

FORMULA KITE 2032: EVIDENCE, OLYMPIC VALUE AND THE DECISION AHEAD

A Public Assessment of the Joint Working Group's Regulation 11.5 Report

All five recommendations presented by the Joint Working Group would remove the existing Men's and Women's Formula Kite Events. The published report does not assess the available option of retaining those Events while reforming their Equipment and delivery. This public assessment examines whether the recommended outcome is supported by transparent evidence, consistently applied criteria and a like-for-like comparison with the proposed alternatives. It is intended to inform MNAs and World Sailing decision-makers before the relevant Committees finalise their recommendations and the matter proceeds to Council and the General Assembly. It also seeks to help ensure that MNAs wishing to support the retention and reform of Formula Kite have a fair, informed and meaningful opportunity to present their position and have it properly considered.

**The line references below correspond to the printed line numbers in the report.*

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
A. Decision affecting Formula Kite		
75–108	All five recommendations classify Men's and Women's Kite as "new Event; new Equipment."	All five recommendations lead to the same outcome: removal of the existing Men's and Women's Formula Kite Events. No option allowing MNAs to support their retention is presented.
113–118	Men's Kite and Women's Kite, identified as Formula Kite, are among the four Events placed under review.	Being placed under review did not predetermine removal. Formula Kite should have been properly assessed against each of the four outcomes available under Regulation 11.5.
143–166	Regulation 11.5 provides four possible outcomes: retain Event/retain Equipment; retain/evolve Equipment; retain/select new Equipment; or new Event/new Equipment.	"New Event; new Equipment" corresponds to replacement of the current Event under Regulation 11.5(a)(iv). It does not mean evolution of Formula Kite. This exclusion results solely from the Committees' current recommendation and is not yet a final World Sailing decision. Formula Kite can—and should—still be given a fair opportunity through the inclusion and proper assessment of a retain-and-reform option before Council and the General Assembly make their decisions.
273–304	The five recommendations are repeated in the main Recommendations section. Every option removes the existing Kite Events.	Repetition does not create alternative choices for Kite: all five recommendations exclude retention.
320–330	Recommendation 1 replaces Men's and Women's Kite with Men's and Women's Wingfoil.	Formula Kite is removed and Wingfoil takes its place.
369–380	Recommendation 2 replaces Kite with Wingfoil and adds Team Racing.	Formula Kite is again removed.
419–430	Recommendation 3a replaces Kite with Wingfoil within a slate also containing a Mixed Team Tournament.	Formula Kite is again removed.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
472–482	Recommendation 3b replaces Kite with Men’s and Women’s Foiling Monohull.	Formula Kite is removed in favour of an undeveloped Foiling Monohull Event.
521–532	Recommendation 5 replaces Kite with Foiling Monohull and also introduces Team Racing.	Formula Kite is removed in every remaining scenario.
Initial finding	In relation to Kite, the report does not contain five genuinely different recommendations.	For Formula Kite, the five recommendations create only the appearance of choice. Decision-makers may choose what replaces Kite, but they are given no opportunity to decide whether the existing Events should be retained and reformed. This must be corrected before the Committees finalise their recommendations.
B. Positive characteristics expressly recognised by the report		
625–629	Men’s and Women’s Kite were introduced into the Olympic sailing programme at Paris 2024.	Formula Kite is an established and successfully delivered Olympic Event, not an untested future concept.
630–632	World Sailing members retained the Kite Events for LA28 in 2023, favouring stability and Event continuity.	The MNAs themselves expressly supported stability and continuity when they retained Kite for LA28. That clear direction is not reflected in the current recommendations. Formula Kite has never been given a stable period in which to develop, having remained under continuous review. Reversing course again would disregard the MNAs’ stated position, damage confidence and undermine the stability expected from an Olympic programme.
633–637	Kitefoiling acknowledged a shift in how modern sailing is practised.	The report recognises Formula Kite as part of the modern development of sailing.
633–637	Foiling and off-the-beach board sailing are increasingly popular and attractive to youth.	Formula Kite connects Olympic sailing with younger athletes and the rapidly growing board-sports community.
635–637	The equipment is described as smaller, easier to transport and more affordable.	The report expressly recognises Formula Kite’s equipment and logistical advantages—advantages that are not properly reflected in its later cost assessment.
638–639	Kitefoil racing is described as the fastest Summer Olympic Event.	Speed gives Formula Kite a unique, measurable and globally recognisable Olympic identity.
638–642	Kite has added a high-speed, skilful and athletic form of sailing to the Olympic programme.	These recognised qualities directly support the report’s own objectives of broadcast attractiveness and global appeal.
643–644	The stated concerns do not diminish Kite’s contribution to Olympic sailing.	The report expressly accepts Formula Kite’s positive contribution to Olympic sailing. Removing two established Events despite that contribution requires clear comparative evidence that replacement would deliver greater Olympic value—evidence the report does not provide.
651–654	Kitefoil racing is visually dynamic and exciting.	The report expressly recognises the fundamental qualities of an attractive broadcast product. Its later conclusion that Kite has low broadcast appeal is therefore not adequately explained.
663–665	Formula Kite remains attractive to many athletes, particularly younger sailors.	The report expressly confirms Formula Kite’s athlete and youth appeal, one of the stated objectives of the review.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
707–708	Kite uses the same field of play as other sailing Events.	This shared field of play is a significant operational advantage and must be included in any fair assessment of Olympic delivery requirements.
C. Overall adverse assessment of Formula Kite		
640–642	Practical experience is said to have revealed challenges involving broadcast delivery, campaign cost, universality, predictability, complexity and athlete weight.	These six subjects form the report’s principal case against Formula Kite, yet they are presented without transparent supporting evidence and without assessing the Class proposals designed to address them.
643–648	The Working Group questions whether the current Event and Formula Kite equipment package remain the strongest long-term Olympic option.	The report moves directly towards replacement without first examining the proportionate options expressly available under Regulation 11.5: retaining the Events while reforming their Equipment and delivery.
647–648	The report states that the current Kite Event may no longer be the most suitable long-term Olympic Event.	The report reaches only a tentative conclusion—“may no longer”—yet converts it into the categorical removal of Formula Kite from all five recommendations. Such an outcome requires clear comparative evidence, not an unverified possibility.
D. Broadcast attractiveness and scheduling		
651–654	Although visually dynamic and exciting, Kite is said to have low broadcast appeal.	Despite recognising that Kite is visually dynamic and exciting, the report reaches a negative conclusion about its overall broadcast appeal without presenting audience figures or comparative broadcast evidence. It also does not address the favourable relationship between broadcast value and production cost identified for Formula Kite in the Paris 2024 Olympic broadcast review. That evidence should form part of any fair comparative assessment of Olympic value.
651–653	Speed allegedly makes athletes and MNA identifiers difficult to see.	This issue is already being addressed for LA28 through the development of dedicated country branding. The report does not acknowledge this practical solution. By 2032, the size, colour and elevated position of the kites can make them among the most visible and recognisable national identifiers in Olympic sailing. This is a major broadcast opportunity—not an inherent weakness of the Event.
653–654	The ability to mount cameras on athletes or equipment is described as limited.	This assertion is contradicted by extensive practical evidence. Helmet-mounted cameras are routinely used in Kite Foil and have produced a large volume of spectacular, high-quality footage from the athlete’s perspective. Integrating live onboard footage into an Olympic broadcast may require further technical development, but that is a production opportunity—not a limitation inherent to Formula Kite or a justification for removing the Event.
655–657	Kite is said to have a relatively limited operating wind range.	This statement is inconsistent with recorded competition delivery. Formula Kite has demonstrated successful competitive racing from 5 to at least 25 knots , with Olympic racing at Paris 2024 continuing during wind readings recorded as low as approximately 4 knots. Describing this range as “relatively limited” without presenting comparative race data fundamentally misrepresents one of Formula Kite’s strongest Olympic advantages.
658–661	Wind, rain and wet sails are said to cause delays, postponements and schedule changes.	Weather affects every sailing Event. The report provides no race-level evidence showing that Formula Kite causes greater scheduling disruption than other current or proposed Events.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
658–661	Failure to race because a sail becomes wet is said to be poorly received by broadcasters and audiences.	This is an anecdotal and unattributed assertion. No evidence is provided regarding its frequency, broadcast impact or the available technical and operational solutions.
E. Athlete appeal and welfare		
663–665	Formula Kite attracts many athletes, especially younger sailors.	Formula Kite’s strong appeal to young athletes directly supports the review’s objective of attracting a new generation to Olympic sailing. This has been achieved despite the Event’s continuing lack of long-term Olympic certainty.
664–665	Technical demands and campaign cost may discourage broader participation.	The report does not provide participation or comparative cost evidence establishing this causal link. It also fails to consider whether limited growth results partly from the continuing uncertainty surrounding Formula Kite’s Olympic status and the resulting reluctance of MNAs to invest in long-term programmes.
666–667	Athletes have reportedly raised well-being concerns about achieving optimum weight, particularly women.	Athlete welfare concerns must be addressed seriously. However, the report does not assess the concrete reforms already proposed by the Class, including a two-kite one-design package and differentiated foil configurations for the Men’s and Women’s Events. These measures apply the experience gained through Paris 2024 and the LA28 cycle to broaden the competitive athlete-weight range. The appropriate comparison is therefore between a proven Event with developed corrective measures and proposed Events whose solutions still need to be designed and tested.
688–689	Optimum weight is said to damage universality and transition between classes.	The report does not assess the extent to which the Class’s proposed equipment reforms would broaden the competitive weight range and improve accessibility and transition. A correctable equipment issue should not be treated as an established reason to remove the Events when the proposed solution has not been evaluated.
688–689	Smaller athletes are said to struggle to remain competitive.	This assertion is presented without disclosed weight, performance or comparative data. Athlete size influences competitiveness across equipment-dependent Olympic Events; an unsupported generalisation is not an adequate basis for removing two established Olympic Events.
F. Campaign cost and equipment		
669–670	Formula Kite campaign costs are described as among the highest in Olympic sailing.	This claim is unsupported by disclosed cost data, a defined campaign-cost model or a like-for-like comparison with other Olympic Events. Formula Kite’s actual Equipment and logistics profile does not support its classification as one of the most expensive Olympic sailing Events: the complete package travels with the athlete in a single airline bag, without separate hull transport, trailers or containerised freight, and is purchased and brought by the athletes rather than supplied by the Organising Committee. IKA’s proposed one-design, two-kite package would reduce Equipment quantity and replacement costs further through a tested and deliverable solution. The comparison is especially unreliable when retained Events such as Nacra 17 are not costed on the same basis and Wingfoil’s Olympic Equipment has not yet been selected, costed or tested.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
671–672	Multiple kites, foils and other equipment are said to be required to remain competitive.	The report does not distinguish between an elite development inventory and the equipment actually required at Major Events. It also fails to explain that development equipment from the previous cycle remains usable at minimal additional cost, while eligible Major-Event equipment is controlled during the relevant Olympic cycle. Without these distinctions, the alleged equipment burden is materially overstated.
671–672	This requirement is attributed to equipment durability and consistency.	No comparative evidence is disclosed. More importantly, the assessment omits the Class’s developed one-design, two-kite proposal, specifically designed to provide a smaller, more affordable and more durable equipment package.
673–674	Many elite campaigns allegedly replace racing kites every two to three months.	The report gives no source, sample, cost record or distinction between routine replacement, accidental damage, development testing and equipment required for Major Events. An unverified statement about selected elite campaigns cannot reasonably establish the cost of Formula Kite as an Olympic Event.
675–677	High-speed coach boats are said to be required for athlete support and safety.	Coach and support boats are common across Olympic sailing, yet the report provides no comparison of their number, cost, operating requirements or fuel consumption between Events. It also appears to assume that high-speed vessels must continuously follow the athletes. In practice, during both racing and training, support vessels generally remain stationed and respond when required. The conclusion therefore reflects an inaccurate understanding—or insufficient examination—of Formula Kite operations.
676–677	Equipment, logistics and coaching costs are said to create barriers for some MNAs.	The logistics claim is particularly difficult to sustain: a Formula Kite athlete can carry the complete equipment package in a single airline bag, without transporting a hull, mast, trailer or container. This portability also enables training and development wherever suitable kite access exists, without the extensive traditional sailing infrastructure required by many other Events. The report presents no comparative logistics-cost evidence.
702–703	Maintaining competitive equipment throughout an Olympic cycle places significant demands on athletes and MNAs.	The report does not quantify this alleged cycle-wide burden or compare it with the cost of maintaining boats and equipment in retained Events such as Nacra 17. Nor does it distinguish training and development equipment from controlled Major-Event equipment. It then compares Formula Kite’s observed costs with proposed Events—particularly Wingfoil—whose Olympic equipment, costs and replacement requirements remain unresolved. This is not a like-for-like assessment.
704–705	The equipment pathway is said to evolve rapidly, creating uncertainty for planning and investment.	The assessment fails to distinguish equipment evolution from the uncertainty created by repeatedly placing Formula Kite’s Olympic status under review. That instability itself discourages MNA investment and long-term development. Formula Kite now offers accumulated Olympic experience and a developed equipment solution; replacing it would discard that experience and begin another unresolved equipment process.
710–712	Equipment optimisation is said to have become increasingly important to performance.	Equipment optimisation is inherent in equipment-dependent Olympic sport, including retained Events such as Nacra 17. The report presents no consistent cross-Event evidence showing that Formula Kite is uniquely burdensome. Its athletes and coaches have already developed world-class technical expertise; that knowledge is an Olympic asset, not a justification for returning to zero with an undeveloped Event and equipment system.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
G. Universality and MNA participation		
679–682	MNA participation is described as lower than initially suggested growth rates, particularly for women.	The report does not identify the original growth forecast, its methodology or the period against which performance is assessed. Participation grew strongly throughout the Paris 2024 cycle, yet Formula Kite has never been given a stable Olympic cycle in which MNAs could invest with confidence. The subsequent uncertainty encouraged some MNAs to redirect investment towards Wingfoil, facilitated by the transferable skills between the disciplines. Growth cannot be assessed fairly without accounting for this policy-driven movement, which should not be presented as evidence that Formula Kite lacks international appeal or development potential.
680–682	Kite is compared unfavourably with established Olympic Events and Windsurfing.	This is not a like-for-like comparison. Formula Kite’s participation is measured shortly after its Olympic debut against Events and disciplines supported by decades of Olympic investment and established national pathways. The report applies no equivalent maturity adjustment and provides no comparable participation evidence for the proposed replacement Events.
682–684	The 21 July 2026 rankings included 35 nations in Men’s Formula Kite and 25 in Women’s Formula Kite.	The rankings provide a limited snapshot rather than a complete picture of Formula Kite’s participation and development. They should therefore be considered alongside broader and more recent participation data, including the 2026 European Championships, which attracted 92 athletes—56 men and 36 women—from 28 nations across four continents.
683–684	Neither ranking included a participant from Africa.	African representation is an important development priority, but absence from one rankings snapshot does not establish the absence of athletes, activity or development potential across the continent. The relevant question is whether stable Olympic status and targeted MNA support can convert that potential into sustained participation.
679–682	The lower participation may partly reflect technical and financial barriers.	The report presents this as a possible explanation without establishing causation. It does not examine the effect of repeated Olympic reviews on MNA investment, despite Formula Kite’s unusually portable equipment and limited infrastructure requirements. Nor does it assess whether the Class’s cost-reduction proposal would remove the identified barriers.
H. Athlete pathway and wider kiteboarding participation		
685–687	Global participation in “kite-surfing” is said not to lead to Kitefoil racing.	The report applies an unduly narrow definition of an athlete pathway. Recreational kiteboarding develops kite control, wind awareness, launching, landing and board skills that transfer directly to Kitefoil. Progression to elite racing requires additional foil and racing skills, as every recreational-to-Olympic pathway does, but it does not begin from zero. This large and internationally distributed participation base is a strategic development asset, particularly for nations without extensive traditional sailing infrastructure.
686–687	Transition from traditional sailing classes to Kitefoil is described as uncommon.	Limited transfer from traditional sailing is not evidence of a weak pathway. Formula Kite brings athletes into Olympic sailing from kiteboarding and other board sports, directly supporting World Sailing’s objective of global growth and engagement with a new generation. Criticising the Event for not depending on traditional sailing pathways undervalues precisely the new audience and reach it contributes.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
688–689	Smaller physiques are said to face difficulties in transferring into Formula Kite.	This repeats the weight concern addressed above and provides no separate pathway or transition evidence demonstrating that athlete size prevents progression into Formula Kite. It should not be treated as independent evidence of a pathway failure.
I. Youth pathway		
690–692	The Kite youth pathway is described as relatively limited compared with other Olympic youth Events.	Formula Kite is compared with youth Events supported by much longer-established Olympic and national pathways, without adequately accounting for its recent introduction or continuing Olympic uncertainty. A developing pathway cannot fairly be judged as though it had benefited from the same time, stability and institutional investment.
692–694	The report presents Youth Sailing World Championship entry figures for 2022–2025.	These figures cover only the first four editions of a newly established youth pathway. Entry at the Youth Sailing World Championships requires substantial MNA expenditure and therefore does not represent the full number of active or developing youth athletes. Limited entries may reflect funding and selection decisions rather than an absence of national participation. Continued uncertainty prevents MNAs from making the sustained investment required to develop Formula Kite—despite its strong and expressly recognised appeal to young athletes.
693–694	Only five of the ten Kite Women entries in 2025 completed more than 50% of their races.	The report does not explain the reasons for non-completion or demonstrate that the same completion test was applied consistently across every Event and edition. One statistic from one gender at one championship cannot reasonably support a general conclusion about the viability of the Formula Kite youth pathway.
695–697	Kite recorded the lowest or among the lowest youth participation, especially in the women’s Event.	The figures show that the youth pathway requires continued development; they do not demonstrate that removing Formula Kite is the appropriate response. Removal would interrupt the pathway already being built and redirect MNA investment once again, while proposed replacement Events have youth pathways that are even less established or remain undeveloped.
J. Long-term predictability		
698–699	Continued affordability is described as a long-term challenge.	The report projects the current cost concerns into the future without assessing the Class’s proposed one-design, two-kite package . Long-term affordability cannot be evaluated while excluding the developed reform specifically designed to secure it.
700–701	Dependence on suitable wind may affect consistent competition delivery.	This conclusion is inconsistent with Formula Kite’s demonstrated competitive range of 5 to at least 25 knots, with Olympic racing at Paris 2024 continuing during wind readings recorded as low as approximately 4 knots. Rather than presenting comparative race-delivery data, the report converts one of Formula Kite’s principal scheduling advantages into an unsupported long-term risk.
702–703	Competitive equipment demands continue throughout the Olympic cycle.	Every Olympic Event requires sustained investment in equipment, training and technical development throughout the cycle; the report does not demonstrate that Formula Kite is uniquely demanding. In any case, the Class has already proposed a controlled one-design, two-kite package that would substantially reduce equipment quantity, cost and replacement demands.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
704–705	Rapid equipment evolution creates uncertainty around future planning and investment.	The statement is misleading. The Formula Kite Equipment eligible for Olympic competition remains fixed throughout the Olympic cycle and is strictly controlled under the applicable Equipment regulations. It does not evolve continuously in the manner implied by the report. The report therefore creates a factually inaccurate impression of continuing Equipment uncertainty for athletes, MNAs and investors.
K. Simplicity, safety and race management		
707–709	Kite requires high-speed support and safety vessels.	Support and safety vessels are common across Olympic sailing, but the report provides no comparison of their number, operating time, cost or fuel consumption between Events. It also appears to assume that high-speed vessels continuously follow the athletes; in practice, during both racing and training, they generally remain stationed and respond only when required. The conclusion therefore reflects an inaccurate understanding—or insufficient examination—of Formula Kite operations.
710–712	Equipment optimisation increases complexity for athletes, coaches and support teams.	Technical optimisation is inherent in equipment-dependent Olympic sport and is not shown to be uniquely burdensome in Formula Kite. Athletes and coaches have already developed elite technical expertise through the Paris 2024 and LA28 cycles. This accumulated knowledge is an Olympic asset—not a justification for restarting with an undeveloped Event and equipment system.
710–712	Equipment complexity increases the learning curve for new participants.	The report confuses entry into kiteboarding with optimisation at elite Olympic level. New participants can develop the fundamental skills at suitable kite venues without boats, marinas or extensive traditional sailing infrastructure. Advanced technical knowledge becomes relevant progressively, as it does in every Olympic Event.
713–715	Race Management Policies state a five-knot minimum, but racing in practice is said to require nine knots.	This statement is inconsistent with recorded competition delivery. Formula Kite has demonstrated successful competitive racing from 5 to at least 25 knots, with Olympic racing at Paris 2024 continuing during wind readings recorded as low as approximately 4 knots. This broad operating range is a major scheduling advantage for the conditions expected at Brisbane 2032.
713–715	This allegedly complicates scheduling and predictable racing.	This conclusion depends on the unsupported nine-knot threshold. The demonstrated race record shows the opposite: Formula Kite can deliver short, successful and broadcast-ready racing across a broad wind range, including conditions in which other Olympic sailing Events may struggle to operate.
L. OCOG (Organising Committee for the Olympic Games) and venue requirements		
717–719	Kite requires dedicated beach operations for launching, landing and athlete support.	Formula Kite requires a managed launching and landing area, as every Olympic Event requires discipline-specific operations. These procedures are established, comparatively simple and already proven at Olympic level. The report identifies no unresolved operational problem that would justify replacing the Events.
717–719	“Very considerable additional space” is required for preparation, rigging and drying.	“Very considerable” is asserted without any measurement, venue plan or comparison. Formula Kite equipment is compact and requires no hull storage, cranes, launching ramps, trailers or containerised boat infrastructure. Without a quantified like-for-like assessment, describing its beach footprint as a major OCOG burden is misleading.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
720–722	The beach should ideally be directly adjacent to the race area.	Direct access between the launching area and field of play is an operational advantage, not an exceptional Olympic requirement. Townsville, one of the expected Brisbane 2032 sailing venues , already has established kiteboarding locations capable of providing this configuration. The report does not assess the actual expected venue before presenting beach access as a difficulty.
722–724	The coach-boat marina should ideally be near the beach.	Proximity between support vessels and the competition area is desirable across Olympic sailing and is not specific to Formula Kite. The report provides no comparative assessment showing that Kite requires more marina capacity or creates a greater venue burden than other Events.
725–726	These requirements increase complexity and resource demand compared with other existing Olympic Events.	This conclusion is unsupported by quantified, comparative or venue-specific analysis. Townsville, one of the expected Brisbane 2032 sailing venues, is an established kiteboarding location with suitable beaches, existing activity and conditions capable of supporting the Event—an important delivery advantage that is absent from the assessment. Formula Kite’s compact equipment and limited infrastructure requirements make it particularly well suited to the expected venue. The report therefore does not establish that Formula Kite would be more complex or resource-intensive for the OCOG than other Olympic Events.
M. Methodology governing the Kite assessment		
123–131	Format, broadcast technology, commentary, storytelling and fan-base development fall beyond the narrow Regulation 11.5 decision.	The report itself confirms that these matters extend beyond the Event and Equipment decision. It is therefore neither logical nor appropriate to treat limitations in presentation, broadcast technology, commentary or storytelling as inherent deficiencies of Formula Kite or as grounds for removing the Event. This is particularly contradictory where the report itself recognises Formula Kite as visually dynamic and exciting—qualities that directly support the broadcast attractiveness Olympic sailing is seeking. Any identified shortcomings should be addressed through improvements in presentation, technology and format, not through replacement of the Event.
113–142	The contextual remarks in lines 113–142 are expressly presented as the views of the Events and Equipment Committee Chairs.	The report’s own footnote states that these views are not necessarily shared by the other Working Group members and were only partially shared, but not fully discussed, during its meetings. Their status, evidentiary basis and influence on the final recommendations are therefore unclear. Remarks that were neither fully considered nor collectively endorsed should not materially influence a recommendation to remove established Olympic Events.
167–184	The two North Stars are broadcast attractiveness and global growth of high-performance sailing.	Formula Kite’s recognised speed, visual impact, youth appeal and accessibility directly advance both North Stars. Yet the report does not explain how these substantial strengths were measured or weighed against the concerns used to recommend its removal. Without disclosed benchmarks or weightings, it cannot be demonstrated that the North Stars were applied consistently—or that replacing Formula Kite would advance them more effectively.
186–219	The evidence base includes data, proposals, ideas, assumptions, tacit knowledge and selected conversations.	The assessment combines verified data with assumptions, tacit knowledge, informal input and subjective judgement without disclosing their respective weight or reliability. Readers therefore cannot determine which conclusions are evidence-based and which depend primarily on untested opinion. Such an opaque evidentiary basis is insufficient to support the removal of two established Olympic Events.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
220–236	Twenty-nine proposals were received; one cluster concerned retaining or evolving current Events.	A retain-and-evolve pathway was formally available within the process and is expressly permitted under Regulation 11.5. Nevertheless, the report does not show how this pathway was assessed against replacement or why reforms capable of addressing the identified concerns were rejected. The resulting recommendation therefore presents replacement as the outcome without demonstrating that retention and reform received an equivalent comparative assessment.
252–253	The report’s proposal-cluster figure expressly includes “Keep/evolve W/M Kite.”	The report’s own proposal map confirms that retaining and evolving Men’s and Women’s Kite was formally before the Working Group. Its complete disappearance from all five final recommendations, without a documented comparative explanation, is a significant methodological omission. Decision-makers are given no basis for determining why reform of the existing Olympic Events was rejected in favour of replacement.
234–236	World Sailing rules are said not to require individual assessment or feedback on each proposal.	The absence of a formal obligation to answer every submission does not remove the need to explain the comparative basis of the final recommendations. Where every recommended option removes two established Olympic Events, decision-makers must be shown why the available retain-and-reform solutions were insufficient. Procedural permission not to respond individually cannot substitute for adequate reasoning on the decisive issue.
238–249	A single Event need score positively on only one Level 1 criterion, while the full recommendation must score positively overall.	This methodology allows weaknesses in a proposed replacement Event to be offset by unrelated strengths elsewhere in the overall programme. Consequently, a positive assessment of the complete slate does not establish that the proposed replacement is stronger, more mature or more suitable than Formula Kite. Without a direct like-for-like comparison, the methodology cannot justify removing Formula Kite in favour of any particular replacement Event.
250–253	Criteria include broadcast, athlete appeal, campaign cost, universality, predictability, simplicity, OCOG cost, weight, maturity and pathways.	The criteria are relevant, but the report does not disclose their definitions, benchmarks, relative weightings or evidentiary thresholds. It is therefore impossible to verify whether Formula Kite, retained Events and proposed replacements were assessed consistently. A list of criteria, without a transparent method for applying them, does not provide a sufficient comparative basis for replacing established Olympic Events.
254–261	Available data, time and capacity did not permit an exact numerical scorecard.	The report expressly acknowledges limitations in data, time and capacity, but provides neither a numerical scorecard nor an equivalent qualitative decision matrix. It does not show how competing advantages, concerns and risks were weighed to produce the final recommendations. The assessment therefore cannot be independently reproduced, tested or verified as consistent—and its conclusion to remove Formula Kite is not adequately demonstrated by the methodology presented.
262–272	Separate task teams produced the building-block reports.	Separate task teams prepared the assessments, but the report discloses no common evidence protocol, comparative template or calibration process. This creates a substantial risk that different Events—and particularly established and proposed Events at very different stages of maturity—were judged against different standards. Without demonstrated methodological consistency, the building-block reports cannot safely support a definitive comparison between Formula Kite and its proposed replacements.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
573–608	The report lists the Working Group and the decision sequence.	No IKA or Formula Kite representative is identified within the Working Group. This does not in itself invalidate the process, but it increases the importance of verified technical evidence, consultation with the Class and explicit consideration of its proposed reforms. The factual and methodological weaknesses identified throughout the assessment show that these safeguards were not sufficiently demonstrated before recommending the removal of Formula Kite.
N. Missing elements from the Formula Kite assessment		
623–726	No Formula Kite-specific SWOT analysis is included.	Formula Kite does not receive the same structured analysis provided for several other building blocks. Its recognised strengths, correctable weaknesses, development opportunities and manageable risks are therefore not considered within a balanced framework. This contributes to an assessment dominated by identified concerns rather than an objective appraisal of whether the Event should be retained and improved.
623–726	No references subsection or claim-by-claim attribution is provided.	Many material assertions concerning cost, participation, wind range, safety, venue requirements and operational complexity cannot be traced to a disclosed source. Without clear attribution, decision-makers cannot verify the information, assess its reliability or distinguish established facts from assumptions and subjective judgement. Unsupported assertions should not form the basis for removing established Olympic Events.
623–726	IKA's proposals are not presented or evaluated.	The report identifies perceived problems but does not present or assess the Class's proposed solutions. Readers therefore cannot determine whether those reforms address the stated concerns or why they were considered insufficient. A recommendation for replacement is incomplete where the available corrective measures have not been transparently evaluated.
623–726	No retain Event/evolve Equipment option is analysed.	Retaining the existing Events while evolving their Equipment is an express alternative under Regulation 11.5 and was formally available within the process. Its omission prevents a proper comparison between targeted reform and complete replacement. The report therefore does not demonstrate that removing Formula Kite is necessary or preferable to evolving it.
623–726	No retain Event/select new Equipment option is analysed.	The report also excludes the possibility of preserving Men's and Women's Kite while selecting different Equipment. This is particularly significant because each final recommendation prescribes "new Event; new Equipment" without explaining why changing the Equipment alone could not address the identified concerns while retaining an established Olympic discipline and athlete pathway.
623–726	No specific equipment-selection criteria are provided for a new Kite Event or for evolved Formula Kite equipment.	Although every recommendation prescribes "new Event; new Equipment" for Men's and Women's Kite, the report provides no Kite-specific criteria for selecting that Equipment. Nor does it evaluate IKA's proposed one-design, two-kite solution against defined requirements. It therefore recommends replacing the existing system without first establishing what the replacement must achieve or whether the Class's proposal already meets those objectives.
623–726	No mitigation analysis is provided for identification, cameras, durability, weight, coach boats or beach operations.	Several potentially correctable delivery issues are treated as reasons for replacement without any documented examination of proportionate solutions. Measures involving improved identification, broadcast technology, equipment controls, operational procedures and venue planning should be assessed before concluding that the Events themselves must be removed. Replacement cannot reasonably be presented as necessary where mitigation has not first been evaluated.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
623–726	No Brisbane-specific wind or venue assessment is presented.	The report reaches conclusions about wind reliability, beach access and OCOG complexity without examining the expected sailing venues. Townsville, one of the expected Brisbane 2032 sailing venues, is an established kiteboarding location with suitable beaches, existing activity and predominantly light-wind conditions that Formula Kite has already demonstrated it can cover reliably. By contrast, the light-wind capability of the proposed replacement Events remains unproven. Without any venue-specific assessment, the report does not demonstrate that Formula Kite is unsuitable for the actual environment in which the 2032 Events are expected to be delivered—or that any proposed replacement would perform more reliably.
623–726	No like-for-like comparison is made with the readiness risks of the proposed replacements.	Formula Kite is assessed on observed and correctable shortcomings accumulated through actual Olympic delivery, while proposed replacements are assessed largely on intended future benefits. Their unresolved equipment, format, participation, pathway, operational and Olympic-delivery risks are not examined to the same depth. Without a common evidence standard and direct comparison, the report cannot establish that replacing Formula Kite would reduce risk or produce a stronger Olympic programme.
O. Asymmetrical treatment in the five recommendations		
333–335	Protection of athlete/MNA pathways, expertise and investment is credited to retained Events.	The same protection is not extended to Formula Kite, despite substantial investment by athletes, MNAs and manufacturers. Nor is sufficient weight given to the report's own recognition of Kite's speed, youth appeal, portability and visual impact, or to its alignment with Olympic priorities including gender equality, global accessibility and broadcast value. Continued uncertainty prevents the Event from realising its full potential and discourages further investment.
343–344; 361–363	Wingfoil's Event format, equipment, pathways and light-wind reliability are admitted to be immature or uncertain.	By the report's own assessment, Wingfoil has no mature competition format, selected Olympic-tested Equipment, established pathway or demonstrated light-wind reliability. Replacing proven Formula Kite Events with this immature concept would introduce a substantial Olympic-delivery risk that is not given equivalent weight.
351–354	Format, presentation, digital technology and storytelling are identified as development opportunities.	These measures are treated as solutions for the proposed Event but are not equally assessed as solutions for Formula Kite. Presentation limitations should be addressed through improvement before being used to justify replacement.
396–399	Loss of established pathways and investment is expressly recognised for Mixed Dinghy.	The corresponding loss for Formula Kite athletes, MNAs, coaches, manufacturers and national programmes is not properly recognised. Pathway protection cannot be material for one Event but largely absent when assessing another.
413–418	Developing several new Events and Equipment systems simultaneously creates delivery and capacity risks before 2032.	The report acknowledges the implementation risks of replacing proven Events but still recommends doing so. It does not explain why uncertain new systems are preferable to retaining and reforming Olympic-tested Formula Kite Events.
446–471	Some proposed concepts remain immature or dependent on unresolved funding, governance, qualification, quota and delivery arrangements.	Proposed Events receive credit for intended benefits despite unresolved structural risks. Formula Kite, by contrast, is assessed against observed shortcomings even where practical reforms are available. The same evidentiary and readiness standard should apply to both.

Report Lines	What the Report Says	IKA Assessment and Response
493–520	Foiling Monohull equipment is not selected or demonstrated and carries wind-range, weight and delivery risks.	An Event with unresolved Equipment, wind-range, weight and delivery questions is nevertheless proposed as a replacement. This is inconsistent with relying on similar concerns to justify removing Formula Kite.
545–572	Transition, investment loss and implementation risks are acknowledged generally.	The specific impact on Formula Kite athletes, MNAs, coaches, manufacturers and programmes is not assessed. The costs of removing Kite are therefore excluded from the comparison, while the anticipated benefits of replacement are fully credited.
P. Conclusion of the Formula Kite Assessment		
Working conclusion	The report recognises Formula Kite as modern, youthful, portable, visually exciting, highly athletic, the fastest Summer Olympic Event, and already proven at Olympic level.	Despite these recognised strengths, the report relies principally on correctable delivery and Equipment-related concerns to justify replacing the Events, without demonstrating that IKA's proposed reforms could not resolve them under Regulation 11.5(a)(iii).
Central structural problem	The report compares the current, observed shortcomings of Formula Kite with the intended future benefits of Events and Equipment that have not yet been fully developed, selected, tested or delivered at Olympic level.	The assessment does not establish, through a consistent like-for-like comparison, that any proposed replacement is more mature, reliable or suitable than a reformed Formula Kite. The recommendation should therefore be reconsidered before it is finalised.
Q. Comparative Consistency Test		
Q.1 Wingfoil	Olympic readiness, Equipment, format, racing/expression uncertainty, pathway maturity, overlap with iQFOiL, light-wind reliability and Brisbane delivery risk.	Wingfoil receives credit for its intended future appeal despite acknowledged uncertainty concerning its format, Equipment, pathways and light-wind delivery. The same development-oriented approach is not applied to the proven and correctable Formula Kite Events.
Q.2 Mixed Multihull – Nacra 17	Campaign cost, universality, Equipment, support requirements and the decision to address identified problems through continuity and reform.	The report protects the Nacra 17 pathway and investment by favouring continuity and reform. Equivalent consideration is not given to retaining Formula Kite while implementing the Class's proposed Equipment and delivery reforms.
Q.3 Foiling Monohull	Absence of selected and tested Equipment, athlete-weight range, light-wind performance, durability and implementation timeline.	Foiling Monohull is proposed despite unresolved Equipment, wind-range, athlete-weight and delivery risks. Similar concerns are relied upon to justify removing Formula Kite, although Kite is already Olympic-tested and has developed corrective proposals.
Q.4 Consistency finding	Whether the same evidentiary standard, risk tolerance and criteria were applied to Formula Kite and the proposed alternatives.	The report does not apply a consistent standard. Formula Kite is judged mainly on observed shortcomings, while proposed replacements receive credit for anticipated benefits despite immaturity and implementation risk. This asymmetry means that the report does not demonstrate that replacing Formula Kite is better justified than retaining and reforming it.

R. IKA Equipment Reform Solution

Reform solution

IKA's developed solution for new Formula Kite Equipment, including the one-design system, two-kite package and measures addressing Equipment quantity, cost, durability, athlete-weight range and wind range.

IKA's Equipment solution is summarised in "Formula Kite 2032 – The Option Missing from the Report." It explains how the one-design, two-kite package and related measures address the principal Equipment concerns identified in the report while retaining the Men's and Women's Kite Events. Implementation would proceed through the applicable World Sailing evaluation and decision-making processes.

S. Decision Requested and Call to Action

Formal request

Proper assessment of an option retaining the Men's and Women's Kite Events while selecting new Equipment.

Council and the General Assembly should be presented with a genuine option to retain the Men's and Women's Kite Events while selecting new Equipment under Regulation 11.5(a)(iii), in line with IKA's reform proposal. This option directly addresses the principal equipment-related concerns identified in the report and must be assessed against the same criteria and Olympic-readiness standards as every proposed replacement before any final recommendation to remove Formula Kite is made.