

Annual General Assembly

Cancun, Mexico

0930, 6th September 2019

Agenda

1. Reading of Notice of Assembly.
2. Report on Credentials of Representatives and Quorum.
3. Exclusion/suspension of a Member Association.
4. Approval of the Agenda.
5. Reading of the Minutes of the last General Assembly and approval thereof.
6. Business arising out of the Minutes.
7. Minute of Remembrance for Friends and Colleagues no longer with us.
8. Report of the President.
9. Report of the Executive Board and Committees.
10. Report of the Auditors
11. Receive the Finance Report, Audited Statement and Discharge to the Board
12. Appointment of the Auditors
13. Presentation of the Budget.
14. Approval of Annual Subscriptions
15. Resolutions.
16. Further business.
17. Elections.
18. Acceptance of a new Member Association.
19. Date and location of next General Assembly.

12. Appointment of Auditors

Resolution

To appoint Mazars as the auditors for the World Curling Federation

14. Approval of Annual Subscriptions

No change is proposed to the rate of the Annual Subscriptions for the 2020/2021 season.

15. Resolutions

The following resolutions have been received by the World Curling Federation in line with the timelines laid down in the Constitution. Where relevant the views of the Competition and Rules Commission and the Athlete Commission are noted.

Any amendments to these Resolutions must be received by the Secretariat by 16 August 2019.

a) Update to WCF Anti-Doping Rules

Rationale

In order to maintain compliance with the WADA Code the following changes are proposed to the WCF Anti-Doping Rules.

Resolution

To add the Curling World Cup to the list of International Events.

b) Update to WCF Anti-Doping Procedures for 2020 YOG

Rationale

In order to improve the handling of Anti-Doping Rule Violations (ADRV) at the Youth Olympic Winter Games the IOC and Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) are repeating the process used for the Olympic Winter Games in 2018. This will be run by CAS at arms-length from the IOC. However, under the current rules the IOC and CAS would only have authority to issue punishments relating to the Games, there would need to be a second hearing process to assess any punishment for an ADRV after the Games which requires to be run by the IF. In discussion with the IOC and CAS it has been agreed that, as happened at the 2018 Olympic Winter Games, it would make more sense for CAS to handle any cases from start to finish and for the IF to authorise CAS to act on their behalf as well. This should simplify the process for everyone involved.

Resolution

For Anti-Doping Rule Violations committed at the Youth Olympic Winter Games 2020 the World Curling Federation agrees to accept the authority and procedure of the IOC Anti-Doping Rules in force for the 2020 Youth Olympic Winter Games and the process of the Arbitration Rules of the CAS Anti-Doping Division. The WCF agrees to recognise any verdicts delivered by the CAS Anti-Doping Division relating to the curling event at the 2020 Youth Olympic Winter Games. This resolution supersedes the current WCF Anti-Doping Rules for the period of the 2020 Youth Olympic Winter Games.

c) Replace the WCF Anti-Doping Hearing Panel with the CAS Anti-Doping Division

Rationale

In order to introduce more independence into the Anti-Doping process the Court of Arbitration for Sport has introduced a dedicated Anti-Doping Division that provides independent hearing panels for cases raised by International Federations. This would remove any perception that the sport is able to influence the outcome of a hearing panel.

Resolution

To replace the use of the WCF Anti-Doping Hearing Panel in the WCF Anti-Doping Rules with the CAS Anti-Doping Division; to update the Rules as appropriate to reflect this change.

d) Proposals relating to The Rules of Curling:

Please note items highlighted in **blue** have been updated to improve the English and clarifying the meaning, the changes do not impact on the intent of the original motion.

Please note items highlighted in **yellow** are either amendments or notes to the original papers.

i) Position of players – Delivering Team - R4 (b) (iii)

The rule says: The players who are not in charge of the house or delivering a stone take positions to sweep.

In rule (iv) it says: Any improper position of players will result in the delivered stone being removed from play, and any displaced stones shall be replaced, by the non-offending team, to their positions prior to the violation taking place.

That penalty is never applied, as the players are not required to sweep all stones.

It is therefore felt that rule R4 (b) (iii) should be removed.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

ii) Sweeping R7

Currently we see a lot of skips / vice-skips doing “housekeeping” before their planned shot. The rule R7 (b) says, that a stationary stone must be set in motion before it can be swept.

By the time the delivered stone reaches the house, the cleaning of the ice surface in this manner will not influence the stones (the heat will not stay on the ice), except it has helped with debris removal.

We recommend to add to the rule:

The person in charge of the house may clean the ice inside the hogline at the playing end prior to the delivery of the next stone.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

Amendment – Royal Caledonian Curling Club:

To clarify what is and is not allowed in terms of “housekeeping” not just in the house we suggest that the new rule instead states:

All players may clean the playing surface prior to the delivery of the next stone.

iii) Scoring R11 (i)

The rule currently gives a penalty, if a team cannot start a game in time (1-15 min. – 1 end considered completed, 1 point, 15-30 min. – 2 ends considered completed, 1 additional point, after 30 min. the game is forfeited).

The mixed doubles teams believe that 15 minutes is too long for a Mixed Doubles Game and should be reduced.

Add to the rule book a specific rule for Mixed Doubles in this situation:

For Mixed doubles the rule would be: 1-10 min. – 1 end considered completed, 1 point; 10-20 min. – 2 ends considered completed, 1 additional point awarded. After 20 minutes, the game is forfeited.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

iv) Wheelchair Curling R13 (a)

The rule says, that stones are delivered from a stationary wheelchair. It is not mentioned what the penalty is, if this rule is broken.

Add to the rule R13 (a): **If a violation occurs, the stone will be removed from play.**

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

NOTE: This proposal is being withdrawn as upon further reflection it is felt that R13(f) covers the penalty.

v) Wheelchair Curling R13 (b)

The current rule states:

When the stone is delivered between the outermost edge of the top of the house and the hog line at the delivery end, **the chair must be positioned** so that at the start of the delivery the entire width of the stone is within the wheelchair lines.

When the rule was written, there was no pull-back in wheelchair curling and the issue that we need to rule on is the position of the stone not the position of the chair.

We recommend to change the rule R13 (b) to:

When the stone is delivered between the outermost edge of the top of the house and the hog line at the delivery end, **the entire width of the stone** must be within the wheelchair lines **upon release**.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

Amendment 1: Royal Caledonian Curling Club

The RCCC believe that the important point to be considered is the start of the delivery not the point of release so the rule should read:

When the stone is delivered between the outermost edge of the top of the house and the hog line at the delivery end, **the entire width of the stone** must be within the wheelchair lines **at the start of the delivery**.

Amendment 2: Royal Caledonian Curling Club supported by Competition and Rules Commission

The full text of R13(b) includes another reference to the position of the Wheelchair in the first sentence. This should also be removed:

When the stone is delivered between the hack and the outermost edge of the top of the house at the delivery end, **the chair must be positioned so that at the start of the delivery the stone is positioned on the centre line.**

vi) Mixed Doubles charts R15 (Page 24 and 25)

If you install the power-play markings in metric measurements, as per the chart, then they are not in a straight line. And measuring with multiple numbers after the comma, is simply not possible.

We therefore feel the metric amounts should be removed from both Mixed Doubles charts.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

NOTE: This proposal is being withdrawn to allow a more in-depth review of the consistent use of metric and imperial measurements in the rule book

vii) Participating Teams C2 (i)

Currently the rule states: For teams in post round robin play, one or two team members (players and/or coach) must attend the play-off meetings, or the team will lose the choices **(first or second practice, colour of stones, etc.)** to which they would normally be entitled.

There is currently only one other option of team choices which is not listed. To avoid the risk that there might be other choices which are then not listed, we recommend to simply **remove the bracketed part**.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

viii) Equipment C3 (e)

The rule currently says as a penalty: If a player sweeps with another person's sweeping device the stone shall be removed from play.

The following might happen: A skip is delivering with a hair-brush. She is back in the head for the opponent's skip to play the last stone of an end. – The stone is travelling down the ice when she realises, that the shot is not perfect but also realises, that she cannot sweep with the hair-brush. She therefore grabs the brush from the Vice Skip to try and sweep out the opponents played stone.

By the rule that stone needs to be removed, but that is definitely wrong. If we remove that stone, we are penalising the non-offending team. We believe the rule should changed and a new sentence added:

Penalty: If a player sweeps with another person's sweeping device **one of their own stones**, that stone should be removed from play. **If a player sweeps with another person's sweeping device a stone belonging to the opponent, the stone should be replaced by the non-offending team where it would have come to rest, had the violation not occurred.**

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

Amendment: Royal Caledonian Curling Club

The RCCC feel it would add clarity to this rule by making it clear that the non-offending team place the stone where "it judges" it would have come to rest so it would read:

Penalty: If a player sweeps with another person's sweeping device **one of their own stones**, that stone should be removed from play. **If a player sweeps with another person's sweeping device a stone belonging to the opponent, the stone should be replaced by the non-offending team where it judges it would have come to rest, had the violation not occurred.**

ix) Game timing C6 (g)

The current rule states: A team delivers stones only when its game clock is running or scheduled to be running. Any violation results in the stone being redelivered after any displaced stones have been returned by the non-offending team, to their positions prior to the violation. The time clock of the offending team will start as soon as any displaced stones have been repositioned and will stop when the redelivered stone reaches the tee line (hog line for wheelchair curling) at the delivering end.

Recommendation: **Remove the penalty** as with thinking time, this is no longer appropriate and the penalty should be removed.

By the rules, the Umpires have the opportunity to issue a warning for inappropriate behaviour, if it is felt that the stone delivered was a safety issue (for the other team).

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

x) Game timing C6 (j)

Currently the rule states: Teams should not deliver the first stone of the next end until less than 10 seconds of the break time remains.

We allow the teams to start within that 10 seconds at the end of the break, as we do not want teams to lose time at the start of each end.

Broadcast is requesting that they get the full break time agreed. – We therefore believe we have to adapt the rule to fulfil the broadcast requirement but in a way that we are not penalising the teams.

We recommend to remove the 10 seconds before the end of a break and change the rule to:

Teams should not deliver the first stone of the next end **before the end of a break. If the first stone of any end is delivered within 10 seconds after the break has elapsed, the time-clock will not start.**

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xi) Stone assignment C8 (f) (iii)

Our rulebook still says who get which choices in the play-off when playing the Page system. The Page system has been removed from the current rulebook except that one sentence.

To be consistent, this sentence should also be removed.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xii) Stone assignment C8 new paragraph g – and subsequent renumbering

Our rule-book currently does not define anywhere, who got the choices in the play-offs when we play a double round robin (i.e. PACC with less than 6 teams), two teams have the same W/L record and each of the teams has won one of the games between them.

Our recommendation is to add:

When a double round robin in one group is played at WCF competitions, the stone colour and first stone in the first end of post round robin games is determined as follows:

- (i) The team with the better win/loss record has the choice of stone colour and playing first or second stone in the first end.
- (ii) If the two teams have the same win/loss record, and one team has won both round robin games between the two teams, that team has the choice of stone colour and playing first or second stone in the first end.
- (iii) If the two teams have the same win/loss record, but each team has won one of the round robin games between them, the team with the lesser DSC has the choice of either stone colour or playing first or second stone in the first end.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xiii) Stone assignment C8 – new sub paragraph for MD

Our rulebook currently does not cover the situation we have now in the Mixed Doubles World Championship: 6 teams play-offs, teams playing in two different groups.

The following should be added as a new paragraph (h) under C8:

At WCF competitions when teams play in two groups and 6 teams qualify for the play-offs (3 teams from each group), for the play-off game(s) the choices for stone handle colour and playing first or second stone in the first end are determined as follows:

- When a 1st ranked team from either pool plays a team ranked #2 or #3, the team ranked #1 has the choice of stone colour and playing first or second stone in the first end. If a 1st ranked team plays the other 1st ranked team, the team with the lesser DSC has the choice of stone handle colour. Then regular LSD procedures (without minimum requirements), will determine which team has the choice of delivering the first or second stone in the first end.
- If a 2nd ranked team plays a team ranked #3 in a playoff game, the team ranked #2 has the choice of stone colour and playing first or second stone in the first end. If a 2nd ranked team plays the other 2nd ranked team, the team with the lesser DSC has the choice of stone handle colour. Then regular LSD procedures (without minimum requirements), will determine which team has the choice of delivering the first or second stone in the first end.
- If a 3rd ranked team plays the other 3rd ranked team, the team with the lesser DSC has the choice of stone handle colour. Then regular LSD procedures (without minimum requirements), will determine which team has the choice of delivering the first or second stone in the first end.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xiv) Team Ranking Procedure C9 (b-iv)

The current rule says:

In the case where all counting LSDs are equal the team ranked higher in the WCF World Rankings is ranked higher.

We only publish world rankings for certain categories. We believe that the word “**official**” should be added before world ranking.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xv) Team Ranking Procedure C9 b (vi)

As we have now a new competition format for the WMDCC with 6 teams advancing to the play-offs, we have to add a new sentence into that rule. As in WMDCC the teams might or might not be from the same group, we feel there has to be a single game between the two losers of the qualification games, if they are not from the same group (as also in WMDCC there are Olympic Points to be allocated).

We recommend to change the rule C9 b (vi) to make it independent of specific competitions:

- In events where a single loss eliminates a team from the competition, teams eliminated during the same session will be listed alphabetically, by their three-letter code, and ranked equal.
- In events with a single group in the round robin and 6 qualifiers for the play-offs, the two losers of the qualification games will be ranked as follows: the team ranked higher after the round robin will be ranked 5th, the other team will be ranked 6th.
- In events with more than one group in the round robin and 6 qualifiers for the play-offs, the two losers of the qualification games will be ranked as follows: if both teams are from the same group the team ranked higher after the round robin will be ranked 5th, the other team will be ranked 6th; if the two teams are from different groups they will play a single game, the winner will be ranked 5th and the loser will be ranked 6th."

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xvi) Team Ranking C9 (f)

Last year sub-rule (f) was agreed and approved. We missed one IOC code completely, and that is DQB (Disqualified Behaving – such as Anti Doping Violation).

That code should also be added to that rule section and treated the same way as a team with a DSQ.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xvii) Ranking C9 (f)

Last year sub-rule (f) was agreed and approved. We were asked to add the order of teams listed at the end of the ranking due to DNS or DSQ.

We recommend that team(s) with a DQB (if approved above) are listed at the very end, above that DSQ and even further above team(s) with a DNS.

Within each of those codes the teams would be listed alphabetically by their 3-letter code.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

Competitions – The Playdown Systems

xviii) Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games

The rule-book currently says how the teams qualify for the Olympic and Paralympic Winter games. The qualification process is only approved by the IOC / IPC 2.5 years (approx.) before the next Winter games. Therefore, the rule in the rule book might not be correct.

We recommend to word the first bullet point for each of the three events more generic to avoid that we need to change that rule it at least twice within each Olympic cycle.

Olympic Winter Games (OWG) - Men & Women

- 10 teams for each gender... **The qualification system will be agreed between the IOC and the WCF. It will be published on the WCF website as soon as it is approved by the IOC.**

- Teams placed in one group, playing a round robin to establish the top four ranked teams.

Play-off System: Semi-finals with 1 v 4 and 2 v 3; winners play in the final (for the gold and silver medals), losers play in the bronze medal game.

Olympic Winter Games (OWG) - Mixed Doubles

- 10 teams ... **The qualification system will be agreed between the IOC and the WCF. It will be published on the WCF website as soon as it is approved by the IOC.**
- Teams placed in one group, playing a round robin to establish the top four ranked teams.

Play-off System: Semi-finals with 1 v 4 and 2 v 3; winners play in the final (for the gold and silver medals), losers play in the bronze medal game.

Paralympic Winter Games (PWG) - Mixed Gender Teams

- 12 teams ... **The qualification system will be agreed between the IPC and the WCF. It will be published on the WCF website as soon as it is approved by the IPC.**
- Teams placed in one group, playing a round robin to establish the top four ranked teams.

Play-off System: Semi-finals with 1 v 4 and 2 v 3; winners play in the final (for the gold and silver medals), losers play in the bronze medal game.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xix) World Mixed Doubles Curling Championship (WMDCC)

This needs updated as we now have a limited number of teams at the WMDCC and an additional event (WMDQE).

World Mixed Doubles Curling Championship (WMDCC)

- 20 teams ... 16 teams from the Associations which qualified from the previous WMDCC + 4 teams from the Associations which qualified through the World Mixed Doubles Qualification Event (WMDQE).
- Teams placed in two groups, playing a round robin to establish the top three teams in each group.

Play-off System: The teams ranked 1st in each group get a bye to the semi-finals. The teams ranked 2nd and 3rd in each group play in qualification games (A2 v B3 and B2 v A3). The winners of those qualification games advance to the semi-finals, with the 1st ranked team playing the lowest ranked winner (e.g. - 6th) and the 2nd ranked team playing the other team. The winners of the semi-finals play in the gold medal game, the losers of the semi-final play in the bronze medal game.

- Relegation: the bottom 2 MAs from each group will be relegated to the WMDQE in the following season.

World Mixed Doubles Qualification Event (WMDQE)

- Open to teams from Associations that have not already qualified for the next WMDCC. Four Member Associations will qualify from this event.
- The format of this “open” entry event is worked out to give every team the chance to win the event and to play as many games as possible **and practicable**.

Play-off System: If there are **less** **fewer** than 16 teams entered, there will be no play-off games played. The top 4 teams after a single round robin will qualify for the next WMDCC.

If the number of entries is more than 16, 8 teams will qualify for the play-offs. A double knock-out system will be used to qualify the 4 teams for the next WMDCC.

- The World Curling Federation reserves the right to adjust the system of play depending on the number of entries and the sheets of ice available.

At the same time we need to also remove the charts on page 52 and 53.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

Amendment 1: Royal Caledonian Curling Club

The RCCC feel that as there are two different groups to be consistent with other WCF events (ECC-B) there should be cross-over games for relegation. So the system should be

- **Relegation: the bottom MAs from each group (A10 and B10) will be relegated to the WMDQE in the following season. There will be play-off games A8vB9 and B8vA9 where the losers of these games will be relegated to the WMDQE in the following season.**

Amendment 2: Royal Caledonian Curling Club supported by Competition and Rules Commission

It is felt that in the description of the format it is not clear that fitting in as many games as possible is not the only criteria that should be considered. There are also practical considerations such as size of venue and number of days of competition. Therefore, for the wording should be:

- **The format of this “open” entry event is worked out to give every team the chance to win the event and to play as many games as possible and practicable.**

xx) Qualification – World Championships Men & Women

There are a few points missing in the part of the World Qualification Event (WQE).

We recommend to add: **All MAs who want to compete in the WQE, even if hosting, must have played in the zonal qualification event of that season.**

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xxi) Qualification – World Championships Men & Women – Americas Zone

Right now the rule-books say, that the winner of the Americas Challenge gets a spot at the WCC, the other MA qualifies for the WQE. In the case that one of the MAs from that zone finishes last at the previous World Championship, that is not true, as that zone would then lose a spot.

Change the wording to:

Americas Zone: There is one place available at the WQE for the Americas MAs (not including the host).

~~If the two MAs agree that the challenge need not be played because one MA concedes, the MA winning by forfeit qualifies for the WCC, the other MA qualifies for the WQE.~~

~~If more than two MAs are registered to play in the Americas Challenge, the challenge must be played.~~

The winning MA qualifies for the WCC, if there is a spot available, otherwise they qualify for the WQE. The 2nd ranked team of the Challenge qualifies for the WQE, but only if the winner does not already occupy that spot.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xxii) Qualification – World Championships Men & Women – Clarification on not taken slots within each zone

Right now only within the European Zone it is clearly written, what happens if an MA chooses not to accept their place at the WQE. That should be added to all zones:

Add to the Pacific-Asia Zone:

If an MA chooses not to accept their place at the WQE, then the slot will be offered to the next highest placed MA from the PACC.

Add to the Americas Zone:

If an MA chooses not to accept their place at the WQE, then the slot will be offered to the next highest placed MA from the Americas Challenge.

Also – add at the very end – who would be playing the WQE, should there be no more MAs within a zone. Our recommendation is to add:

In the event that one of the regions cannot fill up their teams at the WQE, the next highest team not already qualified in the official World Ranking will qualify for the WQE.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xxiii) Seeding teams into groups

In the playdown system it sometimes says that we use the rankings from the previous 3 years, sometimes it says based on last year's result, some other events it is not mentioned at all.

For all WCF competitions we use the system that we place the teams into the groups based on a three year ranking, as requested by the AGA.

We should add to all events where we play in multiple groups:

Rankings from the previous 3 years. MAs that did not play in those events will be ranked (at the end of the list) according to the official WCF World Ranking.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xxiv) Play-off System (clean up)

In our Rule book (page 61 and 62) we show a few play-off brackets. Some of them are no longer used and should be removed, some others which we use regularly (6-team play-off) are not shown.

This needs to be updated with the current play-off systems used at the WCF events.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xxv) Olympic and Pre-Olympic Qualification Events

This section of the rule book needs updated with the new event formats

Olympic Qualification Event (OQE) - Men & Women

- 8 teams for each gender... 1 team from the Host National Olympic Committee (NOC) + 5 teams from the NOCs which gained the most qualification points from the two previous Men's and Women's World Curling Championships but have not already qualified for the Olympic Games + **2-teams from the 2 NOCs qualified from the Pre-Olympic Qualification Event (Pre-OQE).**
- Teams placed in one group, playing a round robin to establish the top three ranked teams.

Play-off System: 1 v 2 - winner qualifies their NOC for the Olympic Winter Games.

The loser of the 1v2 game will then play the 3rd team. The winner of that game also qualifies their NOC for the Olympic Winter Games.

Pre-Olympic Qualification Event (Pre-OQE) - Men & Women

- Open to all Associations / Federations who have competed in a qualification event for the Men's / Women's World Championship in the quadrennial.
- ~~2 teams of each gender will qualify their NOC for the OQE. MA teams will play to qualify their NOC for the last two spaces in the OQE, for each gender.~~
- The format of these "open" entry events are worked out to give every team the chance to qualify their NOC for the OQE. Teams will be advised of the playing system in the Team Meeting Documents, prior to the start of play.
- The World Curling Federation reserves the right to adjust the system of play depending on the number of entries and the sheets of ice available.

Olympic Qualification Event (OQE) - Mixed Doubles

- 16 teams ... 1 team from the Host National Olympic Committee (NOC) + 15 teams from the NOCs which gained the most qualification points from the two previous World Curling Championships but have not already qualified for the Olympic Games.
- ~~2 teams will qualify their NOC for the Olympic Winter Games. MA teams will play to qualify their NOC for the last two spaces in the OQE, for each gender.~~
- The format of this event is worked out to give every team the chance to qualify their NOC for the OWG. Teams will be advised of the playing system in the Team Meeting Documents, prior to the start of play.

Recommendation:

Supported by the C&R Commission – Yes ; Supported by the Athlete Commission – Yes

xxvi) Rule Changes proposed by the Member Associations (See attached letters)

- Norwegian Curling Federation Motion 1 – time outs**
- Norwegian Curling Federation Motion 2 – number of ends**
- Austrian Curling Federation Motion 1 – uniform colour**

17. Elections

Vice-President (Europe)

Bent Ramsfjell (NOR)

Director (Position 1)

Toyo Ogawa (JPN)

18. Acceptance of a New Member Association

19. Future Meetings

Open Meetings for Member Associations will be held in Glasgow, Scotland at the World Men's Curling Championship 3-4 April 2020 (TBC)

The 2020 Annual Congress will be held (venue to be announced at 2019 Annual Congress), Open Meetings 4th and 5th September, Annual General Assembly 6th September 2020.