

J. Laurent Thibault

From: Daniel Sommer[SMTP:daniel.sommer@ivto.com]
Sent: 2000,11,01 11:40 AM
To: liamcorcoran@tinet.ie; duss@dsf.org.au; cofom@wanadoo.fr; tmlin@evta.gov.tw; schropp@muenchen.ihk.de; daniel.sommer@ivto.com; jlthibau@aztec-net.com
Subject: Dubai 2003



EB, 1.11.doc

To the members of the Executive Board

WorldSkills 2003

Dear Sirs,

In agreement with Jack, I had planned a meeting in Dubai from October 31st through November 3rd, 2000. The objective was to discuss all open issues in order to present a report at the EB meeting. Instead of confirming the meeting, Dubai informed us by phone that the UAE decided to withdraw from hosting the competition in 2003. They stated their reasons for this decision, but we asked them for a written statement. We were told to have a letter by 6, November 2000.

Jack asked me

- to make suggestions on how to avoid such short-term cancellations in the future
- to present the available options for WorldSkills 2003.

Of course the following considerations are not meant to be final. They simply should aid us in dealing with the present situation.

1. Dubai 2003

1.1 Year 1998

Just prior to the meetings in Sao Paulo (1998), the Official Delegate of BR informed us that the competition 2003 could not take place in Brazil, as was originally planned.

The Executive Board invited the members to submit new applications for hosting the competition 2003 by the end of April 1999.

While still in Sao Paulo the UAE mentioned that they would be willing to host the competition in Dubai. IT also showed interest.

President Beuk was in Dubai on December 9th and 10th, 1998. In his report to the members of the Executive Board he indicated a positive starting position. Following this several contacts between the President and the UAE took place.

Cees Beuk prepared (as a private person) a "feasibility study" on behalf of the UAE.

sub. com

- Accountability of SG to EB & Pres
- Delegated Authority to P
- Power of EB from G.A.
- Due Diligence Process
- Respective rights & Resp of WS & host members
- Policies & procedures re conflict of interest

1.2 Year 1999

An Executive Board meeting took place in Montreal on May 1st and 2nd, 1999. The proposals from both the UAE and IT were discussed and it was agreed upon that they both would be submitted to the General Assembly for their selection.

The general consensus was that a competition in Dubai would affect the region positively. The Secretary General was instructed to prepare the usual documents in time for the General Assembly and to review the proposals according to the checklist.

In October IT withdrew their proposal... for financial reasons.

During the November meeting of the Executive Board, Mr. Mahdi (UAE) presented his project based on the study prepared by Mr. Beuk. The official, legally valid application and the confirmation of observing the IVTO rules had been submitted. Critical questions were not raised. Resources which might be lacking were to be established through intensive cooperation. The General Assembly unanimously agreed to hold the 2003 competition in Dubai.

Following the competition in Montreal, Jack visited the UAE to discuss further procedures. NOV

1.3 Year 2000

Jack planned to have an EB meeting in Dubai in January 2000. It was then held in London. There was some talk about communication problems with Dubai, but in principal it was believed that the competition could be secured. Jack dealt with the further negotiations and contacts on different levels and there were further discussions during the Lisbon meetings. The religious, cultural, and social differences are large and sometimes led to difficulties in understanding each other.

2000 There was a meeting of the German speaking members in Salzburg in early September at which Jack was also present. He showed concern about the developments in Dubai and feared a fiasco for the IVTO. He believed that the competition could not take place in Dubai. However the attending members did not want to leave any stone unturned. After all, the IVTO could not cancel the competition, only Dubai could do so.

>From these discussions the idea arose that the Secretary General and the Chairman of the Technical Committee, Franz Schropp, should travel to Dubai and discuss the situation openly to submit decision-aiding information to the Executive Board. Franz Schropp and I were convinced that the 2003 Dubai competition could be secured.

2. Lessons for the future

It is the Executive Board's responsibility to learn a lesson from this. I would like to make some comments and share experiences from my point of view:

- By contract with the IVTO Brazil agreed to host the 2003 competition. There was no reaction from IVTO to the cancellation - besides regret.
- Up until the competition in Lyon the responsible representative of the member hosting the competition was the 3rd vice chairman of the IVTO. With the revision of the by-laws in 1995 this point was abolished. By doing so it was underestimated that this change would cause a lack in communication. In 1997 and 1999 this was not very important. There were

traditional contacts and cultural differences did not exist.

- Until and including the year 1999 it was the Secretary General in accordance with the President who negotiated with the members applying to host a competition. The competition in Dubai was negotiated solely by President Beuk and after the elections in November of 1999, by the new President, Jack Dusseldorp.
- In the course of 1999 problems regarding the flow of information and communication emerged. At the same time there was confusion in the UAE based on the overlapping of information and negotiations. Since Jack does not agree with my analysis I do not want to give more details at this point.

3. Options for 2003

3.1 Bozen

We contacted IT and the infrastructure in Bozen is still available. *we?*
However 5 to 6 million CHF are needed for the execution. If we can come up with the financial means the competition can take place in Bozen, South Tyrol.

3.2 Continental competitions

These kinds of competitions can be partially based on already existing infrastructures. The objective would have to be that they take place in adherence to all existing WorldSkills regulations.
A continental competition in South America might lead to new members. In Asia these types of competitions are already known. On the other hand for Africa competitions of this kind are unthinkable. In Europe this idea is viewed rather sceptically. Reasons therefore can be explained verbally.

The idea of a continental competition would currently have to be limited to 2003. Otherwise further confusion might be the result.

3.3 Trade by trade (trade-internal competition)

All members have national competitions to determine the participants for the WorldSkills Competition. Without any large investments the members - under the auspices of WorldSkills - could determine among each other, which professions in which countries should compete "internationally" in 2003. Our rules would remain the basis. From a PR perspective this type of competition (as an exception) could prove very effective, as continuous "trade competitions" would take place during the entire year in different countries.

3.4 Moving up other competitions

Finland and Japan are already committed time wise. Those members of you who have already hosted a competition will agree that moving a competition up is out of the question.

3.5 No competition

The idea of a world congress is not new. Only the competition is the unique product of our organisation. Our youth would not benefit from a congress. If there is no competition in 2003, we run the risk that present structures will disappear and financial sources will be lost. *///*

3.6 Appreciation

It must be the goal to have a competition in 2003.
- Option 3.3 a "trade by trade" competition would be most easily realized *✓*

- Option 3.2 "continental" is conceivable, if flexible solutions are accepted.
- Option 3.1 "Bozen" seems the easiest solution. However sponsors are still missing.

4. Procedure

Resolution of the General Assembly in Lisbon:

"The General Assembly notes that final decisions will be made by October 2000. The General Assembly authorizes the Executive Board to conclude the negotiations by that date.

The members will be informed about the outcome. The Technical Committee will receive detailed information during their meeting in spring 2001."

This means: the President has the competency to act. The Technical Committee can discuss questions regarding the procedures in March 2001.

A detailed project must be submitted to the General Assembly in due time for the September meeting.

It is crucial that a good alternative for 2003 is available which at the same time fits the general concept of the WorldSkills objectives.

5. Summary

We have to solve two tasks:

1. A proper analysis of the Dubai case to avoid similar mistakes in the future.
2. To seize this apparently complicated situation as a chance for developing solutions which are acceptable as alternatives on all levels.

Regards, Daniel Sommer

- Option 3.2 "continental" is conceivable, if flexible solutions are accepted.
- Option 3.1 "Bozen" seems the easiest solution. However sponsors are still missing.

4. Procedure

Resolution of the General Assembly in Lisbon:

"The General Assembly notes that final decisions will be made by October 2000. The General Assembly authorizes the Executive Board to conclude the negotiations by that date.

The members will be informed about the outcome. The Technical Committee will receive detailed information during their meeting in spring 2001."

This means: the President has the competency to act. The Technical Committee can discuss questions regarding the procedures in March 2001. A detailed project must be submitted to the General Assembly in due time for the September meeting.

It is crucial that a good alternative for 2003 is available which at the same time fits the general concept of the WorldSkills objectives.

5. Summary

We have to solve two tasks:

1. A proper analysis of the Dubai case to avoid similar mistakes in the future.
2. To seize this apparently complicated situation as a chance for developing solutions which are acceptable as alternatives on all levels.

Regards, Daniel Sommer