



Strasbourg, 27 July 2017

EPAS (2017) INF15

Enlarged Partial Agreement on Sport (EPAS)

**First meeting of the informal Working Group on the  
“International Sports Integrity Partnership”**

Council of Europe  
55 Avenue Kléber  
(1st floor, Meeting room n° 1)  
F-75116 Paris

Wednesday 21 June 2017  
10.00 a.m. – 5.00 p.m.

**Report**

## Executive Summary

The first meeting of the Informal Working Group on the International Sports Integrity Partnership (“ISIP”) was held at the Council of Europe (CoE)’s Paris office on 21 June.

Co-organised by the UK (Department for Culture, Media and Sport), the CoE, the International Olympic Committee (IOC), and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), representatives from national governments, international sports organisations and intergovernmental organisations came together with the objective of finding ways to address corruption in the governance of sport.

In addition to the above, the following were represented: Argentina, France, Germany, Japan, USA, the Association of National Olympic Committees (ANOC), the Association of Summer Olympic International Federations (ASOIF), the General Association of International Sports Federations (GAISF), the Commonwealth Secretariat and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). .

During the meeting, it was agreed that the partnership would be called the “Partnership against Corruption in Sport” (IPACS) and that its mission statement would be:

“To bring together international sports organisations, governments, inter-governmental organisations, and other relevant stakeholders to strengthen and support efforts to eliminate corruption and promote a culture of good governance in and around sport.”

*“Réunir des organisations sportives internationales, des gouvernements et des organisations intergouvernementales, ainsi que d’autres parties prenantes pour renforcer et soutenir les efforts visant à éliminer la corruption et à promouvoir une culture de la bonne gouvernance dans le domaine du sport.”*

Strong support was expressed that this flexible and informal partnership would start with a working group and three task forces focused on: (1) reducing the risk of corruption in public procurement in the context of sports events, (2) ensuring transparency and integrity in the context of venues for sport events; and (3) compliance with good governance principles in the context of sport settings. There was good buy-in on the topics presented as part of this work programme.. Finally, the meeting also discussed what the next steps should be and, importantly, the idea of gathering the partnership in a broader plenary setting and having high-level meetings at ministerial level to generate political will for the partnership to generate further momentum between working group meetings.

## 1. Welcome and introduction

## a. Host welcome and introduction to the agenda (chaired by the Council of Europe)

Stanislas Frossard, Executive Secretary of the Council of Europe's Enlarged Partial Agreement on Sport, welcomed the participants who introduced themselves. The list of participants can be found in appendix 2 to this report.

Mr Frossard summarised the objectives of the meeting, which were to:

- clarify the partnership's mission;
- share information on existing initiatives;
- identify the partnership's objectives and practical means for reaching these objectives and;
- agree on concrete next steps for taking the partnership forward.

The agenda was adopted as it appears in appendix 1 to the report.

On behalf of the Council of Europe, Elda Moreno, Head of the Children's Rights and Sport Values Department, welcomed the participants to the first meeting of the working group. She noted that states, sports organisations and international organisations have shown great interest in such a co-operation, and that expectations are high to prevent corruption and promote good governance in sport. This partnership joins relevant and important forces against the threat of corruption in sport to build trust and confidence. Mrs Moreno hoped that tangible outcomes such as training programmes and other relevant measures will be produced in the framework of this partnership. She welcomed the discussions today on the partnership's structure and format. She confirmed the Council of Europe's commitment to facilitate this process and reminded those present that good governance of sports organisations is necessary, but not sufficient to prevent corruption.

## b. Presentations on the background decisions (chaired by the United Kingdom)

Hitesh Patel said that due to recent scandals in sport, anti-corruption and good governance in sport remain priority issues in the UK.

Brief oral reports were given on:

- [UK Anti-corruption Summit of May 2016](#)
- [14th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for sport, November 2016](#)
- [International Forum on Sports Integrity \(IFSI\), IOC, February 2017](#)

The Working Group took note of the background information on the origins of ISIP.

## 2. Clarification on the mission and name of the partnership (chaired by the United Kingdom)

The Working Group discussed the following mission statement for the international partnership:

Mission statement

To bring together international sports organisations, governments, inter-governmental organisations and other relevant stakeholders to strengthen and support efforts to eliminate corruption and promote a culture of good governance in and around sport.

Déclaration de mission

Réunir des organisations sportives internationales, des gouvernements et des organisations intergouvernementales, ainsi que d'autres parties prenantes pour renforcer et soutenir les efforts visant à éliminer la corruption et à promouvoir une culture de la bonne gouvernance dans le domaine du sport.

The following title of the partnership (former title: International Sports Integrity Partnership - ISIP) was proposed: International Partnership against Corruption in Sport – (IPACS).

The reason for this was to narrow the scope of the partnership's mission, as integrity is a very broad concept, encompassing topics e.g. match-fixing, anti-doping or violence, which are already covered by other co-operation frameworks. Collaboration may be sought with these frameworks, insofar as they are concerned with corrupt behaviour, but the partnership as such will focus on the risk of corruption.

The Working Group approved the name and mission statement of the partnership.

3. What has been done? What is on-going? (chaired by the OECD)

3.1 Actions taken by international organisations

UNODC drew attention to its handbook "[A Strategy for Safeguarding against Corruption in Major Public Events](#)", its resource guide "[Good Practices in the Investigation of Match-Fixing](#)" as well as the booklet and study conducted in cooperation with the IOC in relation to criminal law provisions for the prosecution of competition manipulation. It was also highlighted that the 7th seventh session of the Working Group on Prevention, held from 22-24 August 2016, had focused on integrity in sport and that there was strong interest in the possibility of a resolution on the topic being introduced at the Seventh session of the Conference of States Parties, scheduled to take place from 6 to 10 November 2017.

The Council of Europe (CoE) presented the [project on the database on alleged corruption cases in sport](#). The aim of this database is to record alleged cases of corruption in sport reported by the media and to monitor the responses given by the institutions involved (disciplinary sanctions) and by the criminal justice systems.

The CoE also reported on the study on private corruption conducted by its Group of States against Corruption (GRECO), as there is – so far – limited knowledge. The study will be available in October and will provide a typology on private sector corruption which will include sport e.g. match-fixing, TV broadcasting rights, etc. It will discuss issues arising from the selected cases across member states such as legal/ practical implementation, international co-operation/ jurisdiction. It will also describe cases – including sport cases – to show how private sector corruption works in practice.

The OECD noted the growing momentum behind combating corruption in sport, including among G20 Leaders who are considering including language on this issue in the Hamburg G20 communiqué, and mentioned how OECD's experience developing and promoting its international standards on integrity can further support this agenda. These standards include the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention, the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, and the OECD's "[High-level principles for Integrity, Transparency and Effective Control of Major Events and Related Infrastructures](#)", as well as the OECD's standards for promoting integrity in public procurement, preventing conflicts of interest, and on corporate governance. These standards are summarised in its brochure, "[Organising Sporting Events: Preventing corruption and promoting responsible business conduct](#)".

### 3.2 Actions taken by governments regarding the implementation of anti-corruption provisions and good governance principles in sport

UK Sport presented on the [Code for Sports Governance in the UK](#), which sets out the levels of transparency, accountability and financial integrity that are required from those who ask for Government and National Lottery funding. Many measures to address corruption in sport are obligatory, such as the introduction of a quota for independent persons on the boards of sport organisations.

The CoE mentioned that it had collected national good practice examples on good governance in sport and had conducted a good governance survey among the EPAS member states. The summary results of the survey can be found [here](#) and the EPAS Secretariat could provide national good practice examples upon request. The CoE briefly introduced the [draft recommendation to member states on the promotion of good governance in sport](#) as proposed by the 14th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Sport, and invited members of the group to give feedback or to make proposals.

The Commonwealth Secretariat presented its [policy guidance to Commonwealth Governments on Protecting the Integrity of Sport](#). This publication provides recommendations to member governments on adopting general principles related to protecting the integrity of sport. The Commonwealth Secretariat emphasised the importance of aligning the work of the partnership with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and of relying on the international existing anti-corruption co-operation frameworks.

### 3.3 Processes on the implementation and/or review of sports organisations with good governance principles

The ASOIF presented the first governance [review of its member federations](#). The results of this review were anonymous firstly in order to build confidence and secondly to avoid naming and shaming. ASOIF said that the federations of winter sports intend to adopt the ASOIF good governance methodology as well.

Provided the ASOIF good governance initiative is a success, the GAISF indicated the possibility that it could also use the ASOIF good governance methodology, so that non-Olympic sport organisations are covered.

The IOC briefly introduced its [framework for the IOC and NOCs implementation of](#) the good governance principles and made reference to the EU project by the EOC EU Office.

The CoE presented further initiatives such as the Sports Governance Observer [SGO 2015/ SGO 2017-18](#) and the [PACE motion on “The legitimacy crisis in international sports governance”](#). ([The CoE presentation is available here.](#))

The Working Group took note of the recent and on-going projects and initiatives.

## 4. What should be done? (Chaired by IOC)

The aim of this item was to identify possible joint actions that could be undertaken within the framework of the partnership. An action-oriented approach was proposed and the resulting solutions should be pragmatic. The representatives of sports organisations underlined the importance of understanding the specificity of sport: that it has a business side as well as a not-for-profit side.

Three task forces with experts from outside the partnership were proposed, on:

1. reducing the risk of corruption in public procurement in the context of sports events;
2. ensuring transparency and integrity in the selection of venues for major sport events in the light of relevant standards on conflict of interest; and
3. optimising the processes of compliance with good governance principles to mitigate the risk of corruption.

Concerning TF1, as presented by the OECD, the following possible thematic priorities were identified:

- public procurement
- transparent and effective management and organisation of events and event-related construction of facilities
- competencies/ skills of staff

The partnership could collect good practices and implement a pilot project offering its expertise to future host cities. Furthermore, it was recommended to also include experts from businesses who can share their experience.

Transfer of relevant know-how, technical assistance, capacity-building initiatives, and trainings were considered as very valuable measures.

The UNODC referred to its practical guide on major public events which is a practical tool also relevant for sport organisations. It recommended carrying out a risk assessment as an important first step.

Concerning TF2, as presented by the OECD, IPACS could benefit from exploring the applicability of private sector corporate governance, responsible business, and compliance standards to the decision-making process on awarding major sports events. By managing conflicts of interest, IPACS can help prevent opportunities for corruption, maintain the integrity of official sports policy and administrative decisions, and support public confidence in governments and sports organisations. The IOC mentioned the organisation is currently reviewing its process to awarding the OG/YOG (In fact the IOC Executive Board made the first decision three weeks ago and during its Session in Lausanne on 11 July this will be discussed and possibly approved by the Session.) The interest of GRECO was also noted, as it can focus on the ability of national jurisdictions to prevent and prosecute corruption, including in the private sector, in the context of the awarding procedure. GRECO country-by-country evaluations may be useful in this regard.

Concerning TF3, the CoE highlighted the challenge linked to the convergence of existing good governance frameworks and proposed a pragmatic approach in order to improve the existing, legitimate frameworks (e.g. stakeholders consultations on the enhancement of the ASOIF questionnaire) and to discuss relevant measures to address the risks of corruption, such as term limits, financial transparency, etc. The conflict of interest issue was mentioned as another important area. The relevance of harmonised requirements is important while addressing national sports organisations, which are likely to be confronted by requirements from their governments and from their international umbrella organisations. The challenges of supporting capacity building on good governance at the national level, and ensuring compliance while respecting autonomy of these organisations, were mentioned.

In the context of the work of the task force, the UNODC mentioned the opportunity of using the monitoring mechanisms of the anti-corruption conventions.

<p>The Working Group decided to set up the three proposed task forces, whose terms of reference will be circulated by the core group to the members of the Working Group.</p>
---

## 5. Next steps: Identifying a way forward for the partnership (Chaired by the United Kingdom)

Regarding the structure, the partnership will be a flexible and informal partnership having no legal personality, and with a rotating secretariat.

There will be different settings:

- Working Group: tripartite forum consisting of sports organisations, governments, and inter-governmental organisations. This group can be expanded to include additional governments and sports federations and organisations, a decision to be taken by consensus. Japan confirmed it would like to play role in the Working Group; Germany stated especially public procurement and the selection process of major sport events are important topics and are thus very interested; and GAISF will give support.
- Three task forces with experts from outside the Working Group:
  - A task force for reducing the risk of corruption in public procurement;
  - A task force on ensuring transparency and integrity in the selection of venues for major sport events in the light of relevant standards on conflict of interest; and
  - A task force on optimising the processes of compliance with good governance principles to mitigate the risk of corruption.
- The CoE, IOC, OECD, UK and UNODC will act together as a core group co-ordinating the preparation and follow up of the Working Group meetings.

The work plan of the partnership will be presented in a roadmap, to be drafted by the core group and adopted by the Working Group, which will cover the tasks of the Plenary Meeting, Working Group and Task Forces. The working group will begin by collecting all the relevant materials (standards, tools, studies) on anti-corruption and governance in an annotated bibliography. It will then start to think about these issues *ex ante* and how they can be tailored to the specific needs of sport and sports organisations. In turn, this analysis will create new knowledge and expertise on the specific challenges of eliminating corruption and promoting a culture of good governance in and around sport.

The Working Group meeting will be held roughly every six months, hosted on a rotational basis between the core group (CoE, OECD, UK, IOC, UNODC). The host of the Working Group meeting will also act as the secretariat for the duration of the period.

Considering its key position as host country of the headquarters of most international federations, Germany suggested inviting Switzerland to be part of the Working Group.

In the future, the representation of the sports movement could be widened to include representatives of interested stakeholders which are quite independent from the pyramidal organisation of the international federations (e.g. professional leagues).

The Working Group encouraged the participation in the upcoming meetings by GRECO representatives, either as part of the CoE delegation or specific countries' delegations, to strengthen the representation of experts from the justice system and anti-corruption authorities.

The OECD will host the next Working Group meeting and will also act as the secretariat for this period. The OECD will take over from the CoE as the contact point. The tentative date set for the meeting is the week of 11 December 2017.

## EPAS (2017) INF15

A plenary meeting of the partnership would be proposed when deliverables can be presented. Attention should be paid to the fact that the partnership is truly international and not only European.

Furthermore, it was proposed to agree on communication elements ideally before the MINEPS conference in July 2017.

The Working Group agreed upon these organisational principles and proposed to include Switzerland in the group.

### 6. Any other business

No items were raised.

### 7. Date and place of the next meeting

The OECD will host the next Working Group meeting in Paris.

The tentative date set for the meeting is the week of 11 December 2017.



## Appendix 1

## First meeting of the informal Working Group on the “International Sport Integrity Partnership”

Council of Europe  
55 Avenue Kléber, F-75116 Paris (1<sup>st</sup> floor, Meeting room n° 1)

Wednesday 21 June 2017, 10.00 a.m. – 5.00 p.m.

### Agenda

#### 1. Welcome and introduction

- a) Host welcome and introduction to the agenda
- b) Presentations on the background decisions
  - UK Anti-corruption Summit, May 2016, ([Communiqué, §23 and 24](#)) 14<sup>th</sup> Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for sport, November 2016, ([SG report, resolution no 2](#))
  - International Sport Integrity Forum, IOC, February 2017 ([See Page 2 of the Declaration](#))

#### 2. Clarification on the mission and name of the partnership

Preliminary talks between promoters showed that the consensus is stronger on measures to be taken by governments, sports organisations and international organisations to address corruption in the governance of sport, within an action oriented informal setting, which meets on a regular basis. It is proposed to discuss this, to agree on a short “mission statement” and on a possible name for the Partnership.

Building upon the May 2016 UK Anti-Corruption Summit, the November 2016 Council of Europe Conference of Ministers Responsible for Sport, and the February 2017 International Forum for Sports Integrity, it is proposed that the Partnership’s mission is *to bring together international sports organisations, governments, international organisations, and other relevant stakeholders in particular through the implementation of high standards of transparency, good governance.*

The Partnership’s name should reflect the Partnership’s multi-stakeholder nature and its emphasis on combatting corruption through the implementation of high standards of transparency, good governance. Does “International Sport Integrity Partnership” reflect this mission? The broad concept “integrity” had induced a wide range of expectations and some misunderstandings. Against this background it is proposed to consider re-wording the title. (e.g. “International Partnership against Corruption in Sport”)

#### 3. What has been done? What is on-going?

##### 3.1 Actions taken by International organisations

- UNODC [A Strategy for Safeguarding against Corruption in Major Public Events](#)

- CoE EPAS Database on alleged corruption cases in sport + CoE GRECO Study on private corruption
- OECD [High-level principles for Integrity, Transparency and Effective Control of Major Events and Related Infrastructures](#) + Brochure "[Organising Sporting Events](#)"
- Possible other presentation

Among recent intergovernmental anti-corruption initiatives that may be relevant to the sport sector, it is proposed to have short presentations from the UNODC, OECD and CoE. Participants will be invited to contribute to this discussion, as well as to react to these projects and suggest how to further co-ordinate initiatives at national level.

### **3.2 Actions taken by Governments regarding the implementation of anti-corruption provisions and good governance principles in sport**

- [A Code for Sports Governance in England](#)
- Examples from other countries
- Other National Good practices collected by EPAS
- Guidance to Governments on measures to take at national level :
  - o CoE Draft recommendation to CoE Member States
  - o Policy Guidance to Commonwealth Governments on Protecting the Integrity of Sport

Governmental representatives will present the processes they have introduced to encourage national sports organisations in their territories to comply with good governance principles and to give them incentives to prevent and fight corruption. The CoE will update the WG on the collection of national good practices and consult the participants on a draft recommendation to national authorities.

### **3.3 Processes on the implementation and/or review of sports organisations with good governance principles**

Presentations on

- [ASOIF](#)
- [IOC framework for the IOC and NOCs](#) (including European [SIGGS](#))
- Other projects and initiatives
  - o [SGO 2015](#)
  - o [PACE motion on "The legitimacy crisis in international sports governance"](#)
  - o [SGO 2017-18](#)
  - o Others

For the sport organisations, which are not primarily responsible for fighting corruption, one of the best ways to protect themselves and prevent corruption in their organisation is to promote good governance. Many initiatives have been completed, or are on-going, aimed at measuring the compliance of sports organisations with good governance principles. It is proposed to have short presentations by ASOIF (10') and the IOC framework for itself and for NOCs (10') and to mention the other initiatives (3 x 2'). A *tour de table* could then allow the stakeholders to comment on the initiatives and suggest how to make them more useful.

## **4. What should be done?**

Building on the existing projects and initiatives, this session will serve to define focus areas. This session aims to identify possible joint actions that could be undertaken within the framework of the partnership. The discussion aims to identify gaps or areas of need, to set priorities, and to identify possibly interested stakeholders to work on them.

Prior to the meeting, a few proposals were identified for possible joint actions within the Partnership. The discussion should allow the group to identify gaps or areas of need, set priorities, and to identify possibly interested stakeholders to work on them. A non-exhaustive list of potential areas of focus includes:

- How to reduce the risk of corruption in public procurement. Proposal from OECD to conduct case studies on major sport events focusing on how the public procurement procedure is consolidated and implemented.
- How to avoid the risk of corruption in the awarding process of major sport events? Proposal from OECD to ensure transparency and integrity in the selection of major sport in the light of relevant standards on conflict of interest, thus preventing opportunities for corruption and to supporting public confidence in government and sports organisations.
- How to optimise the processes of compliance with good governance principles to mitigate the risk of corruption? Proposal from the CoE to promote convergence of good governance frameworks, starting from the critical measures that are relevant to mitigate the risk of corruption.
- Other proposals

## **5. Next steps: Identifying a way forward for the partnership**

Summing up the group's decision on the partnership's mission, key stakeholders (Agenda item no 2), and priority activities (Agenda item no 4), this discussion will focus on the organisation of the partnership and the immediate next steps, including discussion on how to develop and roll out a concrete work plan and meeting schedule for the partnership.

A number of basic governance features were proposed and agreed upon among the promoters of the partnership:

- Key stakeholders should be the Sports Movement, Governments and International Organisations
- The partnership is not expected to be established as a new organisation, but as a flexible informal co-ordination body (no legal personality, no standing secretariat but rotation or joint effort of partners)

Some other features were not yet agreed upon:

- Size and frequency of plenary meetings
- Continental representation of states in plenary meetings
- Rotation for the Chair, Secretariat...

## **6. Any other business**

In addition to the adopted agenda WG participants will be provided with the opportunity to report on other topics or to formulate expectations for the upcoming WG meeting.

## **7. Date and place of the next meeting**

**Appendix 2**

**First meeting of the informal Working Group on the  
“International Sport Integrity Partnership”**

Council of Europe  
55 Avenue Kléber – 75116 Paris  
1<sup>st</sup> floor – meeting room no 1

Wednesday 21 June 2017  
10:00 – 17:00

**List of participants / Liste des participants**

**STATES / ETATS**

**ARGENTINA**

**Gabriel TABOADA**

Minister, Head of OECD Section  
Embassy of Argentina in France

**Ayelén AMIGO**

Secretary  
Section for IO/OECD  
Embassy of Argentina in France

**CHINA**

**FRANCE**

**Frédéric SANAUR**

Chef du Bureau des relations internationales, des affaires européennes et des grands événements  
Ministère de la Ville, de la Jeunesse et des Sports  
Secrétariat d'Etat aux Sports - Direction des Sports

**Philippe VINOGRADOFF**

Ambassadeur pour le Sport  
Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires Européennes

**Anne-Marie BRIGAUD**

Chargée de mission diplomatie sportive

**Sylvain NOGUES**

Chef de Section  
Agence Française Anticorruption

**GERMANY**

**Torsten WEIDEN**

Policy Officer

Federal Ministry of the Interior

**JAPAN**

**Takashi KIRYU**

First Secretary

Permanent Delegation of Japan to the OECD

**Laure MILLET**

Assistant

Permanent Delegation of Japan to the OECD

**SOUTH AFRICA**

**UNITED KINGDOM**

**Hitesh PATEL**

Head of International Sport

Department for Culture, Media and Sport

**Robert MORINI**

Head of International Relations

UK Sport

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**Adam MURRAY**

Counselor for anti-corruption and public governance

US Mission to the OECD

**SPORT ORGANISATIONS / ORGANISATIONS SPORTIVES**

**ANOC**

**Michael Andrew CHAMBERS**

Chairman - Legal Commission

**ASOIF**

**James CARR**

Head of Administration and Projects

**GAISF**

**Davide DELFINI**

Membership Application Manager

**IOC**

**Pâquerette GIRARD ZAPPELLI**  
Chief Ethics and Compliance  
Officer

**Catia GIANNOTTA**  
Administrative Assistant

**SportAccord**

**Marisol CASADO**  
ITU President – ASOIF GAISF and IOC member

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS / ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES**

**Commonwealth Secretariat**

**Oliver DUDFIELD**  
Head of Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) Youth Division

**Council of Europe**

**Eida MORENO**  
Head of the Children's Rights and Sport Values Department

**Stanislas FROSSARD**  
EPAS Executive Secretary  
Tel: 03 90 21 53 76

**Michael TRINKER**  
EPAS Deputy Executive Secretary  
Tel: 03 90 21 54 57

**OECD**

**Nicola BONUCCI**  
Director, Directorate for Legal Affairs

**Mary CRANE-CHAREF**  
Policy Advisor for Anticorruption, Sherpa Office, General Secretariat

**Nejla SAULA**  
Deputy Head, Sherpa Office, General Secretariat

**Kristina MIGGIANI**  
Anti-corruption consultant

**UNODC**

**Ronan O'LAOIRE**

Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice  
Officer

**COUNCIL OF EUROPE SECRETARIAT**

**Helena ORSULIC**

Administrative Assistant

Tel: 03 90 21 62 77

[sport@coe.int](mailto:sport@coe.int)