

STANDING COMMITTEE (T-RV)

**EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON SPECTATOR VIOLENCE AND
MISBEHAVIOUR AT SPORT EVENTS AND IN PARTICULAR
AT FOOTBALL MATCHES**



Strasbourg, 15 December 2013

T-RV (2013) 3 FINAL

**Consultative visit to Romania
on the implementation of the Convention
14-17 November 2012**

Report by the Consultative Team
(including the National report by Romania)

FINAL

Contents

| | |
|--|----------|
| A – REPORT OF THE CONSULTATIVE TEAM | 4 |
| 1. GENERAL REMARKS | 4 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 4 |
| 1.2 Encouraging a multi-agency approach | 5 |
| 1.3 International co-operation | 10 |
| 2. SAFETY | 11 |
| 2.1 National Arena | 11 |
| 2.2 Ilie Oană Stadium | 13 |
| 2.3 General observations in respect of safety procedures and systems | 14 |
| 3. SECURITY | 19 |
| 3.1 Policing | 19 |
| 4. SERVICES | 22 |
| 4.1 Prevention of violence | 22 |
| 4.2 Fight against racism | 24 |
| 4.3 Dialogue with Fans | 25 |
| 5. CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS | 27 |
| 5.1. General conclusions | 27 |
| 5.2. Summary of recommendations | 28 |
| APPENDIX 1 - Action Plan to be completed by the Romanian authorities | 34 |
| APPENDIX 2 – National report by Romania | 46 |
| 1 The subsystem of sport institutions and organisations | 48 |
| 2. The legal frame of prevention violence in sport | 49 |
| 3. General causes of deficiencies in preventing violence in sport | 52 |
| 4. Preventive measures | 53 |
| 5. Europa League Final in 2012 | 54 |

APPENDIX 3 - Programme of the consultative visit of the T-RV Standing Committee experts to Romania56

APPENDIX 4 - List of recommendations adopted by the Standing Committee which could be of particular interest for the Romanian authorities.....58

B - COMMENTS BY ROMANIA 60

A – REPORT OF THE CONSULTATIVE TEAM

1. GENERAL REMARKS

1.1 Introduction

From 14 to 17 November 2012, a consultative team (“the team”) delegated by the Standing Committee (“the Standing Committee”) of the European Convention on Spectator Violence and Misbehaviour at Sports Events and in particular at Football Matches (“the Convention”) carried out a consultative visit to Romania (“the visit”) under the programme for monitoring commitments on the implementation of the Convention.

The team consisted of the following persons:

- Jo Vanhecke, Chair of the Standing Committee, Delegate of Belgium and team leader
- Ana Criado Contreras, Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee and Delegate of Spain
- Dominic Volken, Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee and Delegate of Switzerland
- Rick Riding, Sports Grounds Safety Authority (SGSA), United Kingdom
- Marie-Françoise Glatz, Secretariat of the Standing Committee, Council of Europe

The team met a large panel of key stakeholders: the authorities in charge of Sport, the gendarmerie (including the NFIP), the Football Federation, the Professional Football League, Steaua and Dinamo club representatives, supporters, etc. The detailed programme of the visit is at Appendix 1.

The team would like to thank all its interlocutors for meeting them and answering their detailed questions. They particularly wish to thank Adriana Ciorbaru, Daniela Suta and Adrian Dincă for their practical help and their excellent organisation of the visits and meetings.

In a short visit, it was not possible to conduct an in-depth assessment of every aspect of the arrangements in Romania. It is also possible that some questions or remarks got lost in interpretation.

More significantly, the team can only comment on what it saw. It is aware that the structure and program of the visit, which focused on Bucharest, should not in any way be taken as being indicative of the wider situation in Romania.

The team acknowledges the evolution within Romania over the last years, as mentioned by the State Secretary of Foreign Affairs. The aim of this report is not to criticise, but to help and assist the Romanian authorities and other relevant stakeholders in their learning process in the field of safety and security at sport events. This report and its recommendations should therefore not be seen as a standalone document, but also as a further offer for support to develop and improve the existing system. The Council of Europe Standing Committee on Spectator Violence is ready, if deemed necessary, to cooperate formally or informally with the Romanian authorities to deliver expert advice in all possible fields in this area. The aim of such support is not to propose a copy paste of existing systems in other European countries, but to deliver expertise to look for customized solutions in accordance and in respect with the Romanian constitutional, legal, cultural and historical background.

This report is structured on the 3 key pillars – Security, Safety and Services – of a multiagency approach. It is based on:

- Documentary sources such as the national report, the country profile, the annual questionnaire and some open sources information;
- The English translation of the national law provided by the Romanian authorities;
- The various meetings we had during this visit with all key stakeholders;
- And the attendance at 2 matches in the National Arena in Bucharest and in the Ilie Oană stadium in Ploiești, plus the visit of the Dinamo stadium in Bucharest.

The report may contain issues that appear to be reported twice. However the context of each part is different and it is to ensure a readability of each part independently and it is generally from a different perspective.

1.2 Encouraging a multi-agency approach

1.2.1 At national level

European experience demonstrates that government-led national co-ordination arrangements need to be in place to ensure that a coherent and integrated safety, security and service strategy is developed, refined as necessary in the light of experience (good and bad) and implemented effectively at international, national and local level.

In Romania, the role of this national coordination body is performed by the National Commission against Violence in Sport, which is chaired by the National Authority for Sport and Youth. Although most stakeholders seem to be represented in one way or another, it was mentioned by several persons/agencies, that the role, composition and functioning of this National Commission against Violence in Sport could be further improved. One of the main remarks was aimed at more regular meetings of this National Commission against Violence in Sport with experienced people who deal on a daily basis with safety and security at sport events, and a proactive role of this Commission in preparing policies and long term solutions, and not only meeting in a reactive, incident-based way.

Recommendation 1

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should evaluate the composition, role and functioning of this National Commission against Violence in Sport with all relevant stakeholders.**

We recommend taking into account the following guidelines whilst performing this evaluation:

- It is important that the national coordination group comprises experienced and “influential” persons representing relevant governmental departments and agencies (notably interior, justice and sports departments); prosecuting agencies; national football authorities; relevant policing and security agencies; safety authorities and other agencies with responsibility for a range of logistical, safety, emergency, and service functions, and preventative initiatives/projects. In recognition that legislative and other elements of an integrated safety, security and service approach are likely to fall under the umbrella of different government departments, it is imperative that all such departments are fully represented on the national group;
- It is highly desirable for the national coordination group to consult regularly with representatives of football supporter groups;
- It is recommended that the national coordination group is tasked to consider and resolve a range of crucial enabling imperatives, including:
 - clarifying how good European practice can be adapted and applied;
 - providing legal clarity on the exact roles and responsibilities of the various public and private agencies engaged in minimising football safety and security risks;
 - identifying and recommending to the relevant governmental authority the legislative and regulatory framework necessary to facilitate delivery of key components of the safety, security and service strategy;
 - ensuring that also effective local multi-agency co-ordination arrangements are in place;
 - monitoring (national, multi-agency) preparations for high risk football matches and tournaments played at home or abroad involving national and club football teams representing Romania;
 - monitoring and analysing incidents and other events at football matches played in Romania or involving supporters from Romania at football matches played elsewhere in Europe;
 - developing effective stadium licensing, safety certificate and inspection arrangements;
 - ensuring that key operational personnel (public and private) are trained and equipped to deliver their various tasks effectively and appropriately, arranging specialist joint training for police officers, safety officers and stewards employed on duties where they may be expected to interact either routinely or in high risk scenarios;
 - stressing the importance of the service (“hospitality”) component of the integrated approach in minimising safety and security risks;

- developing a multi-agency media and communications strategy designed to ensure that communities and supporters (resident and visiting) are kept pro-actively informed of the measures pursued in delivery of the integrated multi-agency approach;
- ensuring consideration is given within this integrated approach to preventative projects and measures of social inclusion.

1.2.2 At local level

It is equally important that at local level multi-agency co-ordination arrangements are established. This role is taken up in Romania by the so-called County Commissions of Actions against Violence in Sport. After meeting all of the relevant stakeholders, there is still some un-clarity about the exact role and functioning of these local coordination groups. It is for example not clear if this group is the same group as the local coordination group meeting before each game to discuss specific event related measures. It is also not clear if the County Commissions of Actions against Violence in Sport perform tasks as mentioned in our recommendation below, neither if they report officially to the National Commission against Violence in Sport, and how both commissions (national and local) interlink and interact to avoid duplication either contradiction.

Recommendation 2

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should evaluate the composition, role and functioning of these County Commissions of Actions against Violence in Sport with all relevant stakeholders.**

We recommend taking into account the following guidelines whilst performing this evaluation:

- The results of the evaluation of the composition, role and functioning of the National Commission against Violence in Sport;
- In view of the wide and critical remit of the local co-ordination group, it is imperative that all key local agencies are represented at an appropriate ("influential") level, including: local authorities, police commanders, football clubs and other bodies involved emergency, logistical and preventative projects
- The County Commissions of Actions against Violence in Sport should preferably ensure:
 - local operational arrangements (inside and outside of stadia) take full account of the principles set out in the national integrated approach to safety, security and service;
 - preparation of safety, security and service arrangements for international and domestic league matches played in the locality are comprehensive;
 - operational strategies of local stakeholders are complementary;
 - local strategies are reviewed and updated (where necessary) to reflect any refinements to the national integrated approach and post-match analysis of events connected to previous matches;
 - the respective roles and responsibilities of all personnel engaged in delivery of football related operations are clear, concise and widely understood;
 - multi-agency preparations recognise operational primacy but embrace all aspects of the wider integrated approach that may impact on the match day dynamic, notably policing strategies, stadium licensing, ticketing, stewarding and other in-stadia operating arrangements; local hospitality and related activities (including community and supporter liaison); transport and other logistical factors; and crisis planning for emergency scenarios (inside and outside of stadia);
 - football supporter groups and local communities and businesses, especially those located in the vicinity of football stadiums and city centre areas (where supporters are likely to gather before and after matches) are consulted and kept informed of operational strategies in public and private spaces (including in and around football stadia); and consideration is given to identifying and delivering any football-related community and wider social preventative projects and otherwise promoting the active engagement of local football clubs and partner agencies within local communities.

1.2.3 Legislation

A crucial tool to ensure a multi-agency strategy is naturally an effective legislative framework with appropriate and clear provisions designed to provide legal clarity on roles and responsibilities and empower the relevant authorities to undertake their tasks effectively. European experience demonstrates that an appropriate legislative and regulatory infrastructure will encompass a diverse range of themes (including stadium licensing and safety certification, stadium regulations, enabling policing measures and exclusion of violent supporters through appropriate procedures).

The main tool in Romania in this regard is the Law 4/2008 on preventing and combating violence related to sport competitions and games, as amended in 2012. Specific comments on some areas are made further on in this report, whilst this chapter considers the overall principles and content of the law.

The law focuses on all sport events, although it is widely recognised that problems mainly occur at football matches.

Recommendation 3

- ❖ **In order to be effective and treat problems in a proportionate way, the Romanian authorities should evaluate if most measures stipulated in the law should not be targeted at major football matches, whilst only some key safety principles would then apply to all other sport events and football matches in lower divisions.**

The law determines the key role of the event organiser. In reality, during its visit, the consultative team has noted the overarching role of the Gendarmerie, even in some preventative and anti-racist projects. Whilst this is understandable from a historical point of view, it is important that an evaluation is made of the entire system, in accordance with our recommendations above concerning the multi-agency strategy. The Gendarmerie is perceived by all stakeholders as an excellent partner. This is undoubtedly linked to their expertise and experience, but maybe also because the Gendarmerie seems to take up responsibilities which should be taken up by other stakeholders. These other parties involved seem to be quite happy with the current situation because they do not have to take up their own (legal) responsibilities at the fullest.

On the basis of our practical experience and on the answers given to our questions, a practical event-related example is the rather weak role and responsibility of the club safety officer on match day. The consultative team got the impression the match commander (and in a lesser way the head of stewards) is completely running the operation (with for example the match commander giving direct orders to the stewards), also on safety matters, whilst European good practice shows the importance of a crucial role to be played by the safety officer, certainly of safety issues (“integrated command”).

On the basis of our meetings with all stakeholders, the team also got different answers on who is responsible to do what, certainly on safety matters, inspection procedures, and stadium licensing and safety certification. It was also unclear what the exact consequences are if it was decided a stadium or parts of the stadium did not meet the safety and security requirements. According to the Gendarmerie, that part of the stadium or the entire stadium is closed if this happens, but the exact procedure remains unclear. This is confirmed in the national report (point 3.1). Although it is recognized the language barrier could play an important role in discussions on such technical and legally precise topics, the team estimates it is very important that all stakeholders are informed in a very precise way on the role and responsibility of each and every one of them.

Recommendation 4

The Romanian authorities should:

- ❖ **Evaluate the overarching role of the Gendarmerie, considering which tasks should be performed by them and which tasks should be allocated to other stakeholders, amending if necessary accordingly the existing policies and/or legal provisions.**
- ❖ **Draw up a paper explaining very clearly the role and responsibility of each partner, in particular concerning important safety issues like inspection procedures, stadium licensing and safety certification.**

Recommendation 5

- ❖ **There should be clarity who can make what decision if safety and security requirements are not met in a (part of a) stadium.**

Furthermore, the action plan for each event (see article 10 of the law) is a crucial document for all safety and security measures to be taken by all stakeholders.

Recommendation 6

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities, in order to minimise the administrative workload, should evaluate if parts of this action plan, which are valid for all events in a given stadium, could not be part of an agreement to be signed by all stakeholders before the season, so the action plan would be limited to specific measures for a given event in accordance with the risk level of that specific event.**

The law contains sanctions and procedures for those persons who misbehave. In reality, practically all of the sanctions are imposed by the Gendarmerie (administrative sanction), and not by the courts (judicial sanctions) or the clubs (civil sanctions). It is a reality in a large number of European countries that the existing structures do not stimulate quick and deterrent sanctions through the normal judicial process, neither make it possible to have an effective civil sanction system. A lot of European countries have therefore looked for other methods to ensure an effective sanctioning system for sport related incidents, as this is also the case within Romania. Although the system applied by the Gendarmerie is the one which is used in most cases, and seems therefore to be the most effective one in the current state of play of the legislation, it is important to continuously evaluate the sanctioning system to ensure it is in reality with the evolution of the phenomenon of hooliganism, and to avoid at the same time the system is challenged under national or European law. The exclusion strategy must be seen as tough and speedy but proportionate (otherwise it can alienate many supporters and empower the troublemakers). The approach needs to be ambitious and extend beyond stadium entry bans to embrace exclusion from the wider match day experience in order to undermine the sub-cultural allure of football violence.

As a quick and effective sanctioning system (together with an overall evidence gathering strategy) is one of the main pillars of the overall multi-agency strategy, great care should be taken to ensure this is done in a transparent and comprehensive way, ensuring all troublemakers get sanctioned (those who commit minor offences and those who commit serious crimes). It is also important to ensure an effective evidence gathering system in this respect. It was unclear for the team in how many cases incidents lead effectively and finally to a sanction imposed on those causing or participating in the incident.

Recommendation 7

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should evaluate the full effectiveness of the existing legal provisions on sanctions building on existing European experiences in for example administrative sanctions imposed by an independent body and should develop an effective evidence gathering strategy.**

It has also been mentioned that there is no real effective sanctioning system in case someone does not respect his/her stadium ban. Reference can be made to article 31 of the law. The spotters are supposed to have knowledge of all banned persons and can assist the Gendarmerie to spot banned persons if they try to attend away fixtures across Romania. The Romanian NFIP declared that they have had many cases of persons who didn't obey their stadium ban and they were spotted by Gendarmerie personnel. They were presented to the judge, but none of them was sent to prison for this, they had only been fined.

Recommendation 8

- ❖ **It is crucial that each sanction is also effectively implemented and that a monitoring system to ensure this is introduced.**

As a general conclusion, the team recognises the Romanian law 4/2008 is already at a very advanced stage compared to a number of other European countries. Some provisions in the law can even serve as an example

for many countries throughout Europe, as for example article 1.on the role of the spotters, intelligence officers and NFIP, article 10.1.s and article 12 (preventative messages to the public, educational campaigns) and articles 55 to 58 (communication of personal data).

On the other hand, amendments to the law and possible changes through discussion in or on the road to Parliament have decreased somewhat the logical structure of the law, certainly for an outsider. Furthermore, some stipulations lack a more detailed execution or explanation, as for example:

- Article 1.n: what is exactly the “vicinity of the venue”?, this is quite vague. According to the gendarmerie, it is referring to the area that the Gendarmerie forces are in charge of public order measures. It represents the area outside the stadium gates and the neighbouring streets around it, which can be of interest for the overall public order system regarding a certain fixture. Beyond this area, the National Police is responsible for maintaining public order;
- Article 5.5: this appears to be an approval in writing, but this is not specified;
- Article 9.3: who can evacuate these spectators from the stadium? Who makes the decision to evacuate them? According to the Gendarmerie, this is up to the stewards, and if they cannot handle it, they will get support from Gendarmerie. Nevertheless, it is unclear who gives this order to the stewards (safety officer or match commander);
- Article 9.4: what is the value of these recommendations? To whom do they have to address themselves? Who makes the decision to follow the recommendation or not? According to the Gendarmerie, they are not mandatory and the final decision regarding safety and security is always made by the match commander;
- Article 10.1.h: what are the quantity and quality requirements for CCTV-systems, recording material and people managing the system? According to the Gendarmerie, they will be subject of future stadium licensing provisions;
- Article 10.1.n: what about the number of toilets (men, women, disabled fans)? According to the Gendarmerie, this is a provision of the constructions law in Romania;
- Article 10.2.e and 20.b: is this implemented in reality, as we were informed there is no system of personalized tickets? It appears this is implemented for season tickets;
- Article 10.2.k: what is a high risk competition? There seems to be 4 different predetermined levels of risk for sport events, but with no consideration given to dynamic risk assessment. This appears to be in the process of changing;
- Article 11.2: Although one representative of the local fire brigade seems to be a member of this evaluation team, this is not specified;
- Article 11.5: is this fully implemented?
- Article 13 to 17: there is a mix of safety and security, without it being clear for us who is responsible to do what;
- Chapter 5 and 6: it is very unclear whilst reading the law for an outsider to understand the exact difference in Romania between civil, administrative and criminal liability, and what system is applied in which case or who can impose what sanction. For example, the English translation of article 26.1 of the law states that a criminal act represents a civil penalty. Furthermore, it is sometimes also unclear for an outsider which behaviour is punishable inside or outside the stadium/sport arena, and why sometimes the difference is made between inside and outside the stadium/arena (for example articles 36-38 and article 43);
- Article 24: in how many cases is this applied compared to the number of recorded incidents? According to the Gendarmerie, this is only done in a very few cases;
- Article 47: who is the “fact agent”?

It is clear the above mentioned remarks need to be seen in line with the fact the team is not familiar on a daily basis with the Romanian legal framework, and that it has worked on an English version of the law, so there can be a perfectly understandable explanation or reason for our remarks mentioned above. Nevertheless the team has also noted that not all Romanian stakeholders had the same opinion or interpretation of the law, doubted sometimes the effective implementation of some parts of the law or thought the law could be further improved to create more clarity. If this is already the case for agencies or organisations working in this field, one can suppose that supporters/spectators will also be of a similar opinion.

Recommendation 9

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should structure the law in a clear and comprehensive way (multi-agency approach, safety, security, service/prevention) and make a critical evaluation in cooperation with all stakeholders of each article between theory and practice (is each stipulation really implemented or possible to implement and is it each time clear who is responsible to do what). If deemed necessary, the Romanian authorities can look for assistance of European wide experts to undertake this project.**

The Council of Europe Standing Committee can be contacted to assist in delivering such experts.

1.2.4 Media and communication strategy

Although this item was not a specific topic on the agenda, the role of the media was mentioned by several persons the team has met. In general, the same remarks were made as in most European countries, like for example large media attention for incidents which occur (with sometimes wrong information) and practically no information on measures that are taken or for valuable prevention projects.

European experience demonstrates the importance of developing an effective multi-agency communication and media handling strategy as a means for explaining the importance and content of an integrated multi-agency safety, security and service approach.

National and local experienced spokespersons from all key public and football agencies should, work closely with the media and supporter groups in the preparation and delivery of a comprehensive communications strategy.

In addition to providing explanation and reassurance to local communities and businesses via the media, an effective (multi-agency) media strategy can be crucial in terms of providing supporters with important information on relevant legislative and regulatory provisions (and associated safeguards and reassurances). It can also emphasise the importance which partner agencies (and the integrated approach) place on creating a safe and welcoming environment for all football supporters.

At a local level, local authorities, police and football club spokespersons have a key role in terms of communicating with host and, in particular, visiting supporters about designated/recommended areas for pre and post match recreation and policing tolerance levels (offering clear advice on what constitutes unacceptable behaviour) highlighting any additional or exceptional measures planned for high risk matches. The designated national and local experienced spokespersons should build a media network and proactively and continuously informing media about the measures which are put in place, the incidents which have occurred and the follow-up of these incidents. Such proactive approach avoids media will look to other (less reliable) sources to bring a story.

Recommendation 10

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should develop an integrated and proactive media and communication strategy in the field of safety and security at sport events, in cooperation with all stakeholders involved.**

1.3 International co-operation

Romania signed the European Convention on Spectator Violence in 1994 and ratified it in 1998. Since then, the Romanian authorities have demonstrated that they have taken their responsibilities under the Convention seriously: showing regular participation in the Standing Committee, providing regularly national annual report and requesting the organisation of a study visit in 1999 which was made by John de Quidt, Chairman of the Standing Committee at that time.

This culminated in this initiative to host a consultative visit by sending a very good national report, which described very well the organisation of sport in Romania, the legal framework for safety and security and highlighted a number of fields of priority in preventing violence in sport at national level: safety and infrastructures, stewarding system, prevention and fan dialogue and interaction with supporters.

Romania is also following the international recommendations concerning international police cooperation, in particular the EU handbook on international police cooperation at football matches and has established a National Football Information Point in 2003.

Recommendation 11

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should further promote the European Convention on Spectator Violence and dispatch the Standing Committee recommendations on a large scale at national level.**

Recommendation 12

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities in charge of the implementation of the Convention, in particular the Ministry of Sport and the Ministry of Interior should both follow closely the work of the Standing Committee and any further developments and should clarify if it would be of added value if a representative of the Ministry of the Interior or the Gendarmerie would join the Romanian T-RV delegation, in view of their important roles and powers in the field of security aspects during match day operations.**

2. SAFETY

2.1 Arena National

The Romanian national team and sometimes 3 Bucharest football clubs play their home games at Arena National. The Stadium, was, built in 2011 and is owned by the Municipality of Bucharest. As well as the municipal authorities, the Gendarmerie, police, fire service and ambulance were fully consulted during the design and construction. With accommodation for 55,600 spectators it is the largest stadium in the country. However, the permitted capacity of the stadium is just 90% of the total capacity as under Romanian law 10% of the capacity must remain unsold. The stadium has 3,600 VIP seats, together with 126 seats allotted for the press. When necessary the press allocation can be increased to up to 548 seats. The stadium also has some 360 restrooms.

The stadium has a retractable roof, which can be opened or closed within 15 minutes, and in addition to football it has been used for concerts such as the Red Hot Chile Peppers.

2.1.1 Infrastructure

The stadium was designed by a German architect and is modeled on the Frankfurt Stadium. It has a good design with good sightlines throughout, adequate ingress and egress and wide radial gangways. The concourse space is sufficient with good service layout.

The consultative team visited all areas inside and outside the stadium, both upper and lower tiers, concourses and the stadium control room. However, it should be noted that as a low attendance was anticipated for the Romania v Belgium match the upper tier was not used.

Surprisingly for a newly constructed stadium, there was a lack of directional signage both outside and inside the stadium. Spectators enter the stadium up staircases onto an open concourse which runs around the rear of the seating deck. In many areas of the stadium the stairs on the outside do not have handrails, or tactile surfaces at the top and bottom of landing to help partially sighted spectators.

No ground regulations at the stadium entrances could be seen by the team members.

There were designated viewing areas for wheelchairs users on the mid-level. However there appeared to be a lack of adequate signage outside the ground to enable disabled spectators to navigate to the correct area to enter the ground. The ramps for wheelchairs would not meet recommended standards expected being too long, too steep and without landings.

A number of seats on the upper deck had been broken at previous events and not replaced. It was explained that the breakages had been caused by supporters standing on the seats. Such behaviour should be a cause of concern to the stadium's safety management team as the gradient of the upper deck is 35 degrees and spectators falling off the back of seats could lead to progressive crowd collapse.

The physical aspects of the ground that were observed appeared to be in good condition and were well designed in respect of spectator safety standards. However, there was evidence of some minor design issues, which although they may present a low level of risk, steps should be taken to resolve them. The issues identified were:

- No handrails and balustrading to some stairs/steps outside the turnstiles
- There are no contrasting nosing's or tactile paving to top and bottom of external stairs or internal radial gangways
- It was noted that the overall signage concept around the external stadium environment requires review and improvement which is an important issue where audiences will be unfamiliar with the venue.

2.1.2 Safety Management

Apart from the 10% reduction in total capacity imposed under Romanian law there was no consideration given to ensuring that the permitted capacity for the event should reflect the risk associated with the crowd profile, the physical environment or the quality of safety management.

A risk assessment is produced by the Security/Steward Company which details an action plan for the game. This action plan was a 50 page document which details the stewarding arrangements including location of stewards, searching and operational arrangements. This document is signed by the Gendarmerie, Police, Fire, Ambulance, and Football Federation. The document has been prepared over a 5 day period with meeting of all agencies. The Gendarmerie has the final decision on its content and arrangement. The risk assessment does not seem to consider the quality of safety management or the physical infrastructure. The main appreciation of risk appears to be attributed to public order.

The consultative team was informed that there were 500 stewards inside the stadium 500 Gendarmerie and police reserve inside and outside.

The stadium control room contains 150 CCTV Cameras, PA system, turnstile monitoring, and fire alarm system all with backup power. The Gendarmerie was in command of the Control Room. The consultative team questioned the command and control of incidents with the stewards/security head. He explained that there were no reserve stewards or response team, but each area supervisor had been trained to deal with all incidents and the Gendarmerie would be called inside the stadium to deal with an incident if it escalated. The role of the head of security in the control room was to act as an observer of incidents on CCTV and liaise with the Gendarmerie to deploy Guards when necessary.

It was noted that as spectators entered the stadium outer fence and they were subjected to robust searching. The level of searching caused with very little queuing.

During the match an incident occurred where supporters ignited a flare and displayed a banner. Approximately 20 stewards moved in to remove the banners and eject the spectator with the flare. This turned into a violent confrontation with supporters and stewards pushing, pulling and exchanging punches and kicks before the crowd dispersed. Although it was mentioned to the team stewards were not able to use force, the contrary happened during this incident. The incident lasted approximately 5 minutes and the Gendarmerie was not deployed inside the stadium. The tactics of dealing with this situation did not appear to be managed from the control room, but seemed to escalate because of the steward's lack of crowd control, training or guidance on dealing with conflict management effectively. There was no evidence of clear system for managing incidents or any clear method of incidents being reported to match control. The nature, scale and timing of such a deployment, along with the demeanor and appearance of the stewards, can have a powerful impact upon the mood at the event. If any intervention by stewards is necessary, it is clearly preferable that this should initially be low key and friendly before any incident begins to escalate. Any

significant intervention should where possible be authorized and controlled from the control room and monitored by the safety officer and monitored by CCTV.

During both games, there was no clear indication of an integrated command system. Most stakeholders made clear the final decision making process was done by the Gendarmerie, even in case of safety incidents. Although the system as such is clear (one decision making body in case of any incident occurring), it is important to evaluate the system in accordance with European good practice of integrated command, and to make clear in writing who is responsible to do what under which circumstances.

It has to be noted that several areas of the stadium were cleaned before and during the game, which can only be further recommended.

Some stewards had the word “steward” on the back of their vests, others didn’t, and the blue color vests were very similar to the vests of some police officers the team has seen during half time. This situation can pose problems, certainly for supporters from abroad at international matches

Recommendation 13

- ❖ **The risk assessment for each event should consider the physical environment and quality of safety management as well of the risk associated with the crowd profile. in order to determine an acceptable capacity.**
- ❖ **The overall command and control system should be reviewed to ensure that there are clear arrangements for managing incidents in place, and that there is an understanding of what issues should be reported to match control. A system of integrated command should be developed, determining in writing who is responsible to do what under which circumstances.**
- ❖ **A pre event check should be carried out to ensure that hazards such as broken seats, trip hazards,etc. are identified and rectified.**
- ❖ **An access appraisal should be undertaken together with consultation with any appropriate groups representing persons with disabilities to ensure that appropriate facilities are provided for people with special needs.**
- ❖ **Joint training programs for safety officers and match commanders, and stewards and police officers should be set up and regularly repeated.**
- ❖ **All stewards should be clearly identifiable as steward, and there should be a clear visual distinction between stewards and police officers.**

2.2 Ilie Oană Stadium

The football stadium located in Ploiești, and is the current home of Petrolul Ploiesti. The stadium opened in September 2011 and has an all seated capacity of 15,500.

2.2.1 Infrastructure

The consultative team had access to all areas of the ground including ingress and egress gates, upper and mid level concourses, viewing area, control room and first aid room. Overall the physical aspects of the parts of the ground observed by the team appeared to be in good condition, which is expected of a newly constructed stadium. However, there was evidence of some areas requiring completion. It was observed that some of the design details did not meet recognised spectator safety standards, in particular handrail heights, balustrading details on upper tier balconies and internal stairs, plus missing handrails in some gangways. (See EN 13200 part 3 for European standards on spectator facilities for handrail heights and strengths of balustrading).

The consultative team observed the life safety systems in the control room including CCTV, turnstile monitoring PA system, fire alarm and backup power. Within the control room there was an incident,

contingency plans held on the PC and stadium layouts (fire safety plans) indicating locations of detector heads were pinned to the wall.

There was a lack of emergency exit signs and directional signs around the stadium. The inspection team identified trip hazards some due to design details and others to loose cables. There was also a lack of fire safety consideration with many exit routes being impeded by hot food outlets and drink dispensers. The team was advised by the Head of stewards/security that there was a pre event checklist; however such an inspection checklist should have highlighted these deficiencies.

2.2.2 Safety Management

The consultative team attended the League delegate's briefing where all emergency services and the club signed declarations in respect of the safety for the event. Included in the briefing was a presentation of the Action Plan and Evacuation Plan.

The steward's briefing was not observed as it had taken place before the consultative team had arrived and all stewards were in position, however, there were no stewards in the home end behind the goal despite the fact that the fans in this area were encouraged to create an atmosphere. There did not appear to be any attempt to manage the supporters in the home end nor in the stand for the away supporters. The sole purpose of the steward/security personnel appeared to be to provide a deterrent to prevent spectators entering the area of play. The consultative team did not ascertain whether there had been any discussions between the stadium management and this group about what they could and could not do or whether these "ultras" were tacitly allowed to behave as they wished. When questioned, the Gendarmerie match commander said they were low risk, and arrangements for their control were detailed in the action plan. However there appeared to be a lack of crowd management throughout as spectators in the home area stood on vomitory rails in precarious positions waving large flags, or away supporters climbed the fences after the match. Nobody in these areas stayed seated.

The team did not have an opportunity to question the security personnel about either their tasks or their training. Their role appeared largely passive, though this may not necessarily be a true reflection of the situation. It would be interesting to test how they would react when faced either with a safety problem, or an incident of misbehaviour or with the need to evacuate the stadium.

It was unclear whether the stadium operator had undertaken a fire risk assessment or prepared a fire safety check list. There was no policy in respect of the fire safety of flags and banners.

Recommendation 14

- ❖ **Consideration should be given to ensuring recognised standards are adopted for handrail heights and balustrading (see European Standard EN 13200 part 3)**
- ❖ **The stadium operator should take responsibility for fire risk assessments, the development of a fire safety strategy and prepare a fire safety check list. A policy should be developed in respect of the fire resistance of flags and banners.**
- ❖ **A pre event safety check regime should be carried out and the outcome of the checks and any remedial action taken fully documented (See T-RV Rec (2008) 1 on the checklist of measures to be taken by the organisers of professional sporting events and by the public authorities).**
- ❖ **Stewards should be deployed and play an active role in crowd management in all sectors of the stadium.**

2.3 General observations in respect of safety procedures and systems

Law 4 (2008) Art. 11 (1) states "Before every competition season, all arenas where they organise sport competitions with a high risk level are to be checked in accordance with the security measures, which are to be respected".

(2) “Checking should be done by a commission composed by a representative of the county sport department, a representative of the competent county territorial gendarmerie unit, a representative of the organising committee and the security service responsible person at the venue of the competition”.

Neither the national report, neither the law, neither the visit has brought clarity to the consultative team who exactly is responsible for checking each season the Romanian stadiums to see if they are in accordance with all safety and security recommendations, and who is delivering the safety certificate for the stadium. Different agencies and bodies were mentioned, giving the team the impression this is not clear at all for all parties involved.

It would appear that neither venue had an operations manual setting out the inspections and tests to be carried out on buildings, structures, installations and entrance/exit equipment. However it was claimed that there were regular safety meetings where the Gendarmerie considers all the infrastructure and safety system checks. The consultative team was unable to obtain any information about their content, and it would have been expected that any such inspection would have detected problems such as trip hazards and poor maintenance encountered at the Dinamo Bucharest stadium. The team was unable to establish if the local authorities require any inspection system, by the stadium management or the event organiser.

In the team’s experience, such pre event check of operational records and certificates are an essential part of the safety management of spectators and should be included in the integrated approach referred to above. (See T-RV Rec (2008) 1 on the checklist of measures to be taken by the organisers of professional sporting events and by the public authorities

Recommendation 15

The Romanian authorities should:

- ❖ **Make clear in the law which independent agency is competent to annually check all stadiums on safety and security issues and who is responsible to deliver, on the basis of this report, a safety certificate for the stadium.**
- ❖ **Consider how best to integrate formal annual inspections of the stadium into the approach to safety management mentioned above. Such inspections should be undertaken, by a competent person, appointed by the event organiser. A report of the inspection should be submitted to the permit/certificate-issuing authority, to assist that authority to ensure that the organiser is complying with the conditions of the permit/certificate. See T-RV Rec (2008) 1 on the checklist of measures to be taken by the organisers of professional sporting events and by the public authorities)**

See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/Rec_2008_01_EN_Checklist.pdf

2.3.1 Stadium capacities

The team was unable to ascertain whether, and if so what account the local authority took of the safety management of the stadium, including matters such as the inexperience of the safety officer, in determining the safe capacity of the event. It would appear as though the stated capacity is based upon 90% of the holding capacity of the venue (i.e. the numbers of spectators that it can physically accommodate) and this is not reviewed in response to changes of circumstance or any assessment or observation from the relevant agencies.

Recommendation 16

- ❖ **The local authority (or such other body setting the maximum safe capacity of the stadium) should take account not merely of the number of spectators that it can physically hold, having regard to its design and condition, but also the numbers that can be safely managed, in other words the quality of the safety management. See T-RV Rec (2008) 1 on the checklist of measures to be taken by the organisers of professional sporting events and by the public authorities)**

See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/Rec_2008_01_EN_Checklist.pdf

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should evaluate the added value of the 90% capacity rule, whilst considering an alternative solution to determine the safe capacity of the stadium and each sector, based on the evacuation capacity of each sector and the quality of the safety management of the stadium.**

2.3.2 Risk management – dynamic risk assessment

All Football League 1 and international games are classed as high risk. However the inspection team obtained no explanation as to the reasons.

It would appear that other than considerations based on maintaining public order and risks of violence in the crowd, the Act 4 (2008) does not make provision for any safety risk assessment based on the dangers (hazards) spectators may encounter or on the probability of their occurrence.

The risk assessment process described in the Act 4 (2008) requires the event organiser and their security team to consult with the police, fire service and the medical services and for the submission of their respective opinions to the Gendarmerie for ratification/approval. However, the inspection team formed the opinion that, in practice, only the Gendarmerie has authority in establishing risk, the assessment of which is largely and mainly based on public order considerations.

The team noted that good consultations take place through multidisciplinary safety/security group meetings including representatives of all the bodies concerned.

Recommendation 17

The Romanian authorities should:

- ❖ **Review under Law 4 (2008) Art 7 preliminary risk level of a sport event which needs expanding to introduce a risk assessment system covering all types of danger (hazards) constituting a potential threat to the safety and security of spectators, as well as their dynamic assessment, on the basis of a multidisciplinary security agency mechanism including all the representatives concerned at the local level. (See T-RV Rec (2008) 1 on the checklist of measures to be taken by the organisers of professional sporting events and by the public authorities)**

See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/Rec_2008_01_EN_Checklist.pdf

- ❖ **Further introduce the system of dynamic risk assessment instead of predetermining risk on the basis of the category of games.**

2.3.3 Safety Officer

The role and responsibility of the Safety Officer is key to an integrated approach to safety management.

The owner of the stadium and the owner of the football club call upon the security service and appoint the person responsible for ensuring safety during the football match (security / safety officer). This officer, who, in particular, directs the stewards and the employees responsible for the protection of persons, co-operates directly with the Gendarmerie, police, and fire brigade commanders.

The Football Federation explained that each club has a safety officer who takes charge of all safety and stewarding issues. However, the consultative visiting team was unclear as to the operational responsibilities, powers, training and qualifications of the safety officer, who appears to be subordinated to the Gendarmerie. The team considers that further thought should be given to the position and status of the safety officer. It suggests that, in the long term, the safety officer should have prime responsibility for all safety issues, including both the maintenance of the stadium and the crowd management on match days. This should form part of a co-ordinated management system at local level to match that at the national level.

In order to discharge properly their responsibilities, a safety officer must be given a detailed job description which clearly sets out the functions of their post and should meet the following requirements:

Competence

The person appointed should be a skilled and experienced safety professional who has demonstrated their occupational competency for the role.

A person will be regarded as occupationally competent for the role of safety officer when he or she has sufficient training, experience and knowledge, to be able to implement the functions detailed in the job description. See recommendations below regarding safety officer qualification and training.

Whatever their background, it is essential that safety officers have the necessary character to be able to quickly assess and deal with developing situations in a calm manner and the ability to communicate clearly to their staff

Status

The safety officer should be recognised as being in overall control of operational safety management issues on an event day. On non-event days, the safety officer should be regarded as a principal adviser to the ground management on all spectator related safety issues.

Authority

On event days, the safety officer must have the authority to make immediate decisions on spectator safety without having to refer to senior management, board members or event organisers.

No decision which could have implications for safety should be taken without the agreement of the safety officer

The safety officer must be able, and be permitted, to commit sufficient time to all events to enable thorough preparation and planning to be undertaken.

The specific responsibilities of the safety officer could include but are not limited to:

- pre-event planning and risk assessments;
- pre-event inspections;
- developing safety management systems;
- preparing, monitoring and reviewing safety documentation and safety management systems;
- contributing to the safe capacity assessments;
- recruiting and organising the training of sufficient stewards;
- interacting with external agencies including the local authority, the police and other emergency services;
- maintaining safety records;
- investigation and reporting of incidents and accidents.

Recommendation 18

- ❖ **The safety officer should be provided with a detailed job description which clearly sets out the functions of their post. The (T-RV (2011)1 and its accompanying manual) may be used to compile a checklist of functions necessary for the role.**

See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/T-RV_2011_16_FINAL_Manual_safety_officer.pdf

Recommendation 19

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should lay down the minimum areas of competence to be demonstrated by such safety officers, supervisors and safety stewards, taking into account both the core functions of each group and the variety of roles that they may perform, having regard to the check lists in the Standing Committee's Manual of good practice on this subject.**

See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/Rec_2011_01_EN_Rec_safety_officers.pdf
and

http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/T-RV_2011_16_FINAL_Manual_safety_officer.pdf

Recommendation 20

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should identify and implement systems for ensuring the provision of adequate and appropriate training, at both the theoretical and practical level, for such safety officers, supervisors and safety stewards, and establish, document and monitor procedures for ensuring that those who have been trained are then assessed as being competent to perform their allocated tasks.**

Recommendation 21

- ❖ **The Safety officers should nationally develop a network to share information and intelligence of spectator behaviour and issues along with sharing expertise and good practises. (ESSMA, the European Stadium & Safety Management Association is the European network for this practice <http://www.essma.eu/>.)**

2.3.4 Stewards

Different views were expressed by the various stakeholders at the meeting with the team about the role and competence of the “stewards”. Some were generally complimentary; others were highly critical. It was noticeable however that most appeared to regard the stewards, normally described as private security personnel, as primarily responsible for the prevention of misbehaviour, with rather less emphasis on spectator safety. One of the main preoccupations of the Gendarmerie appeared to relate to the distinction between outside the sports venue (seen as the role of the Gendarmerie and the police) and inside (the role of the private security company).

There was some disagreement by the various stakeholders over the extent to which the private security companies were sufficiently regulated. The companies are required to submit action plans for the maintenance of public order to the Gendarmerie at least five working days before the event. These plans should cover the planned security forces and measures, establish contact with the Gendarmerie, territorial police and possible task sharing, identify the person in charge of security and identify measures for maintaining public order. The Gendarmerie commented that the private security services were not equipped to ensure safety in its entirety.

The team considers that it is essential to specify clearly and in writing the respective responsibilities of the Gendarmerie and the security companies, but also of the match commander, the safety officer and the head of stewards. It was not clear if the action plan covers this. This should preferably be in the form of a management document (not a formal legal agreement) that covers their functions and powers both inside and outside the venue. Thus, if the stewarding companies are to be responsible for “security” inside the venue, this needs to be recorded in detail, along with their powers. The document should also identify who is to be responsible for spectator safety and what they may do.

Recommendation 22

- ❖ **The action plan for each event should contain the respective responsibilities of the Gendarmerie and the security companies.**

2.3.5 Steward training

Law 4 Article 15 (3) requires “Training courses are held on specific topics established by the Romanian Gendarmerie, approved by the National Authority for Sport and Youth Sports Agency and ends by exams for all graduates conducted by a commission, which includes representatives of the gendarmerie, county sports department and public authorities responsible for training, education and employment”. Although the Gendarmerie noted that they did provide some training to stewards, there was no formal certificate or record of individuals completing such training. It was noted that the Ministry of Labour provided the formal qualification.

There was no indication from the meetings with any of the responsible parties that there was any system for checking the quality of stewarding, the number of qualified stewards on duty or the training undertaken by individual stewards. Depending on the private security company which is used, there seems to be a big difference in the quality of stewarding. In the absence of a formal structured training program which requires

a specified level of service, there is a risk that stewards handling of situations or their inaction, indecision and/or unprofessionalism, could lead to conflicts which in turn escalated into violence requiring the intervention of the Gendarmerie.

Consideration should therefore be given by the relevant authorities as to what systems could be put into place to ensure that all stewards are suitably and equally trained and qualified, and the training is delivered by an experienced and competent person. The team was informed that the private security personnel are “experienced”. Such experience is, however, no substitute for proper training. Such training should encompass both theoretical knowledge and supervised practical training in a sports facility. It was pleasing to note the Gendarmerie expressed their willingness to help provide relevant parts of this training.

The syllabus of the training course should be based on a clear statement of the tasks of the stewards. The competency framework for such training could follow the recommendations produced by the Council of Europe Standing Committee Recommendation on safety officer, supervisor and steward training (T-RV (2011) 1 and its accompanying Manual)

Recommendation 23

- ❖ **The event organiser should detail a level of service and training expected of stewards supplied by the steward/security company. A contract to this effect such as a service level agreement specifying the numbers, and quality of stewards should be signed.**

2.3.6 Facilities for people with special needs

Romanian regulations NP 051- 2001 is the Regulation for the adaptation of the civil buildings and urban areas to the requirements of the persons with walking difficulties. There is also an assessment scheme for the accessibility of public building and urban spaces under the control of National Authority for People with Disabilities under Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Protection.

Observation of the three stadiums in Bucharest that while wheelchair users were accommodated within the stadiums, access and facilities for all people with special needs were lacking. There also appeared to be no access appraisal or dialogue with disabled supporters to help determine acceptable standards.

Recommendation 24

- ❖ **The Romanian Authorities should consider setting standards for people with special needing at sporting events. Layout criteria for viewing areas for spectators with special needs contained within the European standard CEN/TR 15913:2009. Spectator facilities may be an appropriate level.**
- ❖ **The football authorities and supporter organisations should consider engaging with organisations which encourage a support people with special needs. (For example Centre for Access to Football in Europe – café, <http://www.cafefootball.eu/>).**

3. SECURITY

3.1 Policing

The Romanian Gendarmerie is in charge to secure football matches in Romania. They are the overall main player in the area of safety and security at sports events in Romania. The concept is based on the three pillars: restoring, assuring and maintaining public order. Organised on military principles as a unitary system of means and forces, according to the administrative-territorial organisation of the country, the Romanian Gendarmerie is lead, at central level by a General Inspectorate, which ensures through its general directorates, the coordination of the activities realized by the 41 county inspectorates and the General Directorate of Bucharest. Furthermore, the General Inspectorate, with the headquarters in Bucharest, coordinates the activity of Special Brigades of Intervention, 8 Mobile Groups, 6 Special Units and 12 Military Training Centers. The NFIP Romania is a part of the Romanian Gendarmerie.

In brief the Romanian Gendarmerie is assuring and restoring public order is managing the hooligan database and is providing expertise in this field of action. On the other hand the Romanian Police is maintaining public order outside of the stadium, the traffic control and is having teams of specialists (judiciary, forensics etc). Finally the General Inspectorate for emergency situations is preventing and extinguishing fire as providing first aid.

The commander of the local Gendarmerie unit and the safety and security officer of the club / organiser establish together the level of risk posed by the sport event. For high risk games it is foreseen that the prefect and a prosecutor are present at the stadium. The organiser includes all the safety and security measures into an action plan for the stewards. The action plan is approved by the commander of the Gendarmerie unit who himself creates the action plan for assuring the public order for the sports event.

The command and coordination of the activities is achieved from the command room which is located inside the stadium by the local Gendarmerie Unit commander or a person designated by him. Inside the command room is present: the safety and security officer of the club / organiser, the commander of the Gendarmerie Unit, the stewards' chief, a representative of the Fire Brigade, Ambulance Service and a prefect (or a person designated by him).

The identification details of the persons who are sanctioned during sports events or banned for attending this kind of activities, are integrated into the hooligan database managed by the National Football Information Point of Romania, from the General Inspectorate of Romanian Gendarmerie.

Law no. 4/2008 is covering the following fields in relation with police work:

- NFIP Romania
- Football Intelligence Officers, Spotters
- Data bases
- Banning orders
- Personal training
- Safety rules enhancement

After an increasing number of banning orders the last for years, in 2012 the banner orders were decreasing (2008: 173, 2009: 145, 2010: 602, 2011: 743, 2012: 251 active banning orders). Law no. 4/2008 sets up the rules for the banning order. The duration goes from 6 months to 10 years. Therefore every law enforcement agent can decree a banning order from 6 months to 2 years, a prosecutor from 1 to 10 years or by court (also 1 to 10 years). Banning orders can be decreed for national and international matches, complementary to minor offences, it could be a judicial measure or based on a criminal offence and it could include a reporting to police station as an additional measure.

The National information point for sports events (Romanian NFIP) is a central structure within Romanian Gendarmerie, in charge with data and information exchange in order to realize the national and international cooperation regarding sports events and exists since 2003. The NFIP stores data from perpetrators in their system EVIC/Infosport, dealing with pre match assessments, post match reports and incident reports. NFIP Romania's work follows the principles of the European collaboration within the NFIPs, e.g. they exchange data on the NFIP homepage. In total 168 spotters are working within Romania, 32 in the first league and in addition a number of 54 Football intelligence officers are available.

Spotters are trained on a regular basis by the Romanian NFIP and meet often to exchange experiences and good practices. There is a clear distinction between the football intelligence officer (who deals with the club) and the head of spotters (responsible for information sharing and relation with the NFIP). However, as also experienced in a lot of other European countries, the specific training and information sharing is lacking at the level of the match commanders.

Recommendation 25

The Romanian authorities should

- ❖ **Keep on investing in the quality and quantity of information sharing, with a crucial role for the NFIP, intelligence officers and spotters.**
- ❖ **Organise specific training course for football/sports match commanders in accordance with the current paneuropean police training program, and a joint training program for match**

commanders, safety officers and heads of spotters is set up, so everyone is aware of each other's role and the added value of experienced spotters.

The team visited the first league game between FC Petrolul Ploiesti and Universitatea Cluj in Ploiesti. Petrolul is playing in the Ilie Oană Stadium (Romanian: Stadionul Ilie Oană), which is located in Ploiești. The stadium opened in September 2011 and has an all seated capacity of 15,500. In this game, 8000 peaceful fans were there, no risk fans present.

The away fans travelled by coach to the match. This fact and the infrastructure of the stadium allow an easy Fan-separation. The police were highly visible at critical points (main entrance, guest entrance) in position. According to statements of the Romanian Gendarmerie more than 150 police officers were deployed. In view of the risk assessment and the audience of 8000 that number of police forces appears particularly high in the light of a European wide recommended low profile approach. Except of fence-climbing in the guest sector, no incidents happened. As far as can be assessed, the security briefing before the match was accurate. All important representatives were present and informed. The team noted with approval that there is an integrated control room within the Petrolul stadium where the police and stadium management are co-located. CCTV is operated from here and the control room is also the location of the computer monitoring the turnstile operation.

All in all, the Gendarmerie takes over a strong role in safety and security concerns. Nonetheless Security officers of the club, the Football Association and the Professional League express very positive about the cooperation with the Gendarmerie.

Romania is complying completely with the EU Council decision on NFIP's, as well as with the EU handbook on international police cooperation. The use of intelligence officers and police spotters is common. A police intelligence co-ordination centre in form of the NIFP manages the national database and the information provided by transit and participating countries. The way this is done and structured is completely up to high European standard.

The team got informed by the sometimes large number of stewards and police/gendarmerie officers deployed at sport events, in particular football matches. Although the police deployment seems to have already heavily decreased over the past years, it is clear there is still room for improvement, as the team could witness at both games it attended. On the contrary of the situation in many European countries, there is no real pressure on police forces to decrease the number of personnel deployed. A decreased deployment as such is naturally not the objective as such, but the aim is a deployment based on a dynamic risk assessment. It seems that the numbers of security and safety personnel deployed is now often taken on the basis of historical customs or on the number of the available stadium capacity, independent of the expected risk and/or the expected number of spectators.

Recommendation 26

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should further develop the concept of dynamic risk assessment in order to ensure a police deployment which is in line with the expected risk.**

It is also important to maintain an appropriate balance between maintaining order, spectator safety and providing an enjoyable experience. Policing should wherever possible be conducted with a light touch, taking crowd management as a priority over crowd control. A low-profile strategy for policing sports events based on the following principles could still bring improvement:

The policing of sports events are a highly professional operation which requires all participating officers to receive proper, updated training. Police commanders and spotters would benefit from attending matches in other countries;

Timely and accurate strategic information about supporters can positively influence the level and style of police deployment. This should be supported by operational dynamic risk assessment throughout the duration of the operation which should, in turn, influence police tactics;

The police deployment should, as far as practicable, be organised in a non-provocative manner in order to underline the festive nature of the event. Police officers are often the first people supporters come into contact with and to whom they may put their questions, as they are highly visible and easy to identify. It is

therefore desirable that all police officers are aware of their role and of the importance of presenting a friendly, calm and respectful response; police units unnecessarily deployed in full protective equipment may not prevent incidents, indeed there is a risk that they may provoke them; sufficient police with the necessary equipment should, however, be available for deployment when needed.

Recommendation 27

The Romanian authorities should:

- ❖ **Balance the police operational profile on the basis of a dynamic risk analysis and low-profile intelligence-led policing: “public relations” police officers to welcome spectators and to communicate and interact with them, riot police for public order interventions (not visible or with low visibility) and specific police officers for evidence gathering;**
- ❖ **Encourage police commanders and spotters to attend matches abroad to gain experience and expertise in identifying and dealing with foreign supporters who may cause trouble, and to provide a specific budget for such visits abroad as to ensure independence from the clubs;**
- ❖ **Discuss the risk assessment with the local authorities and the police, the stadium management and other relevant parties and take account of their views before coming to a final conclusion; procedures should be in place to review the risk assessment in the light of any changes of circumstances before or on the day of the event; the process should furthermore have scope for additional categories of risk so as to allow greater variety in the safety and security management plans.**

Recommendation 28

- ❖ **Perceptions in particular between the police and supporters should be improved by better communication. Lines of communication should be established between them and the local and national security and safety co-ordination structures, with a view to actively involving them in the prevention, hospitality and public relations policies among others.**
- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should create communications structures between clubs, police and supporters’ organisations making full use of the Recommendation of the Standing Committee (Rec (2012) 1) on dialogue and interaction with fans.**

4. SERVICES

4.1 Prevention of violence

The Romanian annual report of the Standing Committee points out, in its Part II–Questionnaire on recent trends (2011-2012) that compared with the last three years the number of incidents both at domestic and international matches has decreased. The same impression emerges from the Report prepared by Romanian authorities for the consultative visit of the T-RV Standing Committee of the Council of Europe. It is therefore recognized that violence incidents occur and preventive measures should cover different matters such as social and educational campaigns, improving relations with supporters, promoting dialogue with rival clubs, strengthening the social role of clubs, organising ticket sale on a coherent bases and improving legislation, apart from others related to safety.

Taking this into account, it is important to mention the conviction of the Romanian Government, expressed to the team through the State Secretary of Foreign Affairs, of the importance of setting up preventive measures before the problem becomes larger. In this way, the Government is conscious that the current financial crisis entails more violence as extremisms run the risk to appear, but the solution is not to have empty stadiums but appropriate people are inside them. So, several key issues such as looking for a balance among all the policies, increase administrative capacity, the training of the trainers and the importance of mass media are pointed out.

With regard to the former, in Romania there exists the National Commission for Action against Violence in Sport which includes representatives of the Police, Gendarmerie, Ministry of Education, Research, Sport and Youth, Ministry of Health, central and local public authorities, Romanian Football Federation, professional leagues, sport federations and is placed under the coordination of the National Authority for Sport and Youth (ANST). It was explained to the team that its members only meet twice per year, although on the occasion of the revision of Law 4/2008 they met more often (see also recommendations in the multi-agency chapter).

The President of the ANST explained to the team that problems have been detected mainly at football games, however also at sports competitions in which players are youngsters or children, ANST is aware that parents' incorrect behavior has a bad influence not only on maintenance of public order but also on their children upbringing. This concern about parents' behavior is also shared by Romanian Football Federation. Currently, the Commission does not elaborate statistics on the issues under its competences nor tackles the relationship between clubs and fans.

At the same time, Law 4/2008 foresees in article 12 a wide range of different kind of preventive measures to be developed by all structures with responsibilities in sport events, sport federations and professional leagues, together with the sport clubs and all other structures with attributions in sports.

Recommendation 29

- ❖ **The National Commission for Action against Violence in Sport should promote good and regular relations with supporters.**

With regard to preventive measures, it must be highlighted that the European Commission financed ELYS project on prevention of sport related violence among young supporters that is been carried out by the National Sports Research Institute.

This project is targeted to youngsters from eleven to fourteen years old and it pursues preventive and inclusive objectives; it focuses in behavior both on and off the pitch related to all sports. The project is being developed in a number (6 to 8) of schools throughout Romania spanning about six hundred pupils and it has been welcomed by local authorities, pupils and school directors. It also counts on the collaboration of "Sport revolution", a sport magazine that acts as its partner to promote the project throughout the country, as media is not often interested in publishing this kind of initiatives. During this first year the budget amount was 20.000 Euros whereas they consider that if the project continued for longer, 15.000 Euros per year should be enough.

The team appreciates the appropriateness of the project in order to prevent sport related violence in a wider sense and the convenience that this kind of initiatives needs continuity to become effective. This is particularly important as it seems that no other stakeholder the team met (clubs, Professional League, Football Federation) seems to be developing sustainable preventive programs aimed to young children and players. Regarding this, it must be pointed out that in their Report, the Romanian Authorities showed concern on some uneducated players who abnormally act in certain circumstances, inciting the spectators and causing violent reactions among them, in particular by addressing obscene gestures or by biased behaviour.

Recommendation 30

- ❖ **A joint and coordinated Romanian policy strategy on hospitality between Public Administration and clubs and federations should be built. Preventative projects (social and educative measures) aimed at young children and players should be part of the ANST long-term strategy that should urge sports clubs and federations to play a key role to carry out this type of projects. Also Educative Authorities have a key role in this field as adequate sport education at schools should cover not only sports training but also education on sport related values.**
- ❖ **Such so-called "football in the community schemes" should be developed in cooperation with local authorities and communities and with the support of local clubs and fan groups. Various European countries can be contacted as a source of inspiration to start off with low budget but highly effective projects.**

- ❖ **The football authorities should set up an information program towards players and officials about unacceptable behavior towards spectators, and to undertake disciplinary actions against players and officials who do act in an offensive way towards spectators.**

4.2 Fight against racism

The Romanian annual report of the Standing Committee points out, in its Part II–Questionnaire on recent trends (2011-2012) as one of the changes detected in the nature of incidents “more racist incidents”. However, the only mention to racism that is contained in the Report prepared by Romanian authorities for the consultative visit of the T-RV Standing Committee is just to express that coordinated law enforcement actions designed to prevent violent incidents focus primarily on preventing the introduction into the arenas of, among others, banners with racist or inciting to violence messages.

From a legal point of view, Romania adopted Ordinance 11/2006 whose aim is to prevent and reduce racism in stadiums. Afterwards, in Law 4/2008 on preventing and combating violence related to sport competitions and games, racist manifestations are banned and sanctioned according to the above mentioned Ordinance. In this way, Law 4/2008 foresees and categorizes as criminal offence the use, within the sport arena, of the fascist, racist and xenophobe symbols and sets the relevant sanctions.

Romania also has a list of forbidden symbols in Law, although they are conscious that racist and xenophobic symbols can evolve so that the list needs to be updated.

During our meetings with most of the stakeholders, practically everyone stated there was no problem whatsoever with racism in Romanian Football. For its part, Romanian Football Federation explained that in 2006, some serious racist incidents used to take place in Romania stadiums and they still occur from time to time, although nowadays they are lower in number and intensity. The former circumstance led in 2006 the RFF to react against this phenomenon and organise a campaign to fight against racism that lasted up to 2007-2008 sport season. In 2009 RFF during the 1st June match another campaign was held. In 2008 RFF organised together with its NGO partner a seminar on promoting social dialogue and combating racism and violence in football as well as other activities. Also in 2011 and 2012 several activities against racism have been developed by RFF, some of them focused to children. Nowadays they show two banners against racism before each match and have made a video-clip against racism. Even though these campaigns they believe sanctions are necessary.

Also in Dinamo stadium a poster containing a message against racism seems to be permanently displayed.

Taking this into account, it is not entirely clear for the consultative team what is the exact extend of racist incidents within Romanian football, and if racism is fully recognized as a sport related problem in Romania. Due to the seriousness of this phenomenon whenever it occurs, special attention should be paid to detect and counteract any incident of this nature.

Recommendation 31

- ❖ **All the involved agencies, both public authorities (included sports federations and the football professional league) and non-governmental organisations (sports associations, clubs, supporters clubs, players organisations, anti-racist associations, etc.) should pay special attention to detect sport related racist incidents and, if it is the case, to counter act and set up the appropriate measures, both of educational and social nature, to prevent them.**

The Romanian authorities should:

- ❖ **Consider engaging with organisations which fight against racism to develop initiatives and contribute to major campaigns (for example with FARE, Football against racism in Europe);**
- ❖ **Keep updated a list of racist symbols which are forbidden and make it known to the appropriate stakeholders, in particular to all match commanders and safety officers, spotters and stewards;**

- ❖ **Make full use of the Rec(2001)6 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to member states on the prevention of racism, xenophobia and racial intolerance in sport which recommends the governments to adopt effective policies and measures aimed at preventing and combating racist, xenophobic, discriminatory and intolerant behaviour in all sports and in particular football, drawing inspiration from the guidelines in the appendix to this recommendation. See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/Ref_Text_Violence_en.asp**

4.3 Dialogue with Fans

4.3.1 Relation between fans and the clubs, football federation and professional football league

One of the issues mentioned in the report prepared by Romanian authorities for the consultative visit of the T-RV Standing Committee is the lack of projects for fans. It is stated that most of the clubs have not been able to propose specific projects to their supporters in order to encourage them to create fan clubs and/or join them, to participate in various activities or to be a real support for their team.

The team met three representatives of Steaua Football Club, a club that has the highest number of supporters in Romania, claiming 67% out of all the Romanian football supporters, and 5% being women.

The representatives assured there is a good relation between the club and its fans as they consider that the club helps and supports them. They explained that they have reached an agreement with the club that has come out in a good, permanent collaboration so that problems are transmitted in both ways. Supporters try to make the club understand what they need, coordinate activities and look for a better communication between them. Matters such as logistic help, trips, communication with other teams, etc. are commonly agreed. The club also sets special places aside at the entry of the stadium for disabled supporters. Supporters are making an effort to try to have more families and children at the stadiums. In this way they visit some schools to try to bring young supporters to them.

The club representatives explained that there is a fan league that gathers just Steaua supporters, as Law obliges fan clubs to organise themselves in leagues according to civil Law. So, each club has a fan league, but there is no umbrella organisation that gathers all the fan leagues from different clubs. These leagues have legal personality and develop their own activities. Relation between these leagues and the clubs is regulated as a relation between two legal entities, so that club cannot adopt disciplinary measures to its fans as these are not its associates.

On the other hand, in the opinion of Romanian Football Federation, supporters mean something minor for clubs that do not look after them sufficiently, even though Federation urges the clubs to support their fans in every match, not just once or twice per year. For the Federation dialogue with fans is not easy, in its opinion, the Law is not quick and hard enough to counter violent acts by supporters. RFF has held five meetings with fan clubs during this year. It met club supporters and national team supporters in two different meetings.

Concerning the Professional Football League considers there is an educational problem of supporters who cause several violent incidents, especially damages and igniting and throwing of pyrotechnics. These incidents are being sensationalized by media according to the PFL. The PFL explained to the team that they have had some attempts at dialogue with supporters but they had not been successful. Even so, there are more and more families in stadiums.

It must be also mentioned the concern shown by Romanian authorities in its national report due to the behavior of some officials, either sport clubs owners or leaders, who defend violent supporters, or hide problems related to stadium facilities.

Recommendation 32

- ❖ **All fan leagues should create an umbrella organisation to act as a partner at national level to discuss with the relevant stakeholders on safety, security and service at football matches (and other sport events). This umbrella organisation should be representative for all clubs and for a**

cross-section of the public present in the Romanian football stadiums (young fans and older fans, disabled fans, etc.);

- ❖ **Clubs should implement measures that favour transparency within them, including Ethics Codes; at the same time they should adopt initiatives focused to bring young supporters and families to its clubs, as well as actions aimed at keeping their current fans by carrying out specific projects aimed to their supporters.**
- ❖ **Clubs, at least first division clubs, should be encouraged to draft joint supporters' charters with their fan league based upon agreed principles as explained in the Standing Committee recommendation Rec (2010)1 on Supporters' Charters;**
- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should take preventive social and educative measures aiming at improving the welcoming and coaching of supporters, with regard to their national circumstances, drawing inspiration from the principles and initiatives presented in the *Handbook on prevention of violence in sport* appended to the recommendation Rec(2003)1 on the role of social and educational measures in the prevention of violence in sport; See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/Ref_Text_Violence_en.asp**

4.3.2 Relation between the fans and the security forces

It seems that relations between the fans and the Gendarmerie is consolidated, however it also seems those relations are not always as fluid as they should be, which is contradictory.

So, the team was explained that there is a sort of triangle relation amongst the Gendarmerie, clubs and fans before each match, which is held according to Law, either if the match is played in Bucharest or not. Supporters can also inform directly the police. In general terms, it seems that there is a good communication with supporters.

However, according to Steaua fans, the Gendarmerie does not always respect the agreements made in advance, and that is the reason why some of them stay at home instead of attending the match. During the discussions, the consultative team could clearly see that the disagreement which arose between the fans and the Gendarmerie was not so much about one or another partner not respecting the agreements made, but moreover a lack of mutually agreed specific understanding of what is the exact content of the measures put in place. It is clear that racist or provocative banners is not allowed, but there is no common agreement what is considered to be racist or provocative, and this is not discussed in depth in between Gendarmerie, club and fans.

On the contrary, according to the supporters, the relation with the spotters and the stewards is better. Concerning the relation between the fans and the stewards, the team could not witness if this good relationship is really in line with reality, because at the Romania – Belgium game, violent clashes occurred between fans and stewards, and at the national game in Ploiesti, no stewards were deployed in the away stand and the home stand gathering all of the more younger and enthusiastic fans. In neither of these games, the team has witnessed any proactive communication between fans and stewards.

From the Gendarmerie point of view, even though there are supporters that prefer not to go to the stadium due to the Gendarmerie intervention, stadiums are still full. In their opinion, they are a public institution whose function is not to organise the match but to ensure that the Law is upheld.

As the team could observe during the match at Ploiești stadium, a video against violence is shown before the match. This video was elaborated by the Gendarmerie together with the club but it is not played in all the stadiums. Also before the match started a group of children went out wearing a T-shirt containing a message against violence. This is also part of the campaign of the Gendarmerie.

Contrary to the National Arena and Petrolul stadium, Dinamo stadium is not a modern one, as it dates back to 1948. Its facilities represent the standard average of Romania stadiums; just 2nd Division games are played there. At the Dinamo stadium the team was explained that there have been some meetings to try to improve the relation between the club and its supporters, but the club added they had no influence on their behavior.

Relation between the Gendarmerie and this club is good but fans are considered not to be serious and do not respect the clubs requirements.

Recommendation 33

- ❖ **The Romanian authorities should create and keep communication structures between clubs, Gendarmerie and supporters' organisations that facilitate an open and transparent dialogue on a short-term (match preparation) and long-term basis (problem solving) as foreseen in Recommendation (2012) 1 of the Standing Committee on dialogue and interaction with fans;**
- ❖ **The existing dialogue structures should go into much wider detail and make clear arrangements on what is allowed and what is not allowed at sports events.
See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/Ref_Text_Violence_en.asp**

5. CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. General conclusions

It has to be recognised that it is impossible for a team coming from abroad to have a complete and detailed picture of the situation in a country on the basis of a number of reports and meetings, regardless of the quality of these reports and meetings. This is not an excuse, but an important element to be taken into consideration whilst reading this report and these recommendations. Safety and security at sport events, in particular at football matches, is a complex area and there are no stand-alone solutions. It would be of little use to propose copy and paste answers coming from other countries. Recommendations can only be made, if they can fit within the historical, political, legal and cultural framework of a given country.

The findings of the team are based on the national report, the consultative visit itself, a study of the law and some open sources, like research of the Internet. The report and recommendations mainly focus on the general framework (multi-agency approach, safety, security and service) without going into too much detail. The team recognizes that some of these recommendations cannot be implemented immediately as they will need to go through a parliamentary process (for example any changes to the existing legislative framework). Nevertheless, during the visit, the team was very happy to learn that at political level, there is a real engagement and willingness to move forward.

In general, the team would like to congratulate Romania on the progress which has been made over the last few years. Romania has put in place, at several levels a structure which is based on recognized European good practice and which is in line with the Convention and most importantly, Standing Committee recommendations. There is a specific legal framework, there is a specific police structure (including NFIP, intelligence officers and spotters) and there is a system in place of safety officers and stewards. It is normal that some of the changes take time, and the aim of our recommendations is to help and support Romania to focus on some key elements in order to further improve the system.

Some of our recommendations can, according to us, be classified as a priority, others can be implemented in a later phase. It is however important to realize that all of these recommendations are interlinked and cannot be seen in isolation. An overall multi-agency strategy depends on a good balance between all of its components, and if one element fails, another organisation or agency has to compensate for this.

By implementing these recommendations, Romania will be able to improve even more their safety and security strategy at sports events, in particular at football matches. The team wishes to repeat that Romania can always count of advice, support and help of the Council of Europe Standing Committee in this process. On the other hand, the Standing Committee would also welcome a periodical feedback on the progress made by Romania concerning the implementation of the recommendations in this report.

Finally, the team would like to thank once again all Romanian colleagues who have helped and supported us during our visit.

5.2. Summary of recommendations

The following recommendations are made in response to the information provided to the team via formal presentations, question and answer sessions, informal discussion and observation at the matches on 14 and 16 November 2012. They are also based on an extensive study of the existing legal framework; The recommendations are intended not to criticise but to assist the Romanian authorities developing an integrated approach of safety, security and services within Romania at sports events, in particular football matches.

Following its consultative visit to Romania
Having regard to its general conclusions listed above,
The Standing Committee's delegation recommends:

ON A MULTI AGENCY STRATEGY:

Recommendation 1

- ❖ The Romanian authorities should evaluate the composition, role and functioning of this National Commission against Violence in Sport with all relevant stakeholders.

Recommendation 2

- ❖ The Romanian authorities should evaluate the composition, role and functioning of these County Commissions of Actions against Violence in Sport with all relevant stakeholders

Recommendation 3

- ❖ In order to be effective and treat problems in a proportionate way, the Romanian authorities should evaluate if most measures stipulated in the law should not be targeted at major football matches, whilst only some key safety principles would then apply to all other sport events and football matches in lower divisions.

Recommendation 4

The Romanian authorities should:

- ❖ Evaluate the overarching role of the Gendarmerie, considering which tasks should be performed by them and which tasks should be allocated to other stakeholders, amending if necessary accordingly the existing policies and/or legal provisions.
- ❖ Draw up a paper explaining very clearly the role and responsibility of each partner, in particular concerning important safety issues like inspection procedures, stadium licensing and safety certification.

Recommendation 5

- ❖ There should be clarity who can make what decision if safety and security requirements are not met in a (part of a) stadium

Recommendation 6

- ❖ The Romanian authorities, in order to minimise the administrative workload, should evaluate if parts of this action plan, which are valid for all events in a given stadium, could not be part of an agreement to be signed by all stakeholders before the season, so the action plan would be limited to specific measures for a given event in accordance with the risk level of that specific event.

Recommendation 7

- ❖ The Romanian authorities should evaluate the full effectiveness of the existing legal provisions on sanctions, building on existing European experiences in for example administrative sanctions imposed by an independent body and should develop an effective evidence gathering strategy.

Recommendation 8

- ❖ It is crucial that each sanction is also effectively implemented and that a monitoring system to ensure this is introduced.

Recommendation 9

- ❖ The Romanian authorities should structure the law in a clear and comprehensive way (multi-agency approach, safety, security, service/prevention) and make a critical evaluation in cooperation with all stakeholders of each article between theory and practice (is each stipulation really implemented or possible to implement and is it each time clear who is responsible to do what). If deemed necessary, the Romanian authorities can look for assistance of European wide experts to undertake this project.

Recommendation 10

- ❖ The Romanian authorities should develop an integrated and proactive media and communication strategy in the field of safety and security at sport events, in cooperation with all stakeholders involved.

ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION:

Recommendation 11

- ❖ The Romanian authorities should further promote the European Convention on Spectator Violence and dispatch the Standing Committee recommendations on a large scale at national level.

Recommendation 12

- ❖ The Romanian authorities in charge of the implementation of the Convention, in particular the Ministry of Sport and the Ministry of Interior should both follow closely the work of the Standing Committee and any further developments and should clarify if it would be of added value if a representative of the Ministry of the Interior or the Gendarmerie would join the Romanian T-RV delegation, in view of their important roles and powers in the field of security aspects during match day operations.

ON SAFETY:

Recommendation 13

- ❖ The risk assessment for each event should consider the physical environment and quality of safety management as well of the risk associated with the crowd profile. in order to determine an acceptable capacity.
- ❖ The overall command and control system should be reviewed to ensure that there are clear arrangements for managing incidents in place, and that there is an understanding of what issues should be reported to match control. A system of integrated command should be developed, determining in writing who is responsible to do what under which circumstances.
- ❖ A pre event check should be carried out to ensure that hazards such as broken seats, trip hazards,etc. are identified and rectified.
- ❖ An access appraisal should be undertaken together with consultation with any appropriate groups representing persons with disabilities to ensure that appropriate facilities are provided for people with special needs.
- ❖ Joint training programs for safety officers and match commanders, and stewards and police officers should be set up and regularly repeated.
- ❖ All stewards should be clearly identifiable as steward, and there should be a clear visual distinction between stewards and police officers.

Recommendation 14

- ❖ Consideration should be given to ensuring recognised standards are adopted for handrail heights and balustrading (see European Standard EN 13200 part 3).
- ❖ The stadium operator should take responsibility for fire risk assessments, the development of a fire safety strategy and prepare a fire safety check list. A policy should be developed in respect of the fire resistance of flags and banners.

- ❖ A pre event safety check regime should be carried out and the outcome of the checks and any remedial action taken fully documented (See T-RV Rec (2008) 1 on the checklist of measures to be taken by the organisers of professional sporting events and by the public authorities)
- ❖ Stewards should be deployed and play an active role in crowd management in all sectors of the stadium.

Recommendation 15

The Romanian authorities should:

- ❖ Make clear in the law which independent agency is competent to annually check all stadiums on safety and security issues and who is responsible to deliver, on the basis of this report, a safety certificate for the stadium.
- ❖ Consider how best to integrate formal annual inspections of the stadium into the approach to safety management mentioned above. Such inspections should be undertaken, by a competent person, appointed by the event organiser. A report of the inspection should be submitted to the permit/certificate-issuing authority, to assist that authority to ensure that the organiser is complying with the conditions of the permit/certificate. See T-RV Rec (2008) 1 on the checklist of measures to be taken by the organisers of professional sporting events and by the public authorities)
See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/Rec_2008_01_EN_Checklist.pdf

Recommendation 16

- ❖ The local authority (or such other body setting the maximum safe capacity of the stadium) should take account not merely of the number of spectators that it can physically hold, having regard to its design and condition, but also the numbers that can be safely managed, in other words the quality of the safety management. See T-RV Rec (2008) 1 on the checklist of measures to be taken by the organisers of professional sporting events and by the public authorities)
See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/Rec_2008_01_EN_Checklist.pdf
- ❖ The Romanian authorities should evaluate the added value of the 90% capacity rule, whilst considering an alternative solution to determine the safe capacity of the stadium and each sector, based on the evacuation capacity of each sector and the quality of the safety management of the stadium.

Recommendation 17

The Romanian authorities should:

- ❖ Review under Law 4 (2008) Art 7 preliminary risk level of a sport event which needs expanding to introduce a risk assessment system covering all types of danger (hazards) constituting a potential threat to the safety and security of spectators, as well as their dynamic assessment, on the basis of a multidisciplinary security agency mechanism including all the representatives concerned at the local level. (See T-RV Rec (2008) 1 on the checklist of measures to be taken by the organisers of professional sporting events and by the public authorities)
See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/Rec_2008_01_EN_Checklist.pdf
- ❖ Further introduce the system of dynamic risk assessment instead of predetermining risk on the basis of the category of games.

Recommendation 18

- ❖ The safety officer should be provided with a detailed job description which clearly sets out the functions of their post. The (T-RV (2011)1 and its accompanying manual) may be used to compile a checklist of functions necessary for the role.

See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/T-RV_2011_16_FINAL_Manual_safety_officer.pdf

Recommendation 19

- ❖ The Romanian authorities should lay down the minimum areas of competence to be demonstrated by such safety officers, supervisors and safety stewards, taking into account both the core functions of each group and the variety of roles that they may perform, having regard to the check lists in the Standing Committee's Manual of good practice on this subject.
See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/Rec_2011_01_EN_Rec_safety_officers.pdf
and

http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/texts/T-RV_2011_16_FINAL_Manual_safety_officer.pdf

Recommendation 20

- ❖ The Romanian authorities should identify and implement systems for ensuring the provision of adequate and appropriate training, at both the theoretical and practical level, for such safety officers, supervisors and safety stewards, and establish, document and monitor procedures for ensuring that those who have been trained are then assessed as being competent to perform their allocated tasks.

Recommendation 21

- ❖ The Safety officers should nationally develop a network to share information and intelligence of spectator behaviour and issues along with sharing expertise and good practises. (ESSMA, the European Stadium & Safety Management Association is the European network for this practice <http://www.essma.eu/>.)

Recommendation 22

- ❖ The action plan for each event should contain the respective responsibilities of the Gendarmerie and the security companies.

Recommendation 23

- ❖ The event organiser should detail a level of service and training expected of stewards supplied by the steward/security company. A contract to this effect such as a service level agreement specifying the numbers, and quality of stewards should be signed.

Recommendation 24

- ❖ The Romanian Authorities should consider setting standards for people with special needing at sporting events. Layout criteria for viewing areas for spectators with special needs contained within the European standard CEN/TR 15913:2009. Spectator facilities may be an appropriate level.
- ❖ The football authorities and supporter organisations should consider engaging with organisations which encourage a support people with special needs. (For example Centre for Access to Football in Europe – café, <http://www.cafefootball.eu/>).

ON SECURITY:

Recommendation 25

The Romanian authorities should

- ❖ Keep on investing in the quality and quantity of information sharing, with a crucial role for the NFIP, intelligence officers and spotters.
- ❖ Organise specific training course for football/sports match commanders in accordance with the current paneuropean police training program, and a joint training program for match commanders, safety officers and heads of spotters is set up, so everyone is aware of each other's role and the added value of experienced spotters.

Recommendation 26

- ❖ The Romanian authorities should further develop the concept of dynamic risk assessment in order to ensure a police deployment which is in line with the expected risk.

Recommendation 27

The Romanian authorities should:

- ❖ Balance the police operational profile on the basis of a dynamic risk analysis and low-profile intelligence-led policing: “public relations” police officers to welcome spectators and to communicate and interact with them, riot police for public order interventions (not visible or with low visibility) and specific police officers for evidence gathering;
- ❖ Encourage police commanders and spotters to attend matches abroad to gain experience and expertise in identifying and dealing with foreign supporters who may cause trouble, and to provide a specific budget for such visits abroad as to ensure independence from the clubs;
- ❖ Discuss the risk assessment with the local authorities and the police, the stadium management and other relevant parties and take account of their views before coming to a final conclusion; procedures should be in place to review the risk assessment in the light of any changes of circumstances before or on the day of the event; the process should furthermore have scope for additional categories of risk so as to allow greater variety in the safety and security management plans.

Recommendation 28

- ❖ Perceptions in particular between the police and supporters should be improved by better communication. Lines of communication should be established between them and the local and national security and safety co-ordination structures, with a view to actively involving them in the prevention, hospitality and public relations policies among others.
- ❖ The Romanian authorities should create communications structures between clubs, police and supporters’ organisations making full use of the Recommendation of the Standing Committee (Rec (2012) 1) on dialogue and interaction with fans.

ON SERVICES:

Recommendation 29

- ❖ The National Commission for Action against Violence in Sport should promote good and regular relations with supporters.

Recommendation 30

- ❖ A joint and coordinated Romanian policy strategy on hospitality between Public Administration and clubs and federations should be built. Preventative projects (social and educative measures) aimed at young children and players should be part of the ANST long-term strategy that should urge sports clubs and federations to play a key role to carry out this type of projects. Also Educative Authorities have a key role in this field as adequate sport education at schools should cover not only sports training but also education on sport related values.
- ❖ Such so-called “football in the community schemes” should be developed in cooperation with local authorities and communities and with the support of local clubs and fan groups. Various European countries can be contacted as a source of inspiration to start off with low budget but highly effective projects.
- ❖ The football authorities should set up an information program towards players and officials about unacceptable behavior towards spectators, and to undertake disciplinary actions against players and officials who do act in an offensive way towards spectators.

Recommendation 31

- ❖ All the involved agencies, both public authorities (included sports federations and the football professional league) and non-governmental organisations (sports associations, clubs, supporters clubs, players organisations, anti-racist associations, etc.) should pay special attention to detect sport related racist incidents and, if it is the case, to counter act and set up the appropriate measures, both of educational and social nature, to prevent them.

The Romanian authorities should:

- ❖ Consider engaging with organisations which fight against racism to develop initiatives and contribute to major campaigns (for example with FARE, Football against racism in Europe);

- ❖ Keep updated a list of racist symbols which are forbidden and make it known to the appropriate stakeholders, in particular to all match commanders and safety officers, spotters and stewards;
- ❖ Make full use of the Rec(2001)6 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to member states on the prevention of racism, xenophobia and racial intolerance in sport which recommends the governments to adopt effective policies and measures aimed at preventing and combating racist, xenophobic, discriminatory and intolerant behaviour in all sports and in particular football, drawing inspiration from the guidelines in the appendix to this recommendation. See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/Ref_Text_Violence_en.asp

Recommendation 32

- ❖ All fan leagues should create an umbrella organisation to act as a partner at national level to discuss with the relevant stakeholders on safety, security and service at football matches (and other sport events). This umbrella organisation should be representative for all clubs and for a cross-section of the public present in the Romanian football stadiums (young fans and older fans, disabled fans, etc.);
- ❖ Clubs should implement measures that favour transparency within them, including Ethics Codes; at the same time they should adopt initiatives focused to bring young supporters and families to its clubs, as well as actions aimed at keeping their current fans by carrying out specific projects aimed to their supporters.
- ❖ Clubs, at least first division clubs, should be encouraged to draft joint supporters' charters with their fan league based upon agreed principles as explained in the Standing Committee recommendation Rec (2010)1 on Supporters' Charters;
- ❖ The Romanian authorities should take preventive social and educative measures aiming at improving the welcoming and coaching of supporters, with regard to their national circumstances, drawing inspiration from the principles and initiatives presented in the *Handbook on prevention of violence in sport* appended to the recommendation Rec(2003)1 on the role of social and educational measures in the prevention of violence in sport;

See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/Ref_Text_Violence_en.asp

Recommendation 33

- ❖ The Romanian authorities should create and keep communication structures between clubs, Gendarmerie and supporters' organisations that facilitate an open and transparent dialogue on a short-term (match preparation) and long-term basis (problem solving) as foreseen in Recommendation (2012) 1 of the Standing Committee on dialogue and interaction with fans;
- ❖ The existing dialogue structures should go into much wider detail and make clear arrangements on what is allowed and what is not allowed at sports events.

See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/Ref_Text_Violence_en.asp

General conclusion

- ❖ The Romanian authorities should keep investing in the research of best practices all over Europe to determine their own national policy and reinforce their role at international level, by taking an active part in the concerned international meetings (Standing Committee meetings, Think Tank meetings) to increase their expertise and experience from international cooperation and European best standards.

APPENDIX 1 - Action Plan presented by the Romanian authorities

| Recommendations | Organisation/body in charge of the implementation of the recommendations | Time schedule and deadline for the implementation of the recommendations | Description of the action(s) taken and achieved results |
|--|--|---|--|
| ON A MULTI AGENCY STRATEGY | | | |
| Recommendation 1 ❖ The Romanian authorities should evaluate the composition, role and functioning of this National Commission against Violence in Sport with all relevant stakeholders. | NCAVIS (National Commission against Violence in Sport) MYS (Ministry of Youth and Sport) MI (Ministry of Interior) | 2 nd semester 2014 | Modify the Law 4/2008 |
| Recommendation 2 ❖ The Romanian authorities should evaluate the composition, role and functioning of these County Commissions of Actions against Violence in Sport with all relevant stakeholders | NCAVIS MYS MI | 2 nd semester 2014 | Modify the Law 4/2008 |
| Recommendation 3 ❖ In order to be effective and treat problems in a proportionate way, the Romanian authorities should evaluate if most measures stipulated in the law should not be targeted at major football matches, whilst only some key safety principles would then apply to all other sport events and football matches in lower divisions. | NCAVIS MYS MI | 2 nd semester 2014 | Modify the Law 4/2008 |
| Recommendation 4 The Romanian authorities should: ❖ Evaluate the overarching role of the Gendarmerie, considering which tasks should be performed by them and which tasks should be allocated to other stakeholders, amending if necessary accordingly the existing policies and/or legal provisions. ❖ Draw up a paper explaining very clearly the role and responsibility of each partner, in particular concerning important safety issues | NCAVIS MYS MI | 2 nd semester 2014 | Modify the Law 4/2008 |

| | | | |
|---|---------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| <p>like inspection procedures, stadium licensing and safety certification.</p> | | | |
| <p>Recommendation 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ There should be clarity who can make what decision if safety and security requirements are not met in a (part of a) stadium | NCAVIS | 2 nd semester 2014 | Modify the Law 4/2008 |
| <p>Recommendation 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The Romanian authorities, in order to minimise the administrative workload, should evaluate if parts of this action plan, which are valid for all events in a given stadium, could not be part of an agreement to be signed by all stakeholders before the season, so the action plan would be limited to specific measures for a given event in accordance with the risk level of that specific event. | NCAVIS | 1st semester 2014 | Analyze the opportunity |
| <p>Recommendation 7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The Romanian authorities should evaluate the full effectiveness of the existing legal provisions on sanctions, building on existing European experiences in for example administrative sanctions imposed by an independent body and should develop an effective evidence gathering strategy. | NCAVIS MYS MI | 1st semester 2014 | Analyze the possibility to implement a stadium ban issued by the club |
| <p>Recommendation 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ It is crucial that each sanction is also effectively implemented and that a monitoring system to ensure this is introduced. | | Existing | |
| <p>Recommendation 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The Romanian authorities should structure the law in a clear and comprehensive way (multi-agency approach, safety, security, service/prevention) and make a critical evaluation in cooperation with all stakeholders of each article between theory and practice (is each stipulation really implemented or possible to implement and is it each time clear who is responsible to do what). If deemed necessary, the Romanian authorities can look for assistance of European wide experts to undertake this project. | NCAVIS MYS MI | 2 nd semester 2014 | Modify the Law 4/2008 |
| <p>Recommendation 10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The Romanian authorities should develop an integrated and | NCAVIS | | |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ A pre event check should be carried out to ensure that hazards such as broken seats, trip hazards, etc. are identified and rectified. ❖ An access appraisal should be undertaken together with consultation with any appropriate groups representing persons with disabilities to ensure that appropriate facilities are provided for people with special needs. ❖ Joint training programs for safety officers and match commanders, and stewards and police officers should be set up and regularly repeated. ❖ All stewards should be clearly identifiable as steward, and there should be a clear visual distinction between stewards and police officers. | Federation) | | |
| <p>Recommendation 14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Consideration should be given to ensuring recognised standards are adopted for handrail heights and balustrading (see European Standard EN 13200 part 3). ❖ The stadium operator should take responsibility for fire risk assessments, the development of a fire safety strategy and prepare a fire safety check list. A policy should be developed in respect of the fire resistance of flags and banners. ❖ A pre event safety check regime should be carried out and the outcome of the checks and any remedial action taken fully documented (See T-RV Rec (2008) 1 on the checklist of measures to be taken by the organisers of professional sporting events and by the public authorities) ❖ Stewards should be deployed and play an active role in crowd management in all sectors of the stadium. | NCAVIS MYS MI PFL RFF | 2 nd semester 2014 | Modify the Law 4/2008 Or promote Stewards Law |
| <p>Recommendation 15</p> <p>The Romanian authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Make clear in the law which independent agency is competent to annually check all stadiums on safety and security issues and who is responsible to deliver, on the basis of this report, a safety certificate for the stadium. ❖ Consider how best to integrate formal annual inspections of the stadium into the approach to safety management mentioned above. Such inspections should be undertaken, by a competent person, | MYS MI | 2 nd semester 2014 | Modify the Law 4/2008 |

| | | | |
|--|----|-------------|----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Keep on investing in the quality and quantity of information sharing, with a crucial role for the NFIP, intelligence officers and spotters. ❖ Organise specific training course for football/sports match commanders in accordance with the current paneuropean police training program, and a joint training program for match commanders, safety officers and heads of spotters is set up, so everyone is aware of each other's role and the added value of experienced spotters. | MI | Permanently | Existing |
| <p>Recommendation 26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The Romanian authorities should further develop the concept of dynamic risk assessment in order to ensure a police deployment which is in line with the expected risk. | MI | Permanently | Existing |
| <p>Recommendation 27</p> <p>The Romanian authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Balance the police operational profile on the basis of a dynamic risk analysis and low-profile intelligence-led policing: “public relations” police officers to welcome spectators and to communicate and interact with them, riot police for public order interventions (not visible or with low visibility) and specific police officers for evidence gathering; ❖ Encourage police commanders and spotters to attend matches abroad to gain experience and expertise in identifying and dealing with foreign supporters who may cause trouble, and to provide a specific budget for such visits abroad as to ensure independence from the clubs; ❖ Discuss the risk assessment with the local authorities and the police, the stadium management and other relevant parties and take account of their views before coming to a final conclusion; procedures should be in place to review the risk assessment in the light of any changes of circumstances before or on the day of the event; the process should furthermore have scope for additional categories of risk so as to allow greater variety in the safety and security management plans. | MI | Permanently | Existing |
| <p>Recommendation 28</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|--|
| <p>spectators, and to undertake disciplinary actions against players and officials who do act in an offensive way towards spectators.</p> | RFF | | |
| <p>Recommendation 31</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ All the involved agencies, both public authorities (included sports federations and the football professional league) and non-governmental organisations (sports associations, clubs, supporters clubs, players organisations, anti-racist associations, etc.) should pay special attention to detect sport related racist incidents and, if it is the case, to counter act and set up the appropriate measures, both of educational and social nature, to prevent them. <p>The Romanian authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Consider engaging with organisations which fight against racism to develop initiatives and contribute to major campaigns (for example with FARE, Football against racism in Europe); ❖ Keep updated a list of racist symbols which are forbidden and make it known to the appropriate stakeholders, in particular to all match commanders and safety officers, spotters and stewards; ❖ Make full use of the Rec(2001)6 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to member states on the prevention of racism, xenophobia and racial intolerance in sport which recommends the governments to adopt effective policies and measures aimed at preventing and combating racist, xenophobic, discriminatory and intolerant behaviour in all sports and in particular football, drawing inspiration from the guidelines in the appendix to this recommendation. See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Resources/Ref_Text_Violence_en.asp | <p>RFF</p> <p>PFL</p> <p>NCAVIS</p> | <p>Permanently</p> | |
| <p>Recommendation 32</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ All fan leagues should create an umbrella organisation to act as a partner at national level to discuss with the relevant stakeholders on safety, security and service at football matches (and other sport events). This umbrella organisation should be representative for all clubs and for a cross-section of the public present in the Romanian football stadiums (young fans and older fans, disabled fans, etc.); ❖ Clubs should implement measures that favour transparency within | <p>NCAVIS</p> <p>MYS</p> <p>MI</p> <p>RFF</p> | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>❖ The Romanian authorities should keep investing in the research of best practices all over Europe to determine their own national policy and reinforce their role at international level, by taking an active part in the concerned international meetings (Standing Committee meetings, Think Tank meetings) to increase their expertise and experience from international cooperation and European best standards.</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

APPENDIX 2 - Report from Romania

Strasbourg, 28 November 2011

T-RV (2011) 37

**European Convention on Spectator Violence and Misbehaviour
at Sports Events and in particular at Football Matches (T-RV)**

Consultative visit to Romania
on the implementation of the Convention
2012

Report prepared by the Romanian authorities for the consultative visit of the
T-RV Standing Committee of the Council of Europe
(Bucharest, 25 October 2011)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| 1. | Structure and organisation of sport in Romania | 48 |
| 1.1. | The subsystem of sport institutions and organisations | 48 |
| 1.2. | The subsystem of sport structures | 49 |
| 2. | The legal frame of prevention violence in sport..... | 49 |
| 2.1. | Regulatory acts | 49 |
| 2.2. | Legal entities implied in preventing violence during sport events..... | 50 |
| 2.3. | How the violence prevention system works..... | 51 |
| 3. | General causes of deficiencies in preventing violence in sport..... | 52 |
| 3.1. | Poor infrastructure..... | 52 |
| 3.2. | Tickets distribution issues..... | 52 |
| 3.3. | Lack of project for fans..... | 52 |
| 3.4. | Misbehaviour of players and/or sport officials | 53 |
| 3.5. | Lack of qualification of civil order forces and stewards..... | 53 |
| 4. | Preventive measures | 53 |
| 5. | Europa League Final in 2012..... | 54 |

Structure and organisation of sport in Romania

The National System of Physical Education and Sport comprises

Main actors: National Authority for Sport and Youth, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Interior, through local authorities, the Romanian Olympic Committee as the main governmental partner of the National Authority for Sport and Youth with the role of sporting bodies to harmonize relationships recognized.

Other central public administration institutions with attributions in physical education and sports activities: Ministry of National Defence, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Transport, Constructions and Tourism, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of European Integration. A brief description of the system, divided in its two large subsystems follows.

1.1. The subsystem of sport institutions and organisations

1. Public administration structures for sport

- 1.1. National Authority for Sport and Youth (ANST)
- 1.2. County Departments of Sport and Youth (DSTJ)

2. Non-governmental structures for sport

- 2.1. Romanian Olympic and Sport Committee (COSR)

3. Other public administration bodies with attributions in physical education and sport:

- 3.1. Ministry of Education, Research, Sport and Youth (MECST)
- 3.2. Ministry of National Defence (MApN)
- 3.3. Ministry of Internal Affairs (MAI)
- 3.4. Ministry of Health (MS)
- 3.5. Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure (MTI)
- 3.6. Ministry of Labour (MM)
- 3.7. Ministry of Cults and Culture (MCC)

4. Other governmental institutions engaged in physical education and sport:

- 4.1. National Institute for Sport Research (INCS)
- 4.2. National Institute of Sport Medicine (INMS)
- 4.3. Sport Union of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (USMIR)
- 4.5. Council of Sport Science
- 4.6. Sports Museum
- 4.7. Romanian Olympic Academy (A.O.R.)
- 4.8. Federation of Security Services (F.S.S.)
- 4.9. National Centre for Education and Training of Sport Trainers (CNFPA)
- 4.10. Institutions of higher education in sport
- 4.11. Foundations and NGOs

5. Specialised parliamentary committees

The subsystem of sport structures

1. sport associations
2. sport clubs
3. county sport associations
4. professional leagues
5. national sports federations
6. Romanian Automobile Club for motor sports and karting
7. Other national sports organisations

The organisation and functioning of national physical education and sport in Romania is regulated by Law 69/2000, which states that “physical education and sport are activities of national interest, sustained by the state”.

The organisation of physical education and sport at school, college and university level are responsibilities of the Ministry of Education and Research.

School and university sports associations are coordinated by the School Sports Federation, University Sports Federation respectively. These two federations are funded by allocations from the state budget (based on their programs), as well as extra income.

Sports Federation for Disabled manages physical activity and high performance issues for people with special needs.

The National Sports Federation "Sport for all" bears the responsibility for maintaining health, recreation and socialization of citizens. The federation has a separate funding line from the state budget, based on the National Program "Sport for all" coordinated by the Committee for sports, physical activity, health, education and recreation, a consultative body within the National Authority for Sport and Youth.

Performance sport is organised by national sports federations; the system prepares the official sports competitions in all sports sectors and manages the records and transfer of athletes/players.

1. The legal frame of prevention violence in sport

Regulatory acts

In democratic Romania, from 1991 to mid 2000s the aspects of Violence in Sport, Spectator Violence and Misbehaviour at Sports Events were regulated by two non-specific laws:

- **law 60/1991** regarding the organisation and deployment of public assemblies and
- **law 61/1991** regarding sanctions for acts of violation of rules of social coexistence, order and public peace.

In the early 2000s' the number and the amplitude of violent acts on stadia rose to an alarming level, due to a poor management of sport competitions, but also to the bad influence of misbehaviour of football fans from abroad, as seen on television or on internet.

A first step for the prevention of violence in sport was taken in 2004, by adopting the **Government Decision no. 792/2004** for the prevention and sanction of violent acts an uncontrolled behaviour of spectators during sport events. However, this regulatory document was too brief and incomplete to generate positive results.

As violence on stadia continued and the Romanian Gendarmerie had a poor legal frame for ensuring and re-establishing the public order during sport events, in 2006 the **Government Ordinance no.11/2006** regarding the prevention and fight against violence in sport was issued.

The ordinance introduced for the first time the penalty of access interdiction at sport events for a certain time for supporters who repeatedly committed violent acts. The sanction was to be administrated by a court of law, at the proposal of the gendarmerie body.

This ordinance was the main instrument in fighting violence in sport for two years, until the adoption of **law 4/2008** regarding the prevention and control of violence during sport events. The law introduces new concepts, such as information officer, order and safety responsible, safety monitor, keeping also the penalty of access interdiction at sport events for turbulent fans.

The law establishes the obligations of the event organiser, the obligations of the order forces and personnel hired by organiser, spectators' rules of conduct, as well as all acts considered misbehaviour and possible sanctions applied.

In completion to this law, the regulatory body, the National Agency for Sport (now National Authority for Sport and Youth, issued **Order 269/2008**, detailing the obligations of sport event organiser during local competitions with small number of spectators and no or low risk of violence.

Law 4/2008 proved its efficiency and usefulness since the beginning and is still in force. However the necessity of adapting the document to the European requirements and legislation sent nowadays the document back to the Romanian Parliament to be submitted to a modification procedure. The most important addition to the law is on establishing the degree of risk of the event and proceduring the safety set-up accordingly.

Legal entities implied in preventing violence during sport events

Law 4/2008 is the actual regulatory document which delimitates the specific attributions during a sport event as follows:

- **Police forces** are in charge of maintaining the public order on the public roads and routes used by spectators to reach the place of the event (stadium, arena and so on);
- **Gendarmerie body** is in charge with maintaining the public order in the vicinity of the stadium/arena and in all places susceptible to be a crossing point of opposing supporters;
- **event organisers and their hired civil order forces** have the responsibility to ensure the protection and safety of spectators, players and officials before, during and after competition, as long as they are inside the stadium/arena (including entrance/exit routes).

The law states that a close collaboration between organisers, Police and Gendarmerie should prevail, in order to minimize the risks of unexpected events. In view of a common approach on managing violence and insuring a safe event, the training of the order forces and personnel used by sport event organisers is thought to be made by the Gendarmerie body.

In case of high-risk sport events, the presence of the local **prefect or his delegate** as well as a **district attorney** is required. The request for their presence should be made by the gendarmerie body.

Sport federations can and will establish supplementary obligations to the event organiser, for certain games or competitions, if they consider being necessary.

National Authority for Sport and Youth directly establishes the obligations of sport event organiser during local competitions with small number of spectators and no or low risk of violence.

Funded in 2002 by Government Decision no.116/2002, the **National Commission for Action against Violence in Sport** includes representatives of the Police, Gendarmerie, Ministry of Education, Research, Sport and Youth, Ministry of Health, central and local public authorities, Romanian Football Federation, professional leagues, sport federations and is placed under the coordination of the National Authority for Sport and Youth.

The Commission controls the way obligations arising from the Law 4 / 2008, related to organisation of sports events and to national sport federations regulations are fulfilled, cooperates with stakeholders in implementing results of research and information programs on sport violence, promoting sport through educational campaigns, promoting fair play and sportsmanship.

At local level, the **County Commissions of Action against Violence in Sport** have much of the same rights and responsibilities as the national one.

How the violence prevention system works

The event organiser is responsible for ensuring order and safety in sports arenas and he will engage the services of specialized companies for protection and safety. All personnel performing order and security activities inside sports arenas should graduate a qualification course of minimum 30 hours, organised by the Romanian Gendarmerie, or specialized companies, under the supervision of Gendarmerie.

In the same time, welcoming is also part of the duties of the organiser and will be performed by specialized stewards.

Stadiums are generally equipped with tourniquets to control the access of participants, with video surveillance systems and communication systems. The organiser is obliged to provide adequate barriers and fences to separate groups of supporters and to demarcate the field of play.

The appreciation of the degree of risk of the event is made in collaboration by the irrespective sport federation and the Gendarmerie body. Regardless of the level of estimated risk, the organiser has the obligation to prepare an action plan including measures to be adopted by the private security team inside the sports arena in case violent events occur.

The intervention of gendarmes inside the stadium/arena can take place only at the express request of the organisers in case of critical situations.

Outside the sports arena, the public order is secured by the police and gendarmerie. Coordinated law enforcement actions designed to prevent violent incidents focus primarily on preventing the introduction into the arenas of alcoholic beverages, pyrotechnics, sharp materials, as well as banners with racist or inciting to violence messages.

Police and Gendarmerie can apply sanctions to spectators: fines of 20-750 euro or 50-300 hours of community service activities; banning access to sports competitions for a period of 6 months to 2 years.

For organisers, law forces can impose fines of 750-12,500 euro, temporary or permanent suspension of the right to organise sports competitions; for the order and safety personnel- fines of 25-125 euro

Incitement to violence by the leaders of clubs, officials and sports can be sanctioned with fines of 750-2500 euro. In case of violation of criminal law imprisonment it is also possible.

2. General causes of deficiencies in preventing violence in sport

Poor infrastructure

Although Law no. 4 / 2008 on preventing and combating violence at sports events and also football international regulatory bodies have clear provisions regarding the arrangements and requirements to be fulfilled by the arenas where competitions or sports games are organised, though very few sports arenas, including those of the First Football League match the requirements of an optimal operation and probably there is no stadium that meets all the criteria.

Although, before the competitive season, legally constituted commission inspect the fulfilment of safety requirements in the local stadiums/arenas in order to grant permission for the organisation of sports events, there are many cases where requirements can not be ensured, leading to the establishment or extension of a time to remedy, which often becomes "forever" for various reasons.

The lack of video surveillance systems or their poor quality makes it difficult to identify persons who commit violent acts and do not allow effective monitoring of places of interest in the sports arena.

Another important issue is the lack of dedicated facilities at the access gates for storing objects that spectators are not allowed to enter the sports arena.

Generally speaking, accepting compromises, even in unimportant cases, over the performance standards required for sports arenas, mainly obstruct law enforcement activities, facilitates and/or encourages violent behaviour and generate incidents.

Tickets distribution issues

Law no. 4 / 2008 sets out clearly the obligations of the organiser regarding the distribution of access to documents (tickets, invitations, season tickets), what kind of documents should be issued and made available to fans so that they can access the event. Unfortunately there are times when no coherent strategy for separating spectators is applied, leading to situations of conflict from the debut of the event.

On the other hand, this type of incoherent distribution encourages illicit activities such as trading on the black market of tickets for important events.

Another reported case is that of invitations or free tickets distributed without clear evidence or without a particular rule in accommodating the spectators.

Lack of project for fans

Most of the sport clubs have not been able to propose specific projects to their supporters in order to encourage them to create fan clubs and/or join them, to participate in various activities or to be a real support for their beloved team. Actions as creating incentives for the purchase of seasonal tickets, transmission of data and information useful to supporters, facilitating or creating opportunities for supporters to travel to encourage their favourite team, involvement of supporters in certain promotional activities are missing almost completely.

Sport clubs should understand that by educating and implicating their supporters in the life of the club, they will get a more responsible and less violent participation during their tournaments and competitions. Their

practice of randomly granting free tickets and invitations during minor competitions does not encourage true supporters, but sometimes turbulent or violent ones.

Misbehaviour of players and/or sport officials

There still are uneducated players that abnormally act in certain circumstances, inciting the spectators and causing violent reactions among them, in particular by addressing obscene gestures or by biased behaviour. The power of such irresponsible acts is immense, since they come from persons that fans are accustomed to love and follow unconditionally.

On the other hand, an even greater impact on supporters have inappropriate gestures and comments of the officials, of the sport clubs owners or leaders, in defending groups of supporters who have committed illegal acts, in hiding problems related to stadium facilities or event organisation to avoid sanctions for non-compliance. Usually those statements are pushed forward by media and amplified to higher levels.

Lack of qualification of civil order forces and stewards

A very sensitive issue is the human quality of security services companies hired by sport event organisers to ensure the safety of players, official and spectators inside the sport arenas.

Generally these companies are not qualified for the provision of such services or the personnel available is poorly prepared, and in most of the cases insufficient, therefore inefficient.

There were reported situations when either their excess of zeal or their passivity, indecision and unprofessionalism, lead to conflicts escalated into violence, requiring the intervention of the Gendarmerie for conflict resolution or evacuation of certain groups of supporters.

In some cases security service companies have sub-contracted the job to other companies which had nor the qualification neither the necessary power to impose law and regulations inside sport arenas.

3. Preventive measures

During sport events, one can find mainly two types of violence: an objective violence, which is of criminal nature (crimes and offenses) and on which state institutions should be empowered to intervene and a subjective violence, which is a more subtle forms of violence, that of the attitude (contempt, humiliation, offence, insult, hate), what we generally call "antisocial behavior". Therefore, the phenomenon of violence at sport events extends on a large scale lies between physical violence (highly publicized, in fact, but without a thorough analysis of its causes) and lack of civilization attitudes (which are very numerous and can seriously affect the climate of the event).

It was also found that the population is greatly aware about the presence and harmfulness of the violence phenomenon. Events such as verbal violence between supporters and players, supporters and leaders of clubs, supporters and the police (swearing, insults, humiliation), physical damages inside and outside sport arenas, refusal to obey rules imposed by organisers and law enforcement companies, began to be a part of sport events on regular bases. For this reason, although the frequency of such events is recognized, both presidents of clubs as well as athletes, do not appreciate that there is a significant increase of the violence phenomenon in recent years, especially in football.

Preventive measures will cover a large area: social and educational campaigns, improving relations between club and supporters, promoting dialogue with rival clubs, spectator control through surveillance cameras, Gendarmerie and Police intervention, investment in infrastructure, strengthening the social role of clubs, organising ticket sale on coherent bases, improving legislation.

The National Commission for Action against Violence in Sport has identified the following general courses of action to fight the phenomenon of violence in sport arenas:

- Updating the law (Law 4 / 2008), after three years of experience in its application. Updating aims at strengthening the authority of the representatives of the law, prompt punishment for offenders, harmonization with EU law provisions;
- Raising the courts awareness for a quick solving of the records of violence in sport, instrumented by Police and Gendarmerie;
- Effective and rapid implementation of the measures ordered by courts;
- Certification and periodic testing of all personnel involved in safety of spectators, players and officials inside the stadium only by Gendarmerie body;
- Development of a National Program to prevent violence during sport events, in collaboration with federations, professional leagues, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health;
- National level campaigns to prevent violence in sport, especially addressed to young people and children;

4. Europa League Final in 2012

The UEFA Europa League final takes place at Bucharest's National Arena on Wednesday 9 May 2012. The National Arena is a new and modern stadium, having a capacity of 55,200 with the potential for expansion to 63,000 and includes a fully retractable roof.

The final is organised by the local organising committee (LOC) on the basis of a contract between the Romanian Football Federation and UEFA. LOC is responsible for:

a) inspecting the stadium and issuing stadium certificates, which have to be forwarded to the UEFA administration, confirming that the stadium meet the structural criteria

b) confirming to the UEFA administration that the stadium, including its facilities (emergency lighting system, first aid facilities, type of protection against intrusion by spectators into the playing area, etc.), have been thoroughly inspected by the competent public authorities and meet all the safety requirements laid down by the Romanian law 4/2008.

The UEFA administration accepts or rejects the stadium on the basis of the above certificate and confirmation and its decision is final.

The UEFA administration may carry out stadium inspections at any time before and during the competition to check whether the required structural criteria have been and are still being met.

According to its own regulations, UEFA has the responsibility of spectators' accident insurance, but only for this final match of Europa League.

In the same time, UEFA owns all rights relating to tickets and decides on the number of tickets to be allocated to the finalists and to the Romanian Football Federation. In addition, the UEFA administration, in conjunction with the Romanian Football Federation, imposes the ticket prices. UEFA may issue ticketing terms and conditions, as well as special instructions, guidelines and/or directives for the sale and/or distribution of tickets (including those contained in the UEFA Safety and Security Regulations).

Directions of action in view of the LOC and Romanian Football Federation:

- implementing a co-ordinating structure for the event, comprising all elements in charge of the safe of the event;
- adopting the principles and guidelines of international regulations and recommendations in the fields of security at football venues;
- monitoring sport group venues and their routes toward the stadium;
- reinforcing international police co-operation and exchange of information over possible turbulent persons and/or groups;
- temporarily reinforcing the Police and Gendarmerie, judicial and immigration service powers as regards to public order and criminal procedures;
- introducing computerized ticketing control, tickets will bear UEFA safety guidelines;
- reviewing the private security system and improving the stewarding by increasing their professionalism and their ratio to spectators;
- involving volunteers for hospitality duties, complementing the stewards' tasks.

APPENDIX 3 - Programme of the consultative visit of the T-RV Standing Committee experts to Romania

Wednesday, November 14

Arrival

17:00 – 19:00 Preliminary meeting of the consultative team

21:00 Attendance of the Romania-Belgium football match on the National Arena

Thursday, November 15

9:15 – 09:45 National Authority for Sport and Youth (ANST)

Mrs. Carmen-Emilia TOCALĂ — president of ANST

Ms. Otilia Bădescu — adviser

Ms. Adriana Ciorbaru — director of International Relations; secretary of the National Commission against Violence in Sport

Ms. Daniela ȘUȚĂ — adviser, International Relations Department

10:15 – 11:15 National Sport Research Institute

Mr. Dan BOBOC — deputy director

12:00–12:30 Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr. George CIAMBA — state secretary

Ms. Oana ROGOVEANU — director of Human Rights and Protection of Minorities Directorate

12:30 – 13:30 Lunch

14:30 – 16:30 Steaua Football Club

Valeriu ARGĂSEALĂ - Chairman of FC Steaua Board

representatives of fans

19:00 Dinner offered by Mrs. Carmen-Emilia TOCALĂ, president of ANST

Friday, November 16

9:30–11:30 Romanian Gendarmerie and Romanian Police (at the RG's headquarters)

Colonel Ovidiu VASILICĂ — first deputy of the general inspector and chief of staff (RG)

Colonel Aurel MOISE — head of Public Order and Safety Directorate (RG)

Officer Adrian DINCĂ — NFIP (RG)

Police chief commissioner Viorel TĂNASE — Public Order Directorate (RP)

12:30–13:30 Romanian Football Federation

Dumitru MIHALACHE - director of Programmes and Marketing

Sorin COJOCARU - Safety and Security officer

13:30 – 14:30 Lunch

15:00 – 16:00 Professional Football League

Valentin ALEXANDRU — Secretary General

Claudiu POPA - director of Competitions

17:00 departure to Ploiești

18:30 – 21:30 visit to “Petrolul” stadium; attendance of the match briefing

21:30 attendance of the match: FC Petrolul – FC “U” Cluj

accompanied by Major Anton CERNAT — NFIP

Saturday, November 17

Morning visit to the Dinamo stadium

Debriefing meeting among the team

Afternoon departure after 1 pm

APPENDIX 4 - List of recommendations adopted by the Standing Committee which could be of particular interest for the Romanian authorities

In terms of SAFETY:

- **Rec (2011) 1 on safety officer, supervisor and safety steward training and its manual** which gives recommendations on how to establish the core functions of safety officers, supervisors and safety stewards, how to lay down the minimum areas of competence to be demonstrated by them ensure an appropriate training.
- **Rec(2008) 1** on the checklist of measures to be taken by the organisers of professional sporting events and by the public authorities (updated version adopted by the Standing Committee on 31st January 2008) which gives guidelines on the identification and agreement of responsibilities between the organisers of sports event and the public authorities of the country where the event is to be held.
- **Rec(2008)2 on the use of visiting stewards**, which recommends to governments that they encourage clubs, stadium owners and/or other appropriate bodies in football and other sports to use a system of visiting stewards at sporting events, based upon the principles developed in the recommendation.
- **Rec(1999)1 on stewarding** which recommends to governments that they encourage clubs, stadium owners and/or other appropriate bodies in football and other sports to develop a system of stewarding at sporting events with large attendances, based upon the principles detailed in the recommendation.

In terms of SECURITY:

- **Rec(2008)3 on the use of pyrotechnical devices at sports events** which recommends to governments that they forbid the use of pyrotechnical devices at sporting events.
- **Rec(1999/2) on the removal of fences in stadiums**, which recommends to proceed to the removal of fences in sports grounds. The removal of fences, which is primarily the responsibility of stadia owners and/or organisers of matches, could be carried out on a voluntary basis and gradually.

In terms of SERVICES:

- **Rec (2012) 1 on dialogue and interaction with fans** which recommends to ensure an open and transparent dialogue between fans, clubs, police and authorities and gives examples on how to foster good behaviour, how to set up a thorough engagement with fans, create opportunities for discussions, etc.
- **Rec(2001)6** of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the prevention of racism, xenophobia and racial intolerance in sport which recommends the governments to adopt effective policies and measures aimed at preventing and combating racist, xenophobic, discriminatory and intolerant behaviour in all sports and in particular football, drawing inspiration from the guidelines in the appendix to this recommendation.
- **Rec (2010) 1on Supporters' Charters** which recommends to encourage sports associations, clubs, fan clubs and associations and all appropriate bodies in football and other sports to draft joint supporters' charters based upon agreed principles.

- **Rec(2003)1 on the role of social and educational measures in the prevention of violence in sport** which recommends that the government takes preventive social and educative measures aiming at improving the welcoming and coaching of supporters, with regard to their national circumstances, drawing inspiration from the principles and initiatives presented in the *Handbook on prevention of violence in sport* appended to the recommendation.

For any further information, look at the Council of Europe website: www.coe.int/sport

B - COMMENTS BY ROMANIA

The Romanian authorities would like to thank the Standing Committee for the competent and extremely useful report drawn by the experts' team. We find all recommendations pertinent and we have started to work towards their implementation. A working group has already been set up within the Romanian Gendarmerie in order to draft a new law on combating violence in sport.

The recommendations will be implemented according to an action plan to be approved by the National Commission of Action against Violence in Sport. In its next meeting, the Commission will decide on the bodies in charge and the time schedule for the implementation of the recommendations. We shall be able to report on the first achieved results at the end of the year 2013.

One of the recommendations, related to the inclusion in the T-RV delegation of a representative of the Gendarmerie, has already been implemented.

As regards new development since the time of the visit up to present, we would like to inform that for the first time in Romania a court ordered 9 supporters' arrest for 29 days for hooliganism in public space.