

A Few Comments about the Document "SUGGESTIONS / REMARKS ORGANISATION EC LASER 4.7"
(Laszlo Matyas)

I was saddened by reading this very disheartening document. Since I was named several times, here are my comments.

Let us start with the fact that I got involved with this championship only a couple of months before the event, so I have/had no knowledge, at least not first hand, about what went on before that. Overall, this was a great event, most sailors and officials went home happy and satisfied. On the other hand, this regatta put a lot of strain on the ILCA Office, the European Chair and Vice-chair, SELK (the local organizers) and the Workum Sailing Club.

This is how I see the reasons:

1. ILCA went into contractual agreement with SELK and not, as usual, with a Club. The reason was that the Workum Sailing Club (WSC) is too small to take on the burden and risk of organizing such an event. On the other hand, the ISAF-RRS 89.1 requires that a sailing club be the organizing authority, an organization like SELK cannot be. It is completely clear that in accordance with RRS 89.1 SELK can/could only be responsible for the logistics. When it comes to race management, the only organizations that carry the responsibility are the (international) Class Association and the Sailing Club that does the event (in this case WSC). Moreover, the relationship between SELK and WSC was, let us be polite, shaky most of the time. This created a very delicate and unfortunate situation for all external parties involved, as SELK did not accept that WSC could be contacted directly without the intermediation of SELK, regardless of the nature of the matter, and how significant or insignificant that matter was. Much time was spent by the Office, the Chair and Vice-chair by calming down and sorting out problems arising from this unhealthy situation.
Recommendation: Preferably ILCA should enter in contractual agreement only with partie(s) which can act as Organizing Authorities.
2. The budget submitted with the original bid and the actual budget were quite different, so as the applications were closing SELK put intensive pressure on the ILCA Office to increase the original entry numbers substantially. The Vice-chair provided detailed statistical and historical data analysis, explaining why the allocation was set as such, and why it would not be beneficial for the Class if practically all applications were accepted. Some quality filter needs to be maintained. Also, as it should be, ILCA consulted with WSC about this issue (as they were responsible for the race management) and got the advise not to increase the number of starting sailors per group to more than 70 in order to ensure fair competition for all, on all levels. However, accepting the financial needs of SELK, the entry limits were increased to 420 overall.
Recommendation: When evaluating the championship application bids, the budget proposals need to be evaluated much more seriously, how realistic they are, etc. A

European Championships cannot be run on a balanced budget without serious sponsorship. The budget proposals need to be scrutinized from the point of view of how realistic expected sponsorship revenues are.

Now turning to the comments about the ILCA representative – who happened to be me, and who was cited by name in the document quite a few times.

(A) I made a few suggestions to the WSC and not SELK about the web-site, things that may be improved, are difficult to find, etc. This was made in good faith, and this was when I realized how bad the relationship was between WSC and SELK.

(B) I indeed filed daily reports about the event on the ILCA web-site: along with pictures and links to the race tracking each time, plus one report on day 0 and one for the prize giving - 8 posts altogether. Why would I need to consult on this with the organizers? These reports were my reports, and not the organizer's reports. The current year I reported on the ILCA and ISAF web-page from a large number of events, and I got thanks from all sides, but SELK, which seemingly (I learn it now, four months later) objected. Hard to comprehend! Moreover, if they had any problem, why wouldn't they discuss their concerns with me on site, at the time.

(C) At the closing ceremony I thanked warmly in private and public WSC, SELK, the volunteers and all involved. In all the ILCA web-site daily posts I made positive comments about the organizers, the site and the race committee. It is unclear to me what else did SELK expect. As for the plaque, it has always been given to the Club hosting the event.

(D) Sorry to say, but the document by SELK, although has some point worth considering, is full of insinuations, allegations, bad faith and is as accurate as the way they spell the ILCA representative's name (wrongly). Just to give a concrete example which concerns me: they claim that: *"costs for Jury, ILCA measurer and ILCA representative (Hotel costs for these persons alone were approx € 7000,--)"* - I was the ILCA representative, and absolutely none of my costs incurred were picked up by the organizers. I was a volunteer both in time and in all travel and on-site costs. Actually, I never ever claimed any cost on ILCA or any organizer, or by the way, anybody else, related to my ILCA activities. This claim is an outrageous insinuation.

The SELK document states the following comments (amongst others) in their conclusion:

- *"respect your contract partner and be aware with whom you communicate"* – quite interesting comment as the current document is not even signed, thus there is no one taking responsibility for the allegations;
- *"open and fair communication is highly recommended..."* – yet SELK is the one who shows up 4 months later with problems. I wonder what is open about it. Another example: open and fair communication also means that when it gets to communication about matters related to race management, all partners involved should be included. The worst miscommunication was posting a changed set of Sailing Instructions on the local event website without informing or even discussing this with the organizing authorities (ILCA and WSC);
- *"show respect... and... be polite"* ...no comment really. The document is anything but respectful or polite.

October 24, 2011

I strongly object to this language and approach which I find deplorable. The (anonymous) authors of the document fairly request some respect, but forget to show some. Maybe the communication between the authors of the document and the volunteers participating in this event (including the ILCA representative) should also be improved.