# MINEPS VI Working Group III Meeting – Protecting the Integrity of Sport Lausanne, 15<sup>th</sup> November 2016 Meeting Summary

## Table of contents

The Opening Session	1
MINEPS V: International Charter & Sport Integrity	2
MINEPS VI: Focus on Action	2
Follow – up framework	2
Main elements of programme preparation	3
The Scope and Sub-topics of theme III	4
Sub-topics of theme III: Question to be discussed	5
Parameters for data collection	5
Progress since 2013	6
Recommendations for future action on an international level	6
List of Participants	7

# The Opening Session

Welcoming words to the participants of the meeting from Jean-Philippe Leresche, Dean of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Lausanne; Nicolas Bancel, Director Institute of Sports Studies at the University of Lausanne; and Patrick Clastres, Director Global Sport and Olympic Studies Center, Philipp Müller-Wirth, Executive Officer for Sport, UNESCO, opened the session.

Mr Müller-Wirth thanked all participants for their commitment to contribute to the informal working group meeting which will help the MINEPS VI Programme Committee **to prepare an action-oriented outcome document** for participants, when they meet in Kazan, the Russian Federation, from 5 to 7 July 2017. Mr Müller-Wirth expressed gratitude to University of Lausanne, the International Olympic Committee, and also used this opportunity to welcome Artem Yakubov who represented the Ministry of Sport of the Russian Federation.

He continued with describing MINEPS as a unique, global platform for sport and physical education policy development and information sharing. The delegates of MINEPS VI will be Ministers and Senior Officials from UNESCO member states, as well as representatives from the global sport movement. To reach effective and sustainable results, the discussions prior to and during MINEPS are meant to work towards a **global consensus**, based on compromising.

A regret has been expressed that the meeting was held with a strong European focus in terms of participants and in terms of experiences that were gathered; nevertheless, an

intention to mobilize the non-European countries to participate in the work of the working groups was clearly articulated.

It was emphasized that thanks to the Commonwealth secretariat this gap can be bridge, as several non-European countries are represented in the Commonwealth constituencies.

Mr Müller-Wirth described the Working Group meeting as a kick-off event, which will continue in a virtual manner until the Programme Committee will convene on 31<sup>st</sup> January until 1<sup>st</sup> February 2017 in Kazan, Russian Federation.

He thanked ICSSPE for contributing to the programmatic preparations for MINEPS VI.

# MINEPS V: International Charter & Sport Integrity

Mr Müller-Wirth outlined the steps taken since MINEPS V, which took place in Berlin, Germany, in 2013. Its outcome document, the Declaration of Berlin, initiated the revision of the International Charter of Physical Education and Sport that was adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO in November 2015.

MINEPS V was placing a high focus on two themes: 1) the sustainability of major sport events; 2) issue of match-fixing (manipulation of sports competitions) which were first addressed at the global level in such details.

**The Declaration of Berlin** was characterized as a policy consensus of policymakers concerning the threats to the sport integrity, notably match-fixing. Declaration focuses on what are measures to protect the integrity of sport and how should different stakeholders tackle these measures.

The International Charter is a different document by nature, it formulates a common vision amongst different stakeholders on what are the fundamental principles and values that should guide policy sport programmes undertaken either by governments but also by other organization.

The Charter focuses on grassroots sports, it barely deals with elite sports.

### MINEPS VI: Focus on Action

According to UNESCO's Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport (CIGEPS), MINEPS VI shall focus on the development of **a call for action** which is based on the Declaration of Berlin (2013), the International Charter of Physical Education, Physical Activity and Sport, as well as on Agenda 2030/Sustainable Development Goals, adopted at the General Assembly of the United Nations in 2015. All these references documents shall be merged into a follow-up policy framework for which UNESCO has developed a first draft.

# Follow – up framework

The ambition is **to create a sport policy implementation framework**. There is a need to look at sport policy implementation on the international level on the basis of the two documents – the Berlin declaration and the Charter. This framework should be used to show what has been done or what has been achieved and what has not been done against these commitments and recommendations.

The intent is **to foster a policy convergence into policy implementation**: there is a consensus on **what** should be done and it needs to be a consensus on **how** it could be done best and how governments can make sound investments in sport programmes.

Convergence has a number of purposes: member states want UNESCO, the Council of Europe, the Commonwealth and all the intergovernmental bodies not to duplicate efforts, and there is a need for a common framework underneath which everybody can align their investments. There is also a need for a basic methodology for comparing what different countries are doing.

A need for a common follow-up framework should be recognized by the ministers as a means to create convergence of implementation of the policy commitments and that MINEPS VI is the place where one can compromise on such a follow-up framework.

The call for action shall encourage immediate response, identify gaps and foster international convergence in policy implementation and its monitoring. It is envisaged to further develop the framework in order to form a basis for a comparison of developments within countries. The vision for MINEPS VII could then be the translation of the international framework into national ones.

# Main elements of programme preparation

Working group participants were informed that the Programme Committee is composed of UNESCO, the Russian Federation, the Chair of CIGEPS, the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, The Association for International Sport for All, as well as ICSSPE.

Working Group participants were reminded of the time constraints due to the scheduled meeting of the PC for  $31^{st}$  January and  $1^{st}$  February 2017. This means that all draft documents would need to be presented to the UNESCO Secretariat not later than  $22^{nd}$  January 2017.

The following tasks were set as objectives of the meeting:

- Clarify scope & sub-topics of theme III
- Identify linkages with the SDGs
- Assess core progress since 2013
- Identify persisting issues / problems
- Suggest actions and solutions
- Commit to further contributions to the working group after the meeting the ICSSPE role is to provide the technology, the information sharing of discussions.

A major aim for this meeting was to clarify the scope of the Working Group and its subtopics, as well as their relation with the SDGs. If time allows, there would be the opportunity to look at positive and negative developments since MINEPS V, and make recommendations for future activities. After the meeting, there would be approximately two

months for a virtual discussion which, in the end, should be part of a draft outcome document to be presented to the PC.

# The Scope and Sub-topics of theme III

Based on the terminology of the Declaration of Berlin, WG participants were invited to brainstorm a list of issues relevant for the scope of WG III. The following proposals were made:

- Sports-related violence;
- Manipulation of sports competitions;
- Anti-Doping;
- Human rights violations;
- Child protection;
- Tax evasion;
- Sexual harassment;
- Prevention education and awareness-raising;
- Good governance;
- Corruption;
- Safety: some participants argued that safety is usually dealt with in the context of safe access in order to improve participation opportunities, especially for children, women and persons with disabilities.
  - It was then suggested to use the term in the contexts of a) spectators' violence, b) human/workers' rights (including protection of minors as well as local populations), as well as under sport-related violence in the context of security and services at sport events.

It was agreed that all these terms represent a preliminary collection; their relationship to each other and their scope need to be discussed, as well as their suitability in a set of conceptual terms that stand on a similar level of generalizations. Mr Müller-Wirth referred to the follow-up policy framework that already contains a list of possible sub-topics.

Then WG participants were requested to discuss whether the following **headings for potential sub-topics** cover the above listed issues:

- 1. Fight against doping;
- 2. Fight against manipulation of sports competitions;
- 3. Good governance of sport organisations;
- 4. Protection of rights of participants, spectators and suppliers;
- 5. Fight against criminal activity in sport;
- 6. Prevention education and awareness rising.

There seemed to be a common understanding that 'Integrity', a term chosen prior to MINEPS V, may continue to serve as an overarching value.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A preliminary list of sub-topics can be taken from the follow-up policy framework.

# Sub-topics of theme III: Question to be discussed

The following section contains issues that were raised during the meeting and which remain open for discussion:

## Safety

- a) How do we relate safety and sexual harassment?
- b) Can safety and integrity be seen outside the issue of human rights?
- c) Child safety and child protection?

## Corruption

Is corruption to be treated as a crosscutting theme that is, for example, visible in the manipulation of sports competition and, at the same time, as a stand-alone topic?

## Fight against criminal activity in sport

Would such a heading be helpful? What would it encompass? Would it be an additional heading between Integrity and, for example, Anti-Doping?

Do we need to mention the term *criminal activities* explicitly or are *manipulation, doping* etc. understood as criminal acts?

#### **Good Governance**

Could institutions develop a global framework composed of minimum standards to be used when planning international or bilateral cooperation? What would this look like and who should be engaged?

### Gender

Is it agreed that SDG 5 Gender Equality should be addressed from a good governance perspective? If so, should it be addressed as an integrity issue (WG III) or as an accessibility/participation challenge (WGI)?

#### Parameters for data collection

It was agreed that the parameters for data collection and for discussions should be:

- Norms, Tools (guidelines, capacity building activities),
- International Champions,
- Monitoring and Evaluation:
  - a) How do we measure the adequacy and effectiveness of programmes? Are there global instruments? If sport programmes are seen in the context of SDGs, would the OECD/DAC criteria be helpful in certain cases? In which cases would they not be appropriate?
  - b) Scientific evidence seems to suggest that the quality of self-regulation suffers when there is no external accountability. What good practice examples can support or challenge this?
  - c) Should there be an obligation to report activities and developments to an observatory or a global agency, such as UNESCO?

- d) The comparability of data collected in different contexts remains a challenge.
- e) The outcome document would entail a Monitoring and Evaluation tool which shall help all stakeholders, intergovernmental agencies, national governments as well as the sport movement, to assess progress.
- Research,
- Advocacy/Promotion, and
- Good Practice.<sup>2</sup>

# Progress since 2013

#### **Norms**

The Council of Europe adopted the Convention on Manipulation of Sports Competitions which has been signed by 25 countries. Although it has not yet been enforced, implementation has already started in some countries. Furthermore, the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Sport in November 2016 will address the two topics match fixing and doping.

WG participants were informed that some national anti-doping laws, e.g. in Belgium and Denmark, refer also to the fitness sector.

## Recommendations for future action on an international level

- The linkages of initiatives that take place on different geographical and political levels were seen as crucial by some participants.
- Education as a means to prevent individuals and organisations from misbehaviour would need to be ensured.
- It was suggested that autonomy of sport should be based on conditions.
  Governments would have the responsibility to hold actors accountable and UNESCO could ensure information flow and knowledge exchange.
- It was also suggested that the issue of whether governments should be obliged to commit to good governance standards before participating in global sport activities should be discussed further.
- Do existing Conventions, like the UN Convention against Corruption, need amendments that specifically address sport?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In the meantime these parameters have been further developed. The current list of parameters can be found in the Manual for expert groups. They are: Norms, Resources, Monitoring and Evaluation, Research, and Promotion/Advocacy.

### **List of Participants**

Kozlovska Liene, Sport division, Council of Europe, France

**Yakubov Artem,** Head of International Communication, Ministry of Sport, Russian Federation

Grothaus Frank, Public Affairs manager, FIFA, Switzerland

Asakawa Shin, CEO, Japan Anti-Doping Agency, Japan

Sugai Tatsuya, Section Chief, Japan Sport Council, Japan

Pederson Michael, Founder, Change the Game, Switzerland

Gjeloshaj Kole, International University Sports Federation (FISU), Belgium

Syvasalmi Harri, Secretary General, Finnish Center for Integrity in Sports (FINCIS), Finland

Schenk Sylvia, Chair of Working Group Sport, Transparency International, Germany

Weiden Torsten, Policy officer, Federal Ministry of the Interior, Germany

Beutler Ingrid, Integrity Manager, International Olympic Committee, Switzerland

**Girard Zappelli Pâquerette**, Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer, International Olympic Committee, Switzerland

**Mascagni Katia**, Head International Relations, International Olympic Committee, Switzerland **Geeraert Arnout**, Post-doctoral researcher, Leuven International and European Studies (LINES) Institute, Faculty of Social Sciences, Belgium

**Donzel Jacques**, Expert, OIPS

Kayser Bengt, Professor, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Chappelet Jean-Loup, Professor, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Van Luijk Nicolien, Chargée de recherche, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Lacarrière Sarah, Secretary General, Global Lottery Monitoring System, Switzerland

Vallini Matteo, Head of Doping-Free Sport Unit, Sport Accord, Switzerland

Bertaccini Paolo, Advisor, ASAG Alta Scuola Università Cattolica, Italy

Clastres Patrick, Professor, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

**Dumon Detlef**, Executive Director, ICSSPE, Germany

Glibo Iva, Manager Physical activity, ICSSPE, Germany

Muller-Wirth Philipp, Executive Officer, UNESCO, France

Vidal Laurent, Professor, Sorbonne-OIPS, France

O'laoire Ronan, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC, Austria

Ohl Fabien, Professor, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Andersen Jens Sejer, International Director, Play the game, Denmark

**Guia Diogo**, Director, ICSS Europe, Belgium

Genniges Valery, Executive Advisor, WADA, Switzerland

Castro Natalia, Researcher, University Externado de Colombia, Colombia

Schwab Brendan, Head, UNI World Athletes, Switzerland

**Saugy Martial**, Director, Research and Expertise Center for Anti-Doping Sciences, University of Lausanne

**Tonnerre Quentin**, Graduate Assistant and sport diplomacy researcher, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Leresche Jean-Pihilippe, Dean of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Switzerland