympic Sailing Competitions, including Rio in 2016. Stadium courses should be located where wind conditions can be expected to provide fair racing.

3.3. The detailed local weather forecasts were of high value for regatta management when planning the schedule for the day, and for race teams when setting courses and starting races on the water.

3.4. Whilst media coverage was extensive, with live television from at least one course everyday, this did not appear to impact the quality of competition. That said, on board cameras had to be removed from the Stars and 49ers early in the 2012 OSC due to concerns over sheets being caught up on them during racing. This was an opportunity lost and must be addressed by earlier engagement with the Olympic broadcaster, and proper ‘rehearsals’ using the same equipment, preferably as part of the ISAF Sailing World Cup.

3.5. There is current a ‘risk and reward’ assessment to be made with regard to use of on board cameras. Olympic boats should ideally be designed with housings for on board cameras and tracking units, so reducing the risk of these interfering with the competition in any way.

4. Duration of regatta and of individual Events

4.1. The Regatta is simply too long. This makes the costs much higher than necessary, with personnel in all functional areas having to be accommodated, and in many cases paid, for more days than necessary. The Women’s Match Racing provided the most extreme example where, during the round robin crews were sailing just two flights of 15 to 20 minutes each day for the first six days of their event, an event that lasted for 12 days. Only the team knockout sports of football, volleyball, basketball and handball, and boxing were scheduled across more days on the Olympic Program.

4.2. Equally, each individual event is too long. Before the introduction of shorter races, it was common to sail one longer race each day for six or seven days. At the 2012 OSC, 10 races were sailed over five days, often with two spare days, prior to the Medal Race. It is surely not necessary to hold 10 races before moving the next stage of the competition. By the time you got to the end, you simply can’t remember what happened at the beginning!

4.3. Whilst the Medal Race worked for some events, it was, by comparison, a failure for others. The Laser Radial Medal Race was a classic with any one of four athletes in the mix. By contrast, the Men’s RS:X and 49er events had been won before the Medal Race took place.
4.4. Also, the skills of match racing an opponent to the back of the fleet to secure a medal are a complete mystery to all but the racing sailor. Any format should encourage sailors to go out and sail to win races.

4.5. The Olympic Regatta, and each Event within it, should build towards a climax. Never was this more apparent than in Weymouth. That said, we must recognise and allow for the fact that we are reliant on wind to make our sport exciting (and indeed for it to happen at all on some days!). The development of any format has to take this into account as a priority.

4.6. The 2012 OSC also provided a sufficiently fair test for sailors to encourage the world’s best sailors to dedicate a four-year campaign to achieve their goal. This is clearly recognised elsewhere in sailing, as it is Olympic medallists who are thereafter in demand and able to go on to Volvo Ocean Race, Americas Cup racing and other similar competitions. Any future change in format should preserve the pinnacle stature that Olympic success currently commands.

5. **Analysis of attractiveness and effectiveness of the various Events and Equipment**

5.1. This is perhaps the most subjective aspect of this report. All Events and Equipment provided a good test of the sailor, demanding athleticism to differing degrees, and with differentiation between Events being on a par with differentiation in rowing or canoeing.

5.2. The Laser and Laser Radial fleets in particular allowed a large number of nations to take part, without there being an ‘extended tail’ at the back of the fleet. The authors believe the Laser Event, with 48 competitors, may have been the single Olympic event that attracted most nations, helping to make competing in Olympic sailing a realistic aspiration for many nations.

5.3. The Olympics should be a test of athlete more than equipment. Whilst sailing is an equipment sport, efforts should continue to keep Olympic campaign costs under control, and to reduce the need for expensive equipment and development to achieve Olympic performance.

5.4. Reviewing the television coverage and looking at the ‘attractiveness’ of the different events and equipment, the multi-handed boats generally ‘score higher’ than the single-handed boats.

5.5. Of the single-handed boats, it was not necessarily those that were the fastest that provided the most interesting competition to watch. As example, the RS:X looked spectacular when sailing, but the competition was probably the hardest of all to follow. The Laser, Laser Radial and Finn, whilst slower and less dynamic to watch, did generate some very interesting and entertaining coverage.

5.6. These differences were less marked with the multi-handed boats. Generally the 49er produced the most spectacular coverage, especially at the lower wind range, but the other classes were no less impressive at the upper end.

5.7. As expected, the Women’s Match Racing provided a good climax in the strongest winds of the 2012 OSC, and some good matches in the earlier rounds. However, interest was limited until the event reached the quarter-final stage.

5.8. Overall the 2012 OSC showed that a shorter regatta, moderate to strong winds, and good sunshine, are probably more important to attractiveness of the OSC than any differences between Events.
6. Suitability of fleet sizes, course areas, courses and race durations

6.1. It is clear that some course configurations are well suited to some boats and not others. Generally the windward/leeward course seemed to suit most of the classes sailed at the regatta. This is not to say that this course should be used exclusively. Also, some variations including leeward, centre and windward gates warrant experimentation, as does starting and/or finishing to windward or leeward, especially when these would provide a better spectator experience without compromising the sailing test.

6.2. There was considerable push back to the use of the windward finish at the 2012 OSC, despite this being an option that had been previously agreed. Increasingly athletes (or the coaches of the athletes) seem to wish to spend time only on practising for things that will happen during the OSC. Thus all courses to be used, or that are likely to be used, in the Olympic Competition should be planned and tested at the Sailing World Cup and any test events.

6.3. Fleets of similar sizes should share courses where possible. This reduces the need to change start line length and relay courses. This in turn reduces the time between starts and allows for a more compact program.

6.4. Target course times were met with good precision by all race teams at 2012 OSC. The 30-minute Medal Race time seemed appropriate, although shorter races could be considered if more than one race was sailed as part of the ‘final’. The longer races appeared to have very little place changing towards the end and could be reduced in time if this would help the overall scheduling of the regatta.

6.5. The smaller fleet sizes are less likely to have general recalls, and this is advantageous for races in front of spectators, and for televised races.

6.6. The rotation of Events to different course areas was a success. As a principle, athletes in every Event should have the opportunity to race where their final race or series is to be held, before the final race or series takes place. This requires careful planning and cooperation between the core strategic team that should include the Meteorologist, Technical Delegate(s), Principal Race Officer, the TV Producer and Field of Play Manager.

7. Other obligations put on sailors

7.1. There is no feedback that any of the other obligations placed on sailors was unreasonable. It is noted that mixed zone, through which all athletes were required to pass, was a popular feature, but athletes should continue to be allowed to make their own decisions as to whether they talk to the media. It would be helpful, both for sailors and media, to introduce such a mixed zone, and to adopt the ‘Athlete Media Guidelines’, at other ISAF Events.

7.2. Medal Race sailors were asked to sail in front of the spectators before the Medal Race, and then for the three Medallists to sail in front of the spectators after the race. In practice most sailors wanted to ‘join in the fun’ and celebrate in front of the spectators after the Medal Race. This concentration of sailors provided the media with their best close-up shots of sailors and it was typically the images from these celebrations that were published worldwide at the end of the day.

7.3. ISAF and ROCOG should review how to maximise the final race spectator and media opportunity, plan the final day racing schedule to take account of it, and update the Athlete and Media Boat Guidelines accordingly.
8. **Shore facilities for sailors and race officials**

8.1. The shore facilities generally appeared good, although the author had no access and is only working on feedback provided through interaction with those that did.

9. **Quality of technology and presentation of the sport: spectators; TV; other media**

9.1. There was a considerable effort made in applying national flags and athlete’s names on mainsails and national flags on all spinnakers, coupled with the ‘London 2012’ look, making for far easier recognition and somehow making the boats more ‘personal’. It is noted that a company was contracted to produce and apply all the decals professionally. This was a very worthwhile investment, with much greater consistency and fewer ‘peeling’ issues experienced. The improved ‘look’ also appeared to be appreciated by the athletes and certainly enhanced the television and other media coverage.

9.2. Considerable efforts were also been made on the ‘look’ of the support boats and personnel afloat. This again enhanced the overall look of the event at the venue and on television.

9.3. By comparison, the container area looked like a temporary market! Either a standard look for containers should be defined, or the containers ‘wrapped’ during the event in the same way as the boats. As a very basic example, the size of the nations’ flags and heights of the flagpoles could all be defined, giving at least some consistency.

9.4. It was very disappointing that, as foreshadowed in May, the tracking output could not be followed on the internet due to unresolved issues with broadcast rights. It is understood that rights holders did have the access to the feed, but it is not known how many, if any, made this feed available on their websites. This situation has remained unchanged for three Olympiads and a renewed effort should be made by ISAF to address it through the IOC before new rights holder agreements are negotiated for future Games.

9.5. The host broadcast pictures were of a good standard, enhanced by the conditions, the ‘look’ of the boats and the on board vision. These made for fast, exciting racing (see **Quality of competition for Sailors** above). The graphic output from the tracking was not of the highest available quality and, as such, looked average when compared to other sailing events. Only leading technologies should be utilised for the Olympic Competition.

9.6. The results system provided interim mark positions and predicted overall positions for all fleets. This system worked well and allowed the remote viewer to follow the action on the various courses, even when the television signal was not available.

9.7. The combination of live pictures, 3D graphics and interim positions to tell the story of the competition was generally not achieved in the broadcast coverage seen by the authors. More effort needs to be made on the presentation if the viewer is to be more fully engaged. The suggestion of a course or workshop for the development sailing commentators has considerable appeal and is something that ISAF should pursue. It would also be better for rights-holders if the OBS output were not so ‘raw’ and could have some tracking images integrated.

9.8. On water, the media, TV, spectator and other boats appeared well briefed and there were no reports of interference with the competition. LOCOG developed a Media, Marshall and Spectator Boat Guidelines document, and gave daily briefings to all drivers and on-the-water media, and this policy should be adopted at future Olympic regattas. Certainly there should be no relaxation of the requirements for these boats and the transfer of knowledge to the Rio
Organising Committee is a key issue. ISAF should continue to investigate innovative ways of capturing images, including the use of drone helicopters that are less expensive and cause less interference.

9.9. The Nothe spectator area was a great success. It was not part of the original requirement agreed with LOCOG. Despite this, most of the challenges were overcome and the experience was at least equivalent to that enjoyed by spectators at other Olympic venues. Spectator satisfaction data has been collected but has not yet been published. The venue benefitted from:

- Big screens with both ‘host broadcaster’ and ‘on site’ feeds
- Commentary from both on the water and in the venue
- Guest appearances from medal winners as they became available
- Pre and post race interviews with athletes and coaches

9.10. Sailing can learn from other sports how to better engage the live audience, something that is pleasing become more of a feature at sailing events. Also the presence of a live audience is an essential aspect of good broadcast coverage. The coverage of the competition, and especially the Medal Races, had ‘atmosphere’ as a result.

9.11. Whilst the figures for broadcast television from the 2012 OSC are not yet available, they are unlikely to be significantly better than those from previous events. Although there is scope for improvement, our sport now has coverage of Olympic sailing that we can take to broadcasters and to which we can expect a reasonable response. Now we have a product, it is important that ISAF engages with the broadcasters to seek feedback and secure interest.

9.12. The only major issue in relation to the spectator experience was the fact the Medal Ceremonies, originally planned for the Nothe (and included on the tickets), were eventually held at the Olympic Regatta Venue. Only those with accreditation could gain access. Special arrangements were made for a limited number of friends and family to attend.

9.13. The situation devalued the experience for the athletes and was a source of considerable frustration for friends and families and some of the spectators. It was a significant issue and a major opportunity lost. The Medal Ceremonies must take place in front of the live audience, immediately after the final race.

10. Any cost-related observations resulting in recommendations

10.1. Many of the observations above address the costs of staging the Olympic Sailing Regatta. Areas to be addressed should include:

- A reduction in the length of the Regatta, to a maximum of 9 days in 2016 and possibly 8 days in 2020
- A reduction in the number of International and National Technical Officials required at the Regatta
- Organisation of the schedule to start the classes more extensive measurement later, reducing the time measurers are required prior to the event
- A review of RRS 42 with the aim of limiting the number of classes to which it applies, reducing or removing the need to on water judging
10.2. As an example, the number of ITOs, NTOs and SSV (sport-specific volunteers) for Weymouth 2012 totalled 353. This is high given the number of athletes (380) and the duration of the event, and continued efforts should be made to reduce this number without compromising the quality of the regatta.

11. Other opportunities to improve event for sailors, media and spectators

11.1. Clearly all requirements must be properly defined in the bid documents. This would seem a key issue for ISAF but the bid document currently receives no exposure to any of the ISAF Committees. It might be that an improved outcome could be achieved if this was the case.

11.2. Equally, ISAF is required to provide a report each four years to the IOC, information from which is included in the IOC Program Commission Report. Again, this is a key document and it contains at least a level of subjective opinion that is not discussed within any ISAF Committee. This would seem to be an oversight given the significance of the information provided.

12. Recommendation

12.1. It is recommended that the Events Committee adopt this report and that ISAF, and the Technical Delegate in particular, work as appropriate to implement the various recommendations contained to further enhance the Olympic Sailing Competition.
Rio 2016 Olympic Games – 5-21 August

General Summary:

Following the initial site visit to Rio in 2008 ISAF was satisfied that the proposed venue would cope well with the demands of the Olympic Sailing Competition. The shore facilities were very good and the Marina da Glória is currently being renovated for the Olympic Games. The Rio 2016 Sports Department sent a strong delegation to Weymouth and Portland during the London 2012 Olympic Games and they are in close contact with ISAF. The wind strength in August in Rio is light and as a result of this it will be important that the sailing schedule is flexible and that 4 course areas are available for racing. It is essential that the 2014 and 2015 Test Events are run in August to give ISAF and the national race management teams the best possible understanding of the sailing conditions. ISAF has already run a Race Management Seminar in Rio and over the next four years ISAF should work closely with the Rio 2016 Sports Department to help develop, train and prepare the national volunteers.

Weather:

Data to represent Rio de Janiero were available from three locations: The Rio de Janiero International Airport in the inner harbour, Santos Dumont Airport on the west side of the entrance to the harbour about 3-4 miles north of Copacabana beach, and a military airport close to the water about 30 miles to the west. Santos Dumont (SBRJ) airport was selected as being the most representative; although it is likely that the high terrain (to over 2000 ft to the W and SW of Santos and NW-N of the course area) will turn winds more L at Santos Dumont than on the course under sea breeze conditions.

For Rio de Janiero, August 5-21 is mid to late winter, and despite the subtropical latitude, the area experiences occasional cold frontal passages from the south and southwest. Except with frontal passages, gradient winds are rather light, and with relatively little temperature difference between land and water, thermal circulations are rather weak. Strong winds from any direction are rare. Overall, winds speeds are light, being the least of any of the four locations considered here. For August, average wind speeds are 5.2 kts at 1200, 7.5 kts at 1500 and 6.3 kts at 1800.

When there are no strong gradient winds, mornings usually favour a light northerly drainage offshore with wind speeds less than 6 kts. At 1200 SE-S-SW winds are most common, representing both gradient winds following the occasional cold front and developing onshore thermal breezes, and account for 41% of the total, versus 35% for NNW – NE. SSE-SSW winds 7-10 kt speeds occur 15% of the time, as do SE-S winds 4-6 kts, while N-NE winds 4-6 kts are seen 21% of the time.

By 1500, onshore winds directions dominate, although most are 10 kts or less. SSE-SSW winds occur with 7-10 kt speeds 32% of the time, 4-6 kt speeds 18% of the time and 11-16 kts 12% of the time. All NW-NE winds are now only 10% of the total at 1500.

By 1800 we see even a more dominant onshore flow direction, although speeds are weakening a little. Also, the direction typically clocks right a little to include more SW
winds. SSE-SW winds of 4-6 kts occur 31% of the time, with 7-10 kts 27% of the time. NW to NE wind directions now account for less than 5% of the total.

For the afternoon, especially after 1300-1400, winds on the course likely will favour more right than at the airport, likely by about one (16-point) compass point, with speeds perhaps 2-3 kts higher than at Santos Dumont airport.

In composite, for 1200-1800, the most frequent wind range is 4-6 kts, with 40% of the time, followed by 7-10 kts, with 34%. Winds of 11-16 kts occur only 9% of the time, although that number is 16% on the 1500 hour. Winds speeds of 17 kts or higher occur less than 1% of the time.

Afternoon thunderstorms in Rio are infrequent in August, having never been observed at either 1200 or 1500 in 19 years of data, and occurring just 0.2% of the time at 1800.

**Venue:**

The venue is located near the city centre in Flamengo Park at the existing Marina Da Glória, with the picturesque backdrops of Sugar Loaf Mountain and Corcovado. The venue includes the incorporation of a temporary 10,000 seat stadium on Flamengo Beach, directly in front of the proposed gold medal course. The medal ceremonies will be conducted in front of the spectators as soon after racing as possible.
Proposed Course Areas: Subject to ISAF and ROCOG test events

Competition Management:

The Rio 2016 Sports Department sent the Sailing Manager to Weymouth & Portland to fully observe all areas of the 2012 Olympic Sailing Competition. ISAF is planning the first technical site visit for early 2013.

Alastair Fox  
Head of Competitions  
24 October 2012
NEW 2016 OLYMPIC EQUIPMENT – PROGRESS SINCE MAY 2012

1. INTRODUCTION

Following on from the Equipment and Events decisions in May 2012 the ISAF Technical and Offshore department has undertaken the following actions for the Nacra17 and 49erFX decision:

- Immediately following the decision the following news article was published [http://www.sailing.org/27422.php](http://www.sailing.org/27422.php) that invites MNA to place orders for the Nacra17 and the 49erFX with the manufacturers before the 15 June 2012. This invitation includes an order and payment protocol.
- ISAF controls the distributions of the first 55 49erFX rigs and 100 Nacra17 boats.
- After receiving and verifying MNA orders, ISAF creates a priority list based on the best shipping solution and distribution for the boats.

In addition the ISAF Technical and Offshore department has been working with the IKA and other IKA representatives on the Kiteboarding decision.

The current situation with the new equipment follows:

2. NACRA 17

The first 100 MNA reserved boats were quickly allocated with the following global spread: 25 Nations from 5 continents: ARG, AUS, AUT, BEL, BRA, BUL, CAN, ESP, FIN, FRA, GBR, GER, HKG, ISR, ITA, JPN, NED, NZL, PUR, RUS, SUI, SWE, TAH, URU, USA.

There is a program of distribution that starts with boats arriving at NACRA distribution hubs at the end of November 2012 through to March 2013.

The ISAF Technical and Offshore department has been working closely with NACRA receiving regular updates and inputting on many areas from building quality control to certification procedures.

The latest report from NACRA is as follows:

Nacra have signed orders for 170 boats and still many in the pipeline. Boats are now in full production and at the beginning of October there are 46 boats produced with a projection of 5 to 6 boats a week.

Boats shipping schedule for the first 100 boats will be: October: 34 boats, November: 20 boats, December: 26 boats

There will be a final draft of the class rules ready to be sent to ISAF by end of October.

The first NACRA17 World Championship will be held in Scheveningen in 2013 and the committee are formed. NACRA are also talking with a couple of venues to have the Europeans in 2013

3. 49ERFX

The first 55 reserved 49erFX rigs were quickly allocated with the following global spread: 19 Nations from 4 continents: AUS, BER, BRA, CAN, DEN, ESP, FIN, FRA, GBR, GER, ITA, NED, NOR, NZL, POL, SUI, SWE, USA. ISAF limited the first shipment to a maximum allocation of four 49erFX rigs per country but the MNA orders amounted to 84 rigs in total, with subsequent shipments satisfying the additional orders.

The ISAF Technical and Offshore department has been working closely with Mackay boats receiving regular updates and inputting on many areas including construction and Class Association formation.
The latest report from Mackay boats is as follows:

- At the end of September there were already FX sailing in 19 different countries.
- By the end of October 135 rigs will have been shipped to 21 different countries.
- The class rules have been finalised and the class has a constitution and ICA alongside the 49er.
- The first class VP is Kristen Lane from USA.
- The sailors are all very happy with the boat and there has been a lot of really positive feedback.
- A number of teams have posted sailing pictures and videos onto the 49er facebook page.

4. KITEBOARDING

Following on from the Kiteboarding submission and the Constitution Interpretation 002-12, specifically item 2(e) here: [http://www.sailing.org/tools/documents/Interpretation00212-[13217].pdf](http://www.sailing.org/tools/documents/Interpretation00212-[13217].pdf) issued on the 16 July 2012 a Kiteboarding Equipment Evaluation working party has been set up with members of the Equipment Committee, Windsurfing and Kiteboarding Committee, Events Committee and ISAF staff. The working party will have a paper evaluation study of Kiteboarding equipment presented at the various committees at the November conference.

During the time since May 2012 the ISAF staff has been working closely with the International Kiteboarding Association (IKA) developing an enhanced formula production licensing system for competition kiteboards, kites and associated equipment. The IKA and ISAF staff have drawn up full manufacturer licensing contracts and also developed the IKA class rules to deal with this area for an annual licensing system for production boards to be used at the Olympics and ISAF Graded events. The staff and IKA believe this system is ready to start pending decisions from the ISAF Council this November meeting. Details of this system will be presented in the working party evaluation.
ISAF 2016 Olympic Kiteboarding
Equipment Evaluation Report

Task
The Executive Committee asked the chairman of the Equipment Committee to form a panel to make an evaluation of the most suitable equipment for the Olympic Kiteboard events.

ISAF Reg. 23.1.3(c): Selection of New Equipment (for both a New or Retained Event)
New Equipment shall only be selected following Equipment trials or other evaluation against the specified criteria, and shall be decided no later than November of the year four years before the Olympic Games.

Evaluation Panel:
- Georg Tallberg EQ, EQCSC and CRSC chair.
- Carolijn Brouwer EQ and EC
- Kamen Fillyov Council, RR and WSKC chair.
- Bruno De Wannemaeker EQ, EQCSC and WSKC
- Markus Schwendtner IKA

Format of Olympic Kiteboarding Course Racing
The equipment evaluation has been based on the format recommendations of the ISAF Santander Kiteboarding Format Trials. The recommended format is “course racing”, even if the competition may be conducted in heats and different shape course. Races will be both upwind and downwind, and therefore the equipment has been recommended to suit such courses. Even if the format would be slalom or marathon, the equipment would be the same. Sailors at the 2012 slalom European and World championships widely used the same equipment that they used in the course racing events. Marathon events use the same equipment as well.

Recommendation
The panel has made an evaluation on the best possible equipment to be chosen for the women’s and men’s Olympic kiteboard events. The main possibilities are to stay with the box rule that the class uses currently, or develop a separate one design class rule.

The evaluation panel is recommending the selection of the IKA “Formula Kite” equipment as equipment for the 2016 Olympic Sailing Regatta and all ISAF graded events. The proposed box rule effectively addresses cost and availability issues and represents the history and philosophy of the discipline of kiteboarding. It is also recommended by the top sailors.

By choosing one design equipment there would be a risk to have an event on the Olympic Sailing Competition that is felt by sailors and general public not being the pinnacle event for this discipline of the sport. Top sailors strongly favour the box rule concept as it allows participants of a wide weight and size range to compete with equal chances. Only the box rule concept ensures participation of the world’s top athletes.

Summary Narrative
There is currently only one class representing course racing kiteboarding. This Kiteboarding Class (International Kiteboarding Association – IKA) has class rules in ISAF standard format. The Class Rules are written as “open” rules and include measurement control on boards. This allows multiple
manufacturers to develop boards within certain maximum and minimum dimensions. Only one board may be registered for an event. Only 3 kites may be registered for an event. The sizes of the kites are free. This enables sailors of a wide variety of sizes to be able to race in a wide variety of wind strengths.

Boards and kites must be production manufactured and registered with the class ahead of event eligibility, in a similar system used since years in certain windsurfing classes, namely Funboard, Formula Windsurfing and Raceboard.

A registration system is already in place and can be seen at the IKA website. One of its main features is that it ensures a fair distribution of board models among MNA’s and NCA’s. It introduces a yearly registration deadline, and equipment becomes eligible several months later, ensuring enough time for production, distribution and training. The deadlines do consider equipment eligibility with regards to the major ISAF events. The registration system also includes a pre-order system for MNAs at reduced prices. The registration scheme slows down development to the normal product life duration, ensures low prices and world wide availability.

The class rules are controlling the class well. Minor changes proposed put a special emphasis on the maximum and minimum dimensions of the box rule, and allowed materials to be used. The material limitations establish the status quo of current technology and prevent the development of exotic and expensive materials and production methods, while allowing evolution within the box rule. For boards, the limitations are already rather tight. The kites will be limited to the materials currently used. For fins, there is currently no need to change, however the class rules and registration scheme make provision to address the same procedures if it is felt necessary to enforce.

The panel evaluated the two principles against each other – “box rule” vs. “one design”. If one design should be chosen, the panel thinks it would lead to a smaller range of size/weight among the top sailors. The one design class would after some time be slower than the box rule equipment. Top sailors would not be sponsored by a kite brand if the number of brands would be limited. Top sailors would most likely not participate in the Olympics, which would be bad for the sport.

Evaluation against the criteria in regulation 23.1.2
The panel has aimed to compare the Formula Kite with a one design option based on the criteria in ISAF Regulation 23.1.2. A chart providing an overview over the compliance with the criteria set out in regulation 23.1.2 can be found in appendix A

23.1.2 Preamble
The philosophy of the discipline of kiteboard racing is that sailors use their own equipment, provided by various brands. By selecting a box rule, the selected equipment would most likely represent the pinnacle for that discipline of sailing. A one design option could probably not gather all course racing kiteboard sailors and there would be two competing classes.

23.1.2(a) demonstrate the diversity of skills required to race various types of small boats, and minimize the overlap between Events
The overlap between events would be reduced by selecting Formula Kite as these would be the only sailing events not being one design.

23.1.2(b) place an emphasis on athlete skill rather than equipment development, and limit the impact of equipment on performance
One design equipment is believed to put the focus on sailing skills rather than on equipment. This
has a positive impact when considering a group of sailors of similar body physics (weight and stature). If sailors do not comply with the optimum size/weight for the chosen equipment, they are rather disadvantaged by the equipment and their chances to win are low despite of sailing skills. Like windsurfing, kite sailors are not transferring to other classes to find suitable equipment for their weight. This is an additional reason that equipment should enable a wide variety of size and weight of sailors.

23.1.2(c) demand a high level of athletic ability as well as excellent sailing skills
These criteria apply to both box rule and one design equipment, however, constantly evolving equipment (within the natural product life time cycles) is considered to be more rewarding and challenging to sail. These criteria are best met if sailors of different size can be competitive.

23.1.2(d) be attractive and accessible to young athletes from all continents, and of different size and weight, with a clear pathway from ISAF Youth to Olympic Events and Equipment
Evolving equipment representing the current state of technology is considered by the panel to be more attractive to young athletes. Box rule equipment allows competitors of different size and weight to compete with equal chances as sailors can select equipment according to their body physics. In the 2012 Worlds, on box rule equipment, competitors with a weight band of 70 to 100 kilogram finished among the top six in the men’s fleet. In the women’s fleet, competitors with a weight band of 55 to 70 kilogram finished among the top 4. In youth competition the weight band is lower, and the equipment can be adjusted to suit lighter sailors.

23.1.2(e) maximize the participation of the world’s best sailors and showcase the diversity of the sport
To maximize participation a box rule is seen by the panel as the choice to enable sailors of different weight and size to compete with equal opportunities. The box rule leads to a more effective distribution of equipment and keeps more manufacturers interested developing kiteboarding.

23.1.2(f) provide an effective platform for promotion of the sport, and elite sailors, between Olympics
Currently all kiteboard racing events are conducted on box rule equipment, with world and continental tours in place. Selecting the current “box” rule for the Olympics, consistency between the Olympic pathway and the professional pathway would be ensured.

23.1.2(g) progress towards an equal number of Events for men and women to participate in
Kiteboarding is conducted by women and men. It is natural that they have their own racing fleets. On national level and in training the “box” rule will be more equal. There will not be a Radial and a Standard class that performs differently. It will be similar to training in the 470, which clearly supports female participation from emerging nations.

23.1.2(h) avoid unnecessary or excessive equipment costs, development costs, measurement costs, coaching costs, race organization and race official costs, and television and other media costs
Initial equipment costs should be equal for box rule equipment than for one design equipment. Competition between brands has shown in other classes that manufacturer classes are not cheaper and quality is usually worse. The box rule equipment provides opportunity for manufacturing around the world, including developing nations, reducing the cost of production and benefits regions where high import taxes are a problem. The proposed registration scheme for the box rule reduces the amount of model changes to the expected life cycle of the equipment (new evolved equipment becomes available when the former equipment would need to be replaced for performance reasons anyway). Development costs are in the end shared by all customers not only
the Olympic sailors and are a small part of the price. Measurement costs for a “one design” rule would be marginally higher, as the control would be stricter than in the box rule. All other costs should be similar for both models.

23.1.2(i) offer continuity of Events and evolution of Equipment to give MNAs and sailors a dependable pathway into Olympic competition with continuity of investment.

The equipment for the box rule is available already now, a one design class would need to be started. Equipment for the box rule concept constantly evolves within the natural life duration of equipment, bigger one-time investments as in changing from one type of equipment to another does not happen.

23.1.2(j) provide suitable Events and Equipment for Regional Games and other regattas.

Box rule gives more freedom for sailors to find suitable equipment.

23.1.2(k) minimize environmental impact.

Box rule equipment allows for regional builders which minimizes environmental impact of shipping etc.

**Sailor Feedback**

Current kiteboard sailors have made clear that they want to continue to race on box rule equipment as it allows a wide range of weights and body physics to compete on equal opportunities. They also want to compete on competitive equipment that follows the development of the sport.
Appendix A: Comparison Chart Evaluation against criteria in regulation 23.1.2
++ is most positive, for the type of equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box Rule (&quot;Formula Kite&quot;)</th>
<th>“One Design“</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is equipment representing pinnacle of discipline</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate diversity of skills.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize overlap between events</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place emphasis on athlete skill rather than equipment development</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall limit the impact of equipment on performance</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires high level of athletic ability</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires excellent sailing skills</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive and accessible to young athletes from all continents and of different size and weight</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear pathway from ISAF youth to Olympic events</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize participation of the world’s best sailors</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcase the diversity of the sport</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an effective platform for promotion of the sport, and elite sailors, between Olympics</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid unnecessary or excessive equipment costs</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development costs</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement costs</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching costs</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer continuity of events and evolution of equipment</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide suitable events and equipment for regional games and other regattas</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize environmental impact</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This paper presents the final recommendations of the Format WP. For the earlier, more detailed analysis, please refer to the Mid-Year Report – April 2012, which was attached to the minutes of the May 2012 meeting.

Recommendations

A. General

1. The formats should vary across the Events. The name of the Event should be decided after the format decision, and may reflect the format or the Equipment as some Events may be described better by format than by Equipment.

2. The Olympic format should not necessarily be the same as for World Championships, as fleet sizes are likely to be smaller, and the broadcast and spectator opportunities and demands are different. However:
   a. the Olympic format should be true to the Event, and test the same skills as are tested at the World Championships and other Olympic Qualifiers;
   b. where the Olympic format is not intended to be replicated at other events, this should be clearly stated.

3. The new formats should be introduced in 2013 for testing at Sailing World Cup and class events. They should be reviewed and finalised at November 2013 conference.

4. Where the race format changes part way through an Event, the sailing skills required to win should not change.

B. Schedule

5. The regatta should be scheduled over 8 days, from Tuesday 9th to Tuesday 16th August 2016. Wednesday 17th should be reserved for use if there is no sailing on 16th. Except that ISAF should have authority to extend this planned programme if wind conditions at the Olympic venue are likely to be particularly difficult.

6. Racing should take place primarily on three courses: Stadium, Inner and Outer. A 4th course should be provided to be used on the busy middle days, and to provide a practice area for sailors and race committee on other days. This course would also be used if the regatta is behind schedule. The Outer & 4th courses should be large enough to accommodate a trapezoid course.

7. Each Event should be scheduled across 5 days:
   - a 3 day “Opening Series”;
   - a “Reserve Day” used for racing only if the Opening Series has not been completed;
   - a “Finals Day”.

   All Finals Day races, and any other knock-out races, should be umpired. If no races are completed on Finals Day, the races may be postponed once to a later day.

8. The primary purposes of Finals Day should be to:
   a. help focus media coverage and stories on the top 10 nation sailors in an Event;
   b. increase the likelihood of place changes, while remaining true to the sport and preserving the fairness and consistency of the competition;
   c. provide a good spectator experience for the live audience.
Finals Day should be the day on which the winning sailor needs to peak. For most Events, Opening Series points should be carried forward, but performance on Finals Day should still be the most significant in determining the medallists.

9. There should be two Events with Finals Day on each of Saturday 13th, Sunday 14th and Monday 15th, and 4 Events with Finals Day on “Super Tuesday”. The Medal Ceremony should take place in front of spectators as soon as possible after the race has finished.

10. There should be no formal practice races although race management teams may choose to schedule these within their own practice plans. Events requiring significant measurement time should be scheduled for later in the regatta to allow this measurement to take place once some Events have started.

11. The chart below shows a possible order of Events and course allocation. The actual programme should be decided by ISAF TDs in consultation with ROCOG, and take into account expected weather conditions and input from Classes and Race Officials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day # &amp; Date</th>
<th>Inner Course</th>
<th>Outer Course</th>
<th>4th Course</th>
<th>Reserve Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stadium Course</td>
<td>Skiff M&amp;W day 1</td>
<td>Skiff M&amp;W day 2</td>
<td>Laser M&amp;W day 3</td>
<td>470 M&amp;W Finals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skiff M&amp;W day 2</td>
<td>Skiff M&amp;W day 3</td>
<td>Laser M&amp;W day 3</td>
<td>470 M&amp;W Finals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skiff M&amp;W day 3</td>
<td>Laser M&amp;W day 3</td>
<td>Laser M&amp;W day 3</td>
<td>470 M&amp;W Finals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skiff M&amp;W</td>
<td>Laser M&amp;W</td>
<td>Board M&amp;W</td>
<td>M’hall &amp; Finn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skiff M&amp;W</td>
<td>Laser M&amp;W</td>
<td>Board M&amp;W</td>
<td>470 M&amp;W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Specific Event Formats

12. All the recommendations below should be evaluated and reviewed by the Olympic Classes during 2013, and be finalised in November 2013.

13. The Laser, Radial, 470 M&W and Finn should sail a 6-race Opening Series (single fleet) followed by three double-point, non-discardable Medal Races on Finals Day for the top 10 boats. Scoring during Finals Day should be updated (for sailors and spectators) on scoreboards or other displays.

14. Target race times should be: Opening Series: 50 minutes; Medal Race: 30 minutes.

15. Races should be conventionally scored except that ties should be broken on the basis of the last race sailed. In addition two options should be trialled during 2013:

a. first place scores 0 points. The advantage of this is that it increases the points gain of finishing first, and therefore increases the chance of medallist place changes on Finals Day. However, if adopted, RRS Appendix A should be changed so it becomes a standard for all racing.

b. one discard is applied to the Opening Series score from the outset. The two advantages of this are (i) it eliminates the “hard-to-explain” adjustment of earlier standings when the discard starts to apply, and (ii) consistency – it removes the arbitrary number of races that determines, for example, whether an earlier BFD can be discarded.

16. The formats for the Skiff and Board Events should be closer to a knock-out, last-day-decides format, and be based on recommendations from the Class Associations. Initial recommendations should be provided to ISAF’s November 2012 conference.
17. The Multihull Event format should be considered during 2013 as the Association and racing develops, with final recommendations published by 1\textsuperscript{st} October 2013 for decision in November 2013. In the meantime Organising Authorities should decide the format for their regattas, liaising with ISAF and the Class organisation as appropriate.

18. Courses should be windward / leeward except that:

a. when Class championships normally include other legs (such as a reach), these should be included when the course area and programme allow it. In particular a trapezoidal course may be used to enable two fleets to sail on the same course area at the same time;

b. when practical and appropriate for the Event, the final leg should be changed to position the finish in front of the spectators.

19. Subject to discussion with the Classes and Race Officials, rule 42 should only apply to the Events in paragraph 13. If an Event has a rule 42 wind speed limit, this should be as low as is sensible for the Equipment in order to minimise the judged element of the Event, and shall be the same at Class championships. The current limits of 8 knots for the 470 and 10 knots for the Finn are believed to be appropriate. Any limits should apply after starting. When rocking and pumping are permitted, ooching should be too.

\textbf{D. Fleet Sizes}

Revised fleet sizes proposed at the 2012 ISAF Annual Conference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th># Crew</th>
<th>2012 # Entries</th>
<th>2012 MNAs</th>
<th>Difficulty*</th>
<th>Options for 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012 Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td>Format WP</td>
<td>Regions WP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P Dinghy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P Dinghy</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P Dinghy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P Dinghy</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiff</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiff</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} 1P Dinghy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keelboat</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Racing</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Totals}

| # athletes  | 380    | 380    | 380    | 380    |
| # men       | 237    | 212    | 218    | 220    |
| # women     | 143    | 168    | 162    | 160    |
| %W ratio    | 38%    | 44%    | 43%    | 42%    |

Difficulty: \#places / \#MNAs competing at Qualification Event. Low % = Difficult

Board difficulty numbers reflect RS:X. Proposed fleet sizes are for Kite
# Evaluation criteria for sports and disciplines - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. General</td>
<td>Value added by the sport to the Olympic Games; Value added by the Olympic Games to the sport.</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Governance</td>
<td>2. Existence of a Code of Ethics</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Alignment of IF’s Code of Ethics with the principles and rules of the IOC Code of Ethics</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Existence of transparent and enhanced internal dispute resolution mechanism</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Submission to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) of all disputes which cannot be settled amicably or through local arbitration or mediation; types of disputes for which the CAS is used; number of cases in which the IF is involved</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Summary of key strategic priorities</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Gender equity in elected bodies</td>
<td>8. Comparison between number of women and number of men in the executive board (or equivalent)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Illegal and irregular betting</td>
<td>9. Rules and procedures to fight against competition fixing</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Sport/IF</td>
<td>10. Date of establishment of the International Federation</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7. Olympic Games</td>
<td>11. Year of introduction to the Olympic programme; number of times the sport has been included on the Olympic programme</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. World Championships</td>
<td>12. Year the World Championships and Junior World Championships were first held for each discipline or sport, for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Number of World Championships and Junior World Championships held to date for each discipline or sport, for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Frequency of World Championships and Junior World Championships</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Other multi-sports Games</td>
<td>15. Number of times each recognised discipline or sport has been included in the selected multi-sports Games (World Games, Universiade, Commonwealth Games, Continental Games – All Africa Games, Asian Games, Pan-American Games and Mediterranean Games)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10. Number of affiliated national federations</td>
<td>16. Number of National Federations affiliated to the International Federation which correspond to National Olympic Committees</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Active member national federations</td>
<td>17. Number of National Federations which organised National Championships for men and women during the two years preceding the upcoming Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Number of National Federations which participated in the last two Continental Championships for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 Number of National Federations which participated in the last two Junior World Championships for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Number of National Federations which participated in the last two World Championships for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 Number of National Federations which participated in the qualifying events for men and women for the last two editions of the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Global spread of excellence - Olympic Games</td>
<td>22 Number of medals awarded at the last two editions of the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Number of NOCs per continent that won medals at the last two editions of the Olympic Games for men and women</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Global spread of excellence - World Championships</td>
<td>24 Number of medals awarded at the last two World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Number of countries per continent that won medals at the last two World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General public appeal</td>
<td>26 Appeal of the sport among the general public. Survey requested by the IOC and run by an external company around Games time.</td>
<td>Third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth appeal</td>
<td>27 Appeal of the sport among young people. Survey requested by the IOC and run by an external company around Games time.</td>
<td>Third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 Steps taken by your IF to present your sport in the most interesting and attractive manner, in particular to young people</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>29 Best athletes’ participation in the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Spectators - Olympic Games</td>
<td>30 Number of tickets available for paying spectators at the last two Olympic Games</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 Number of tickets sold to paying spectators at the last two Olympic Games</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spectators - World Championships</td>
<td>32 Number of tickets available for paying spectators at the last two World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 Number of tickets sold to paying spectators at the last two World Championships (or equivalent events) for men and women</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Media - World Championships</td>
<td>34 Number of media accreditations granted (TV, written press and internet journalists) at the last two World Championships</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Press coverage</td>
<td>35 Written press coverage during the Olympic Games. Quantitative and qualitative data gathered through a study requested by the IOC and run by an external company</td>
<td>Third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television coverage - Olympic Games</td>
<td>36 TV coverage during the Olympic Games. Quantitative and qualitative data gathered through a study requested by the IOC and run by an external company</td>
<td>Third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital media</td>
<td>37 IF official website: Number of unique visitors &amp; visits during the year</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF official website: Number of unique visitors &amp; visits during the Olympic Games</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic.org and OCOG website: Number of visits in the dedicated section of the website during the year</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>IOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic.org and OCOG website: Number of visits in the dedicated section of the website during the Olympic Games</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>IOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube: Number of videos viewed per sport during the year</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>IOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube: Number of videos viewed per sport during the Olympic Games</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>IOC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook: Number of fans &amp; unique active users during the year</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter: Number of followers during the year</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of major sponsors and the kinds of benefits (cash, VIP, discounts, services, other) received</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility for athletes to vote within the decision-making bodies of the IF (commissions &amp; technical committees, executive board or equivalent)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of an athletes’ commission within the IF</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election process for the IF athletes’ commission</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of programme or resources to assist athletes with studies, development of life skills and post-athletic career transition</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of an Entourage Commission within the IF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of initiatives or specific tools (e.g. code of conduct, licence system for agents, etc.) to inform and monitor the athletes’ entourage (coaches, agents, medical staff, etc.)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of rules to sanction members of the entourage who are found to be involved in matters such as doping, sexual harassment, etc.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Commission representative on IF executive board (or equivalent)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal scientific strategies to monitor and ensure the health, safety and security of athletes (e.g. injury and illness surveillance systems and pre-competition health checks)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of in and out-of-competition anti-doping tests (blood and urine with respective percentage) carried out in the last two years by all approved drug-testing agencies and percentage of tests conducted or financed by the IF. Existence or plans to introduce the athlete biological passport.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>IF/WADA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Anti-Doping Rule Violations</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>IF/WADA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF’s financial distribution system to support National Federations and continental associations</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of the three main development programmes</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of sport development programmes or events for young people</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Technical evolution of the sport</td>
<td>Existence of means to control the technical evolution within the sport regarding venues, sports equipment (items used by athletes in the practice of the sport) and competition clothing (items worn by athletes and subject to IF technical specifications)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Gender equity</td>
<td>Comparison between National Federations which took part in female vs male qualifying events for the last two editions of the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sport for All</td>
<td>Existence of a Women in Sport Commission within the IF and/or specific Women in Sport initiatives</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Transparency and fairness on the field of play</td>
<td>Steps taken by the IF to ensure that the outcome of the competition will be as objective and fair as possible, including selection &amp; evaluation process for judges, training and certification and impact of judging on results</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Existence of policies and/or guidelines on the environment</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Use of acknowledged standards of accounting; verification of accounts by an independent auditor; publication of accounts on IF website</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Income &amp; Expenditure</td>
<td>Total income in the 2008-2011 period (membership fees, Olympic revenues, marketing, broadcasting, other)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total expenditure in the 2008-2011 period (administrative costs, operational costs, development costs, fight against doping, fight against competition-fixing, other)</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Venue costs at the Olympic Games</td>
<td>Ability to share venues with other sports</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Technology requirements</td>
<td>Level of technological complexity and costs required at Olympic Games competition venues for each specific sport/discipline</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Television production</td>
<td>Costs and complexity of television production per sport/discipline at the Olympic Games</td>
<td>IOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above list of criteria and items do vary slightly for the Recognised International Federations (no questions on past Olympic Games and additional questions on added value)
Events Committee Meeting
Item 9(b) Implementation of the SWC 2013-2016

1. Current venues for the next cycle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 Venues</th>
<th>2014 and 2015 Venues</th>
<th>2016 Venues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne (December)</td>
<td>Qingdao (October)</td>
<td>Melbourne (December)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami (January)</td>
<td>Melbourne (December)</td>
<td>Miami (January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palma (April)</td>
<td>Palma (April)</td>
<td>Palma (April)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyères (April)</td>
<td>Hyères (April)</td>
<td>Hyères (April)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are having conversations with possible venues in Middle East and South America that would be added from 2014 onwards.

2. In progress:
- To provide a package for all Events including:
  - Entries and Online Registration
  - On-Venue Results Services
  - Real-time tracking for Medal Races.
  - Offline tracking for
  - 2D/3D Graphics
- Sponsor to cover the cost of the above package.

3. Other tasks:
- Event Manual
- Media and Marketing Strategy
- ISAF Website and Social Media
May 2012 site visit:

Following the 2012 ISAF Mid-Year Meeting ISAF and representatives from the Olympic Classes attended a 2 day site visit in Santander to review the Santander 2014 plans for the World Championships.

The following attended the meetings:

Alastair Fox – ISAF Head of Competitions
Rafa González - Santander 2014
Alejandro Abascal – Santander 2014
Rory Ramsden – Olympic Classes
Stanislav Kassarov – Olympic Classes

A wide range of topics were discussed including the venue plans, sailor facilities, the test event, entry fees for the World Championships, race management, media requirements and training opportunities.

It was agreed that at the 2012 ISAF Annual Conference the ISAF, Santander 2014 and the Olympic Classes would agree the quotas and format for the test event.

October 2012 site visit:

Following the London 2012 Olympic Games ISAF and Santander 2014 arranged a further site visit in Santander to discuss the budget for the event and to review the progress of Santander 2014.

The following people attended the meetings:

Alastair Fox – ISAF Head of Competitions
Tamsin Rand – Communications Co-ordinator
Gerardo Pombo – Santander 2014
Gerardo Seeliger – Santander 2014
Rafa González - Santander 2014
Alejandro Abascal – Santander 2014

Budget & Venue Plans

The main focus of the meetings was the Santander 2014 budget and the venue plans and development. ISAF discussed the budget with Santander in detail and also held a meeting with Mayor of Santander. As a result of these meetings it was agreed that Santander 2014 would present a financial report to the ISAF Executive Committee at the 2012 ISAF Annual Conference. Work has begun on the Santander 2014 venue plan; the City of Santander has begun work on the boat parks and the budget for the waterfront redevelopment plans have been approved. Santander 2014 has signed a contract with the university that will guarantee the provision of rooms for the regatta office, competition management, jury, press, etc.
ISAF also discussed television production, the event website, timing and scoring, volunteer training and the test event.

Television

It was agreed that ISAF and Santander 2014 would work quickly to define the television production requirements following a full review of the London 2012 Olympic Games and aim to have appointed the host broadcaster in the first quarter of 2013.

Test Event

Santander 2014 and ISAF have agreed that the Test Event will be held from 9-15 September 2013.

Alastair Fox
Head of Competitions
30 October 2012.
Qualification for 2014 ISAF World Championship Santander  
(Version 2)

Quotas for each Event: (insert table)

1. Entries are awarded to MNAs in the following order until the quota is filled;  
   a. Every MNA is awarded one entry per event if requested by 1 January 2014 and paid by 1 February 2014.  
   b. The following places are awarded based on the 2013 World Championships;  
      i. 90% of the MNAs that had a second entrant finish within the quota at the respective 2013 World Championships gets a second entry in order of their finish.  
      ii. 70% of the MNAs that had a third entrant finish within the quota at the respective 2013 World Championships gets a third entry in order of their finish.  
      iii. 50% of the MNAs that had a fourth entrant finish within the quota at the respective 2013 World Championships gets a fourth entry in order of their finish.  
      iv. Entries based on the 2013 World Championships must be confirmed by 1 January 2014 and paid by 1 February 2014.  
   c. The following places are awarded based on the ISAF Rankings available on 10 February 2014;  
      i. An MNA that has a second athlete within double the quota of the rankings that has not already received a second entrant gets a second entry in order of their ranking.  
      ii. An MNA that has a third athlete within double the quota of the rankings that has not already received a third entrant gets a third entry in order of their ranking.  
      iii. An MNA that has a fourth athlete within double the quota of the rankings that has not already received a fourth entrant gets a fourth entry in order of their ranking.  
      iv. Entries based on the ISAF Rankings must be confirmed by 1 March 2014 and paid by 15 March 2014.  
   d. Any places not already awarded and paid by 16 March 2014 are reserved to the Santander Qualification Commission and may be awarded on a discretionary basis as follows;  
      i. MNAs that have no entries and may have missed the deadlines above.  
      ii. MNAs that only have one entry in an event may be awarded a second entry.  
      iii. Emerging MNAs or special circumstances.  
      iv. Entries awarded by the Santander Qualification Commission must be confirmed by 15 April and paid by 30 April 2014.  
   e. No MNA shall have more than four entries per event unless places are available after 30 April 2014.  
   f. The following places are awarded based on the ISAF Rankings available on 1
May 2014

i. Any MNA that has more athletes or teams ranked in the top 100 then places awarded and confirmed to date, and requests additional entries after 1 May and before 15 May 2014 gets additional entries in order.

ii. Entries based on the 1 May 2014 ranking must be confirmed and paid by 30 May 2014.

g. Entries for places available after 1 June 2014 will be first come, first serve.

i. Applications for these places received before 1 June 2014 will be treated as having been received on 1 June 2014.

ii. Applications shall only be made by email to (insert ISAF email).

iii. Applications received on the same calendar day (GMT) will be ranked by a separate lottery for each event with no MNA being awarded more than one additional place before another MNA receives a place.

iv. Applications that exceed the available places will be maintained on a waiting list.

v. Entries awarded after 1 June and before 1 August 2014 must be confirmed and paid within five days of award.

vi. Entries awarded after 1 August 2014 must be confirmed and paid within 24 hours of award.

2. All entries above are awarded to the respective MNAs which will determine the athletes to fill those entries. Athlete names shall be provided by the MNA to the Santander Organizing Authority no later than 1 August 2014 through the online entry system, except for those entries that may be awarded after 1 August 2014.
New Rankings System:

The following Grades apply:

**200-points**
ISAF Sailing World Cup, Olympic Class World Championships (that take place in the Host Continents Window or in the Free Window), ISAF Sailing World Championships

**100-points**
Olympic Class World Championships (not-compliant with 200-point criteria), Olympic class Continental Championships and Other major international events using Olympic equipment

**50-points**
Olympic Class Continental Championships, other international events using Olympic equipment (not compliant with 100-point criteria).

The new calculation is:

\[
\text{Ranking Points} = \frac{E(N-P+1)}{N}
\]

Where \(E\) = Event Grade, \(N\) = Number of Entries, \(P\) = Position in regatta

**Continental Windows:**

- Asia / Middle East: 1 October – November 30
- Oceania: 1 December – January 15
- Americas: January 16 – February 28
- Africa / Middle East: March 1 – March 31
- Europe: April 1 – May 30
- Free: June 1 – 30 September

**Database:**

The ISAF Competitions Department, the ISAF Communications Department and SOTIC have all worked on implementing the new ranking system. The new system was launched on 1 September 2012 with the first publication of the new Rankings on 19 September. The Men’s and Women’s Kiteboarding events joined the ISAF World Rankings list on 10 October following the Kiteboarding European and World Championships. The 49er FX and Nacra 17 Rankings will be introduced following their first events.

The work that needs to be done is as tied to the results upload system – currently, the rankings are calculated on a date set by ISAF but the goal is to have automatic calculation after regattas – this requires further project work by our web-partners and will only be possible after the results upload system is working correctly.

Alastair Fox
Head of Competitions
30 October 2012
ISAF Youth World Championships
Entries by Event

---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
W/s M | 29 | 14% | 23 | 14% | 26 | 14% | 25 | 12% | 30 | 13% | 34 | 14% | 30 | 12% | 28 | 12% | Ave. Entry | %
W/s F | 18 | 9% | 16 | 9% | 15 | 8% | 15 | 7% | 19 | 8% | 20 | 8% | 23 | 9% | 18 | 8% |
1P M | 43 | 21% | 41 | 24% | 43 | 23% | 55 | 26% | 50 | 21% | 50 | 20% | 58 | 23% | 49 | 21% |
1P F | 41 | 20% | 34 | 20% | 40 | 22% | 41 | 19% | 46 | 19% | 41 | 17% | 42 | 17% | 41 | 18% |
2P M | 33 | 16% | 23 | 14% | 25 | 14% | 34 | 16% | 36 | 15% | 34 | 14% | 30 | 12% | 31 | 14% |
2P F | 25 | 12% | 17 | 10% | 19 | 10% | 25 | 12% | 28 | 12% | 31 | 13% | 26 | 10% | 24 | 11% |
M/hull | 14 | 7% | 15 | 9% | 16 | 9% | 18 | 8% | 11 | 5% | 14 | 6% | 15 | 6% | 15 | 6% |
Skiff | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
Total | 203 | 169 | 184 | 213 | 238 | 247 | 248 | 227 |

Notes:
1. 1P M changed from Laser to Laser Radial in 2009
2. 2P dinghy was 29er in 2007 and 2008, and 420 in other years
3. Multihull was SL16 in 2008, 2010 – ‘12. Otherwise it is Hobie16 with spinnaker and double trapeze
### ISAF Youth World Championships

**MNAs by Continent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ISAF Youth Worlds

**MNA Entries by Continent**

[Chart showing MNA entries by continent for various years.]
### ISAF Youth World Championships

#### # events per country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 event</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 events</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 events</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 events</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 events</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 events</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 events</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of MNAs

by Number of Events Entered

![Bar Chart: Number of MNAs by Number of Events Entered](chart.png)
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Item 14 Nanjing 2014 Youth Olympic Games

Events & Equipment

Men’s Windsurfer – Techno 293
Women’s Windsurfer – Techno 293
1 person Dingy – Byte CII
1 person Dinghy – Byte CII

Qualification System

The ISAF Qualification System for the Nanjing YOG has been approved by the IOC and was published on the ISAF website in September 2012.

The key difference between the 2010 YOG qualification system and the 2014 qualification system is that for 2014 NOCs may qualify athletes in each of the 4 events. For the 2010 YOG NOCs was initially restricted to qualify in only 2 of the 4 events.

The ISAF YOG Working Party will now work with the Classes and the ISAF Executive Committee to finalise the dates and venues of the qualification events. All dates and venues, where possible, will be published as soon after the 2012 ISAF Annual Conference as possible to allow as many MNAs as possible to attend the qualification events. The number of MNAs at the qualification events will be a key measure of the success of the 2014 YOG as with the new qualification system it is expected that there will be fewer nations competing in the 2014 YOG than in the 2010 YOG.

Competition Schedule*

Following feedback from the 2010 YOG ISAF has reduced the length of the sailing competition schedule for the 2014 YOG. This will reduce the costs for the event organisers and will also allow the athletes to fully join in with the YOG cultural and educational activities.

Competition Format*

The ISAF YOG WP is currently finalising the 2014 YOG competition format. ISAF has a meeting on 19 November with the IOC to start working on the timing and scoring rules for the 2014 YOG.

2013 Site Visits

A site visit to Nanjing is being planned in the first quarter of 2013 and ISAF has requested that a small test event is held in August 2013 to enable ISAF to gain vital experience of the expected weather conditions and the sailing venue.

* Attached as part of this paper.

Alastair Fox
Head of Competitions
30 October 2012.
Communications Department Report

1. ISAF Website

1.1 Website Redesign
The new ISAF website was launched in July 2012. The new site presents the business work of the International Sailing Federation under isaf.com with sailing.org devoted to the news, photography, TV and social media.

The objective was two-fold. To make it easier for users who do ‘business’ with ISAF i.e MNAs, Classes, Race Officials etc to navigate and quickly find the information they need. The media site provides a home for us to really promote the sport of sailing by focussing on the incredible imagery and news and engaging with the fans.

1.2 Future projects
The redevelopment of the ISAF Youth Worlds website (youthworlds.com) and the ISAF Sailing World Cup website (sailing.org/worldcup) is ongoing.

1.3 ISAF TV
The ISAF TV player, launched in December 2011, carries content from ISAF Events and Class Championships. The department pro-actively contacts event organizers to gain access to footage for the player.

1.4 Advertising
The audience profile of the ISAF websites make them extremely valuable for advertising and the new designs have increased positions for advertisers. Advertising in specific areas such as the Equipment Rules of Sailing and Offshore Special Regulations has been sold to coincide with the publication of the new books and work is on-going to secure advertising in other areas of the website.

2. Social Media
Audiences have steadily grown across all channels with significant growth in July and August.

2.1 Facebook
The primary Facebook page is ‘World Sailing’ (renamed from Connect to Sailing to better represent all ISAF business).

Fan growth from 9,890 (16 October 2011) to 43,877 (344% growth)
The ISAF Youth Worlds Facebook page has grown from 2,300 to 4,022 (75% growth)

A perhaps more important measure than the number of fans is the audience engagement and this is

(a) Facebook Competitions & Campaigns

Working with an agency specialising in making the most of social media three Facebook campaigns have been run with a fourth project scheduled to coincide with the start of the 2012-13 ISAF Sailing World Cup.

(i) Spinlock Competition – sponsorship activation

Users answered a question to win Spinlock products – three winners were selected from over 300 entries.

(ii) Support your nation
Highlight of 2012 was the Olympic Sailing Competition at Weymouth and Portland, superbly managed and delivered by the LOCOG team headed by Rob Andrews, and by the ISAF Race Officials and TDs. Coming from the host country, I’d like to commend in particular the work of the ISAF Race Officials who helped coach and develop the local race officials, at the Olympics and in the lead-up years. This is one huge legacy that is rarely mentioned, and I’m sure sailing in Brazil will similarly benefit over the next 4 years.

15 nations from 4 continents won medals, the highlight for many being the Silver won by Pavlos Kontides from Cyprus in the Laser Standard. With 48 nations taking part, we believe that, of all 2012 Olympic events, this may be the one competed in by most nations. And for Cyprus, it was their first ever Olympic medal. Together these show the value in ISAF continuing to make Olympic sailing and associated pathway as accessible and affordable as possible. There is a nice chain of events with Pavlos starting his sailing journey with assistance from ISAF’s APP programme, to his success first at the ISAF Youth Worlds and then at the Olympics, to the profile and boost he has given our sport in Cyprus, to next year’s ISAF Youth Worlds being held in Cyprus.

At Weymouth many lessons were learnt, many opportunities to improve further identified. Events Committee has responsibility for conducting a formal review; 5 top level recommendations from this review should be highlighted to Council at this opportunity.

First, for the first time sailing was watched by paying spectators. This was an outstanding success, and all days were sold out for the whole regatta. The sailors clearly enjoyed the cheering from the stands during the race, and all joined in the celebrations after the finish that created the images that were beamed around the world. Clearly in 2016 we need the medal ceremonies to be in front of those same spectators as soon as possible after the finish of the last race. We should record our thanks to the 2012 medallists who took time the following day to go to the spectator area and add to the experience for spectators.

Second, in terms of a regatta, at 15 days the Olympic Sailing Competition is simply too long. And instead of reaching a climax, it fizzles out with the dinghy park gradually becoming more and more deserted. This also makes it too expensive. Hence the recommendation for 2016 to reduce the regatta to 8 days, run it across 4 courses instead of 5, and have 4 gold medals decided on the final day.

Third, the co-ordinated appearance of competitor and official boats, with professionally applied logos, and flags on sails, was a big step forward that can and should be adopted more widely across our sport. Hulls and sails provide our sport with a presentation opportunity that few other sports have.

Fourth, the television images were very beautiful, and the tracking system was very sophisticated. But they didn’t really come together to tell the story for the remote spectator. This is our next challenge, as it is through TV and on-line that we can reach out to the global community of non-sailors who represent our future growth potential. Sailing has to try to influence IOC, and its partners, to make the tracking publicly available, and to improve how the “story” is told, who is ahead at any moment, what is in the mind of the sailor. And our format decisions, and in particular what the final day of any Olympic Event looks like, will help deliver success in this area.
And fifth, there is nothing like wind to make a regatta successful, but wind is typically not front of IOC voters’ minds when they are choosing the best Olympic city for all sports. Exciting spectating and spectacular TV images are determined more by how much wind there is rather than what the event, format or equipment is. Long term we have to do what we can to highlight our dependence on wind, but we have to agree a schedule and event formats that preserve fairness and have sufficient contingencies to make sure that when we crown our Olympic champions, we really are crowning a rightful winner, whatever the weather.

Leading up to the Olympics, our SWC organisers delivered very fine regattas and entry numbers remained strong. But our 2012 event calendar was too crowded, in particular in Europe where the Sailing World Cup regattas competed with the Olympic Class Worlds that had been scheduled in Europe as Olympic qualifiers. The Holland regatta was particularly hit. Moving to continental-based Olympic qualifiers in the year preceding the 2016 Olympics will make it easier and lower cost for sailors to participate in qualification, allow nations to know earlier if they have qualified, and will remove the event congestion in Olympic year.

The ISAF Youth Worlds here in Dublin was a great success, very well organised and managed by Brian Craig, and financially supported by vital headline sponsorship from 4Star Pizza. A record 248 entries from 61 nations showed that the major challenge for this regatta is how to cope with its appeal. This year’s organisers have made specific recommendations to ISAF to provide greater continuity and co-ordination from one year to the next; we still have the challenge of tackling the size and cost of the regatta, and the number of separate fleets within it.

We have launched the new ISAF Sailor Rankings system. The previous system counted results over two years, the points calculation was somewhat complex, and the re-calculation was only done occasionally through the year. As a result the Rankings often appeared out-of-date and surprising. The new system is based on a 12 month calculation; we have re-labelled our regatta grading as 200-pointers, 100-pointers or 50-pointers; and we have simplified the points’ calculation. With the Exec submission on XRR, there is the future prospect of immediate update, and sailors will then, as in other sports, be able to calculate that with victory in a certain regatta they will become World #1.

Working Parties have been helping us with decisions in a number of areas. I’ve mentioned the Olympic Review. We have also had Working Parties looking at 2016 Olympic format, 2016 Allocation of Continental Places, and 2014 Worlds Qualification & Fleet Sizes; the sub-committees have been looking at future Youth Worlds and Team Racing strategies. Their recommendations have helped guide our decisions on future events.

I’d like to record my thanks to the hard work of committee and sub-committee members over the last 12 months. As always the committee and working parties have received excellent support from the ISAF Secretariat, and in particular Pauline Webb, Antonio de la Madrid and Alastair Fox. At the end of this 4 year programme, I would like to pay especial thanks to Alastair. He manages the impossible of coping with so many demands, engaging with each and every stakeholder, offering extremely wise advice, and remaining calm and cheerful throughout it all. All chairmen depend on their ISAF opposite number; the committee and I have been extremely fortunate to have Alastair’s guidance and support over the last 4 years.

Chris Atkins, November 2012