

1st Winter Youth Olympic Games in 2012

REPORT OF THE IOC PANEL OF EXPERTS

Lausanne, 2 July 2008



© IOC July 2008 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED



Table of contents

Introduction.....	3
1 → HARBIN.....	9
2 → INNSBRUCK.....	12
3 → KUOPIO.....	15
4 → LILLEHAMMER.....	18
Conclusion.....	21



Introduction

Introduction

PREAMBLE AND COMPOSITION OF THE PANEL OF EXPERTS

Following the decision taken at the IOC Session in Guatemala in July 2007 to implement the Youth Olympic Games (YOG) project, the IOC launched the bid process for the 1st Winter Youth Olympic Games in 2012.

In the context of the YOG 2012 bid process, the IOC President appointed a number of experts, including representatives from the IOC, the International Federations (IFs), National Olympic Committees (NOCs) and the IOC Athletes' Commission, and established an IOC Panel of Experts composed of the following persons (in alphabetical order):

Ms Jacqueline BARRETT	IOC Head of Bid City Relations IOC OCOG Liaison for Culture and Education
Professor Philippe BOVY	IOC Transport advisor Retired Professor of transportation, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Lausanne Member of the IOC Evaluation Commission (2012/2014) Member of the IOC Candidature Acceptance Working Groups (2008 – 2014) Member of the IOC Panel of Experts, Youth Olympic Games 2010
Mr Christophe DUBI	IOC Sports Director
Mr Gilbert FELLI	IOC Olympic Games Executive Director
Mr Essar GABRIEL	Head of the Youth Olympic Games
Gian Franco KASPER	IOC Member President of the International Ski Federation Member, IOC Coordination Commissions for the Olympic Winter Games (2002, 2006, 2010) Member, IOC Radio and Television Commission
Mr Victor KHOTOCHKIN	First Vice-President of the Russian Olympic Committee Member of the Supervisory Board for the Olympic Winter Games Sochi 2014

Continued on next page



Introduction, Continued

- Mr Martin RUTISHAUSER** Secretary General, Swiss Olympic Association
Member of the EYOF Commission of the European Olympic Committee
Chairman, Coordination Commissions for the Winter EYOF 2005 and 2009
- Mr Thierry SPRUNGER** IOC Finance and Administration Director
- Mr Etienne THOBOIS** Olympian, Badminton (1996)
Chief Executive Officer, 2007 IRB Rugby World Cup
Planning and Sports Director, Paris 2012
Finance and Public Services Director, IAAF World Championship Athletics (2003)
Member of the IOC Panel of Experts, Youth Olympic Games 2010
Member of the IOC Candidature Acceptance Working Group (2016)
- Ms Pernilla WIBERG** Nine Olympic and World Championship medals (alpine skiing)
IOC Member
Member, IOC Athletes' Commission, Ethics Commission and Nominations Commission
Member, IOC Evaluation Commission and Coordination Commission (2010)

The IOC has verified that none of the above-mentioned persons have been commissioned by any YOG Candidate City. Their studies and reports have been carried out and submitted in full independence.

2012 YOG CANDIDATE CITIES

Four cities ("YOG Candidate Cities") have submitted YOG Candidature Files to become the host city of the 1st Winter Youth Olympic Games in 2012. In alphabetical order, the 2012 YOG Candidate Cities are:

- Harbin (CHN)
- Innsbruck (AUT)
- Kuopio (FIN)
- Lillehammer (NOR)

Continued on next page



Introduction, Continued

In order to assist YOG Candidate Cities in replying to the IOC Questionnaire, the following services were provided by the IOC:

- **Youth Olympic Games Event Manual** which outlines the key principles as well as the obligations relating to the organisation of the Youth Olympic Games. As an appendix to the YOG Host City Contract, the Event Manual contains contractual requirements;
- **A workshop held in Lausanne from 27-28 March 2008:** the aim of the workshop was to brief the cities on IOC requirements and to assist them in understanding the concept and scope of organising the Youth Olympic Games;
- **Access to the IOC's Olympic Games Knowledge Management database** which holds detailed information and statistics on previous editions of the Olympic Games.

All four YOG Candidate Cities replied to the IOC's questionnaire and submitted the following documents within the deadline set by the IOC (19 June 2008):

- Candidature Files
- Guarantees Files
- Photographic Files
- Maps
- CD ROMs containing electronic versions of the candidature file, photographic files and maps.

GENERAL REMARK

The panel of experts would like to commend all YOG Candidate Cities on the work achieved through their candidature. The panel was impressed by the level of detail shown throughout the documents provided by the cities but noted that it may have been difficult for cities to obtain all guarantees necessary to substantiate their projects in such a short period of time (3,5 months). The panel would also like to acknowledge the significant level of commitment and support obtained from public authorities by the YOG Candidate Cities.

Following the panel's assessment of the 2012 YOG Candidate Cities and its recommendation to the IOC Executive Board, the short-listed cities will be evaluated by an IOC Evaluation Commission which will further investigate the areas of risk highlighted in this document and produce a report on the basis of which the IOC Executive Board will put forward the names of the cities to be put to the vote by all IOC members.

Continued on next page



Introduction, Continued

PANEL OF EXPERTS' MEETING AND METHODS OF ASSESSMENT

The panel of experts met in Lausanne from 30 June to 2 July 2008.

As a first-time assessment of the Winter Youth Olympic Games, the panel of experts began discussing the methods it would apply to its analysis of the projects put forward by the four YOG Candidate Cities. Through these discussions, it became clear that the Winter Youth Olympic Games concept as developed by the IOC contains a certain level of flexibility in the way it could be applied to any one city.

The panel noted that the four YOG Candidate Cities have proposed diverse projects in terms of number of sports, disciplines and events in line with the facilities available and geographical layout of the local environment. It therefore came to the conclusion that the analysis of the YOG 2012 projects should not be made against a pre-determined benchmark, but **each project should rather be assessed in relation to the concept of the Youth Olympic Games as defined by the IOC Session in Guatemala as well as within the context of minimising the risk associated with hosting the 1st Winter Youth Olympic Games in 2012.**

Through an analysis of the risks and opportunities included in each of the four bids, the panel endeavoured to assess how the YOG concept had been applied to each city's own context whilst placing a strong emphasis on the level of quality and detail relating to the technical aspects of the candidature files, thus giving an indication on the robustness of the project.

The panel of experts based its analysis on the information contained in the YOG Candidature Files and other documents submitted by the YOG Candidate Cities and assessed the YOG Candidate Cities on the basis of a number of themes including, but not limited to guarantees & legal matters, general infrastructure, sport and venues, culture and education, Youth Olympic Village, transport, security, accommodation and finance.

In drawing its conclusion, the panel believed it should highlight each city's qualities in relation to the individual project it has proposed in response to the IOC's questionnaire and YOG concept and the risks and opportunities presented in terms of jointly developing the project with the IOC to achieve successful Games in 2012. The panel expressed its recommendation to the IOC Executive Board, and in due course to the IOC Members, to bear in mind two principles when taking their decisions with regards to the 2012 Youth Olympic Games:

- given the timeframe available to organise the event (3 years) and the fact that 2012 will be the 1st Winter Youth Olympic Games, the choice of the host city should take into account both the robustness of the technical aspects of the project and the extent of assimilation of the YOG concept and philosophy to achieve successful Winter Youth Olympic Games in 2012
- the philosophy behind the IOC's decision to organise Youth Olympic Games at the IOC Session in Guatemala to develop an event that could also be hosted by cities/countries smaller than those that can host the Olympic Games should be taken into account



General comments

General comments

The panel's assessment of each of the four YOG Candidate Cities for the 1st Winter Youth Olympic Games in 2012 follows. Before entering the body of the report which is organised city by city, the panel would like to make a number of general comments concerning all cities and identify some of the elements taken into consideration in its assessment.

In terms of governance, the panel of experts identified and assessed the level of involvement of the national, regional and local authorities in each city's Youth Olympic Games project through a thorough analysis of the guarantees provided with the candidature files. Particular attention was focused on guarantees pertaining to customs and immigration, the protection of Olympic intellectual property and overall financial commitments.

In its analysis of the sport and venue concepts, the panel noted that the dates proposed by all YOG Candidate Cities correspond to IOC requirements. In terms of experience from past sporting events, the panel took into consideration events hosted in the last ten years. The panel would also like to underline that all cities would be required to provide the necessary emergency services at all competition venues for the Winter Youth Olympic Games in accordance with individual IF regulations. Finally, the panel concluded that, based on existing infrastructure and each city's proposed event programme, all four Candidate Cities would, in terms of sports and venues, have the capacity to organise the Winter Youth Olympic Games.

The assessment of the Youth Olympic Village (YOV) was based on a number of parameters including overall concept and location in relation to other Youth Olympic Games venues. Some of the elements taken into consideration were the type and size of accommodation, whether the village infrastructure already exists or whether it would require new construction and the general atmosphere and suitability of the YOYV in relation to the IOC's YOG concept.

The panel of experts based its analysis of culture and education on the content and vision of the programmes proposed by each Candidate City, in line with IOC expectations in these fields. In evaluating culture and education, the following elements were taken into consideration:

- programme content (pre-Games, Games-time and post-Games)
- audience understanding and level of interactivity
- integration of the eight themes identified by the IOC
- digital platform and global reach
- proposed venues

The panel assessed each city's capacity to reach all audiences identified by the IOC with a particular emphasis on YOG participants, as well as local and international youth communities.

In terms of general infrastructure, the panel based its analysis on the following parameters:

- **Transport** - international access to the candidate city (mainly by air) and overall capacity to absorb Games-time traffic based on the infrastructure in place. Given the size of the Winter Youth Olympic Games, traffic demands should be considerably lower than on any high season peak day in the city. In addition, indoor venue capacities are relatively low and for outdoor venues, the generation of spectator traffic will vary greatly according to the attractiveness of each sport in any given city. All travel times in the report are indicated for travel by bus.
- **Technology** - level of existing infrastructure and interconnectivity between Olympic sites. Whilst further details would be required to fully determine each city's infrastructure, the panel does not foresee any major issues in terms of technology.
- **Main Media Centre (MMC)** - location, type of building and size.

Continued on next page



General comments, Continued

In its analysis of accommodation, the panel used the information included in both the candidature files and the guarantees provided by each Candidate City. The following elements were taken into account:

- a city's overall existing room capacity within a radius of 20 km of the city centre and within 10 km of any major competition cluster
- number rooms/beds guaranteed
- overall accommodation plan concept, including geographical distribution
- maximum room rates

In terms of security, the panel considered the following elements:

- the experience of the city/country in hosting events involving large numbers of spectators and/or dignitaries
- the proposed command and control structure
- security guarantees provided

Finally, in assessing the financial aspects of each bid, the panel of experts aimed to determine whether a Candidate City would be able to provide the necessary financial support and guarantees required to organise Winter Youth Olympic Games in 2012. The financial analysis focused on the robustness of the financial guarantees provided to cover any potential economic shortfall in the YOGOC budget as well as the reasonableness of the budget developed to support operations and level of services proposed in the candidature files. Investment requirements for general infrastructure and/or venues are not included in the YOGOC budget but were analysed for competition venues, culture and education venues, Youth Olympic Village (YOV) and Main Media Centre (MMC).



1 → HARBIN

HARBIN REPORT

Harbin is the capital of China's Heilongjiang Province, with a population of approximately 2.6 million. Harbin's bid enjoys strong municipal and provincial support and the involvement of the Chinese NOC. Should Harbin be awarded the Winter Youth Olympic Games, it is unclear what the proposed legal status of the Youth Olympic Games Organising Committee (YOGOC) would be.

Whilst Harbin has provided reasonable guarantees overall, a number of clarifications would be required as indicated throughout this report.

All guarantees pertaining to customs and immigration have been provided by Heilongjiang Province – these matters would however normally be under the responsibility of the national government.

Intellectual property protection has only been guaranteed at the municipal level. The panel of experts therefore questions whether the regulations in place for the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games will continue to apply through to 2012. In addition, the bid committee states that it would only register Harbin 2012 word marks and domain names if Harbin is awarded the Games.

Based on an 84-event competition schedule, (including a number of events that are not particularly adapted to youth competitions), Harbin proposes a dispersed venue concept across three main areas: Harbin, Mao Ershan (70 km from Harbin) and Yabuli (150 km from Harbin). With three planned Youth Olympic Villages, average distances and travel times to venues from the respective athletes' accommodation would be 4 km and under 12 minutes. Of the 13 competition venues proposed, 12 venues already exist and 1 would be constructed as a permanent venue (Bobsleigh and Luge track).

Harbin has good experience in hosting international and national events in ice sports (with the exception of sliding events), but limited experience in hosting snow sports events. Experience in international multi-sport events should be gained during the Winter Universiade in 2009.

It should be noted that the climatic data provided in Harbin's candidature file do not seem representative of actual conditions in the proposed mountain areas and information on snow making capabilities may be required.

Construction timelines for the track do not appear sufficient to take into account the period required for testing and, whilst a guarantee has been provided by the Municipality of Harbin for the construction of the Bobsleigh and Luge track, construction costs are estimated at USD 4 million which appears to be very low. More information would be required to determine how this figure was reached. In addition, no guarantees were provided to substantiate the funding of temporary works at competition venues, amounting to USD 214 million, from the various bodies indicated in the candidature file.

Continued on next page



HARBIN REPORT, Continued

Harbin's three-village concept could present difficulties for both the NOCs and the YOGOC. The NOCs would face the challenges of managing numbers of team officials between the three villages and of fostering team spirit. The YOGOC's challenge would be to find a way to unify all YOG participants while ensuring identical service levels in the three village locations. The Harbin village would consist of existing university accommodation with sufficient capacity to allow for contingency. Whilst the Mao Ershan village would provide adequate capacity to host proposed residents, clarification would be required to understand the acquisition of hotel rooms/beds for possible use by YOG participants in the Yabuli village. While a guarantee from the owner of the Harbin Youth Olympic Village has been submitted, guarantees for the two sub-villages are not mentioned.

In terms of operations, clarification would be required to better understand the layouts of both sub-villages as well as village management, with a particular emphasis on the implementation of culture and education activities. Further clarification would also be required regarding the bed to bath ratio in each village.

The Harbin bid committee has guaranteed a low maximum price of USD 45 per person per day at the Youth Olympic Villages including accommodation, three meals a day and all taxes and commissions.

The proposed culture and education programme largely focuses on sustainable development, targeting the 1.5 million youth living in the Harbin area. Key elements required by the IOC have not been included and the programme generally lacks detail and creativity. Specific athlete-related programmes have not been identified and digital media is not proposed as a vehicle for the culture and education programme. Whilst a good pre-Games programme is proposed to target national and regional Chinese students, the candidature file lacks detail regarding pre-Games initiatives for YOG participants and no specific legacy initiatives are indicated.

The majority of culture and education activities would take place in Harbin, in the Youth Olympic Village and in a number of existing venues/institutions. Given that Harbin's concept includes three villages, participants staying in the Yabuli and Mao Ershan villages may have difficulty in participating in the education and cultural programme.

The culture and education budget proposed is considered to be adequate for the projects outlined in the candidature file.

Harbin has plans for three media facilities: the Harbin MMC to be located within the existing Heilongjiang Provincial Broadcasting & TV Centre, a sub-MMC near the Yabuli snow venues and a sub-MMC near the Mao Ershan venue complex. The proposed Yabuli sub-MMC seems to be an existing facility and no details were provided for the Mao Ershan sub-MMC. Further details regarding size, use of space and services would be required for all media facilities.

Harbin is greatly improving its main transport infrastructure. Although not directly required by an event such as the Youth Olympic Games, major transport investments are planned by 2012: two metro lines and the fourth Harbin ring road. Access to Harbin by air is adequate with frequent connections with Beijing Capital Airport.

The 195 km road link and a new express rail line both offer comfortable 2 to 2.5-hour travel times between Harbin and Yabuli Sports Centre. With adequate traffic management measures, the ample transport infrastructure would cope with all YOG travel demands.

Continued on next page



HARBIN REPORT, Continued

The total existing hotel capacity within a 20 km radius of Harbin is 10,984 rooms, of which 5,492 have been guaranteed, mostly within a 10 km radius of the city centre. Within a 10 km radius of the snow sports sub-village in Yabuli, 352 rooms have been guaranteed. Even if the number of overall guaranteed rooms largely covers Winter Youth Olympic Games accommodation needs, the panel of experts is concerned by the relatively small number of rooms that have been guaranteed in the Yabuli area. Due to the distance between Harbin and Yabuli, further information would need to be provided regarding the proposed accommodation allocation plan as daily commuting between the two cities would appear to be rather difficult. No guarantees have been provided by individual hotel owners although a general guarantee has been provided by the Harbin Tourism Bureau concerning room availability and “no minimum stay” policy. Furthermore, no information regarding room rates was provided.

Whilst the YOGOC would bear the cost of emergency medical care, participants would be required to take out their own medical insurance, contrary to IOC requirements.

Although the candidature file states that responsibility for security would lie with the Director General of Heilongjiang Provincial Department of Public Security, the security guarantee has been provided by the Harbin Security Bureau. Heilongjiang Province and Harbin have a high level of experience in the management of large events.

Harbin has presented a YOGOC expenditure budget of USD 43 million and identified potential revenues of USD 42 million. Sufficient financial guarantees have not been provided to back up all financial commitments made in the candidature file (e.g. USD 15 million government subsidies). Whilst the panel of experts believes that revenue targets may be optimistic, some of the expenditure line items may have been over scoped, thus possibly allowing for some reductions.

The City of Harbin has guaranteed to cover any potential economic shortfall in the YOCOG budget.



2 → INNSBRUCK

INNSBRUCK REPORT

Innsbruck is the capital of the Tyrol region of Austria, with a population of approximately 118,000. The Innsbruck bid enjoys strong government support, demonstrated by a government multi-party agreement which determines the financial responsibilities of all levels of government (national, regional and local). The Austrian Olympic Committee is also a signatory to the multi-party agreement. Should Innsbruck be awarded the Winter Youth Olympic Games, the Youth Olympic Games Organising Committee (YOGOC) would take the form of a limited liability company involving the three levels of government as well as the NOC.

Innsbruck has generally provided strong and comprehensive guarantees. A number of clarifications would however be required as indicated throughout this report.

Whilst access to the country is guaranteed for accredited persons, there appears to be a discrepancy between the candidature file and the guarantee provided by the Austrian government in terms of what documents would be required to enter the country (passport + visa vs. passport + accreditation card). It is also unclear whether visas would be issued free of charge. As Austria is part of the Schengen zone, clarification would be required to understand what agreements the Austrian government would reach with other Schengen states in order to ensure free entry for Youth Olympic Games participants entering the Schengen zone through other member states.

The Minister of Finance guarantees that all necessary steps would be taken to ensure the temporary importation of goods free of customs duties.

In addition to general trademark legislation, Olympic trademarks and word marks are protected by the Austrian Federal Law for Protection of Olympic Emblems and Markings.

Based on a 64-event competition schedule, Innsbruck proposes a compact Games concept composed of two main clusters, Innsbruck and Seefeld, 28 km apart, and a single Youth Olympic Village (YOV). Average distances and travel times to venues from the Youth Olympic Village would be approximately 15 km and 25 minutes, with the furthest venues located approximately 35 minutes from the village (Cross Country, Biathlon, Ski Jumping, Nordic Combined, Freestyle Skiing and Snowboarding). Of the 12 competition venues proposed, 10 venues already exist, 1 (Curling) would be a temporary set-up within the existing venue hosting the MMC and 1 (Biathlon) would be built as a temporary venue.

Innsbruck has a very good level of experience in hosting international events in snow and ice sports, as well as international multi-sport events.

All guarantees have been submitted and clearly state how works would be funded with the exception of the guarantee for Nordpark Innsbruck (Halfpipe and Moguls) which has not been provided. In addition, a number of venue guarantees state that rental costs are to be determined which could have an impact on the budget.

Continued on next page



INNSBRUCK REPORT, Continued

Innsbruck proposes a good one-village concept comprising eight residential buildings to be constructed and a number of existing buildings that would deliver all necessary services on the site of a military compound. The village would be situated near the city centre, hospital and venues. Whilst the City of Innsbruck has guaranteed to secure EUR 58 million (USD 87 million) for the development of the village, negotiations are still currently underway to guarantee acquisition of the land required for the YOY from the Ministry of Defence, should Innsbruck be selected as a shortlisted Candidate City. A detailed analysis of the proposed construction framework would need to be carried out. In terms of operations, further clarification would be required to better understand the plan to house a large number of beds within individual apartments and how to address the issue of the bed to bath ratio.

The Innsbruck Bid Committee has guaranteed a maximum price of USD 198 per person per day at the Youth Olympic Village including accommodation, catering costs and taxes.

A very well thought-out culture and education programme is proposed, covering all themes required by the IOC and targeting all audiences. Operational aspects are detailed and well planned with an emphasis on the use of digital media as a vehicle for the programme. The cultural programme focuses on creating a young and festive atmosphere in the city around the centrally-located medals plaza. A comprehensive education programme is put forward, though perhaps slightly ambitious in terms of compatibility with the sports schedule. The programme would begin three years ahead of the Games for all target groups. Legacy initiatives are well explained and include transfer of knowledge elements to future YOGOCs.

Culture and education activities would take place in a central hub within the Innsbruck Congress Centre in close proximity to the Youth Olympic Village, with additional activities planned at the village and at competition venues. The venue guarantees provided specify that rental costs are still to be determined which could present financial risk. The culture and education budget appears to be on the low side and clarification would be required regarding the roles and financial responsibilities of non-YOGOC partners.

The Main Media Centre (MMC) would be located within the Innsbruck Exhibition Centre (IEC), very close to the Youth Olympic Village. The IEC currently consists of 41,500 m² including press facilities, two restaurants, a 500-seat auditorium and outdoor spaces. The surface allocated to the MMC would be approximately 2,700 m², plus external areas. In addition to the MMC, the IEC would also house the Curling competition venue and the Ice Skating training rink. The IEC is scheduled to undergo a full renovation between 2008 and 2011 at a cost of USD 43.5 million, which has been guaranteed by the "Congress und Messe Innsbruck GmbH".

Innsbruck has a well-balanced road and public transport system with good connections to neighbouring resorts, including Seefeld. Transport systems and traffic management, including Innsbruck International Airport, are capable of comfortably and successfully handling large crowds as demonstrated during other mega events hosted in Innsbruck. No additional transport infrastructure or upgrades would be required to host the Winter Youth Olympic Games.

The total existing hotel capacity within a 20 km radius of Innsbruck is 4,537 rooms, of which 2,000 have been guaranteed. In addition, the city's overall inventory and the extra 4,591 rooms located within 10 km of Seefeld would offer plenty of additional capacity if required. Individual hotel guarantees have been provided and the "Innsbruck Information und Reservierung GmbH" has further guaranteed that all IOC accommodation requirements would be met. The room rates guaranteed by the individual hotels appear reasonable.

Continued on next page



INNSBRUCK REPORT, Continued

All necessary medical care for accredited persons would be provided free of charge from the opening to the closing of the Youth Olympic Village.

Responsibility in terms of security would lie with the Federal Ministry of the Interior. Austria and Innsbruck have a high level of experience in the management of large events. The guarantee provided by the Federal Minister of the Interior covers IOC requirements.

Innsbruck presents a balanced YOGOC budget of USD 22.5 million, on the basis of the cost of the Winter Universiade hosted by Innsbruck in 2005. In anticipation of a higher level of event service delivery, the bid committee states that the subsidies provided by the three levels of government were increased by 45% compared to those provided for the Universiade.

As set out in the multiparty agreement, the Republic of Austria, the State of Tyrol and the City of Innsbruck guarantee "a joint solution to secure the organisation of the Youth Olympic Games at the minimal level of service prescribed by the IOC".



3 → KUOPIO

KUOPIO REPORT

Kuopio is a university town in Central Eastern Finland, with a population of approximately 90,000. Kuopio enjoys strong local government support with the City of Kuopio responsible for providing 45% of the YOGOC budget as well as the shortfall guarantee. Regional government involvement is unclear and no guarantee has been provided to back up the national financial commitment of EUR 1 million indicated in the YOGOC budget. Should Kuopio be awarded the Winter Youth Olympic Games, the YOGOC would take the form of a non-profit association led by the City of Kuopio and the Finnish NOC.

Whilst Kuopio has provided reasonable guarantees overall, a number of clarifications would be required as indicated throughout this report.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs guarantees that visas would be issued without discrimination but does not mention that such visas would be issued free of charge. As Finland is part of the Schengen zone, clarification would be required to understand what agreements the Finnish government would reach with other Schengen states in order to ensure free entry for Youth Olympic Games participants entering the Schengen zone through other member states.

The Finnish National Board of Customs states that it would facilitate the import, use and export of goods but does not mention that this would be free of customs duties.

Olympic-related marks and designations are protected within the framework of existing design copyright and trademark laws in Finland. Kuopio has only managed to secure the domain name kuopio2012.fi as domain names with extensions .com .net and .org have already been registered by a third party.

Based on a 59-event competition schedule, Kuopio proposes a Games concept with a single Youth Olympic Village and venues distributed across four main areas including two snow sports clusters (Tahko Ski Centre, 64 km from Kuopio and Puijo Ski Station, 5 km away). Average distances and travel times to venues from the Youth Olympic Village would be approximately 24 km and 25 minutes, with the furthest venue located approximately 75 minutes from the village (Luge). Kuopio's schedule does not include Bobsleigh as no venue exists. The bid committee however proposes to organise Luge events on an existing natural track located 90 km from the Youth Olympic Village. Alpine Skiing events would only include Slalom and Giant Slalom as Tahko Ski Centre offers a maximum vertical drop of 200 m. Out of the 8 competition venues proposed, 7 venues already exist (one of which requires permanent works) and 1 would be constructed as a permanent venue (Speed Skating).

Kuopio has a good level of experience in hosting international sports events (Ski Jumping and Cross Country World Cups), but not in all disciplines featured at the Winter Youth Olympic Games.

Permanent works amounting to USD 1.6 million are indicated in the candidature file as required at the existing Puijo Ski Stadium. However, as no decision has yet been made on the financial responsibility for these works, no guarantee has been provided. In addition, no temporary works have been included in the candidature file. A review of all temporary overlay needs would be required to ensure that sufficient budget is allocated in this regard.

Continued on next page



KUOPIO REPORT, Continued

Kuopio proposes a good one-village concept and layout comprising of existing student housing. The village is well situated, approximately 4 km from the city centre. In terms of operations, further clarification would be required to better understand the types of units provided (i.e. number of bedrooms and bed to bath ratio).

The maximum price of USD 144 per person per day at the Youth Olympic Village, including accommodation, full board, taxes and commissions, has not been guaranteed by the bid committee.

Kuopio's approach to the culture and education programme corresponds to the IOC's philosophy for the Youth Olympic Games, with a majority of themes required by the IOC being addressed, though some areas somewhat lack detail. The programme would combine cultural and educational elements with an emphasis on activities for the local youth. The programme is planned to begin two years before the Games for all target groups. The virtual classroom project is a good educational initiative in line with the IOC's objectives. It has the potential to provide an excellent legacy, though is rather limited in scope targeting only 5-10 countries. The cultural programme focuses on creating a young and festive atmosphere in the city around the centrally-located medals plaza. The leveraging of existing digital tools could in general be further developed to enhance the programme.

The majority of culture and education activities would take place within a number of venues approximately 5 km from the Youth Olympic Village, as well as at the village itself.

In view of the low culture and education budget provision, the panel of experts believes it may be challenging to deliver the programme as described in the candidature file.

The Main Media Centre (MMC) would be located in an existing multi-purpose facility (Kuopio Hall), 8 km from the Youth Olympic Village. Kuopio Hall includes a 1,300-seat auditorium and a cafeteria. The surface allocated to the MMC would be 3,000 m² (out of a total of 14,400m²). As two competition venues (Short Track and Figure Skating) are also planned to be located within Kuopio Hall, specific noise and climate control as well as operational considerations would need to be further described.

Kuopio is well connected to Helsinki by road, rail (4.5 hours travel time) and air. Kuopio has a small airport with eight daily connections to Helsinki. Tahko Ski Centre (60km away) and the natural luge track (90km away) are linked to Kuopio by provincial roads. With adequate traffic management measures, existing transport infrastructure should be able to cope with all YOG travel demands.

The total existing hotel capacity within a 20 km radius of Kuopio is approximately 1,300 rooms, most of which have been guaranteed. In a 10 km radius of the Tahko Ski Centre, additional capacity of 200 hotel rooms exist, of which 167 have been guaranteed. Whilst the number of guaranteed hotel rooms is slightly under the number of rooms recommended by the IOC, the bid committee mentions that alternative existing accommodation opportunities exist, especially in the Tahko Ski Centre area with 3,500 beds in holiday homes. Individual hotel guarantees have been provided.

Should Kuopio be selected as a shortlisted Candidate City, more information concerning the accommodation allocation plan would be required in order to have a better understanding of the split in operational needs between the Kuopio and Tahko Ski Centre areas. More information on the alternative accommodation opportunities in terms of quality, geographical distribution and rates would also be required.

The room rates guaranteed by the individual hotels appear reasonable.

Continued on next page



KUOPIO REPORT, Continued

Clarification would be required as to the type and cost of medical care to be provided for accredited persons.

Responsibility in terms of security would lie with the Police Command of the Province of Eastern Finland but it would be important to define the precise responsibilities of the cooperation partners mentioned in the candidature file. Whilst the level of experience of the Police Command of the Province of Eastern Finland is unclear, Finland has a high level of experience in managing large events. The guarantee provided by Police Command of the Province of Eastern Finland covers IOC requirements.

Kuopio presents a balanced YOGOC budget of USD 13.6 million. The panel of experts questions Kuopio's ability to deliver the required service levels and operational requirements of the Winter Youth Olympic Games within the proposed financial envelope.

The guarantee provided by the City of Kuopio to cover any potential economic shortfall of the YOGOC budget is limited to a maximum of EUR 300,000 (USD 469,000).



4 → LILLEHAMMER

LILLEHAMMER REPORT

The Municipality of Lillehammer, located in the Oppland County of Norway, has a population of approximately 25,000. Both Lillehammer and the regional authorities support the Youth Olympic Games project through the provision of venues. Lillehammer also enjoys the support of the Norwegian NOC. Should Lillehammer be awarded the Winter Youth Olympic Games, the YOGOC would take the form of a private limited liability company involving the city and NOC. The government would also be invited to join.

The Lillehammer bid presents a financial risk as no guarantees have been provided to substantiate a national government subsidy of USD 19 million included in the YOGOC budget nor to cover any potential economic shortfall of the YOGOC budget. According to the Lillehammer bid committee, the request for such guarantees would only be submitted for approval at this autumn's legislative session, with a decision expected in late October 2008. In addition, many guarantees are still outstanding and/or under discussion.

Whilst the Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion guarantees that visa applications would be handled rapidly and without reservations, there is no mention that such visas would be issued free of charge. As Norway is part of the Schengen zone, clarification would be required to understand what agreements the Norwegian government would reach with other Schengen states in order to ensure free entry for Youth Olympic Games participants entering the Schengen zone through other member states.

The Norwegian Customs and Excise Services' guarantee allowing the temporary import of goods free of customs duties makes reference to a number of exemptions including some consumables and firearms which would need to be further clarified.

Whilst the bid committee states that legislation may be required to protect the Youth Olympic Games event and its commercial partners, the required guarantees have not been delivered. Lillehammer has only secured the domain name lillehammer2012.no – domain names with extensions .com .net and .org have not been secured as required by the IOC.

Based on a 56-event competition schedule, Lillehammer proposes a Games concept with a single Youth Olympic Village and venues distributed across three main areas: Lillehammer, Hamar (65 km from Lillehammer) and Hafjell (18 km away). Average distances and travel times to venues from the Youth Olympic Village would be approximately 20 km and 25 minutes, with the furthest venues located approximately 65 minutes from the village (Skating). Of the 9 competition venues proposed, 8 venues already exist (of which 4 would require permanent works) and 1 (Curling) would be constructed as a permanent venue.

Whilst the candidature file states that the investment of USD 8 million to construct the new permanent curling venue has already been approved by the Board of Directors of Lillehammer Municipality, no guarantee has been provided. In addition, a number of venue guarantees state that rental costs are to be determined which could have an impact on the budget.

Lillehammer has a very good level of experience in hosting international sports events (World Cups in Ski Jumping, Alpine, Cross Country, Speed and Figure Skating, Bobsleigh and Luge), as well as in multi-sports events.

Continued on next page



LILLEHAMMER REPORT, Continued

Lillehammer proposes a good one-village concept that would comprise a mix of new construction and existing buildings. The village is well situated among competition and non-competition venues with the exception of the skating venues. Further clarification would be required to better understand the quality of the proposed existing housing facilities. No financial or construction guarantees for the Youth Olympic Village were provided and a detailed analysis of the proposed construction framework would need to be carried out.

In terms of operations, whilst room layouts in the buildings to be constructed would provide three beds per apartment and a good bed to bath ratio, further information would be required to understand the concepts proposed for housing athletes in equal conditions in both the existing buildings and planned temporary sleeping units. There is also a concern regarding the limited contingency capacity that would be available.

The maximum price of USD 400 per person per day at the Youth Olympic Village seems particularly high and the price has not been guaranteed by the bid committee.

Lillehammer's culture and education proposal lacks detail and creativity. The Games-time cultural programme would provide for a festive atmosphere with activities focused around the Medals Plaza. Whilst a number of target audiences have been identified, Lillehammer's programme does not appear to respond fully to the IOC's concept in terms of reach. The use of digital media would need to be further developed to ensure that the programme is widely disseminated.

The intention to create pre-Games programmes and legacy initiatives is mentioned, but no details are provided. Culture and education activities would take place within a number of venues in Lillehammer, including within the Olympic Village. The relevant guarantees have been provided, although for some venues, the period of availability would have to be verified.

Further details would be required concerning programme content in order to assess the budget put forward.

The Main Media Centre (MMC) would be centrally located near the Youth Olympic Village. The proposed MMC venue is currently used as a High School and is owned by the County of Oppland. The existing buildings provide a total area of 4,400 m² and would be leased by the YOGOC for the duration of the Youth Olympic Games. There are plans for cabling and technological infrastructure upgrades prior to YOG, but no details have been provided on the extent of these upgrades in terms of works and/or budgets. The layout described would need to be further assessed.

Located approximately 145 km north of Oslo International Airport, Lillehammer is well connected to the capital city by highway and frequent express rail services. Oslo International Airport is well linked to world air networks and offers plenty of capacity to meet Games-time needs. Both Hamar to the south and Hafjell to the north are well connected to Lillehammer and with adequate traffic management measures, the existing transport infrastructure would cope with all YOG travel demands.

Continued on next page



LILLEHAMMER REPORT, Continued

The total existing hotel capacity within a 20 km radius of Lillehammer is 4,119 rooms, of which 1,920 are indicated as guaranteed in the candidature file. Whilst the number of guaranteed rooms, as specified in the candidature file, is just under the number of guaranteed rooms recommended by the IOC, the city's inventory shows that additional capacity exists. Whilst the "Lillehammer Turist AS" guarantees that accommodation would be available during the Winter Youth Olympic Games period in 2012, only five individual hotel guarantees have been provided, representing approximately 630 rooms. Should Lillehammer be selected as a shortlisted Candidate City, guarantees from all hotels would need to be obtained.

The guaranteed room rates provided by Lillehammer 2012 appear to be relatively high.

The Lillehammer bid committee states that during the Youth Olympic Games, accredited persons would be covered by a special health insurance. It is not clear, however, who will be responsible for the cost of such insurance.

Although it is clear from the candidature file that Lillehammer understands the challenges and operational needs to deliver such an event in terms of security, it does not clearly describe the roles and responsibilities of each of the mentioned partners or who would bear ultimate responsibility for security. A guarantee has been provided by Lillehammer Chief of Police. Norway and Lillehammer have a high level of experience in the management of large events.

Lillehammer presents a balanced YOGOC budget of USD 48.6 million. Revenues would include an IOC contribution of USD 16.2 million, or 33.3% of the budget. The candidature file states that USD 10.5 million of this contribution would cover the costs of accommodation, food services and transport for athletes and officials, which appears to be particularly high. Some USD 5.6 million would also be included in the IOC contribution for technology, information systems, telecommunication and internet services, a cost which is not foreseen in the IOC 2012 Youth Olympic Games Event Manual. The panel of experts also questions the scope and costing of the budget for the Youth Olympic Village and for administration costs which appear to be particularly high.

Whilst meetings have been held between the Lillehammer bid committee and the Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs, guarantees to cover a potential economic shortfall of the YOGOC budget and a USD 19 million subsidy from the national government would still need to be obtained through an application to the Norwegian Parliament during the autumn legislative session (October 2008).



Conclusion

Conclusion

As set forward in the introduction, the panel of experts believes that, beyond the general assessment of the YOG Candidate Cities on the basis of a number of themes, particular attention and consideration should be given to the following principles:

- given the timeframe available to organise the event (3 years) and the fact that 2012 will be the 1st Winter Youth Olympic Games, the choice of the host city should take into account both the robustness of the technical aspects of the project and the extent of assimilation of the YOG concept and philosophy to achieve successful 1st Winter Youth Olympic Games in 2012
- the choice of the host city should take into account the philosophy behind the IOC's decision to organise Youth Olympic Games at the IOC Session in Guatemala to develop an event that could be hosted by cities/countries smaller than those that can host the Olympic Games

Harbin's project is technically robust as the majority of venues already exist and the city is experienced in hosting major international sport events. However, the remote location from Harbin of the two snow clusters (70 km and 150 km) with their respective additional Youth Olympic Villages would not allow for young athletes to be gathered in one unique location and fully experience the concept of the Youth Olympic Games. This is further reinforced by the lack of detail of the culture and education programme. A number of guarantees which would normally be the responsibility of the national government have been provided by local and regional governments. The panel of experts believes that, for the 1st Winter Youth Olympic Games, it would be important to ensure a full Youth Olympic Games experience for all athletes balancing sport, culture and education and that Harbin's dispersed project would make it difficult to achieve this objective.

Innsbruck's project is robust and very well thought through and makes good use of existing venues and infrastructure. The city is experienced in hosting both international sport and multi-sports events. The overall concept is very compact (all within 30 minutes) allowing for reduced transport times for young athletes that would all live in the same Youth Olympic Village. The culture and education programme is youth-oriented, encompasses all audiences and provides for a festive downtown atmosphere. Whilst Innsbruck provided solid guarantees overall, the construction timelines and guarantees for the Youth Olympic Village would need to be further assessed. The panel believes that Innsbruck's proposal well embraces the philosophy of the Youth Olympic Games all the while providing for a reliable project for 2012.

Kuopio's project is well thought through, with technical aspects for sports, culture and education integrated in a relatively compact concept making good use of existing venues. The city has a good level of experience in hosting international events in a number of winter sports. In accordance with the YOG 2012 Event Manual, Kuopio does not plan to organise Bobsleigh and Skeleton competitions and is proposing to use an existing natural track for Luge competitions. All young athletes would live in a single Youth Olympic Village with all venues located less than 15 km away, with the exception of the Alpine Skiing venues (64 km) and the Luge venue (90 km). The culture and education programme has been well designed with all activities centred in the city. The panel believes that Kuopio's project, though not including all Olympic winter sports and presenting a number of challenges due to limited financial resources that would need to be further assessed, fits well within the philosophy of the Youth Olympic Games.

Continued on next page



Conclusion, Continued

Lillehammer's project is technically robust and relatively compact with all sports components integrated in an overall concept that makes good use of existing venues. The city is experienced in hosting both international sport and multi-sports events. All young athletes would live in a single Youth Olympic Village with all venues located less than 18 km away, with the exception of the Skating venues (66 km). The culture and education programme generally lacks detail and creativity, does not fully identify targeted audiences and has yet to be developed further. The panel has found it very difficult to assess this important component of the Youth Olympic Games. The same applies for the assessment of the robustness of the project as a number of major guarantees have not been provided. Furthermore, Lillehammer presents a budget with very high expectations from IOC funding which exceeds the framework indicated in the YOG 2012 Event Manual. The panel believes that Lillehammer's proposal for 2012 currently lacks important guarantees (including shortfall guarantee) and has still to balance sports, culture and education, a fundamental concept of the Youth Olympic Games.