<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Current MNAs in group</th>
<th>Recommended changes (new countries in black, additions in blue, subtractions in red)</th>
<th>Comments received (and which country these are received from):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| C     | Belarus, Bulgaria, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Ukraine | Latvia, Lithuania                                                                   | Bulgaria (Group C Council): Not against the proposal of Latvia and Lithuania if they are agreed with the proposed change.  
Poland (Group C Council): No comment |
| D     | Cyprus, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Malta, Monaco, San Marino, Turkey      | Albania, Lebanon                                                                      | President MNA Malta: Agrees that all African countries should be in one group. |
| G     | Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden                                    | Latvia, Lithuania                                                                    | President of Lithuanian Yachting Union: We fully agree with the logics of the new ISAF Groupings and are looking forward to a useful and pleasant cooperation.  
Danish Sailing Federation: Thanks for the proposal for new ISAF Groupings as a result of the work in the Constitution Committee. We will of course respect any decision from Latvia (LAT) and Lithuania (LTU) in respect of the proposed changes in the ISAF Groupings.  
The present ISAF Group G, Northern Europe would welcome the inclusion of LAT and LTU in our group, as we support a close cooperation between MNA’s around the Baltic Sea.  
We normally meet at least twice a year for a Spring Meeting in April and an Annual Meeting in October, where we discuss general matters of common interest, Nordic Sailing Championships, ISAF, EUROSAF & EBA matters etc. |
<p>| I     | Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Kuwait, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Djibouti | Jordan, Lebanon, Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, Libya, Sudan, Tunisia | No comments received. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>China, Chinese Taipei, Guam, Hong Kong, Japan, DPR Korea, Korea, Phillipines</td>
<td><strong>Guam Sailing Federation: from the President of Guam Sailing Federation – See Appendix 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Japan Sailing Federation:</strong> We received the mail on MNA Groupings from Guam Sailing Federation dated July 4, 2013 and we support the position and the opinion of Guam Sailing Federation. We, Japan Sailing Federation, oppose your proposal to change the region assignment in Group J.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>China council member:</strong> As the representatives of Group J, we would like to urge the Committee to take into consideration the majority view of the Group J countries that Guam should stay in Group J. Victor of Guam Sailing Federation has submitted a comprehensive analysis on why Guam should remain in the group and we trust the Committee would be able to understand our rationale behind this request.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Chinese Taipei Sailing Association (TPE):</strong> as the member of Group J and the review of the Council groupings, Guam is much closer to us geographically (airfare-wise as well) and especially sailing activity-wise. So we would like Guam stay in Group J as before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Vietnam</td>
<td><strong>No comments received.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>American Somoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Fiji, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Somoa, Tahiti, Vanuatu</td>
<td><strong>President of Somoa Sailing Association:</strong> This serves to confirm receipt of the proposed amendment in Group L. It does make sense to have Guam in our Group, if Guam is fine with the recommendation.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>CEO Yachting Australia:</strong> We have noted the very well argued points made by Vic Torres, President of the Guam Sailing Federation, in relation to this issue. Like our friends in New Zealand, Yachting Australia considers that these points should be taken into consideration by the Constitution Committee. We also believe strongly in self-determination where appropriate. The wishes of Guam should be paramount in this decision. Accordingly, unless there is an overwhelming reason to change the current position, we do not support the proposed change in respect of Guam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Brazil, Paraguay</td>
<td><strong>Venezuelan MNA – Venezuelan Federation: See Appendix 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Executive Secretary of the Brazilian Sailing Association:</strong> I received the email showing the reasons why Venezuela should not join group N. I admit that I am not aware of the criteria for forming groups nor the reason for such change. At first look, joining Venezuela and Brazil in the same group seems a complete nonsense. This is like joining Russia and USA in the same group because they are separated by just 82km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at the Bering Strait. Therefore, we totally support Elliot’s view (in email above. The same reasons also applies to Colombia.

We would be pleased to contribute further in this discussion, if consulted. We also appreciate to receive more details about these recommendations from the Constitution Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>Antigua, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Colombia, Cuba, El Salvador, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Puerto Rico, Trinidad &amp; Tobago, US Virgin Islands, Venezuela, Belize, St Lucia, Netherlands Antilles (representing Curacao and St Maarten)</th>
<th>Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, Dominica, Turks &amp; Caicos</th>
<th>See comments in Group N.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q  | Angola, Botswana, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Senegal, Seychelles, South Africa, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Uganda | Malawi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Congo, Ghana, Somalia, Swaziland, Zambia, Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, Libya, Sudan, Tunisia | **MNA Angola:** agrees with the inclusion of all African countries in Group Q and representation increase.  
**MNA Seychelles:** agrees that all African countries should be in one group.  
**South Africa:** If you are getting all African nations together, then Djibouti should also be included. They are also part of the All Africa Games and of course on the Continent. |
The Guam Sailing Federation (GSF) has reviewed the ISAF Constitutional Committee – MNA Groups Working Party Recommendations for Guam and the discussion paper by the working party. GSF has the following comments on those recommendations.

While the discussion paper notes that Guam competes in the Pacific Games, Guam does so only once every two to four years. Due to the astronomically high travel costs, indirect air routes, and length of travel time to many of the island countries in the South Pacific region, where most Group L countries are located, the GSF does not normally compete in other Group L regional sailing events other than the Pacific Games itself.

Guam lies in the northwestern Pacific. This makes it geographic closer to the Philippine Islands, Japan, Hong Kong and China. Air travel to these areas is direct, frequent, and less costly than travel to Group L countries. Travel to the Philippine Islands and Japan is $437.00 and $1072 U.S. dollars respectively. In contrast, travel to Nadi, Fiji from Guam is $2622 U.S. dollars. Travel originating in Guam to the other more remote and less traveled destinations in the South Pacific is difficult and normally requires multiple flights and layovers. This increases the days devoted to travel and increases the cost of air travel significantly. A table of quoted fares to various destinations follows.

The airfare travel costs do not take into account that air service to a destination in the South Pacific is not offered on a daily basis. Flight plans may require interim lodging accommodations prior to the next connecting scheduled flight.

Although it may initially seem logical to move the Guam Sailing Federation MNA to Group L because of its participation in the Pacific Games, the move will actually hurt Guam’s sailors by making it significantly costlier for Guam sailors to compete in the Group L arena.

It also disrupts the long established relationships with Group J countries that have provided benefits to the sailing community in Guam. Guam already has long established ties with several Group J countries.
Throughout the years, Japanese sailors have comprised the largest non-local competitor group in Guam sailing events. They reflect the trend of Japanese travelers that make up the largest visitor group to Guam. Over the years, Guam sailors have also traveled to Japan, Hong Kong, Korea, and the Philippines for competition. We currently have a commitment from one of our long-time Japanese sailing supporters to improve our exchange to benefit the sailing community on Guam.

Guam has been in Group J Region for many years, during which we competed in the Pacific Games. The Guam Sailing Federation recently clarified our ability to remain in Pacific Game competition in spite of involuntary separation from the Guam National Olympic Committee. Guam plans to continue competition as soon as we can, pending the ability to raise the necessary funds for travel.

While we identify closely with many of our island brothers in the South Pacific, at this time, Guam strongly recommends to the ISAF Constitutional Committee – MNA Groups Working Party that the Guam Sailing Federation remain in the ISAF’s Group J region. A move to the ISAF Group L region will actually hurt the sailing community on Guam.

Guam Sailing Federation hereby opposes a change in region assignment and requests that our input be given primary consideration as a key factor in determining regional adjustment.

Sincerely,

Vic Torres

President, Guam Sailing Federation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESTINATION</th>
<th>QUOTED TRAVEL COST IN U.S. DOLLARS (Round Trip Flight)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam to Manilla, Philippines (Group J)</td>
<td>$437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam to Narita, Japan (Group J)</td>
<td>$1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam to Seoul, Korea (Group J)</td>
<td>$1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam to Hong Kong (Group J)</td>
<td>$1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam to Nadi, Fiji (Group L)</td>
<td>$2622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam to Papeete, Tahiti (Group L)</td>
<td>$3806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam to Apia, Samoa (Group L)</td>
<td>$5934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On Tue, Jun 25, 2013 at 11:06 PM, Lisa Greenwood <Lisa.Greenwood@isaf.com> wrote:

Dear ISAF Group J MNAs

As required by the ISAF Regulations, the ISAF Constitution Committee has conducted the 4-yearly review of the Council groupings and has now finalised its recommendations. These recommendations were presented in draft to Council in November 2012 and May 2013 and have been released for consultation with those MNAs affected by the changes.
I attach the proposed new groupings and the report of the Constitution Committee. If you wish to make any comments on the proposals or the Committee’s recommendations, please do so by email to Lisa Greenwood (lisa.greenwood@isaf.com) no later than **Friday 19 July 2013**.

Following consideration of the comments received, the Committee will make its final recommendation to Council for approval in November this year.

If you have any questions, please do let me know.

Kind regards

Helen

Helen Fry
Head of Administration

ISAF UK Ltd. - Company registered in England under No. 3255744

ISAF Secretariat
Email: helen.fry@isaf.com
Phone: +44 (0)2380 635111
Fax: +44 (0)2380 635789
Website: sailing.org ; isaf.com

Please consider our environment before printing.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. The content and opinions contained in this email are not necessarily those of ISAF. If you have received this email in error please contact the sender.
Reasons to keep Venezuela in Group O

Venezuela is located on the northern coast of South America, and is part of the Caribbean South America. The country borders the Caribbean Sea to the north, Colombia to the west, Guyana to the east and Brazil to the south. Due to its privileged geographical location, Venezuela is part of both the “South American Games” and the “Central American and Caribbean Games”, as well as the “South American” and the “Central American and Caribbean Sailing Federations” (the latter has not yet filed to be a member of the ISAF).

Group N, formed by Brazil and Paraguay, does not share any of their navigable bodies of water with Venezuela. On the other hand, aside from inland lakes and with 2,800 Km of coastline on the Caribbean Sea, Venezuela shares the same navigable body of water as those countries that form Group O (see appendix #1, picture #1).

It is no wonder that neither culturally nor historically Venezuela has had any type of similarities with either Brazil or Paraguay, yet holds a huge bond with those countries in Group O (see appendix #2). With Aruba, Curacao and Bonaire to the northwest of the country and Trinidad and Tobago to the northeast, and with 12 nm of territorial sea, Venezuela is only at 14.7 nm from Aruba and 7 nm from Trinidad at their closest points (see appendix #1, pictures #2 & #3). Venezuela also shares a 2,200 Km border with Brazil due south. However, this border is uninhabited and part of the Amazon Jungle (see appendix #1, picture #4); while from our closest ports there is a distance of 1,109 nm. It is important to note that these two ports (Cristobal Colon in Venezuela and Macapá in Brazil) are small commercial ports not suitable for the sport of sailing, and that in order to reach the other port one must sail through four different countries (Trinidad & Tobago, Guyana, Suriname and French Guiana) (see appendix #1, picture #5). The distance between the most western port in Venezuela and Rio de Janeiro in Brazil is of 3,175 nm, which is farther than the distance between Venezuela and the farthest port of the farthest country in Group O by more than 1,000 nm (see appendix #1, picture #6 & #7 also see picture #8).

Brazil, as a country, has a significant sailing power and is in a different and more advanced stage of development within the sport, and thus has different needs and ways to achieve them; whereas the countries in Group O are all equally small and share the same problems and challenges. If Venezuela is moved to Group N it would not only lose a deciding seat on the counsel before the executive, but due to all that has been explained, we (Venezuela) would not feel as if we were properly represented within the ISAF.
Possible solutions or alternatives to the over crowded Group O
(from best to worst)

1. Leave the group as is welcoming the new countries into the group, and increasing the amount representatives by one (1) for a total of three (3).

2. Instead of moving Colombia and Venezuela out of Group O move Mexico, Bahamas and Bermuda into Group P. Commercially speaking Mexico is already part of North America, and the proximities of Bermuda and the Bahamas to The United States of America, plus the fact that those islands are neither Central American nor Caribbean countries would make them a good geographical match. It is also important to note that Group P, which is made only by The United States of America and Canada, has three counsel representatives.

3. Divide Group O by Central American countries and Caribbean countries, or by north and south; hence having Group O₁ with one representative and Group O₂ with one representative.

Recapping Key Points

1. Venezuela shares the same navigable bodies of water with the countries in Group O, but not with the countries in Group N.

2. Venezuela does not share the same culture as the countries in Group N, but holds a strong bond with the countries in Group O.

3. Venezuela is geographically closer to the countries in Group O, than it is to the countries in Group N.

4. Venezuela shares the same problems and challenges as the countries in Group O, but not with Brazil.

5. If moved to Group N, Venezuela would lose a counsel representative and would not feel as if it was properly represented within the ISAF.

6. There are at least 3 possible solutions or alternatives to the over crowded Group O that does not include moving Venezuela from its Group.
Appendix #1

Picture #1

Venezuela, with 2,800 Km of coastline on the Caribbean Sea shares the same navigable body of water as the countries in Group O.

Picture #2

Aruba, to the northwest, is only 14.7 nm away from Venezuela.
Trinidad, to the northeast, is only 7 nm away from Venezuela.

The Amazon Jungle covers Venezuela’s entire 2,200 Km border with Brazil.
The distance between the most western port in Venezuela and the most northern port in Brazil is 1,109 nm. To get to that Brazilian port from Venezuela one must sail through Trinidad & Tobago, Guyana, Suriname and French Guiana.

The distance between the most western port in Venezuela and Rio de Janeiro in Brazil is 3,175 nm. This is a lot farther than the distance between Venezuela and the farthest country in Group O.
The distance between Venezuela and the farthest port of the farthest country in Group O is 1,960 nm. This is closer than the distance between Venezuela and Rio de Janeiro by more than 1,000 nm.

The distance between the most western port in Venezuela and Porto Alegre (most southern port) in Brazil is of 4,031 nm.
Appendix #2

Venezuela’s Caribbean Culture

About 93% of Venezuelans live in urban areas in the northern part of the country that stretches up to the Caribbean Sea. That region of the country shares the same tropical climate, flora and fauna found throughout the Caribbean. Due to this fact it is easy to understand why Venezuelan cuisine, local customs and general culture is so similar to that of its Caribbean neighbors.

Venezuela shares part of the rich Caribbean history, which includes the Spanish, pirates, gold/silver, slaves and a long etc. As a matter of fact, Venezuela's heritage, art, and culture have been heavily influenced by the Caribbean context. These elements extend to its historic buildings, architecture, art, landscape, boundaries, and monuments. Venezuelan culture has been shaped by Indigenous, Spanish and African influences.

Venezuela’s unique orientation towards the Caribbean has also caused the country's Spanish to develop distinctly from other forms of Spanish in South America. Spanish in Venezuela is in fact closer to Spanish from Central America and Spanish spoken in the Caribbean. Aside from peninsular Spanish, Venezuelan Spanish was influenced by Spanish from the Canary Isles, which in itself is more influenced by African languages.

Just like in most of the Caribbean countries, African heritage maybe heard in Venezuelan folk music. Syncopated rhythms, call-and-response musical forms, drums and other African-inspired instruments, and the strong connection between music and dance maybe found in Venezuelan folklore. The extent of the Caribbean influence on Venezuelan music does not stop there. Originated in the Caribbean West Indies, Venezuelan folk music also includes calypso music and rhythms, which are sung in Spanish and/or in a combination of Spanish and Caribbean English.

All our cultures are so intertwined that the first indigenous people of Barbados, were Amerindians from Venezuela that paddled in long dugout canoes, with which they crossed the ocean and currents that challenge modern sailing vessels. Much later people like Pedro Luis Brión who was born in Curaçao in 1782, rose to the rank of Admiral in the Venezuelan navy and fought in the Venezuelan war of independence. Today, Venezuela’s current President Nicolas Maduro may trace his family lineage to Sephardic (Spanish) Jews from Curaçao, where the family name Maduro is widely known. The largest financial institution in the Dutch Caribbean is called Maduro & Curiel's Bank (MCB).