



TYOLOGY OF SPORTS MANIPULATIONS RESOURCE GUIDE



Convention on the Manipulation
of Sports Competitions
Macolin Convention
(CETS No. 215)

TYOLOGY OF SPORTS MANIPULATIONS

RESOURCE GUIDE

Convention on the Manipulation
of Sports Competitions
Macolin Convention
(CETS No. 215)

The reproduction of extracts (up to 500 words) is authorised, except for commercial purposes as long as the integrity of the text is preserved, the excerpt is not used out of context, does not provide incomplete information or does not otherwise mislead the reader as to the nature, scope or content of the text. The source text must always be acknowledged as follows “© Council of Europe, year of the publication”.

All other requests concerning the reproduction/translation of all or part of the document, should be addressed to the Directorate of Communications, Council of Europe (F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex or publishing@coe.int).

All other correspondence concerning this document should be addressed to the Sport Division of the Council of Europe, Council of Europe, F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex
E-mail: sport@coe.int

Cover design and layout:
Documents and Publications Production
Department (SPDP), Council of Europe

Photos: Shutterstock

This publication has not been copy-edited by the DPDP Editorial Unit to correct typographical and grammatical errors

© Council of Europe, March 2023
Printed at the Council of Europe

CONTENTS

WHAT IS THE TYPOLOGY FRAMEWORK?	7
WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO USE THE TYPOLOGY FRAMEWORK?	7
BACKGROUND TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TYPOLOGY OF SPORTS MANIPULATIONS	8
CLASSIFICATION OF TYPES OF SPORTS MANIPULATION	11
THE INTERACTIVE TYPOLOGY TOOL	16
CONCLUSION	18
APPENDIX 1 – DETAILED EXAMPLES OF TYPOLOGIES AND ELEMENTS OF MACOLIN DEFINITION	19
APPENDIX 2 – SUMMARY OF THE PROCESS	27
APPENDIX 3 – DEFINITIONS AND GLOSSARY	29

WHAT IS THE TYPOLOGY FRAMEWORK?

Article 3 of the Macolin Convention sets out the definition of the manipulation of sports competitions. Using consistent terminology, the Framework classifies the different types of competition manipulation that could fall within this definition. It also provides links to media articles to demonstrate 'real life' examples of cases of each type.

The Framework is not intended to be an exhaustive list of every possible scenario of competition manipulation.

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO USE THE TYPOLOGY FRAMEWORK?

The term 'match fixing' is often used to describe all kinds of sports competition manipulation; but to many 'match fixing' means fixing an event to lose, to profit from betting, mostly linked to organised crime.

However, events can be manipulated in many different ways, driven by a wide range of motives. It is important to understand all the ways in which an event could be manipulated, so the potential risks can be identified and managed.

The typology also enables clearer communication across all organisations involved in protecting and managing sports integrity. It does this by categorising the different ways an event might be manipulated using a common and consistent language.

This consistency also provides a basis upon which uniformed statistical information may be collected, for example, to help the GoC Secretariat identify areas of risk or emerging threats.

BACKGROUND TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TYPOLOGY OF SPORTS MANIPULATIONS

Introduction

Since the Macolin Convention has been open for signature, national and international stakeholders that make up the Macolin community have devoted significant cooperative effort towards developing an understanding of the manipulation of sports competitions, in all its forms. This has been through a range of activities and initiatives such as the “Keep Crime Out of Sport (KCOOS and KCOOS+) projects¹, the activities of the GoC and various other initiatives.

This Typology Resource Guide (TRG), an initiative of the GoC, sets out the Typology Framework (the Framework) developed by the GoC’s Typology Working Group (WG – T).

The aim of the Framework is to define and articulate the GoC’s collective view on the *manipulation of sports competitions* as defined in the Macolin Convention.

The intended primary audience and consumers of this guide are the National Platforms (NPs) established under the Macolin Convention. However, the concepts are also for the information of any interested stakeholders.

The Framework and the TRG will continue to evolve as practical experience enhance our knowledge of the manipulation of sports competitions. It is anticipated that this evolution will be accelerated through enhanced capability, capacity and operational insights as the expertise of the NPs expands across the GoC.

Inevitably, those engaged in competition manipulation will also evolve to exploit new opportunities and develop new methodologies to manipulate sport for undue advantage. To ensure the GoC’s knowledge and this Framework remains contemporary, relevant and accurate, the members of the GoC will need to closely monitor instances of the manipulation of sports competitions across the world.

1. KCOOS Guidebook 2017 (Joint project of the Council of Europe and the EU) + “Panorama”, Council of Europe 2018

Rationale

This Framework provides members of the GoC with common references and practical tools to:

- ▶ create a common language allowing for better communication within and between NPs;
- ▶ assist NPs understand the breadth of sports competition manipulation; and
- ▶ inform the development of strategies to address and respond to potential or emerging risks.

The Framework is a critical body of work supporting the operationalisation of NPs in accordance with the scope on the Macolin Convention. The scope of NPs as set out in the Convention should include or aim to include;

- ▶ the NP’s focusing resources on detecting suspicious activities that are within the scope of the Convention (including producing “alerts” which mobilize the national resources and facilitating the exchange of information);
- ▶ focusing prevention measures to mitigate the various types of sports competition manipulation;
- ▶ establishing procedures and mechanisms according to the existing legal and professional frameworks ensuring the best possible response to the situations, including the collection and the treatment of multi-source information, and ultimately providing key information to law enforcement, judiciary agencies and other relevant stakeholders;
- ▶ guiding the implementation and development of national policies and improving as necessary the legal and professional frameworks in line with the provisions of the Macolin Convention.

Definition of Manipulation of Sports Competitions

The Macolin Convention defines (art. 3) the manipulation of sports competitions as “An intentional arrangement, act or omission aimed at an improper alteration of the result or the course of a sports competition in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition with

a view to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others.”

The Macolin Convention’s definition of the manipulation of sports competitions is characterised by a number of core elements. These are:

- ▶ the manipulation of sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission;
- ▶ these arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition;
- ▶ the alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competitions;
- ▶ these arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again, successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others;
- ▶ the definition of sports competition manipulation includes the intention of manipulation, even if that intention is unsuccessful and fails to obtain the undue advantage sought²
- ▶ the undue advantage always has a financial dimension either directly or as a consequence of the sports competition manipulation³. The exploitation of betting markets is just one of the many ways of obtaining an undue financial advantage.

As outlined in paragraph 35 of the *Explanatory Report to the Council of Europe Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competitions* “The preamble makes it clear that this convention covers cases of national or transnational manipulation of sports competitions, whether or not they are linked with sports betting or involve a criminal offence. It thus recognises that the manipulation of sports competitions is not necessarily linked to sports betting or criminal offences.”

As highlighted in paragraph 51 and 52 of the *Explanatory Report to the Council of Europe Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competitions* The words “aimed at” indicate that the definition includes not only arrangements, acts or omissions which improperly alter the result or course of a competition, but also the acts committed with the intention of improperly altering the result or course of a competition, even if the arrangement, act or omission is unsuccessful (e.g. if a player on whom pressure has been brought to bear is not actually selected for the competition). The term “in order to” indicates an intention to obtain an undue advantage for oneself or others, even if this intentional arrangement, act or omission, aiming at improperly modifying the results or course of a sports competition, fails to obtain the advantage sought (e.g. if the competition in question is the subject of an alert issued by the regulator and the sports betting operators refuse to take bets on the competition, thereby preventing the undue advantage from being obtained).

3.

Key Issues Considered

In developing this Framework the GoC considered a wide range of associated issues, and the application of the Framework on the operations of the NPs. Some of the key underlying issues that were identified were:

Enforcement of Sport Rules

The interplay between the rules of sport, the sport’s enforcement of those rules, and other forms of manipulation of sports competitions which may be captured by domestic criminal legislation is a complex question. At times, instances of manipulation of sports competitions may be both criminal, while also being a contravention of the rules of the sport, and therefore subject to parallel sanctioning frameworks.

The Macolin Convention recognises the fundamental role of sports organisations in protecting sport as reflected in the preamble which states:

“Emphasising that sports organisations bear the responsibility to detect and sanction the manipulation of sports competitions committed by persons under their authority”

The Convention preamble continues:

*“Acknowledging that, in accordance with the principle of the autonomy of sport, **sports organisations are responsible for sport and have self-regulatory and disciplinary responsibilities in the fight against manipulation of sports competitions**, but that public authorities, protect the integrity of sport, where appropriate.”*

Article 1 of the Convention further recognises the key responsibility of sports:

“The purpose of this Convention is to combat the manipulation of sports competitions in order to protect the integrity of sport and sports ethics in accordance with the principle of the autonomy of sport.”

As articulated in the Macolin Convention, the GoC’s consideration of the scope of the definition of manipulation of sports competitions recognises that addressing competition manipulation, in all its forms, is a shared responsibility between all stakeholders. This includes the identification of manipulation of sports competitions, the sharing of relevant information, investigation and ultimately the sanctioning of those who engage in the manipulation of sports competitions.

Framing of domestic criminal offences

In addition to the rules of sport, it is recognised that a number of the identified typologies are criminal offences according to some parties' domestic legislation. It is therefore necessary to also acknowledge and highlight the Macolin Convention's relevant text in relation to criminal offences, namely Article 15 – Criminal Offences Relating to the manipulation of sports competitions which states:

"Each Party shall ensure that its domestic laws enable to criminally sanction manipulation of sports competitions when it involves either coercive, corrupt or fraudulent practices, as defined by its domestic law."

While the work conducted by the GoC has demonstrated that the definition of manipulation of sport competition includes criminal offences, Paragraph 20 states:

"With regard to the various aspects of law enforcement, the convention seeks, inter alia, to identify those acts which should be prosecuted without, however, imposing the creation in each Party's domestic law of a harmonised special criminal offence in the field. The purpose of clarifying which types of conduct are to be considered offences is to facilitate judicial and police co-operation between Parties."

Paragraph 50 of the *Explanatory Report to the Council of Europe Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competitions*, further states that the definition of manipulation of sports competitions "is an integral part of criminal offences relating to the manipulation of sports competitions" (defined in Article 15), but **this definition alone does not intend to define the scope of criminal offences."**

The Macolin Convention and Anti-Doping Conventions

In developing an understanding of the scope of the definition of competition manipulation, it was evident to the GoC that the use of performance enhancing drugs by athletes is a form of competition manipulation. The use of performance enhancing drugs to manipulate an athlete's physiology (an intentional act) that has the potential to alter the result or course of a competition for an undue advantage, is likely to fall within the scope of the definition of competition manipulation.

Although doping is within the definition of competition manipulation, doping in sport is dealt with, appropriately, through long-standing and established conventions, namely:

- ▶ UNESCO International Convention against Doping in Sport (2005).
- ▶ Council of Europe Anti-Doping Convention (1990).

It is therefore necessary to acknowledge that doping is considered to be a form of competition manipulation as defined in the Macolin Convention, however, also recognise that the established anti-doping conventions (UNESCO and CoE) provide the authority for governments to address doping in sport. **Doping is acknowledged as a form of competition manipulation but given the structures, programs and activities that are already in place along with the access to experts in doping, this issue was not explored in detail through the work of the GoC.**

CLASSIFICATION OF TYPES OF SPORTS MANIPULATION

Types of Sports Manipulation

The usual / classical distinction between “betting” or “non-betting” manipulation is no longer relevant in the context of this Framework. Betting is not the purpose of competition manipulation but rather a method of gaining an undue advantage and as a possible vehicle for obtaining the final undue advantage pursued through the manipulation. This is valid either in the case that:

- ▶ the primary intention of the manipulator is to obtain money through corrupting betting markets;
- ▶ the case that betting may be abused by the manipulator as a secondary (possibly even unintended) benefit rather than a primary aim. This activity could also include sports betting rules breaches.

Consequently, the risk of manipulations related to betting could be present in all types identified and the betting on corrupted events is an aggravating factor which has to be properly considered by all stakeholders.

There are twelve types of manipulation which are structured using a two-factor classification method:

- (i) the type of manipulation
- (ii) the instigator of the manipulation

The three types of sports competition manipulation are:

1. **Direct interference** during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a predetermined outcome.
2. **Use of false information** relating to an athlete with the intention to gain an unfair advantage in an event or competition. This could be information about athletes':
 - i. personal data
 - ii. physical capabilities
 - iii. intellectual capabilities
3. **Illegal or non-compliant modifications** intended to achieve an unfair advantage in an event or competition, relating to:
 - i. playing surfaces
 - ii. equipment, technology or software
 - iii. athlete physiology
 - iv. sporting venue

These three types can then be further sub-categorised by using the following criteria relating to the instigator(s) of the manipulation. **The instigator** could be an individual or group who:

- A. Holds a **dominant position** in a sport. For example, a club owner, high ranking official or senior executive.
- B. Has **direct authority or influence** on participants within a sport. For example, a sponsor, coach, etc
- C. Is from **outside** the sport. For example, a person linked to organised crime or a person who is a personal associate of a participant.
- D. Is a **participant*** in the sport.

* For the purposes of this Framework, 'Participant' means Athlete(s), Athlete Support Personnel or Competition Officials

For example, if the result of an event was manipulated to achieve a predetermined result, by **participants** who took a bribe from an organised crime group (i.e. they are from **outside of the sport**) this is classified as **Type 1C**

Each type has a descriptor sheet that contains more detailed information, including:

- ▶ The instigator(s) i.e. person or group who initiates the manipulation.
- ▶ The executor(s) i.e. person or group who are directly involved in making the manipulation happen.
- ▶ What happens on and off the field.⁴
- ▶ How the attempted aim is achieved.
- ▶ Why the instigator(s) might organise the manipulation.
- ▶ Why the executor(s) might carry out the manipulation.

The key arguments behind the development of each type are provided in this section.

The table at figure 1 gives some illustrative examples to demonstrate what might fall into each type.

4. “the field” relates to the sporting activity which may take place on a field, track, pool, table, etc. “the field” is used as the generic term for ease of reference.

Figure 1

	<p>Type 1: Direct interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a predetermined outcome. The outcome may be the end/final result or an element within a competition or event.</p>	<p>Type 2: Use of false information relating to an athlete with the intention of gaining an unfair advantage. This could be information about: i. personal data ii. physical capabilities iii. intellectual capabilities</p>	<p>Type 3: Illegal or non-compliant modifications intended to achieve an unfair advantage in an event or competition, relating to: i. playing surfaces ii. equipment, technology or software iii. athlete physiology iv. sporting venue</p>
	<p>Illustrative Examples</p>		
<p>A Holds a Dominant Position within the sport</p>	<p>Type 1A The owners of two sports clubs pre-agree the outcome of a match due to take place on the last day of the season i.e. they agree who will win. One club is mid-table, the other will secure promotion to a higher league if they win. The participants playing for the mid-table team are instructed by the owner to lose. They are told that they will not be paid their salary for that week if they fail to comply with this instruction.</p>	<p>Type 2A The head of an international sports federation instructs a coach to include a gymnast in their squad who is under the minimum age eligibility criteria for a competition. The gymnast is thought to be a better performer, with more chance of winning a medal than their older teammates and competitors.</p>	<p>Type 3A Prior to the start of a competition, the CEO of a sports club instructs ground staff to illegally modify a playing surface, to provide the home team with an unfair advantage and therefore a greater chance of winning the competition. Although this is against the rules of the sport, the ground staff fear they will lose their jobs if they don't comply.</p>
<p>B Has direct authority or influence on participants within the sport</p>	<p>Type 1B A sponsor promises a new lucrative sponsorship deal to a participant if they underperform to try and secure a loss in their next game. The sponsor will benefit financially if the opposing team wins the match and wants to do all they can to try and make this happen.</p>	<p>Type 2B The coach of a team competing in an U17 competition knowingly includes older, more experienced athletes in their squad to gain an unfair advantage.</p>	<p>Type 3B A coach orders their squad to make non-complaint modifications to their equipment in order to gain an advantage in a competition. Squad members are told they will lose their place on the team if they fail to comply with this instruction.</p>
<p>C Is from outside the sport</p>	<p>Type 1C An organised crime group (OCG) bribes a tennis player to lose the first set of a specific match. They use this information to place in play bets on the predetermined outcome of this element of the match.</p>	<p>Type 2C An athlete is given a false identity by an organised crime group (OCG). This allows them to play sport in a country in which they would not ordinarily be allowed to enter or compete. The OCG then instructs the athlete to lose specific events. This allows the OCG to profit from betting on pre-determined outcomes.</p>	<p>Type 3C An organised crime group uses threats of violence to force ground staff to switch off floodlights during an evening event, when the competition reaches a specific score. This enables the OCG to profit from betting on the final score.</p>
<p>D Is a Participant(s) in the sport</p>	<p>Type 1D Two darts players agree between themselves the final outcome of their match before it begins. i.e. they agree who will win the match. They use this information to place bets on the predetermined outcome of the match.</p>	<p>Type 2D An athlete knowingly modifies their personal data to enable them to compete in a competition classification for which they are not eligible i.e. they are older and more experienced than their competitors and therefore have a greater chance of winning.</p>	<p>Type 3D Athletes illegally tamper with a ball during an event to change the way it performs, providing them with an unfair advantage against their opponents.</p>

Type 1 – Direct Interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a pre-determined outcome. The outcome may be the end/final result or an element within a competition or event.

The direct, pre-meditated or planned manipulation of a sports competition or element of a sports competition by an individual or individuals in order to gain an undue advantage (sporting and/or financial).

Key Arguments

Executors are those defined within the convention as **competition stakeholders** which includes athletes, officials, and athlete support personnel. These individuals are directly involved in the sporting competition or are in a position to improperly alter the result or natural course of a sports competition. Examples of the types of individuals who **could** be involved include:

- ▶ Athletes who can influence the natural run of play.
- ▶ Athlete support personnel who can unfairly influence the natural course of an event prior to or during the event.
- ▶ Improper decision making or application of sporting rules by competition official(s) prior to or during the event.

Some examples of the manipulation that fall into this type are:

- ▶ Two teams agreeing a pre-determined outcome prior to the beginning of a match.
- ▶ A coach and a participant agreeing to aim for a pre-determined outcome of a competition or element of a competition (e.g. set, round, point etc.).
- ▶ A competition official disallowing a goal or a point etc. that should have been allowed under the rules of the competition.

Type 2 - Use of false information relating to an athlete with the intention to gain an unfair advantage in an event or competition.

Providing false information related to personal data, physical characteristics or capabilities (intellectual or physical) either as an individual/team in order to gain an undue advantage.

Key Arguments

- ▶ Typically involves deception or fraudulent activity regarding the personal data of athletes.
- ▶ Instigators most likely to be from within sport but external actors could also facilitate this activity.
- ▶ Executors could be coerced OR complicit OR acting individually.

- ▶ Can be carried out for sporting OR financial reasons.

Some examples of the manipulation that fall into this type are:

- ▶ Providing a false birthdate to enable the participation of an athlete who is younger than the minimum age criteria of the competition to take advantage of their increased flexibility or stamina.
- ▶ Claiming an athlete is less able-bodied to enable them to participate in a disability classification for which they are not eligible, to gain an unfair advantage.

Whilst the instigators are most likely to be competition stakeholders bound by the rules and codes of a sports organisation, this type of activity can also be facilitated by corrupt external actors, such as physicians or individuals with expertise in technical data manipulation and/or counterfeiting.

The executors of the manipulation can be induced to commit the manipulation through bribery or coercion/blackmail. They may also agree to carry out the manipulation for their own personal financial or sporting gain.

Type 3 - Illegal or non-compliant modifications intended to achieve an unfair advantage in an event or competition in relation to:

- I. playing surfaces
- II. equipment
- III. athlete physiology
- IV. a sporting venue

Key Arguments

- ▶ Improving or degrading playing surfaces, equipment or athlete physiology to improperly influence the natural course of the event, or an element of an event, to achieve a specific outcome, obtaining a final undue advantage.
- ▶ Instigators and Executors have links to the sport (competition stakeholders).
- ▶ Facilitators are often needed to help with the modification (physicians, technical experts).
- ▶ The motive could be for sporting reasons and/or financial reasons.

Some examples of the manipulation that fall into this type are:

- ▶ Using unauthorized equipment that will give an athlete an unfair advantage for example using a small hidden motor on a bicycle.
- ▶ Tampering with a ball to make it perform in a specific way that is unknown to an opponent.

Manipulation Typology

Sub-Categories (The instigators behind the manipulation)

Sub-category A – People who hold a dominant position in a sport. For example, a club owner, high ranking official or senior executive.

Instigated by someone in a dominant position within a sports organisation. For example, officials such as club owners or executives. Involves misusing the power of a dominant position to force or coerce participants to take action intended to manipulate a competition or event.

Key Arguments

- ▶ Intentional - to improperly alter the result of course of sport competition.
- ▶ Instigators and Executors have links to the sport.
- ▶ The primary motive could be for sporting reasons, however, invariably there will be a secondary financial benefit.

Sub-category B – someone who has direct authority or influence on participants within a sport. For example a sponsor, coach, etc

Instigated by someone with direct authority or influence within a sport, with an interest in the athletes' or teams' economic rights or sporting achievements. For example, agents, sponsor, coaches etc. Involves misuse of this authority or influence, to force or coerce participants to take action intended to manipulate a competition or event.

Key Arguments

- ▶ Could be strong financial ties between Instigators and Executors.
- ▶ Both Instigators and Executors could have links to the sport.
- ▶ The motive could be for sporting reasons, to benefit from betting on the manipulation, or both.

Sub-category C - Is from outside the sport

Instigated by someone from outside of the jurisdiction of a sport. For example, criminals or associates of a participant(s). Involves an approach to participants to agree to, or force them to, take action intended to manipulate a competition or event.

Misusing sport as a vehicle and exploiting the executors to gain potentially illicit financial benefit but not for a sporting advantage.

This is the traditional type of competition manipulation and which has commonly referred to as match-fixing.

Key Arguments

- ▶ The instigators are outside the **sports organisation**. This could include criminal groups and other individuals or groups who engage in competition manipulation.
- ▶ The executors are those defined within the convention as **competition stakeholders** which includes athletes, officials, and athletic support staff.
- ▶ In addition to **competition stakeholders**, executors can include any other individual who can improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition, but must be from within the sports organization.
- ▶ The executors of the manipulation (competition stakeholders) are induced to commit the manipulation through bribes, other financial or non-financial benefits (such as promotion) or coercion such as blackmail.
- ▶ The primary financial benefit to the external parties is obtained through the placing of money onto betting markets.

Sub-category D - Is a Participant(s) in the sport

Instigated by participants involved in a sports competition. For example, athletes, athlete support personnel, competition officials, judges etc. Involves a participant acting alone, or by mutual agreement with other participants, to take action intended to manipulate a sports competition or event

Key Arguments

- ▶ No coercion from third parties.
- ▶ Individuals acting alone or an agreement between two or more actors.
- ▶ Instigators and Executors have links to the sport.
- ▶ The motive could be for sporting reasons, to abuse betting or both.

Detailed information on the potential motivations of the instigators and executors can be found in the Interactive Typology Tool, available as part of the [Macolin Toolbox](#) on the Council of Europe website.

For information

As previously stated, the Framework is not intended to be an exhaustive list of every possible scenario of competition manipulation. It is a reflection of real-life examples as observed by National Platforms and other key practitioners, developed through consultation with the Council of Europe.

Just to note, in many cases it may not be possible to identify who instigated a manipulation until the full facts are known or a case is closed. There may also be some overlaps between the types. For example, a coach who misuses their authority to force an athlete to manipulate an event would be categorised as Type 1B. A coach who makes an agreement with an athlete to take action to manipulate an event would be categorised as Type 1D.

THE INTERACTIVE TYPOLOGY TOOL

The Interactive Typology Tool (the tool) is a key element of the overall framework. It explains each type of manipulation in detail in 'descriptor sheets' which explain who may be involved as instigators and executors along with the potential motivations. It also offers information on how a manipulation might be achieved and links to media articles to help bring each type to life.

It is a living document and it was agreed at the start of the process to develop the framework that the tool would require regular reviews to incorporate the latest understanding and developments related to competition manipulation.

Version 1 was published on the Council of Europe website in June 2020 in .pdf format.

Version 2 was published in October 2022, in a new all interactive format. A pdf version is also available. The tool is structured as follows:

- ▶ Typology Framework Overview (including benefits to stakeholders)
- ▶ How to use the Typology Framework
- ▶ How to Use the Interactive Typology Tool

- ▶ How to use the Typology Descriptor Sheets
- ▶ Interactive Typology Tool Home Page
- ▶ Descriptor Sheets for each type
- ▶ Glossary

Buttons to specific types and topics provide easy navigation around the tool. Pop Ups are used on the descriptor sheets to help drill down into specific information on each type. A diagram of the tool's home page can be found at figure 2.

We know that the risks, threats and motivations will advance over time as new and more sophisticated methods are used to corrupt or manipulate events. Further iterations of the Typology Tool will be developed to reflect these changes.

Figure 2 – Picture of the Typology Tool Home Page

Interactive Typology Tool Home Page Click on the relevant button to access more information

	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	
What is the manipulation type	<p>Direct interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a predetermined outcome.</p> <p>The outcome may be the end/final result or an element within a competition or event.</p>	<p>Use of false information relating to an athlete with the intention of gaining an unfair advantage This could be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Personal Data Physical Capabilities Intellectual Capabilities 	<p>Illegal or non-compliant modifications intended to achieve an unfair advantage in an event or competition, relating to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Playing surfaces Equipment, technology or software Athlete physiology A sporting venue 	
	<p>The instigator (i.e. the person or group who initiates the manipulation) is someone who;</p>			
Who instigates the manipulations	<p>A – Holds a dominant position within the sport Instigated by someone in a dominant position <u>within</u> a sports organisation. e.g. officials such as club owners or executives. Involves misusing the power of a dominant position to force or coerce participants* to take action intended to manipulate a competition or event</p> <p>B – Has direct authority or influence on participants within the sport Instigated by someone with <u>direct authority</u> or <u>influence within</u> a sport, with an interest in the athletes' or teams' economic rights or sporting achievements. For example, agents, sponsor, coaches etc. Involves misuse of this authority or influence, to force or coerce participants to take action intended to manipulate a competition or event</p> <p>C - Is from outside the sport Instigated by someone from <u>outside</u> of the jurisdiction of a sport. For example, criminals or associates of a participant(s). Involves an approach to participants to agree to, or force them to take, action intended to manipulate a competition or event</p> <p>D – Is a participant(s) in the sport Instigated by participants involved in a sports competition. For example, athletes, athlete support personnel, competition officials, judges etc Involves a participant acting alone, or by mutual agreement with other participants, to take action intended to manipulate a sports competition</p>	<p>Type 1A !</p> <p>Type 1B !</p> <p>Type 1C !</p> <p>Type 1D !</p>	<p>Type 2A ID</p> <p>Type 2B ID</p> <p>Type 2C ID</p> <p>Type 2D ID</p>	<p>Type 3A ⚡</p> <p>Type 3B ⚡</p> <p>Type 3C ⚡</p> <p>Type 3D ⚡</p>

Glossary

Definition

Back to overview

Back to Title Page

Back to How to use the Tool

CONCLUSION

The Typology Framework is the first step in an iterative process for the GoC in understanding the scope of the definition and classification of the manipulation of sports competitions as defined in the Macolin Convention. This guide represents the collective work of the GoC, as a point in time in the Group's understanding of what falls within the scope of the Macolin Convention, and therefore within the remit of the NPs.

As demonstrated by this resource guide, the manipulation of sports competitions is a complex phenomenon. Given the pace with which the manipulation of sports competitions is accelerating, all stakeholders involved in detecting, preventing and sanctioning the manipulation of sports competitions are having to respond equally rapidly, and understand this phenomenon as it evolves. This resource guide provides a key first step for NP's in articulating the GoC's understanding.

In endorsing the Typology Framework, the GoC has made an important step in the process of clarifying concepts and terms, to ensure that all members can speak the same language and share the same global objectives under the umbrella of the Macolin Convention.

The framework is an indispensable step in ensuring the effective functioning of the NPs, and especially the development of their trans-national co-operation in the fight against the manipulation of sports competitions. Only action built on a shared understanding and conceptualization of sports competition manipulation, in all its forms, will enable NPs to develop effective strategies, frameworks and mechanisms to respond to, and ultimately reduce the manipulation of sports competitions, and safeguard sport from those who seek to corrupt and profit from the manipulation of sports competitions.

APPENDIX 1 – DETAILED EXAMPLES OF TYPOLOGIES AND ELEMENTS OF MACOLIN DEFINITION

In understanding the scope of the definition of sports competition manipulation, each definition was examined through consideration of the individual components of the broader definition. Identification of the key elements of each of the different typologies through which sports competitions could be manipulated were also deliberated.

Examples which would demonstrate these key components were developed to test the conceptualisation of the different typologies against the definition of sports competition manipulation. These examples were developed by members of the WG-T and presented to the wider Group of Copenhagen in the meeting in Rennes in 2019. *(Note: wording of each type and instigator has been amended to reflect the content of version 2 of the Typology. However, each example remains as it was presented in 2019).*

Example 1: Type 1A Direct interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a pre-determined outcome. The outcome may be the end/final result or an element within a competition or event.

Instigated by someone who holds a **Dominant Position within the sport**

Owners of two clubs (A + B), active in the first division in two different European countries decides which team will win the national championship and participate at the European Champions League.

Key points:

- ▶ End of season matches;
- ▶ Financial benefit for both teams (directors, coaches, players);
- ▶ Aims nature of the match (and the competition) is removed.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	Team B have to lose their last matches so they do not win their national championship
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	The result is predetermined by the athletes involved
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The unpredictable nature of the match is removed as the winner is predetermined
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The undue advantage is clearly financial (Inside information can lead to abuse betting)

Example 2 Type 1B Direct interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a predetermined outcome. The outcome may be the end/final result or an element within a competition or event.

Instigated by someone who has **direct authority or influence** on participants within a sport.

A sponsor of a club promises money and a new contract to a player of another team if he “helps” his team lose the next game.

Key points:

- ▶ Clear benefits promised to the player;
- ▶ Status “Sponsor” vs “Owner” vs “Agent” which can be under the same umbrella;
- ▶ Some other players could get involved in the scheme.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	Sponsor and athlete have agreed who will win the match
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	The result is predetermined by the athletes involved
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The unpredictable nature of the match is removed as the winner is predetermined
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The undue advantage is achieved by obtaining a better placement, higher fees, higher profit

Example 3: 1B Direct interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a predetermined outcome. The outcome may be the end/final result or an element within a competition or event.

Instigated by someone who has **direct authority or influence** on participants within a sport.

A player agent (intermediary) has an element of control over athletes through their capacity to influence current or future contracts. The agent (intermediary) using this element of control over the player(s) coerces the player(s) to manipulate the results of matches.

Key points:

- ▶ Results of matches between specific clubs could be predetermined;
- ▶ The strongest team can receive a “wild card” for some matches;
- ▶ Coaches could choose not to put the best possible team on the field.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	An agreement between agent, athletes and athlete support personnel is indeed in place
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	The result is predetermined by the athletes involved
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The unpredictable nature of the match is removed as the winner is predetermined
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	It will be easier to increase the financial power and obtain better contacts

Example 4: Type 1B Direct interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a pre-determined outcome. The outcome may be the end/final result or an element within a competition or event.

Instigated by someone who has **direct authority or influence** on participants within a sport.

Two athletes competing against each other have the same equipment supplier. The latter wants to be sure the “best” player will go to the next round.

Key points:

- ▶ The athletes can achieve the same financial benefits, even by losing a match;
- ▶ The supplier exerts his influence over the athletes.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	The athletes won't play at their best to win the competition
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	The result is predetermined by the athletes involved
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The unpredictable nature of the match is removed as the winner is predetermined
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The supplier can reach the widest possible market, the athletes will obtain good contracts

Example 5: Type 1C Direct interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a pre-determined outcome. The outcome may be the end/final result or an element within a competition or event.

Instigated by someone who is from **outside** the sport.

Players manipulate match outcomes at the direction of external match-fixers.

Key points:

- ▶ Players and coach sent to Australia by external match-fixers;
- ▶ Players and coach were paid to fix matches;
- ▶ Money placed on corrupt matches on Asian betting markets.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	The players agreed to manipulate the number of goals
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	The result is predetermined by the athletes at the direction of the external organisers (match fixers)
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The unpredictable nature of the match is removed as the contingencies were determined by the instigators (match fixers)
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The undue advantage is achieved by unfairly placing bets on a known result and the players were paid to fix the match.

Example 6: Type 1C Direct interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a pre-determined outcome. The outcome may be the end/final result or an element within a competition or event.

Instigated by someone who is from **outside** the sport.

Individual athlete deliberately loses games, with instigators placing bets on the athlete to lose.

Key points:

- ▶ Athlete agrees to lose games in a match following agreement with instigator;
- ▶ The athlete comes to an agreement with the instigator as to which games to lose;
- ▶ The instigator places bets on the athlete to lose and pays the player a small fee.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	The athlete has come to an agreement with the instigator to lose games in a match
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	The results of the match are altered by the athlete who loses on purpose
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The unpredictability of the match is removed by the player who agrees to lose the games
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The external instigator benefits by placing bets on the athlete to lose and the player benefits by the instigator playing a small fee to lose the games.

Example 7: Type 2B Use of false information relating to an athlete with the intention to gain an unfair advantage in an event or competition.

Instigated by someone who has **direct authority or influence** on participants within a sport.

A sports federation involved in an U17 international football team fields overage players in an attempt to ensure that they win.

Key points:

- ▶ Players are stronger and more experienced gaining unfair advantage;
- ▶ Sports federation is complicit by deliberately implementing a flawed age-testing regime.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	The sports federation has deliberately allowed overage players to compete
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	The aim of this manipulation is to improperly increase the likelihood of the overage team winning
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The unpredictable nature of the match is partially removed due to unfair competition
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The undue advantage is to win the match for sporting reasons or to place bets, for financial gain, on the increased likelihood of a certain sporting outcome

Example 8: Type 2D Use of false information relating to an athlete with the intention to gain an unfair advantage in an event or competition.

Instigated by participant(s)

An athlete knowingly modifies their personal data to enable them to compete in a classification for which they are not eligible.

Key points:

- ▶ Could involve any characteristics that relate to sporting classifications / categories;
- ▶ Enables them to have a significant unfair advantage against their fellow competitors.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	Deliberately modified or fake data provided by athlete to federation or competition organiser
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	Enables the athlete to improperly compete in a category for which they are ineligible, thus changing the natural course of the event
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The unpredictable nature of the event is removed as the athlete has unfair advantages (in strength, ability, etc.) over the competition
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The undue advantage could be for sporting purposes (to win a race/competition) or for betting purposes to achieve a financial gain

Example 9: Type 3B Illegal or non-compliant modifications intended to achieve an unfair advantage in an event or competition.

Instigated by someone who has **direct authority or influence** on participants within a sport.

Deflategate (2014/2015)

Key points:

- ▶ Footballs of Patriots team were deliberately underinflated to gain illegal advantage;
- ▶ 11 out of 12 balls were found to be below the minimum permitted air pressure levels;
- ▶ 243-page investigative report: more probable than not that Patriots' equipment personnel were deliberately circumventing the rules; Received a 1 million dollars fine.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	Equipment personnel deliberately underinflated footballs
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	By under deflating the footballs below the minimum permitted pressure levels, the course of the game is altered
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The unpredictable nature of the match is removed as the chance of winning has been knowingly increased for one of the teams
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The undue advantage is achieved by increasing the chance of winning prize money, sponsorship, etc. and by increasing the likelihood of progression to the later stages of the competition

Example 10: Type 3D Illegal or non-compliant modifications intended to achieve an unfair advantage.

Instigated by participant(s)

Sandpapergate (2018)

Key points:

- ▶ Australian ball-tempering scandal: cricket player roughs up one side of the ball to make it swing in flight during test match against South Africa;
- ▶ Captain and vice-captain were found to be involved;
- ▶ All three were sanctioned by Cricket Australia for breaching the Code of Conduct;
- ▶ The motivation for tampering with the ball was to make the ball swing in the air more when bowled by an Australian bowler, and therefore make it harder for the batsmen to hit and increase the chances of getting the batsmen out.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	The athlete deliberately roughens the surface of the ball with sandpaper
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	The alteration will cause the ball to behave differently and in a way unexpected by the opponent
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The athlete knew this would influence the outcome of the game
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The alteration will cause the ball to behave differently and in a way that is unexpected by the opponent

Notes - the athlete gains a sporting advantage as other players that are also involved in the high-profile tournament could be playing in this one but play to the best of their abilities. The athlete unfairly retains his sponsorship deal

Example 11: Type 3D Illegal or non-compliant modifications intended to achieve an unfair advantage.

Instigated by participants

Mechanical doping

Key points:

- ▶ Using a hidden motor to propel a racing bicycle;
- ▶ Such actions are prohibited by the Union Cycliste Internationale;
- ▶ 2010 first allegations (Hesjedal a.o.), 2016 first confirmed case (Femke van den Driessche during UCI Cyclo-Cross WC).

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	The bicycle has been altered by adding a hidden motor
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	By doing this the cyclists using the bicycle have an advantage over the competitors
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The motorised bicycle will increase the chances of winning the race
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	By winning the race this way an undue advantage has been obtained (prize money, higher ranking, increased sponsorship opportunities, etc.)

Points that may be raised – some sports may see this as ‘tactical’. However, most sports would have a ‘moral code’ that expects athletes to perform to the best of their ability. (e.g. Olympic code). Betting markets could be compromised as the result is pre-determined.

Example 12: Type 1D Direct interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a pre-determined outcome.

Instigated by participants

Players from two teams agree the final outcome of an event. They agree that Team A will win the match.

Key points:

- ▶ End of season match;
- ▶ No benefit to either team if they win or lose;
- ▶ Agreement made between players for betting purposes.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	The two teams have agreed who will win the match
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	The result is predetermined by the athletes involved
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The unpredictable nature of the match is removed as the winner is predetermined
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The undue advantage is achieved by unfairly placing bets on a known result

Example 13: Type 1D Direct interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a pre-determined outcome.

Instigated by participants

Individual athlete deliberately withdraws from an event in which they are expected to compete to the end.

Key points:

- ▶ Low tier tournament with no impact on ranking but sponsorship deal requires athlete to compete;
- ▶ Athlete is playing in a high-profile tournament the following week. It is an important tournament in terms of ranking and prize money and the athlete wants to preserve energy and avoid injury;
- ▶ Athlete withdraws in the first stage of the event feigning injury.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	The athlete has decided to withdraw from an event for a non-legitimate reason
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	Under the normal run of play he should have finished the match
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The athlete knew they would withdraw, the unpredictability is removed as the winner is decided by default
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The athlete gains an individual and sporting advantage. Betting markets are compromised as the unpredictable nature of the event is removed

Example 14: Type 1D Direct interference during play of an event or competition intended to achieve a pre-determined outcome.

Instigated by participants

A team decides to underperform in a match in the group stage of a competition to avoid a specific draw in the next round.

Key points:

- ▶ Team are already through to the next round;
- ▶ If they win the group stage they know they will play the favourites in the first round of the knockout phase of the competition;
- ▶ The team would be expected to win their final match. They underperform to deliberately lose. They come second in the group and will play what they see as an easier opponent in the next stage of the competition.

Key Elements of the Competition Manipulation	Factors Present	Key Elements of Manipulation in this example
The manipulation of the sports competition involves an intentional arrangement, act or omission	Yes	The team has decided not to play to their best ability to avoid winning the match
These arrangements, acts or omissions aim, successfully or unsuccessfully, to improperly alter the result or the course of a sports competition	Yes	The result is predetermined by some of the athletes involved
The alteration of the course of the event occurs in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition, and	Yes	The unpredictable nature of the match is removed as the likely winner is predetermined
These arrangements, acts or omissions occur with a view, once again successfully or unsuccessfully to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others	Yes	The undue advantage is for sporting purposes by hoping to secure an easier route through to the knockout stage of a competition.

APPENDIX 2 – SUMMARY OF THE PROCESS

The first Working Group on Sports Manipulations (WG-SM) was established by the Group of Copenhagen at its 6th meeting in Lisbon (Portugal) on 17-18 April 2018 to:

- ▶ capture the evolving and increasing understanding of the manipulation of sports competitions [as defined in the Macolin Convention];
- ▶ provide greater precision in language when discussing sports competition manipulation;
- ▶ focus discussions and the development of strategies to address the manipulation of sports competitions.

The Group of Copenhagen, at its 7th WG-Group of Copenhagen meeting (Oslo, Norway, 18-20 February 2019), confirmed the continuation of activities through the renamed Working Group – Typology (WG-T).

Working Group – Sports Manipulations (WG-SM, April 2018-February 2019)

The WG-SM was composed of representatives/experts from the following NPs: Australia, Belgium, Cyprus, France, Portugal, The Netherlands and Switzerland.

The WG-SM devised a checklist containing items that can be considered to be ‘manipulation of sports competitions’ and developed a comprehensive analysis / data collection in order to establish the competencies of the Macolin Convention. Achievements have been reported as the following to the 7th meeting of the Group of Copenhagen held in Oslo (Norway) in February 2019:

a. Pooling together of key information

18 NPs provided a considerable amount of information related to cases that constituted the critical mass enabling the WG-SM to clear up certainty around various vocabulary terms used in the domain, systematically distinguishing their meanings (for example differentiating methods used to manipulate from aims). This categorization of information helped to specify a good data collection tool.

b. Enlightened Concept of manipulations of sports competitions

The WG-SM was able to propose a “**Conceptual framework of manipulation of sports competitions**” [see T-MC(2018)87rev] which:

- ▶ Cleared up a number of erroneous ideas (for example illustrating the distinction between

« match-fixing » and the larger concept of « manipulations of sports competitions »).

- ▶ Emphasized a number of fundamental ideas (manipulations of sports competitions almost always, in one way or another, result in an undue financial advantage).
- ▶ Highlighted that there are various types of manipulations (thus moving away from the dual distinction of “sport-related” or “betting-related”).

c. Typology

The structured analysis was used as a framework to identify, initially (version 1), 7 distinct types of methods by which the manipulation of sports competitions could or have occurred. These types were then distributed to the members of the Group of Copenhagen, for NPs to critique.

Working Group – Typology (WG-T, March 2019 – June 2020)

The WG-T is composed of representatives / experts from the following NPs: Australia, Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Switzerland and United Kingdom.

The primary aim of the WG-T was to:

- ▶ analyse and explore the definition of manipulation of sports competitions as defined in the Macolin Convention;
- ▶ identify the various methods by which sports competitions were/are manipulated or intended to be manipulated;
- ▶ develop broad types by which past and future instances of manipulation of sports competitions could be categorized (typology);
- ▶ clarify the internal information handling processes within the NP based on a common language;
- ▶ clarify the remit of NPs within the Group of Copenhagen;
- ▶ provide practical guidelines enabling the NP to implementing relevant countermeasures specifically designed according to the different types, taking into account the existing legal and professional situation in the countries, as well as the necessary developments to be operated in line with the Macolin Convention provisions.

The Typology (second version) was presented at the 8th meeting of the Group of Copenhagen, (Rennes, France, 17-19 June 2019) by the members of the WG-T. Coordinators of the NPs were provided with an Explanatory document [T-MC(2019)51], encouraging

them to engage their national stakeholders into an “experimental phase” to further consider and deliberate, including the identification of strengths and weaknesses of the six draft types developed by the WG-T.

From July to November 2019 a dozen NPs have confirmed their commitment to Phase 3 (not counting the NPs active in the WG-T). Six of them submitted a written contribution as a result of the actions that were taken. All written contributions were forwarded to WG-T and discussed at the working meeting in Brussels on 15 October 2019. The work of the NPs has made an essential contribution to the improvement of “Typology of Sports Manipulations”. The terminology was clarified or detailed and explanations could be provided to make the 6 types more readable.

The starting point of the WG-T process was to collect and collate information on sanctioned cases (criminally or disciplinary) related to sports manipulations from the NPs. A comprehensive analysis of this information was developed in order to list issues, questions and concerns that have been confirmed to be causes / sources of sports manipulations within the competencies of the Macolin Convention. The reasoned approach in the analysis allowed the WG-T to delve into detail, breaking down the facts and to arrive at an interpretation helping to understand the intrinsic nature of cases of manipulations of sports competitions.

The simple structured analysis approach developed for the “Typology of Sports Manipulations” identifies types of sports manipulations by the detailed categorization of the acts perpetrated and is based on a standardised set of factual questions:

- ▶ What is the manipulation?
- ▶ **Who** are the manipulator(s)?
- ▶ The **instigators** will arrange the manipulation prior to the event taking place. They will not only approach and ensure that the executors will fix the event on the sport field but will also undertake to ensure an undue advantage from the same fix on the field.
- ▶ The **executors** are the actors that fix the event (match, game, tournament, etc.).
- ▶ **How** (using which medium) did the manipulators achieve their final “undue advantage”?
- ▶ **What** happened on or off the field?
- ▶ **Why** (for which final undue advantage) was the manipulation organised by the manipulators?
- ▶ **Why** (for which final undue advantage) was the manipulation undertaken by the executors?

The (provisional) types of sports manipulations depend on the different medium used or final undue advantages pursued. This means there are various possible permutations and combinations, (see type sheet-descriptions below).

The structure of the Typology Framework was re-considered by the T-WG at a meeting in Birmingham in February 2020. A new format was agreed to enhance understanding of both the Framework and how it can be applied whilst adhering to the basic principles agreed at the start of the project.

Working Group – Typology (WG-T, March 2022 – present)

The Council of Europe appointed a consultant to lead the review of the framework. The WG-T is composed of representatives / experts from the following NPs: Australia, Belgium, the Netherlands, and United Kingdom, along with representatives from the GoC secretariat.

A proposal outlining the scope and approach to the review was developed by the lead consultant, in conjunction with the Council of Europe. The proposal was signed off by Bureau members in February 2022. It was presented to Group of Copenhagen on 5 April 2022, who also endorsed the suggested approach. Regular meetings were held with the WG-T and the GoC secretariat to discuss revisions of content and structure.

The aim of the review was to ensure the types reflected the current landscape of event manipulation and that any new developments in this landscape were referenced. The examples within each type would also be reviewed to ascertain if more up to date and relevant cases could be included.

It was agreed that the Resources Guide will also need to be updated to reflect changes made to the Typology.

It was agreed early in the review process that no major changes to the general structure of the tool i.e., the types and subcategories were required. However, the WG-T remain open to reviewing this in future iterations if improvements can be made.

It was agreed that the terminology and phrasing within the interactive could be improved; every attempt has been made to ensure that the revised version is written in plain English. A new fully interactive version of the Tool had also been created. This enables easy navigation of the information within the Tool, using pop ups and links throughout.

APPENDIX 3 – DEFINITIONS AND GLOSSARY

For the purpose of the Typology the following definitions apply

- 1. Athlete:** means any person or group of persons, participating in sports competitions.
- 2. Athlete support personnel:** means any coach, trainer, manager, agent, team staff, team official, medical or paramedical personnel working with or treating athletes participating in or preparing for sports competitions, and all other persons working with the athletes.

Anyone involved in maintenance of competition venues or equipment, for example floodlight technicians, electrician, grounds person etc. or individuals working for a competition organiser or volunteers.
- 3. Competition Official(s):** anyone who is involved in overseeing a competition to ensure fair play and that rules are adhered to. For example, referees, judges, umpires, officials etc.
- 4. Course (in context of sports competition) -** the length of time between the start and finish of a sporting competition.
- 5. Element within a competition or event –** something that happens in play before the final result. For example, a player being sent off, the result at half time, the first corner of a game. Sometimes referred to as spot fixing.
- 6. Intentional arrangement:** means that the arrangement is deliberately aimed at improperly influencing the natural and fair course or the result of a sports competition.
- 7. Improper alteration:** is a change to something that makes it different through an arrangement, act or omission which infringes the existing legislation or the regulations of the sports competition or organisation concerned.
- 8. National Platform:** The coordinator of the fight against the manipulation of sports competitions within a jurisdiction (which can be an organisation or a collection of relevant stakeholders) as defined in Article 13 of the Macolin Convention.
- 9. Officials of sports clubs/teams:** includes owners or executives of sports clubs and ultimate beneficiaries.
- 10. Others/other persons:** used to refer to people or things that are additional to or different from people or things that have been mentioned or are known about. This can include for example, tutors, guardians and mentors or intermediaries.
- 11. Participant:** For the purposes of this Framework, 'Participant' means Athlete(s), Athlete Support Personnel or Competition Officials.
- 12. Result:** the final score or the name of the winner/s in a sports competition.
- 13. Sports competition:** means any real sports⁵ event organised in accordance with the rules set by a sports organisation listed by the Convention Follow-up Committee in accordance with Article 31.2, and recognised by an international sports organisation, or, where appropriate, another competent sports organisation.
- 14. Undue or unfair advantage:** An advantage that puts one in a favourable or superior position, that is undue or unfair because it arises from an improper arrangement, act or omission.
- 15. Unpredictable:** likely to change suddenly and without reason and therefore not able to be predicted i.e. before it happens or an outcome depended on.

5. According to Article 3 i.43 of the Macolin Convention Explanatory Report, "real sports event" does not include virtual sports events such as those simulated by certain fixed odds terminals.

www.coe.int

The Council of Europe is the continent's leading human rights organisation. It comprises 46 member states, including all members of the European Union.

All Council of Europe member states have signed up to the European Convention on Human Rights, a treaty designed to protect human rights, democracy and the rule of law.

The European Court of Human Rights oversees the implementation of the Convention in the member states.