The Events Committee met at 09:30 – 18:00 hours on Thursday 12 November 2015 at the Kempinski Hotel, Haitang Bay, Sanya, China.

Please refer to the ISAF website www.sailing.org for the details of the submissions on this agenda.

1. Welcome & Introduction
   The Chairman opened the meeting and welcomed committee members.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
   (a) Minutes
      The minutes of the Events Committee meeting held on 8 May 2015 were noted. The minutes can be downloaded at www.sailing.org/meetings
      Tomasz Chamera noted that he did not agree with the minute for point 11 b iv.
   (b) Minutes Matters Arising
      There were no other matters arising not covered elsewhere on this agenda.
3. **Conflicts of Interest**
   All conflicts of interests were discussed

4. **Executive Committee Update**
   The minutes of the Executive Committee meeting held in September 2015 were noted.

5. **2016 Olympic Games**
   (a) The committee received a report from the ISAF Head of Events on the following areas of the Rio 2016 Olympic Games.
      i) It was confirmed that the numerical system will be used at the Rio 2016 Olympic Games. This new system will also be adopted at all Sailing World Cup events. ISAF will work with the Olympic Classes to ensure that the new system is implemented across a wider range of events.
      ii) The qualification system was noted to be running smoothly and that the IOC had made two changes to clarify the policies for hierarchal events and the qualification pathway.
      iii) Venue – the venue is due for completion in March after this time Rio will take over the responsibility for the venue.
      iv) OBS – there will be two live course areas: Pão de Açúcar and Escola Naval. There will be highlights from other course areas.
      v) Spectators – tickets are now for sale although the overall number has been reduced to around 5,000 per day.
   (b) The Committee received a report on the 2015 Test Event.
   (c) The Committee received a report on pollution in Guanabara Bay from the ISAF Head of Events.
   (d) The Committee received a report from the ISAF Medical Commission.
   (e) Race Management policies at Rio 2016 were discussed.

6. **Support Team Regulations**
   The Committee reviewed the Support Team Regulations for the 2015 Aquece Rio Olympic Test Event Olympic was reviewed. It was noted that the polices had worked well but that some specific wording could be improved. It was noted that restrictions on communication were critical and that any infringements should be treated extremely seriously.

7. **ISAF Events Strategy**
   The Committee discussed the ISAF Events Strategy paper.
   It was noted that this was a ‘live’ document which would be updated after each meeting. Any substantial changes to the document would require the committee to take a vote.
   Appendix 1
8. **IOC Agenda 2020**

The Committee reviewed the IOC Agenda 2020 Report and discussed current ISAF event policies in relation to the report.

The Head of Events noted that all International Federations were now organising their own events and that the IOC was looking to IFs to work on strengthening the spectator experience, sports presentation and broadcast areas of their events.

It was noted that with the IOC moving towards an event based sports programme for 2020 and beyond it was essential that ISAF selected the best possible 10 events for the Olympic Games to showcase the sport of Sailing and to offer the best possible value to the IOC.

9. **2020 Olympic Games**

The Committee received a progress report from the ISAF Head of Events including:

(a) **Venue**

It was noted that ISAF looked at three potential venues for 2020. After that, ISAF recommended that the sailing is moved to Enoshima for the following reasons; The venue was used for the 1964 Olympic Games, there is a strong group of volunteers already available, the water quality is the highest possible grade in Japan and they are already hosting large sailing events there.

(b) **Test event dates**

It was confirmed that there will be a test event in 2018 which will be held outside of the Olympic dates to avoid a clash with the Aarhus 2018 ISAF Sailing World Championships. The test event in 2019 will be held as close to the Olympic dates as possible.

10. **2020 Qualification System**

(a) The Committee reviewed the responses from Qualification System survey which was sent to all Committee members ahead of the meeting.

It was confirmed that the Aarhus 2018 Worlds will be the first Olympic Qualification event for Tokyo 2020 and the Events Committee will confirm at the 2016 Mid-year meeting whether it will have 40% or 50% of the quota places. **Appendix 2**

(b) The Committee considered submission 102-15 from the international Finn Association regarding equal opportunities for sailors above 85kg. No vote was taken but this will be taken into consideration for the future.

11. **2020 Format**

(a) The Committee reviewed the responses from Format survey which was sent to all Committee members ahead of the meeting.

It was noted that there needs to be more focus on making the sport more appealing and interesting for the public. The events should look different and the working party will report in May on the way forward. **Appendix 3**

(b) The Committed discussed the format policies for the 2020 Olympic Games and timelines for decisions.
12. Event Evolution
   (a) To note ISAF Regulation 23.1.3.
   (b) The Committee discussed the future evolution of events at the Olympic Games including Olympic Class equipment evolution.

   The Events Committee supports the recommendation of the Equipment Committee to request support from the Council to proceed with the manufacturer to evaluate and evolve the Nacra 17 to a foiling configuration for the 2020 Olympic Sailing Competition.

   Vote: 18 for, 1 against, 3 abstain

13. Paralympic Games
   (a) The Committee received a report from the ISAF Head of Events and the Chairwoman of the Disabled Sailing Committee on Paralympic Sailing.

   It was commented that the costs of Paralympic Sailing needs to be looked to identify areas where it can be reduced in order to encourage more people to participate.

   (b) To consider submission 291-15 from the Chairman of the Regional Games Committee, Sail Canada and US Sailing regarding Para sailing at Regional and Continental Games and make a recommendation to Council.

   Recommendation to Council: Approve

   Vote: unanimous

14. ISAF Sailing World Cup
   (a) The Committee received a report from the ISAF Sailing World Cup Manager on the 2015/2016 ISAF Sailing World Cup.

   (b) The Committee received a report on the future development of the ISAF Sailing World Cup.

   It was noted that there are still many answers needed to questions and issues which are not yet identified in the report.

   It was requested that Events Committee members send their opinions on the paper to Head of Events as soon as possible as current implementation needs to be moved forward quickly. The feedback and opinions should be presented to the Executive Committee.

   (c) To consider submission 101-15 from the International 49er Class regarding reducing the continental spread of Sailing World Cup events in a single season and make a recommendation to Council.

   Recommendation to Council: Reject

   Vote: 2 for, 14 against, 7 abstain

15. ISAF Sailing World Championships

   The Committee received a progress report on the Aarhus 2018 ISAF Sailing World Championships from the ISAF Head of Events.

   The Head of Events reported that the contract for the event had been signed and that the Aarhus stakeholders were all working closely together on the implementation plan.
It was noted that going forward, ISAF and the Aarhus organisers want to have more involvement with Olympic Classes and all stakeholders to ensure that they are all fully engaged with the event.

16. **ISAF Youth World Championship**

(a) The committee received a progress report on the 2015 ISAF Youth Sailing World Championships.

The bid process and panel for 2019 Youth Worlds was noted. Appendix 4

It was also noted that the SL16 had been a great asset to the youth event and evolution to the new Nacra 15 was to begin in 2016.

(b) To consider submission 052-15 from the Executive Committee regarding Associate Members Regulation 1.17(d) and make a recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve**

Vote: 22 for, 0 against, 1 abstain

(c) To consider submission 106-15 from the Executive Committee regarding regulation 24.4 and make a recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve**

Vote: 22 for, 0 against, 1 abstain

(d) To consider submission 107-15 from the Events Committee regarding the regulation 24.4.9 and the Youth Multihull Equipment and make a recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve**

Vote: 21 for, 0 against, 2 abstain

(e) To consider submission 108-15 from the Equipment and Events Committees regarding the regulation 24.4.9 and the Youth Multihull Equipment and make a recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve**

Vote: 22 for, 0 against, 1 abstain

(f) To consider submission 118-15 from Deutscher Segler-Verband regarding age criteria in regulation 25.2.5 and make a recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

Vote: 11 for, 11 against, 1 abstain

The Chairman then voted against.

17. **ISAF Emerging Nations Programme**

The Committee received a report on the integration of the ISAF Emerging Nations Programme across all ISAF events.

It was noted that 79 nations registered for the 2015 ISAF Youth Worlds. This number is 12 more than in 2014 (67 nations) and means that the target set for the YW ENP project in terms of increasing participation at the 2015 event by 11 nations, has been met.
18. **Youth Olympic Games**

(a) The Committee received a progress report on the 2018 Youth Olympic Games. The Working Party reported that the IOC had confirmed 5 events for sailing:
- Boy’s Windsurfer – Techno 293+
- Girl’s Windsurfer – Techno 293+
- Boy’s Kiteboarding – Equipment to be confirmed
- Girls Kiteboarding – Equipment to be confirmed
- Mixed Multihull – Nacra 15

(b) To review the QS, formats and equipment.

It was noted that the Working Party would now be working of the final formats for the event and the qualification system.

(c) The Committee considered submission 091-14 from the Swedish Sailing Federation regarding age limits for the Youth Olympic Games and made the following recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

Vote: 0 for, 18 against, 4 abstain

(d) To consider submission 030-15 from the Laser 4.7 Class regarding the inclusion of Laser 4.7 in the 2018 Youth Olympic Games and make a recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

Vote: 0 for, 18 against, 4 abstain

(e) To consider submission 031-15 from the Sailing Cook Islands regarding the events in the 2018 Youth Olympic Games and make a recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

Vote: 0 for, 18 against, 4 abstain

(f) To consider submission 032-15 from the Fiji Yachting Association, Guam Sailing Federation, Korea Sailing Federation, Malaysia Sailing Association, Pakistan Sailing Federation, UAE Sailing and Rowing Federation regarding the events in the 2018 Youth Olympic Games and make a recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

Vote: 0 for, 18 against, 4 abstain

(g) To consider submission 033-15 from the Sailing Cook Islands, Fiji Yachting Association, Guam Sailing Federation, Korea Sailing Federation, Malaysia Sailing Association, Pakistan Sailing Federation, UAE Sailing and Rowing Federation regarding events to be included in Youth Olympic Games and make a recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

Vote: 0 for, 18 against, 4 abstain
19. **Sports Presentation**

   The Committee did not discuss this agenda item due to time restraints.

20. **World Championships**

   (a) The Committee received a report from the Class Worlds Working Party. [Appendix 5](#)

   (b) The Committee discussed Junior, Masters and Gender specific World Championships and noted that the Working Party would continue to review these issues.

   (c) The Committee considered submission 103-15 from the Executive Committee regarding regulation 24 and 25 and made the following recommendation to Council.

   **Recommendation to Council: Approve**

   Vote: 22 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstain

   (d) The Committee considered submission 104-15 from the International Formula Windsurfing Class regarding regulation 25.2.4 and made the following recommendation to Council.

   **Recommendation to Council: Reject**

   The Events Committee Class Worlds Working Party is reviewing all World Championship Regulations.

   Vote: 1 in favour, 20 against, 1 abstain

   (e) The Committee considered submission 105-15 from the International Kiteboarding Association regarding regulation 25.2.4 and made the following recommendation to Council.

   **Recommendation to Council: Reject**

   The Events Committee Class Worlds Working Party is reviewing all World Championship Regulations.

   Vote: 1 in favour, 20 against, 1 abstain

   (f) The Committee considered submission 110-15 from the International Finn Association, International 470 Class Association, International 49er Class Association, International RS:X Class Association, International Nacra 17 Class Association, International Laser Class Association, the Chairman of the ISAF Classes Committee regarding regulation 25.2.6 and made the following recommendation to Council.

   **Recommendation to Council: Reject**

   The Events Committee Class Worlds Working Party is reviewing all World Championship Regulations.

   Vote: 1 in favour, 20 against, 1 abstain

   (g) The Committee considered submission 111-15 from the Chair of the Women's Forum regarding regulation 25.2.6 and made the following recommendation to Council.

   **Recommendation to Council: Reject**

   The Events Committee Class Worlds Working Party is reviewing all World Championship Regulations.

   Vote: 1 in favour, 20 against, 1 abstain

   (h) The Committee considered submission 112-15 from the International Funboard Class
Association regarding regulation 25.2.5 and made the following recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

The Events Committee Class Worlds Working Party is reviewing all World Championship Regulations.

Vote: 1 in favour, 20 against, 1 abstain

(i) The Committee considered submission 113-15 from the Chairman of the Windsurfing and Kiteboarding Committee regarding regulation 10.4, continental participation and made the following recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

The Events Committee Class Worlds Working Party is reviewing all World Championship Regulations.

Vote: in favour, against, abstain

(j) The Committee considered submission 114-15 from the International Funboard Class Association regarding regulation 25.5.2 and made the following recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

Vote: 3 in favour, 15 against, 4 abstain

(k) The Committee considered submission 115-15 from the International Kiteboarding Association regarding regulation 25.2.6 and made the following recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

The Events Committee Class Worlds Working Party is reviewing all World Championship Regulations.

Vote: in favour, against, abstain

(l) The Committee considered submission 116-15 from the International Kiteboarding Association regarding regulation 25.2.2 and made the following recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Reject**

Vote: 8 in favour, 10 against, 4 abstain

21. ISAF Calendar and ISAF Ranking System

(a) The Committee received a report on communication and policies for the ISAF calendar and ranked events from the Chairman of the Sail Rankings Sub-committee. Appendix 6

(b) The Committee reviewed the proposed recommendations from the Sail on crew changes in two person boats. The Committee supported these recommendations and as a result the Olympic Classes Sub-Committee withdrew submission 119-15.

(c) The Committee considered submission 117-15 from the Executive Committee regarding regulations 25.7 and 27.1 made the following recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve**

Vote: 21 in favour, 2 against, 0 abstain
22. **Team Racing**

The Committee received a verbal progress report on the 2015 Team Racing World Championship.

23. **Other Submissions**

(a) The Committee noted, and where necessary made recommendations to Council on the specific submissions listed below;

i) The Committee considered submission 019-15 from the Executive Committee regarding changes to the committee structure for 2017-2020 and made the following recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve**

- Approve Proposal 1
- Vote: 17 in favour, 3 against, 2 abstain
- Approve for option 4 of proposal 2
- Vote: unanimous

ii) The Committee considered submission 020-15 from the Executive Committee regarding Sub-Committee recommendations to council and made the following recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve**

- Vote: 17 in favour, 3 against, 2 abstain

iii) The Committee considered submission 024-15 from the Executive Committee regarding the Youth Worlds Sub-Committee and made the following recommendation to Council.

**Recommendation to Council: Approve**

- Vote: 20 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstain

(b) The Committee considered submissions for which the Events Committee is an Other Committee

i) The committee considered submission 015-15 from the International Kiteboarding Association regarding ISAF regulation 25.12.2 and made the following opinion to Council.

**Opinion to Council: Reject**

- Vote: 4 in favour, 14 against, 4 abstain

ii) The committee considered submission 023-15 from the Executive Committee Association regarding the Match Racing Committee and made the following opinion to Council.

**Opinion to Council: Approve**

- Vote: 11 in favour, 7 against, 2 abstain

iii) The Committee considered submission 025-15 from the Executive Committee Association regarding the Ranking Sub-Committee and made the following opinion to Council.

**Opinion to Council: Approve**
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Vote: 19 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstain

iv) The Committee considered submission 034-15 from the Sailing Cook Islands, Fiji Yachting Association, Guam Sailing Federation, Vanuatu National Sailing Association regarding Continental Associations and made the following opinion to Council.

**Opinion to Council: No Opinion**

v) The Committee considered submission 050-15 from the Federación Mexicana de Vela regarding a change to the definition of continents in the ISAF Regulations and made the following opinion to Council.

**Opinion to Council: Approve**

Vote: 18 in favour, 0 against, 4 abstain

24. **Any other Business**

There being no other business, the meeting was closed
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Item 7

International Sailing Federation
Olympic Events Strategy 2015 Onwards

1. Introduction

1.1 The ISAF Olympic Commission’s reports adopted by Council in 2009 proposed an integrated strategy for Olympic Class racing, and greatly assisted ISAF’s policy decision-making thereafter. However the key recommendation regarding the Sailing World Cup was not initially implemented and so ISAF did not have an annual event property through which it could enhance and promote sailing, sailors and ISAF.

1.2 The Olympic Commission published updated recommendations in November 2013. Since then ISAF has made some significant decisions.

(a) The new Sailing World Cup now provides ISAF with that annual event property through which it can promote the sport, raise the appeal of the sport to IOC and its value to sponsors, and encourage local supporting qualification regattas.

(b) Continental Olympic qualification in all 10 Olympic Events now provides a catalyst for further event and participation growth on every continent.

1.3 One recommendation of the Olympic Commission in 2013 was: “once the future shape of the Sailing World Cup has been agreed, the Events Committee should be invited to further develop the structure of events to support Olympic sailing”. It is therefore an appropriate time to review and confirm ISAF’s overall Olympic events strategy, and clearly define the purpose of the various events within ISAF’s portfolio.

1.4 This paper sets out ISAF’s current Olympic events strategy, as adopted by the Executive Committee in February 2015. It defines the strategy based on which committees should make their policy and implementation recommendations. It is a living document, and the Events Committee and others are encouraged to review it and make suggestions on it to alastair.fox@isaf.co.uk.

1.5 ISAF’s stakeholders each have their own events and strategies, and this document will help them ensure that their events support ISAF’s overall strategy.

2. Objectives of ISAF Olympic Events Strategy

2.1 ISAF’s Olympic Events Strategy should be clearly stated and communicated to all (sailors, MNAs, Continental Associations, Classes, IOC, media etc). Its goals are to:

(a) promote the sport and elite sailors globally and be attractive to media;

(b) support ISAF’s growth of the sport in all regions of the world;

(c) provide a clear, simple and accessible pathway for sailors from learn-to-race through junior and youth competition to the Olympic Sailing Competition;

(d) make sailing a “natural” sport for the Olympic Games for both IOC and NOCs and:

   i) maximise the revenue ISAF receives from IOC;

   ii) preserve or increase the number of sailing Events at the Olympic Games.

(e) attract and deliver sponsor value;

(f) be supportive of both “elite” and “participation” events organised by others;
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(g) provide a career path for professional sailors and those employed in support of such sailors.

3. Event Properties

3.1 Event properties (for Olympic, Paralympic and pathway class racing) covered within the strategy are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IOC / IPC</th>
<th>ISAF</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Sailing Competition (4)</td>
<td>Sailing World Cup (Rounds &amp; Final)</td>
<td>Continental Games (4)</td>
<td>Class World Championships</td>
<td>100-point regattas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralympic Sailing Competition (4)</td>
<td>Sailing World Championships (4)</td>
<td>Regional Games with sailing (2 or 4)</td>
<td>Class Continental Championships</td>
<td>50-point regattas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Olympic Games (4)</td>
<td>Youth World Championships</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class Age Championships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled Sailing World Championships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olympic Qualification Events (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most events are annual; those marked (4) are 4-yearly. Olympic Qualification events may be organised by others under the authority of ISAF.

3.2 ISAF’s primary goals or purposes of each event property are as follows:

(a) Olympic Sailing Competition (4)
   i) Meet the expectations of IOC for a modern, attractive and accessible sport that remains a natural sport within the Olympic Games.
   ii) Provide the sailors with the pinnacle competition that is a true test of sailing skill, with the Olympic Gold medal remaining the most desired and lauded competitive sailing achievement.
   iii) Promote the sport and its heroes to the widest possible global audience, both remote and at the event, and including both public and sponsors.
   iv) Leave as a legacy a stand-out sailing venue, facilities and race officials for future international competition and to drive growth in local participation.

(b) Paralympic Sailing Competition (4)
   i) Meet the expectations of IPC for a modern, attractive and globally-accessible sport that creates heroes and inspires.
   ii) Provide disabled sailors with their pinnacle 4-yearly competition.
   iii) Help and inspire MNAs to run disabled sailing programmes, and disabled people worldwide to take up the sport of sailing.

(c) ISAF Sailing World Cup
   i) Create an annual series of regattas around the globe that promote the sport, and elite sailors, in the time between Olympic Games.
      - These regattas should encourage local supporting regattas and wider participation.
   ii) Provide elite sailors with the best annual “Olympic look-alike” competition.
   iii) Provide ISAF and sailors with an event property:
that is attractive to sponsors, TV and local spectators;
- at which ISAF can evaluate new formats suitable for the Olympic Games, raise standards in field-of-play management, and develop other ISAF services that promote and raise the appeal of the sport.

(d) ISAF Sailing World Championships (4)
  i) Drive growth in global participation through an ISAF regatta that all nations can enter, and which supports ISAF’s Emerging Nations Programme.
  ii) Raise the media coverage of Olympic Class World Championships, and their sailors and champions, by bringing them all to a combined championships mid-way between Olympic Games.
  iii) Begin the media build-up to the next Olympic Sailing Competition and provide the first opportunity for Olympic Qualification.
  iv) Leave as a legacy a stand-out sailing venue, facilities and race officials for future international competition and to drive growth in local participation.

(e) ISAF Disabled Sailing World Championships
  i) Drive growth in Paralympic class participation through an annual ISAF regatta that all nations can enter, and which disabled sailor and nation support programmes can focus on.
  ii) Provide one “Paralympic look-alike” regatta each year that can be used to test and enhance formats, procedures and promotion of Paralympic sailing;
  iii) Maintain media coverage of Paralympic sailing and sailors between Paralympic Games by show-casing them at an annual combined championships.

(f) ISAF Youth World Sailing Championships (YWSC)
  i) Drive the growth of youth sailing and international competition globally by providing, for sailors of both genders, an accessible multi-class annual Under-19 championships in pre-determined globally available classes.
  ii) Provide a focus championships for ISAF’s development and emerging nations programmes.
  iii) Promote to sailors and MNAs a simple and realistic pathway from “learn-to-race” junior classes to Olympic / adult elite sailing.
  iv) Provide the first opportunity for every MNA’s best sailors to represent their nation in an Olympics-style competition.

(g) Youth Olympic Games (YOG) (4)
  i) Support IOC in its declared principles for the YOG to:
     - inspire young people;
     - celebrate the world’s best athletes;
     - use the YOG as a laboratory for sporting innovation;
     - reach and engage the local youth.)
  ii) Showcase the sport of sailing as appealing and exciting for young people worldwide, with participants becoming role models for their country’s youth.
  iii) Clearly and substantially differentiate sailing at YOG from YWSC (e.g. in terms of events, equipment or format).
(h) Olympic Qualification Events (OQE) (4)

i) As required by IOC, decide MNA qualification to the Olympics under the supervision of ISAF in a manner that:
   - is open to all IOC members who are MNAs of ISAF, and is merit-based;
   - provides each MNA with at least two qualification opportunities in each Event;
   - provides continental representation at the Olympics.

Note: the current three qualification opportunities seem appropriate for sailing. Consideration should be given to how the number of places available is distributed across these opportunities, and to their order.

ii) Increase the number of nations that compete for Olympic sailing qualification;

iii) Drive growth in local or global participation in competitive sailing;
   - ISAF should select OQEs that assist initiatives and opportunities to raise participation.

(i) Continental & Major Regional Games (4)

i) Strengthen sailing in all continents and major regions through its inclusion in all Games that attract government funding and regional promotion;

ii) Strengthen sailing as an Olympic sport by providing an accessible regional step towards future Olympic qualification and participation. Most events and formats should reflect Olympic Events or pathway events;

iii) Raise regatta and race management skills in the region, and leave a legacy of facilities, equipment, race officials and volunteers.

(j) Other Regional Games (2 or 4)

i) Expand international competition by including sailing when appropriate.
   - Events should be those that have the greatest participation within the region.
   - Events using universally available Olympic equipment should be included.

ii) Raise regatta and race management skills in the region, and leave a legacy of facilities, equipment, race officials and volunteers.

(k) Olympic Class World Championships

i) Grow participation by enabling each Olympic class to holding its own large-fleet-size, many-MNA, annual championship regatta.
   - This may result in a need for qualification regattas that drive further participation.

ii) Enable each class to grow its popularity and media reach, strengthen its race management, deliver value to its sponsors, improve the format and presentation of its racing, and leave legacies in all continents and regions.

(l) Olympic Class Continental Championships
i) Promote and grow Olympic class activity and participation, and therefore the aspiration of Olympic participation, on all continents.

ii) Establish 100-point regattas for all Olympic Classes on all continents.

(m) **Olympic Class Age Championships**

i) Encourage and support the development of sailors from Youth to Olympic level competition.

ii) Retain, as active international participants, sailors of all ages.

(n) **100-point Regattas**

i) Recognise the leading Olympic class sailing regattas on each continent, and encourage both local and overseas participation at them.

ii) Establish consistent and high quality event and race management on all continents.

(o) **50-point Regattas**

i) Recognise regionally-important Olympic class sailing regattas, and encourage regional participation at them;

ii) Identify events that can help raise regional event and race management expertise.

4. **ISAF Regatta Calendar & ISAF World Sailor Rankings**

4.1 The ISAF Calendar and ISAF Rankings are the two programmes that together enable ISAF to give structure to the Olympic-related event properties identified above.

4.2 The ISAF Calendar provides an ISAF-managed regatta schedule that supports the strategy objectives, minimises regatta conflicts, and assists with forward planning by sailors, event organisers and other stakeholders. The ISAF Rankings recognises and publicises sailor performance at ranked regattas over a 12-month period, and provides the basis for qualification to the elite regattas. For elite sailors, the calendar seeks to enable the efficient shipping of equipment from regatta to regatta.

4.3 The calendar is structured around the following “Continental Windows”:

(a) Oceania: Mid-November to Mid-January

(b) S America, Caribbean: Mid-January to Mid-March:

(c) Europe: Mid-March to End-June

(d) Asia: Mid-Sept to Mid-November

(e) “Open window”: July to Mid-Sept

*Note: It is recognised that currently northern North America and Africa do not have their own window. Major events in northern America are typically held in the open window. Africa is an emerging continent and spans both hemispheres, and ISAF does not want at this time to specify when it should hold events. It is expected that Southern Africa would host events in the time of windows (a) and (b) above, and Mediterranean Africa between mid-March and mid-April.*
(a) 200-point regattas are SWC Rounds and Final, and Olympic Class World Championships (including the ISAF Sailing World Championships).

(b) 100-point regattas are Olympic Class Continental Championships and other major international Olympic class regattas.

(c) 50-point regattas are other international Olympic class regattas.

4.5 To help overseas sailors plan to attend, 200 and 100-point regattas are required to be held either in the host continent’s window, or in the open window. If they are held outside these times, their ranking points are reduced by one level. 50-point events are not date-constrained.

4.6 Sailing’s “centre of gravity” is Europe, but ISAF’s strategy is to grow sailing on all continents of the world. Regattas outside Europe should not be disadvantaged by the Rankings System, or made less attractive to attend than regattas in Europe.

4.7 100-point regattas are those on a continent that attract the continent’s best sailors and visiting overseas sailors. 50-point regattas play a key role in widening the local base of the Olympic sport. Both incentivise sailors to compete locally. They help local sailors climb the Rankings and have their success recognised without expensive travel. It is important for ISAF to liaise with MNAs and Olympic Classes and grow the number of 50-pointers on all continents, and to report the total number of ranked sailors to the IOC.

4.8 To be ranked, a regatta is currently required to agree its dates with ISAF 6 to 9 months in advance (regulation 27.1.1). Classes planning their own events, and sailors planning their international travel, require longer notice. A submission will be made in November 2015 proposing the following requirements:

(a) 200-pointers: agree dates prior to 1st January of preceding year;
(b) 100-pointers: agree dates prior to 1st July of preceding year;
(c) 50-pointers: agree dates prior to 1st January of year of regatta (or at least 6 months before the regatta if that date is earlier).

The submission will also require the ranking level to be stated in the NoR, and will state that, unless there is good reason otherwise, calendar clashes are resolved in favour of the higher ranked, then earlier submitted regatta.

4.9 The requirement to qualify for Sailing World Cup Rounds and Final has made the ISAF Rankings system relevant to leading sailors. Major changes to the calculation at this time would be unfair and unwise. ISAF is establishing a supporting process that enables Rankings questions to be promptly answered and omissions in the system to be corrected. It will also be proposed that some “Closed entry” regattas are ranked; it is important for the strategy that sailors should be able to count good results in those closed regattas (e.g. Regional Games) that are key target regattas for regional NOCs and attract local funding and publicity.

Chris Atkins, ISAF Vice President, Events
Pablo Masseroni, Chairman Events Committee
Alastair Fox, Head of ISAF Competitions Department
27 March 2015
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Item 10(a)

Qualification & Quota 2\textsuperscript{nd} Round

Q1 As noted in the results of the first round of the survey; there is a good consensus on the following facts:
1. There should be three qualifying opportunities
2. The first one should be in two years (2018) before the Olympic Games (2020)
3. The events for the first two Qualifiers should be: a. 2018 ISAF Olympic Classes Worlds b. 2019 Olympic Classes Worlds
Do you agree with the previous statement?

Answered: 18  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 18
Q2 Continental Qualifiers, The feedback related with Continental Qualifiers shows two major choices associated with the ISAF Sailing World Cup Continental Events (combining the Open Qualifier and the ISAF SWC Event) and the Olympic Classes Continental Championships. Both options face us with a different challenge,

1. ISWC has not defined its events for the 2017 – 2020 Cycle, but here is a strong possibility that some Continents will not have an ISAF SWC event in the year needed for the Qualification. Additionally ISAF SWC events are closed events and a modification.

2. Some Olympic Classes have no Continental Events in some of the Continents

3. Around 80% of the answers define at least one place for every class at each Continent. Taking into consideration the previous information, which would be your choice?

---

![Bar Chart]

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapt the episodes of the ISAF SWC and its pre-events to fit in the Continental Qualifiers</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Events organized by the Continental Associations</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Classes events and declare the quota unused when the Class doesn’t run such an event</td>
<td>11.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Continental Events (Europeans) for all classes organized by either the classes or continental associations
9/30/2015 1:04 PM  View respondent's answers

### Continental events or Continental Classes event
9/29/2015 5:32 AM  View respondent's answers

A mix between one and two
9/22/2015 11:39 PM  View respondent's answers

Solution is a mix of the above options, tailored to each continent.
9/22/2015 1:00 PM  View respondent's answers

### Continental classes events where they exist and work with continental/class associations to create a stand-alone or a multi-class or a multi-class/multi-continent (2 max) event where it needs to be developed. We cannot have one situation suits all. SWC continentals can prove to be very biased to the home sailors.
9/22/2015 11:56 AM  View respondent's answers
Q3. More than 60% of the surveyed state that we should have 4 events (2M and 2 W) to represent Universality and that for this classes (RS:X and Laser Standard and Laser Radial) two places (when the number of MNAs is enough to confirm participation) per continent should be awarded in the Continental Qualifiers. Taking this definition the Quota allocation for Continental Qualifiers has a range between 29% (2016) and 32% (2020). Based on this figures, and that 75% of the answers for the quota of the first qualifier where in the 40% to 50% range, and assuming that the final percentage of Continental Qualifier will be around 30%, which split do you recommend for the first two qualifiers?

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 ISAF OC Worlds 40% a... and 2019 OC Worlds 30%</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 ISAF OC Worlds 50% a... and 2019 OC Worlds 20%</td>
<td>35.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (1)
Q4. Which will be your proposal for the allocation of the quota within the ten events (Number of Athletes is fixed), based on RIO 2016 distribution?

Answered: 16  Skipped: 2

- Windsurfer - RS:X Men...
- One Person Dinghy Men -
- One Person Dinghy...
- Two Person Dinghy Men -
- Skiff Men - 49er...
- Windsurfer - RS:X Women...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Keep</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windsurfer - RS:X Men</strong></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boats: 36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sailors: 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One Person Dinghy Men - Laser Standard</strong></td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boats: 46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sailors: 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One Person Dinghy Heavyweight - Finn</strong></td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boats: 23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sailors: 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two Person Dinghy Men - 470</strong></td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boats: 26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sailors: 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skiff Men - 49er</strong></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boats: 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sailors: 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windsurfer - RS:X Women</strong></td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boats: 26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sailors: 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One Person Dinghy Women - Laser Radial</strong></td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boats: 37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sailors: 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two Person Dinghy Women - 470</strong></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boats: 23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sailors: 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skiff Women - 49erFX</strong></td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boats: 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sailors: 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nacra 17</strong></td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boats: 20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Item 11(a)

Which should be the prime differentiator for Windsurfs/ Kiteboards

Answered: 17  Skipped: 3

- Course, including Slalom: 70.59% (12 responses)
- Judged Event: 11.76% (2 responses)
- Keep Current: 17.65% (3 responses)

Total: 17 responses

Comments (4)

1. 
I think you need to separate boards and kites not ask questions about them together. judged event for kites, course including slalom for board.
10/4/2016 3:16 AM  View respondent's answers

2. 
Course close to the shore
9/29/2016 6:23 AM  View respondent's answers

3. 
More spectacular and attractive for media
9/22/2016 1:46 PM  View respondent's answers

4. 
Steeple for the kites
9/22/2016 12:52 PM  View respondent's answers
Which should be the prime differentiator for Dinghies

Answered: 18  Skipped: 2

- Keep Current: 55.56%  10 responses
- Include Course Variations: 44.44%  8 responses

Total: 18 responses

Comments (2)

Format, course, scoring, and other differentiators
9/22/2015 12:44 PM  View respondent's answers

It should be a mix of options depending on equipment. Sailing style like free pumping and displaying physicality, shorter / more endurance races. Format has to enhanced the best out of each equipment/athlete
9/22/2015 11:49 AM  View respondent's answers
Which should be the prime differentiator for Skiffs

Answered: 18  Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course, including theatre style</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Current</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (3)

- only theatre style of results in fair racing vs outcome which can be venue dependent
  10/4/2015 3:16 AM  View respondent’s answers

- Plus other differentiators
  9/22/2015 12:44 PM  View respondent’s answers

- I think we have to discuss more than just theatre style. Format etc. But for sure not current.
  9/22/2015 11:31 AM  View respondent’s answers
Which should be the prime differentiator for Multihulls

Answered: 17   Skipped: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evolve to foils and theatre style</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep current</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (5)

- Foils as only theatre style if venue permits fair racing and not whooly about the start. 10/4/2015 3:16 AM  View respondent's answers.
- Evolve to foils. 10/1/2015 9:14 AM  View respondent's answers.
- Foils yes, not theatre style as longer courses are much better for foils. 9/29/2015 3:30 PM  View respondent's answers.
- Course close to the shore. 9/29/2015 5:23 AM  View respondent's answers.
- Add Long distance race. 9/22/2015 12:44 PM  View respondent's answers.
- Same as above. Discuss more than foils and theatre style. 9/22/2015 11:31 AM  View respondent's answers.
New Scoring System

Answered: 20  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should every event have the same Scoring System?</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should every event carry over the points for the final medal race?</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should skiffs, Multihull &amp; boards go to the knock down system?</td>
<td>57.89%</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programmed races per day

Answered: 18  Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 Races</th>
<th>3 Races</th>
<th>4 Races</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windsurf</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>72.22%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasers</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>61.11%</td>
<td>38.89%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470s</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49ers</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>61.11%</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacra 17</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>61.11%</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total number of opening series races

Answered: 17  Skipped: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keep</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>17.85%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

- As per Rio e.g. 10 races Laser, Finn & 470 12 races RS:X 49er & Nacra

**Responses (5)**

- **but shorter races, maybe different format completely**  
  9/30/2015 12:36 PM  View respondent's answers

- **12 FOR ALL CLASSES**  
  9/30/2015 6:47 AM  View respondent's answers

- Fewer competition days, fewer reserve days, maybe 9 skiff races plus final over four days total.
  9/22/2015 12:44 PM  View respondent's answers

- questions 6 and 7 go into too much details. It depends on choices above and respond to a logic! Hard to separate each item
  9/22/2015 11:49 AM  View respondent's answers

- Im missing the initial statement that we are ready to sacrifice a bit of the "fairness" in order to attract media. If you say yes to that its much easier to answer all the other questions.
  9/22/2015 11:31 AM  View respondent's answers
Who should define the course format evolution?

Answered: 19  Skipped: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Class</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Events Committee</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Working Party</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (8)

Showing 8 responses:

- "some objectivity needed and also assessment of impact on sport as a whole and other Olypic events. Class decision maker does not allow for this"
  10/4/2015 3:16 AM  View respondent's answers

- "The Events committee on closed cooperation with a working party (recommendation)"
  10/1/2015 6:14 AM  View respondent's answers

- "The suggestions should come from the classes and their expertise should be taken into account"
  9/30/2015 12:36 PM  View respondent's answers

- "a working party and the class"
  9/29/2015 6:23 AM  View respondent's answers

- "class needs to have strong input"
  9/22/2015 11:36 PM  View respondent's answers

- "The Event Committee and then the Council shall define the proposals of working parties."
  9/22/2015 2:53 PM  View respondent's answers

- "Classes should suggest, Events Committee evaluate and decide, but not bound to agree with classes"
  9/22/2015 12:44 PM  View respondent's answers

- "a WP including the classes"
  9/22/2015 11:49 AM  View respondent's answers
Which traditional elements of the sport may be modified to improve the spectator and broadcasting experience? Please provide and suggestions in the comment box below.

Answered: 12 Slipped: 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category as...</th>
<th>Filter by Category</th>
<th>Search responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sailing must be better understanding and visibility for spectators</td>
<td>10/1/2015 9:14 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses closer to shore, shorter races, courses that adapt to different locations. We have to allow more &quot;loser&quot; - the last race or races should define the winner.</td>
<td>9/30/2015 12:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter races near from the shore the winner of the last race must be the winner of the regatta</td>
<td>9/30/2015 6:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplification of the rules. Careful consideration of the penalty system as the current framework is difficult to explain to general public.</td>
<td>9/28/2015 3:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open clean wind/water</td>
<td>9/20/2015 6:23 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring and course</td>
<td>9/20/2015 6:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short, fast races with eliminations and new attractive formats including short track, slalom, etc.</td>
<td>9/22/2015 2:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep it simple, on the water umpires, so everything happen on the water is final and no redress</td>
<td>9/22/2015 1:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple classes should be traditional (maybe Finn, 470). Two races per day for 3 or 4 days. 60 minute target. No medal race, no discards, no redress. Need to dramatically enhance tracking and animation, and then live mix into Broadcast coverage.</td>
<td>9/22/2015 12:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have to explore fully the sport presentation opportunities before trying to change the sport! We are far from that!</td>
<td>9/22/2015 11:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. starting procedure 2. rule 42 limiting human factor's influence in both cases</td>
<td>9/22/2015 11:17 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The format is the key. Quarter finals, semifinals act make it more interesting.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 11:31 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 4
## Bid Procedure for the ISAF Youth World Championship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>An interested Member National Authority will email intent to bid to the ISAF Secretariat and request a Bid Summary Form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>A completed Bid Summary Form is completed by the Member National Authority and returned to the ISAF Secretariat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November Conference</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>The Evaluation Panel and Youth Worlds Sub-Committee to note the Member National Authority’s intention to bid and review the Bid Summary Forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>A full application is submitted by Member National Authority to the Evaluation Panel, through the ISAF Secretariat, following the bid guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 10</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>The Evaluation Panel to shortlist bids (if required) and invite Member National Authorities to present their bid in Southampton, GBR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Nations interested in hosting Championship make presentations to the Evaluation Panel. Final Host Nation recommendation is made to the Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Executive Committee to approve or reject the recommendation at the February Executive Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February - April</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Venue visit by the Technical Delegate Meet with Organizing Committee Visit the proposed accommodation Visit the proposed dinghy park, competitors areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Confirmation of the venue at the Events Committee Mid-Year Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 5
1 Working Party members

The Class Worlds Working Party comprises the following members:

Sarah Kenny (Chair)
Stefan Rahm (Events Committee Representative)
Zvi Ziblat (Events Committee Representative)
Cedric Fraboulet (Equipment Committee Representative)
Luissa Smith (Olympic Classes Representative)
Jeff Martin (International Classes Representative)

ISAF support:
Alistair Fox
Jason Smithwick.

2 Terms of reference

The terms of reference for this Working Party are attached in Schedule 1. The initial focus for our work was on the issues arising under, and the possible improvement of, ISAF Regulation 25, so that it is easier for the Classes to understand and easier for ISAF to manage.

Once our work commenced, it became apparent that the issues associated with Regulation 25 were complex and there was a need to understand the broader question of what ISAF’s strategy should be in relation to Class world championships, particularly given there are 109 ISAF Classes and in excess of 250 world championships (or world championship titles awarded) each year.

3 Executive Summary

The term of reference for this WP have raised a number of complex issues. Most members of the WP are of the view that the current system does not necessarily result in the best outcomes for our sport and would like to continue to work on viable alternatives to the current system. However, the Classes Representatives are not yet convinced of the need for significant change.

The WP is continuing its work and would like to share their progress to date via this paper and encourage others to contribute their ideas and feedback on the issues raised.

4 The Current Regulation

The key concerns expressed with the current system are that the Regulations are somewhat complex, not as clear as they could be, can be too restrictive and in some cases operate unfairly,
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and require significant ISAF administration to keep track of entry details etc for all World Championships over 3-4 year periods for 109 classes.

In summary, the current system is as follows:

- ISAF Classes are entitled to hold one world championship per year;
- ISAF Classes may award an additional 3 ‘Subsidiary’ world championship titles which may be for one women’s World championship, one youth World championship and one further World championship title on the basis of gender, age or discipline;
- In the case of the World Championships and the ‘subsidiary’ world championship titles, numeric criteria for number of continents, number of countries and number of entries apply;
- In addition, those competing for a ‘subsidiary’ world championship title must race as a separate fleet;

To retain the right to hold the World Championship, the ISAF Class must meet or exceed the numeric criteria in 2 of the last 3 World Championships. If a Class does not, it may only call its next event a World Championship and award World Championship titles if the participation levels at that event meet the numeric criteria.

There is also an ability to apply to ISAF to approve other events as a World Championship. ISAF grants this approval from time to time. By way of example, ISAF has given approval to the organisers of the 34th and 35th America’s Cup to hold a World Series. The Professional Windsurfing Association also has the right to a World Tour. ISAF has also given approval for organisations like the World Military Games to use the word “World” for the sailing events.

The current system is described in the diagram below – using boats up to 6m as the example (there are different numeric criteria for boats of different lengths).
5 Advantages and Disadvantages of Current System

The advantages and disadvantages of the current system that have been identified in the Working Party discussions are summarised in the following tables, which include the WP comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Numeric criteria recognises that sailing is not yet universal (in all / most countries or continents) and equipment is difficult and expensive to transport or provide.</td>
<td>Concept of numeric criteria recognised by WP as the only real proxy for quality requirement. Increase to 3 continents is not broadly supported. Alternate proposal – based on current system suggested by Classes representatives: 2 Continents, 15 entries; 5 countries for all Classes with no limit on number or type of World Championship. Other WP members in favour of some limits on number of World Championships and more stringent entry requirements see also section 6 of this paper for Possible Alternate Approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Permits Class World Championships to represent pinnacle of sailing in that Class without requiring every Class to meet elite/professional sailing level.</td>
<td>Some WP members think World Championship title should be reserved for elite level with alternate title used for other events (like French national system).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “World Championship” title is universally recognised and understood and facilitates funding often not available for other events.</td>
<td>WP agrees World Championship title will facilitate funding and potentially other benefits and in return, encourage participation. This benefit to be weighed against disadvantages of current system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encourages and incentivises participation and retention at all levels/ ages which is consistent with ISAF strategy to be a sport for life.</td>
<td>Not all WP members think reducing number of world championships will have a significant impact on participation or retention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. World Championships attract media and any media exposure is positive for our sport.

This view is countered by the view that the large number of world championships creates confusion for the media, devalues the world championship title in sailing and does not encourage universality in our sport.

6. Innovation often comes from smaller / less universal or elite classes (eg International Class, Moth and evolution of foiling and skiffs to 29er/49er)

Some WP members see this as a good reason to retain flexibility in the regulation of world championships, including to enable discipline/format World Championships within a Class to encourage innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Results in too many World Championships</td>
<td>WP divided. Strong views expressed that World Championships number should be reduced, reserving title for elite level and using alternate titles for other events (like French national system). Equally strong view from Classes representatives that World Championships provide opportunities for growth in our sport, increased country participation (critical for an Olympic sport) and encouragement for youth and women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of World Championships is confusing for media and devalues “World Championships” as marketing properly for sponsors.</td>
<td>WP queried whether confusion and devaluation issue is real and if so, whether a reduction in number will have any impact on either issue given there will always be a large number of Class World Championships in sailing, even if there is a significant reduction from current numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality is varied and only small % elite level.</td>
<td>Difficulty here is how do you address this issue? WP has not yet identified a suitable way to ascertain / impose a quality requirement for sailing, apart from suggesting certain classes will inherently meet the elite requirement eg Olympic and specific pathway or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Time consuming / onerous for ISAF to administer / enforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onerous administration burden created by current system is acknowledged. However, this should not be the sole reason for changing the current system. This issue should be capable of being addressed by an online, transparent, possibly more Class administered system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Too restrictive for classes with multiple disciplines or formats eg kites and boards or broad range of age participants otherwise satisfying numeric criteria eg Laser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support in principle for more flexibility in number of World Championships where Class has high participation across wide age range or high participation in multiple disciplines or formats that are innovative, exciting, attractive for youth and media. By the same token, WP recognise an unbounded system could get out of control and result in an inappropriate number of world championships in a Class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Women’s and other World Championships shouldn’t be described as “subsidiary”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WP agrees “subsidiary” World Championship title is an inappropriate way to describe the Women’s world championship title in particular, and should be removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Requirement for all subsidiary world championships to sail as a separate fleet is too restrictive and not enforced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 views expressed. Separate fleet should be a requirement; separate fleet should not be required if suitable numeric criteria apply, i.e. no World Championship title if eg 2 in Open fleet; and most support the third view, that the Class should determine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Women/Youth WC should not have the same entry criteria as open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In principle support from WP, that numeric criteria for e.g. entries for open may set the bar too high in most Classes for women and youth. WP agrees World Championship strategy should aim to promote growth and retention of women and youth in sailing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Working Party considered the following matters of principle relevant to ISAF’s Class Worlds strategy:

**What is the appropriate “quality” requirement for an event to be described as a world championship?**

It is difficult to define quality in sailing other than by Class e.g. Olympic or ISAF Youth Classes and one option is to reserve the “world championship” label for these classes. However, for many Classes the ability to hold a world championship is the reason why they maintain ISAF class status (and pay the fee). The countervailing view is, so long as the Class World Championship is the pinnacle event for that Class, it does not matter that the quality varies or that some Classes are not elite.

“Some Classes are more popular than others, but almost all will have a role along the pathway of introducing sailors to international sailing and later the Olympics through their World Championships”

“Quality does not depend on numbers”.

**The strategy should encourage growth in the sport, particularly for youth and women.**

WP agree this principle is fundamental. For this reason, majority of WP acknowledges the validity of the principles reflected in a number of the Submissions clarifying or relaxing some of the current requirements in connection with youth and women’s world championships. One suggestion was that women could be 75% of men’s number until 2024 and 100% by 2030. One response to this: “It is unrealistic to expect the same number of women and men to be on the start lines even over a period of time”

**The strategy must be consistent with, and not adversely impact sailing’s ability to meet the IOC’s requirements for Olympic sports including the promotion of universality, sustainability, gender equality and youth appeal.**

WP agree this principle is important. WP acknowledges that in some classes, like kites and boards, multiple disciplines may need to be recognised or a different approach adopted. However, there is a need to be cautious about changing the rules for all Classes to accommodate legitimate needs in some Classes. On sustainability, there is concern that the current system is not consistent with sustainability eg “Class shouldn’t be punished if it uses the same hull and therefore reduces cost for sailors”

**What is the appropriate number of world championships.**

WP divided. Some think number is not important. Others think number should be significantly reduced. “Without radical change, we will not increase the value of our WC titles considerably. Even if we halve the number of WC titles to 150 there are still a great number of titles. Still too many to significantly increase the value of the WC title.”

**Should there be a standard age for youth worlds or should it be Class determined?**

Majority view supports a standard age for youth worlds. Some support for ISAF Youth Worlds age. Also strong support for older age to encourage youth between 19 and 23 to stay in the sport with suggested ages of 20, 21 or 23. Classes reps prefer class to determine. “Olympic classes vary from Under 21 to Under 23 based on how quickly youth sailors start competing on equal terms with adults in each class”.

**What are the considerations for yachts and offshore racing including focussing on sailor rather than boat nationality? Should one design classes be different?**

Some support to focus on sailor nationality (at least 50% of crew to be from one country) or home port rather than skipper nationality. No strong views expressed to treat one design differently. Any change must ensure the data is not too difficult to collect nor the system easy to cheat.
7 Possible Alternate Approaches

During WP discussions, the following possible alternate approaches have been raised:

the current system to 2 Continents, 15 entries; 5 countries for all Classes with no limit on number or type of World Championship.

The numeric criteria is increased with the consequence that the number of WC will decrease.

The “spheres” idea similar to the French national system. Eg. 6 spheres 1. Olympic 2. ISAF youth Classes 3. Paralympic 4. Professional Events 5. Development Classes (eg Bic Techno) and 6. All other ISAF International Classes. Alternate “spheres” may be eg Elite (which could include professional and Olympic), Youth and pathway, Paralympic and All Other. “World championship” would then be used in some but not all of these “spheres”.

The more “recreational” Classes (but not youth or pathway) being entitled to have a WC but not every year eg every 3, 4 or 5 years.

All classes get an agreed number of WCs (say 4) if they meet certain numeric criteria: open or men; women; youth girl; youth boy. A “special worlds” box where we put everything else eg other disciplines.
Terms of Reference

Objective

Over the last two years the ISAF Secretariat has received four requests for Championships in addition to those permitted by ISAF Regulation 25, ‘ISAF approval of World Championships and other Events’. This regulation was amended in 2011 when the distinction between “International” and “Recognized” classes was removed, and all classes became entitled to the same number of World Championships. The regulation allows more than one World Championships per class to accommodate separate championships for:

1) Women’s, men’s and mixed sailing
2) Age specific events from youth through to masters in both genders
3) Different events for the same equipment e.g. Slalom, Freestyle, course racing, long distance windsurfing and kite boarding
4) Pathways from youth to senior
5) Disabled sailing

At the same time the regulation sets numerical minimum participation numbers of sailors and nations for World Championships using 5 simple categories based on the length of the boat with smaller numerical requirements as the length of boat increases.

Subsidiary’ may not be the best description for some events. For some classes the split between age and gender does not work. For some classes that cross different events, gender and ages the number of World Championship available may not be as many as they would like. Some World Championships may be desirable for parts of ISAF strategy even though they may not meet the current minimum number of competitors or countries. Many believe that sailing already has too many world champions, and the number should be decreased or the number of entries requirements increased. ISAF may want to evolve new events for future Olympic Games whilst still maintaining the traditional events or they may want to consider combined events for certain medals.

A working party should be formed to investigate these and other related issues with the ISAF Secretariat to see if improvements can be made to ISAF Regulation 25 concerning subsidiary World Championship that is easier to for the classes to understand and easier for ISAF to manage; ensuring a simple and enforceable set of Regulation.
1. **World Championships** The old ranking system always counted the last World Championship that occurred in that class, but never counted two World Championships if they occurred within the same twelve months. Similarly, the old rankings never had zero World Championships in the point total even if none had occurred within the past twelve months. Currently the new rankings are strictly based on the past twelve months. At one point, several classes were counting two World Championships and the maximum rankings total is 1100 points (2 Worlds, 3 SWC events at 200 points each, and 1 event worth 100 points). Recommend changing the policy to reflect the old system and always count only the last World Championship that occurred.

2. **Regional Games** Old Ranking system did not count Regional Games because of limited entries at the various Regional Games. Recommend counting major Regional Games as 100 point events that include fleet racing in Olympic Classes.

3. **100 point Events**
   a. Continental Championships of Olympic Classes
   b. Continental SWC Qualification Events
   c. Major Regional Games
      i. Asian Games
      ii. Pan Am Games
      iii. ???
   d. Eurosaf Championship Events within continental or open window
      i. Garda Trentino
      ii. Kieler Woche
      iii. (Palma, Hyeres, Medemblik, Weymouth already qualify as 100 or 200)
   e. Other major multi class Olympic regattas within continental or open window, e.g.
      i. Sail Sydney
      ii. CORK, Kingston, Canada
      iii. Asia, SA, Africa?
   f. Other class events within continental or open window such that each continent has a minimum of two 100 point events in each Olympic Class every year.
   g. Subsidiary World Championships? U21, Youth Worlds?

4. **50 point Events** Any other event that applies and meets minimum criteria.

5. **Doublehanded boats**helm, helm/crew, helm and crew separately
   a. Split points for helm and crew, and then combine
   b. Start over if new pairings.

6. **Continental Windows** definition

7. **SWC Final** 100 points, 200 points?, one of three SWC events

8. **Quality Factor**

9. **Two years vs one, or counting two World Championships**


**Effective date for changes**