#### 1. Para-Rowing Review Project

A separate meeting was held to present the Para-Rowing Review Project and to hear the feedback and ideas from para-rowing coaches and coordinators.

The following questions and comments were received from the national federations (NFs) present. The responses from FISA are noted below each question:

- NF1 Including PR2 singles and PR3 pairs is a way to build towards the PR2 double and PR3 four if, for example, you have two women but not men in the PR3 category. The PR3 single would be less useful because it excludes rowers with upper limb impairments. Having these smaller boats will be very helpful in keeping rowers engaged while we build our crews.
- NF2 The more boats we can offer the better.
- FISA Do you believe you would be able to get funding for these boats that are not on the Paralympic programme to attend the World Championships?
- NF Yes (strong agreement from NF representatives in the room).
- NF Would it be possible to arrange the programme so that athletes can double up in two events, as they can in Gavirate?
- FISA We will look into this.
- NF Should we continue to have different eligibility requirements for the PR3 double and PR3 four?
- FISA Noted. We will look at this.
- NF Has there been any further consideration to including para events in the European Championships?
- FISA This was raised with the European Rowing Management Board following the NF meeting in Gavirate. It is under consideration and should be voted on at the European Rowing Extraordinary General Meeting in September.

#### 2. Rule 36 – World Rowing Championship Programme

- NF Some of the options proposed increase the number of events, yet you have spoken previously about reducing or capping the size of the World Championships?
- FISA This is a valid point and should be included in the consideration of these proposals. We also need to bear in mind the credibility of the medal we have spoken about having at least three rounds to retain the value of the event and the medal, which is where the

Natural Death rule would become relevant. These are all elements to be considered when making the decision on the programme.

- NF The JM4+ and BM4+ are both viable events, but would it be an option to phase in the JW4+ and BW4+ in a couple of years, to allow some time for participation in the women's sweep events to grow following the inclusion of the W4- in the Olympic programme?
- FISA Point noted for consideration.

#### 3. 2020 Olympic Qualification System

- NF Is the proposed reduction in the number of places in the 4x and 4- events to 7 (or 10) a consequence of the reduction in athlete quota places?
- FISA No, it is related to what we believe to be the number of boats needed to make an attractive programme while balancing the athlete numbers between events, e.g. 13 boats give semi-finals, which is ideal, 10 boats gives a four-boat B final which is still attractive, whereas a 2- or 3-boat B final is not.
- NF A reduction to 7 boats in the quads, for example, will dramatically reduce the ability of smaller nations to qualify as these events will be dominated by the larger nations, so you will see a decrease in participation in these events.
- FISA This is a valid point, but this needs to be considered alongside the other factors.
- NF All of the principles are interconnected, so a decision taken on one will impact how we make a decision on another, e.g. if we reduce the number of quads, capping the excellence quota becomes a different discussion.
- FISA Agreed; it is a very complex process.
- NF If we agree on the 70:30 split between excellence and participation, then it should not be necessary to place a limit on qualification at the World Championships and Final Qualification (excellence places), as the distribution of qualification places will ensure the ratio is achieved?
- FISA Noted.
- NF Not allowing NFs that have qualified at the World Championships to participate in the Continental Qualification is not a bad proposal because it means the larger nations cannot access the participation places, so this will achieve the participation objectives.
- FISA Agreed. This also addresses the point raised at the Belgrade NF meeting that USA, CAN, AUS, NZL should qualify through their own continents rather than through Europe,

however this rule would mean that they would probably not be allowed to participate through the continents in any case as they should (according to historical performance) qualify sufficient boats at the World Championships.

- NF Not allowing participation at the Continental Qualification for those nations qualifying through the World Championships could penalise lightweights, and they will not have two chances to qualify.
- FISA We have discussed this with the IOC and their view is clear, that these athletes could try for other boats (theoretically), but yes it is true that they would not have a second chance to qualify in a lightweight boat.
- NF Considering the method to determine which boat qualifies at the Continental Qualification Regatta when two boats from the same nation have the same rank, various responses were noted:
  - It will be difficult to take an objective decision, but the NF should have the right to decide. They should in any case prioritise their boats when making the entries.
  - The international federation should set the standard, whatever that may be, rather than the NFs, so that all crews are treated equally.
  - The international federation should set the standard; maybe it could be based on rankings from previous regattas that season, e.g. the World Cups, rather than the World Best Time?

FISA Noted.

### 3.1. Additional Comments received from continental confederations and other national federations

The following additional comments regarding the 2020 Olympic Qualification System were received in the period before the Poznan NF Meeting:

NF

- Not in favour of capping the total number of boats an NF can qualify at the World Championships. However, support the idea that after World Championships if an NF has qualified 10 or more crews, they are not eligible for Final Olympic Qualification Regatta.
- In favour of an NF qualifying above a certain number of crews at World Champs not being eligible for the Continental Olympic Qualification (one or two crews is suggested).
- Not in favour of an 'objective ranking' to select crew when two are equally ranked and only one can qualify.
- Not in favour of a limit of one crew per NF at the Continental Olympic Qualification Regatta. Possible, to limit to two crews per NF but could be one per gender, two men's or two women's crews.
- Encourage the consideration of more lightweight doubles in the distribution of the quota.

- In favour of the addition of the 2- to the Continental Olympic Qualification but only if this did not affect the quota for the lightweight 2x.
- Raised a question over the level of the single sculls in the bottom part of the Rio Olympics and whether these places should be better allocated?

#### Continental Confederation

- In favour of limiting the number of boats per country to achieve greater participation and to have increases in gender equality.
- In favour of limiting the NFs that can go to Continental Olympic Qualifiers based on results at World Championships.
- Selection of the best crew when 'tied' between two within the same NF should be the choice of the NF/NOC. Each situation is different and the country is responsible for dealing with this choice.
- Support that a balance between Excellence and Participation be identified.
- Support that a minimum standard is applied such as in Athletics and Swimming for all crews to increase the performance level.
- within favour of inclusion of 2- on the continents.
- Important to continue to emphasize development of women's rowing.
- In favour of the proposal that freed up places are attributed to federations that have not yet qualified a crew.