

EU Sport Forum 2010

Organised by the European Commission in Madrid on 19-20 April 2010

REPORT

Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union calls on the EU to promote sport and to develop the European dimension in sport. It gives clear indications on the possibilities as well as the limits of future EU action. In the field of sport, the EU has a supportive, coordinating and supplementing role. The Commission has launched a broad consultation process at different levels, involving the Member States, the European Parliament, the sport movement and the public at large (on-line consultation).

The EU Sport Forum 2010 was dedicated to the future implementation of the new Treaty provisions on sport. As the Commission envisages proposing a new EU agenda for policy-making and cooperation in sport in autumn 2010, the main objective of the Forum was for the Commission to listen to the voices of sport at EU and international level.

Due to the exceptional circumstances as regards air transport, it was not possible for many of the invitees to attend the Forum. Out of the 340 registered participants, 148 were eventually able to attend¹. Taking into account the lower level of attendance, the Commission decided to reorganise the programme of the event so as to merge the two workshops foreseen for 19 April.

A Joint Panel with EU Sport Ministers was organised the 20 April on the topic "The Lisbon Treaty and sport – a new EU agenda". Following introductory speeches pronounced by Spanish State Secretary for Sport, Jaime Lissavetzky, and Commissioner Androulla Vassiliou, the high-level panel discussion included the following panellists: Portuguese Secretary of State for Sport, Laurentino Dias; Slovak General Director for Sport, Elena Malíková; Alejandro Blanco on behalf of the European Olympic Committees; Patrick Baumann, Fédération Internationale de Basketball; Nar Zanolin on behalf of the European Team Sport Association; Emilio Butragueño on behalf of the European Club Association; Emanuel Macedo de Medeiros, European Professional Football Leagues; Marisol Casado, International Triathlon Union; Walter Palmer, EU Athletes and Jan Truszczyński, Director General Education and Culture of the European Commission.

Monday, 19 April 2010

Jaime Lissavetzky, Spanish State Secretary for Sport, and Pierre Mairesse, Director for Youth and Sport at the European Commission, welcomed the participants to the first EU Sport Forum since the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty and the second since the adoption of the White Paper on Sport. They highlighted the momentum for EU-level discussions about the new EU competence for sport and the need for an open dialogue involving all the different stakeholders.

1. First session: "EU level cooperation in sport – recent developments"

Implementation of the White Paper on Sport

¹ A list of sport stakeholders represented at the event is available in annex to this report

The Commission, Pedro Velázquez, presented the state of implementation of the White Paper. Practically all the actions have either been completed or are in the process of being implemented. Although the "Pierre de Coubertin" Action Plan was designed for an implementation period of 5 years, until late 2012, it has already reached an implementation rate of roughly 90%. This good result has been made possible by good cooperation by stakeholders, including sport organisations and the Member States.

Preparatory Actions in the field of sport 2009 and 2010

The Commission, Jaume Bardolet, explained that the objective of the Preparatory Actions was to prepare the implementation of the new EU competence for sport and a possible future EU sport programme. The EU's mandate to support and coordinate the actions of the Member States would be translated into support for the Member States' policy-making processes by facilitating knowledge-building and knowledge-sharing (through studies, surveys, conferences and seminars). The EU's mandate to supplement the actions of the Member States would be translated into support for suitable networks and the exchange of good practices (through calls for proposals). The activities carried out in 2009 and the perspectives for 2010 were also presented.

Projects under Preparatory Action 2009 are successfully ongoing providing for useful experiences for the preparation of future programme proposals. The projects awarded in 2009 were exhibited in the conference hall. Due to the transport disruption, only 3 out of 18 ongoing projects managed to be present in Madrid. Commissioner Vassiliou visited the exhibition and met with the project leaders.

2. Second session: "Priorities for the planned Commission initiatives in the field of sport"

The second session of the Forum was initially planned to take place in two parallel workshops (Workshop I: Sport's societal function and Workshop II: The organisation and financing of sport). Due to the reduced number of participants it was decided to hold a single workshop covering the two domains successively.

I. First part: Sport's societal function

Pedro Velázquez, Deputy Head of the Sport Unit, animated the discussion. He mentioned the most important challenges or problems which occur regarding the societal functions of sport, asking what objectives, actions, tools and priorities the EU should focus on. The following topics were covered:

Health-enhancing physical activity

The Commission explained that overweight and obesity were a growing problem in the EU. The 2008 EU Physical Activity Guidelines defined how policies and practices of all actors (public and private) at all levels (EU, national, local) could be used to make it easier for citizens to move more in their daily lives.

Stakeholders mentioned the importance of promoting a healthy lifestyle and expressed satisfaction with the EU Physical Activity Guidelines. Support for the implementation of these Guidelines at local level was requested.

Sport and education & training

The Commission explained that the organisation of sport-related education and training and of the regulation of qualifications in sport differs between Member States and sports. The continuing professionalisation of sport, combined with higher levels of mobility in the EU, was increasing the relevance of transparent national qualification systems as well as international qualification systems of the sport movement with a European reference (e.g. EQF).

Stakeholders highlighted that the cooperation between sport organisations and educational institutes could also be beneficial for other reasons (it increases participation in sport, motivates students in their school careers, contributes to the development of healthy lifestyles and makes it possible for talented young sportspeople to combine training and education). The need to increase physical education activities at all levels of education was underlined. School competitions were also mentioned as interesting tools.

Volunteering in sport

The Commission mentioned that the 2009 study on volunteering in the EU confirmed trends and challenges faced with regard to voluntary activity in sport in social terms (e.g. lack of recognition; better employability; dominance of male volunteers), in political terms (e.g. lack of national strategies), in legal terms (e.g. lack of specific legal frameworks; unclear tax regimes) and in economic terms (e.g. funding needs; under-estimated economic value).

Stakeholders highlighted the need for recognition and asked the EU to promote the suppression of legal and financial obstacles to voluntary activities. The need of specialised training and ‘professionalisation’ of the volunteer’s role was also mentioned. The economic potential of volunteering was underlined. Stakeholders also highlighted the vital role of volunteers in sport, from coaching to event organisation.

Social inclusion and equal opportunities in and through sport

The Commission reminded of the importance of the role of sport in promoting social networks and active citizenship. Sport had the potential to promote community identity, coherence, integration and gender equality.

Stakeholders confirmed the potential of sport in this field, in particular in relation to people with a disability, migrants and persons of foreign origin and gender equality. The need to support accessibility and to work on education and prevention of exclusion was also mentioned. Special attention should be paid at local level. Attention was called to the difference between integration through sport and integration in sport. Stakeholders agreed that a higher level of integration in sport was needed to achieve real integration through sport.

Protection of minors/integrity of young sportspeople

The Commission mentioned that young people were most actively involved in sport at all levels. Young athletes involved in elite sports may put at risk their health and general wellbeing because of increasing pressure to achieve results even at the lowest levels of competitions.

Stakeholders added that risks faced by young sportspeople include overtraining and exploitation, missed education opportunities, use of doping substances, and sexual abuse and harassment. This may require increased surveillance from public authorities, sport

stakeholders and/or families. The EU could support these activities, raise awareness and promote prevention measures.

The fight against doping

The Commission explained that as the Treaty asked the EU to protect the physical and moral integrity of athletes, the Union should contribute more to the fight against doping in cooperation with the Council of Europe.

Stakeholders said that the EU should become involved in promoting educational and preventive action in amateur sport and fitness, should support scientific research and cooperation between laboratories, and should give financial support to local clubs for testing measures.

The fight against racism and discrimination

The Commission commented that racism and discrimination in sport could have a big social impact because of the interest of the public and the high media coverage of sport. Based on the Framework Decision on Combating Racism and Xenophobia, Member States were adapting their legislation, including sport-related legislation, to ensure that racism and xenophobia were punishable by effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal sanctions.

Stakeholders highlighted the need to complement dissuasive and repressive measures with educational and preventive action. An updated strategy could be developed with stakeholders in sport, making use of existing good practices. It was said that more coordination was needed among Member States to address these negative aspects of sport and society.

Violence in sport stadiums

The Commission expressed the view that integrated in-stadium safety and security arrangements should be developed for all football grounds hosting international matches. Other measures such as stadium or exit bans, expert evaluation of tournaments, training and exchange of best practices could also contribute to reinforcing security and safety at sport events.

The Council of Europe underlined the close cooperation between the Council of Europe and the EU in the framework of the European Convention on Spectator Violence and Misbehaviour at Sports Events and in particular at Football Matches, expressing the wish that the EU sign the Convention.

Stakeholders mentioned that athletes should be protected against violence at the workplace. Recent studies were mentioned which highlighted that some professional athletes were facing more violence at the workplace than the average EU worker.

Transnational mobility in the sport sector

The Commission explained that according to article 165 of the Treaty, EU action should be aimed at developing the European dimension in sport, and reminded that in the fields of education and youth, mobility programmes had played an essential role in building a European dimension.

Stakeholders confirmed that transnational mobility in the sport sector should be supported, mainly for young people and not exclusively for athletes. The possibility of an action similar to Erasmus was also mentioned. Two dimensions were pointed out: mobility of students who

are also active sportspeople, and the need to enhance mobility of young athletes outside education.

II. Second part: The organisation and financing of sport

Borja García, professor of sport policy at Loughborough University, animated the discussion. He presented the most important challenges in relation to the governance of sport, asking the audience what objectives, actions, tools and priorities the EU should focus on. He considered paramount to build a knowledge base before taking any decisions over policies in this area. He encouraged stakeholders to approach EU institutions with their ideas and suggestions, but with a sound knowledge and research base.

Free movement

Prof. García considered that discussions on the free movement of sportspeople touched on one of the fundamental freedoms of the European Union, but also on one of the fundamental elements of the specific nature of sport, namely the organisation of sport on a national basis. He reminded that the obstacles to free movement in sport at amateur level tend to be overlooked, while sport can play an important role in facilitating integration and free movement. The "theme-per-theme" approach seemed to be an effective way to address free movement issues in this context.

Stakeholders highlighted that the EU should ensure free movement in the field of sport especially for some categories of people such as managers, coaches, students and volunteers.

Transfers

Prof. García explained that transfers of players were another distinctive element of the specific nature of sport, being in fact a unique system of developing labour relations between clubs and players in team sports. He asked whether alternative mechanisms could be found to avoid setting arbitrary age limits to transfers of young athletes. He called attention to the necessity to involve players in any decision-making in this area.

The Commission mentioned that in 2001, after a discussion with the Commission in the context of an antitrust case involving transfer rules for football players, football authorities adopted a set of rules which had since then been included in FIFA's Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players.

Stakeholders expressed the opinion that transfer systems pursue in principle legitimate objectives such as ensuring the fairness and integrity of competitions, but concerns were expressed about the legality of the acts and about the transparency of financial flows involved. The EU should play a role in this respect. Stakeholders argued strongly in favour of social dialogue to deal with these issues and requested the Commission's advice.

Sports agents

Prof. García explained that, according to the recently published study, there were discrepancies in the way the activity of agents was regulated in Europe but there were no major obstacles to the free provision of sport agents' services across the EU as a result of differing national or private regulations.

The Commission commented that the independent expert study on sport agents carried out on behalf of the Commission in 2009 gave an in-depth view of the activities of sport agents in the

EU and that ethical issues raised by these activities, notably in areas such as financial crime, exploitation and trafficking of players deserve more attention at EU level.

Stakeholders considered that these ethical issues should be addressed as they risked undermining the fairness of sporting competitions and threatening the integrity of sportspeople.

Match fixing

Prof. García considered that match fixing was a blatant violation of the principle of fairness of sporting competitions. It was also a major threat to the basic values of ethics and integrity on which sport is built. As such, match fixing was considered as a form of corruption and punished accordingly in the Member States' jurisdictions.

The Commission raised the question of the effectiveness of existing sanctions and of their dissuasive nature. Match fixing was often, though not always, associated to illicit betting.

Stakeholders mentioned that this was a trans-national phenomenon which required a coordinated international approach. The EU should cooperate with all interested parties (Member States, sport movement, gambling and betting operators) in order to fight against these illegal practices.

Sport betting and gambling

Prof. García explained that the organisation of gambling services, including those run by private operators and those run or licensed by the State, directly or indirectly contributed to the financing of sport activities and other public interest activities in all EU Member States. He explained that the financing of sport, especially at grassroots level, needed to be taken into consideration when regulating this sector.

Stakeholders pointed to the need to address the financial return for sport, especially grassroots sports, from the organisation of gambling, in particular sports betting activities. It was considered that the EU should take action in this field. It was also mentioned that the EU should promote and facilitate sponsorship by private firms at all levels of sport, in the context of their corporate social responsibility.

Intellectual property rights

Prof. García explained that sports-related intellectual property rights (IPRs) such as copyright and neighbouring rights as well as trademarks were an essential source of income for professional sport.

Stakeholders underlined the need to ensure a transparent redistribution of revenues from professional to grassroots sport. The need of defining a property right for the organisers of sport competitions in relation to the event they organise was also mentioned. Reference was made to the fact that licensing of IPRs represented the lifeblood of the whole sporting chain, generating revenues that were partly redistributed from professional to grassroots sport. Stakeholders also called attention to IPRs as part of the athlete's working conditions, which could perhaps be dealt with in the social dialogue.

Good governance

Prof. García mentioned that it was not possible to identify a single model of governance in European sport in view of the large differences between the various disciplines and the national organisational systems. However, the exercise of autonomy by sport organisations

within the limits of the law, democracy, transparency and accountability in decision-making, and inclusiveness in the representation of interested stakeholders should be considered the key principles of good governance in sport. Good governance should enhance sport's autonomy and avoid recourse to the Courts. He underlined that EU institutions could help to promote good practices in governance, but it was ultimately the responsibility of sport organisations to deliver good governance and they should be held accountable for that.

Stakeholders expressed agreement with the mentioned principles and considered that the EU should take action to support the promotion of these principles.

Structured dialogue on sport

Prof. García considered that thorough reflection was needed as to how dialogue and cooperation on sport between the EU level and sport stakeholders could be further promoted and strengthened while at the same time remaining efficient and inclusive.

Stakeholders highlighted the need to ensure real representativeness of participants in the structured dialogue in full respect of the diversity of sports and of different stakeholders. The need to involve municipalities and grassroots organisations was also mentioned.

Social dialogue

Prof. García explained that social dialogue was part of the European social model, as it empowered representatives of European trade unions and employers' organisations to address issues of common interest and reach autonomous agreements. He suggested it might be a tool for better dialogue and governance, but stakeholders needed to make an effort to maintain its effectiveness.

The Commission mentioned that since 2008 a sectoral European social dialogue committee existed in the field of professional football.

Stakeholders considered that social dialogue should be extended to all sectors of sport and that the EU should promote and support it as a key principle of good governance. Such social dialogue could be useful to cover issues related to working conditions including violence at the work place.

Conclusions

Jan Trzuszczński, the new Director-General for Education and Culture at the Commission, thanked the participants for their presence and contributions to the discussion and summarised the different interventions of the Forum, which demonstrated the big expectations created by the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. He explained that the Commission was aware of these expectations regarding EU sport policy but reminded that the tools and funding at the Commission's disposal remained very limited. In these circumstances, the EU could not do everything with the same intensity and effectiveness. It appeared that a better knowledge of the sport world had been identified by several stakeholders as a basic need in several areas in order to identify lines of action for the EU.

Priorities needed to be identified and, taking into account the different interventions, it seemed clear that EU action should be focused on supporting national action in the following areas: promoting fair play and the fight against doping, protecting young athletes, combating racism and violence, and promoting grassroots sport as well as lifelong amateur sport for all. In its upcoming policy document, the Commission intended to present a number of initiatives that presented particular added value at EU level. The Commission hoped to table a policy

framework for sport at EU level before the end of the year. The document would be followed by a tool to implement the policies and a proposal for a future EU sport programme. The new programme would be prepared on the basis of experience gained from the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport being conducted from 2009. It must cover actions where the added value of EU intervention can be demonstrated. The first, limited EU sport programme should follow the Preparatory Actions in 2012-2013, before a fully-fledged programme could begin under the EU's next financial perspectives in 2014.

Tuesday, 20 April 2010

The second day of the Forum started with a welcome cocktail offered by the Spanish Presidency and a joint lunch with EU Sport Ministers hosted by the Spanish State Secretary for Sport, Jaime Lissavetzky, and the European Commissioner for Sport, Androulla Vassiliou. This was followed by a Joint Panel with EU Sport Ministers, co-organised by the Commission and the Spanish Presidency.

3. Joint Panel with EU Sport Ministers: "The Lisbon Treaty and sport – a new EU agenda"

State Secretary for Sport Jaime Lissavetzky and Commissioner Androulla Vassiliou pronounced introductory speeches.

Mr Lissavetzky mentioned the challenge of developing policy initiatives under the new framework provided by the Treaty but recalled that we were not starting from scratch as the White Paper on Sport formed an excellent basis for further work. Europe should have the ambition to be a model for the world in developing public sport policies.

Ms Vassiliou stated that Europe was on the brink of a new opportunity to harness the potential of sport and to make sport one of the building blocks for creating an innovative, inclusive Europe. Challenges must be addressed together through cooperation and mutual respect. She declared herself to be in a listening mode to hear sport stakeholders' ideas and input on the best ways to put this cooperation into practice.

A high-level panel discussion chaired and moderated by Mr Lissavetzky took place with the following panellists (including Ms Vassiliou and Mr Truszczyński):

- Portuguese Secretary of State for Sport, Laurentino Dias
- Slovak General Director for Sport, Elena Malíková
- The European Olympic Committees (EOC), Alejandro Blanco
- Fédération Internationale de Basketball (FIBA), Secretary General, Patrick Baumann
- European Team Sport Association (ETS), Nar Zanolin
- European Club Association (ECA), Emilio Butragueño
- European Professional Football Leagues (EPFL), Chief Executive Officer, Emanuel Macedo de Medeiros
- International Triathlon Union (ITU), President, Marisol Casado
- EU Athletes, Secretary General, Walter Palmer.

Mr Lissavetzky asked the panellists to reply to the following two questions:

1. Which are from your point of view the priority themes to be addressed by the European Commission for the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty in the field of sport, taking into account the autonomy of sport organisations and the EU competence in the field of sport?
2. How should cooperation and dialogue between the sport movement and the European Union be organised?

Mr Baumann said that the main priority was to clearly define the notion of specificity of sport. In his opinion, while the aim should not be to introduce general exemptions, due account should be taken by EU authorities of the specificity of sport in the following areas: sporting rules, technical rules, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The creation of an appropriately structured dialogue with the sport movement was a second priority. This dialogue should take place primarily with the Olympic and sport movement represented by the IOC and international sport federations so as to take due account of the universality of sport structures and rules.

Mr Blanco underlined the need to safeguard the special characteristics of sport activity. He referred to the IOC position paper on the implementation of the new Treaty provisions on sport where the priorities of the Olympic movement were detailed. He mentioned the fight against doping and against illegal betting as areas where EU and governmental intervention was needed. Regarding cooperation and dialogue between the sport movement and the European Union, the universality of sporting rules and the pyramidal structure of sport were the main arguments for the Olympic and sport movement to be represented by the IOC.

Mr Dias stated that we were facing hard problems with soft law. His first priority was to reinforce the presence of sport and physical activity at schools. Concerning cooperation and dialogue he said that dialogue between public authorities and sport stakeholders was already well established at national level. Dialogue at EU level should aim at establishing convergent positions of sport stakeholders. He warned against an excess of international sport events at all levels which were becoming a serious challenge especially for small countries.

Mr Macedo de Medeiros said that the specificity of sport had already been well recognised by EU institutions but that there was a need for guidelines setting limits for the application of EU law to sport. He considered that the protection of intellectual property and neighbouring rights of sport event owners must be a priority as financial streams to grassroots sport were at stake. In particular, he referred to the need to maintain the principle of territoriality for media rights and to better regulate betting activities at EU and national levels. Good governance was a priority and common principles of good governance should be developed. He referred to social dialogue as a tool for good governance and called upon other sports than football to also develop EU social dialogue committees. On dialogue and cooperation he asked for an inclusive, democratic and transparent structure where all sport stakeholders and interests would be represented.

Ms Malíková said that the priorities should coincide with the fields covered by the six existing sectoral EU working groups in the field of sport. On structured dialogue she stated that we were not starting from scratch. It could be developed at three levels: a broad and inclusive dialogue with sport stakeholders at the annual EU Sport Forum, a broader dialogue with civil society (e.g. through online consultations), and a third level of dialogue with limited but representative stakeholders.

Mr Zanolin mentioned sport at school and the need for more legal certainty on the application of EU law to sport as his main priorities. On dialogue he underlined that it must be as inclusive as possible and that the voice of team sport federations must be heard. He also stressed the importance of setting clear goals for the dialogue in order to make it fruitful and concrete.

Mr Palmer stressed the importance of developing EU social dialogue in the field of sport as a means for ensuring that work rights of sport employees are respected and to develop the concept of specificity of sport within the limits of EU primary law and principles. He called on the Commission to send strong messages in favour of social dialogue. Topics such as the adequate involvement of athlete representatives in the fight against doping, intellectual property rights issues, sport agents and the fight against match fixing (related to betting) were mentioned as priorities for his organisation. Regarding the structured dialogue he emphasised the need for athlete representatives to be adequately represented.

Ms Casado said that social inclusion and education were her main priorities for EU intervention in the field of sport. Regarding structured dialogue she underlined the role of international sport federations and the need for each sport to reach common positions between international and European federations.

Mr Butragueño said that some aspects of the application of EU law to sport should be clarified, but without requiring exceptions. Issues related to sport agents needed to be tackled and EU intervention in this field was necessary. Regarding structured dialogue he underlined the need for any new structure to be inclusive and warned against the risk of excluding important sport stakeholders. He considered that existing structures such as the Forum were to be maintained but there would probably be a need in the future for specific meetings or events with stakeholders sport per sport.

After the replies of the panellists Mr Lissavetzky gave the floor to other participants in the Forum. UNI-Europa stressed the usefulness of EU social dialogue to address a number of issues that had been discussed. The regional government of Extremadura called attention to the need for consulting Europe's regions and the important role of sport as a non-formal educational tool. The Spanish Athletics Federation recalled the important role of national federations and said that the priorities of EU action should be the fight against obesity and the role of sport in education. The International Mountaineering and Climbing Federation referred to the important role of this activity for safeguarding the environment. The Confédération européenne de Roller Skating underlined the role of sport federations and mentioned sport at school as the main priority.

Mr Lissavetzky concluded that dialogue was essential for the implementation of EU initiatives but that sport stakeholders were fragmented and everybody wanted to be part of a structured dialogue. He said that sport stakeholders needed to organise themselves better and decide who would represent them. He also concluded that the EU Sport Forum had showed to be an essential tool for dialogue and that this event must take place at least once a year in the future. On the specificity of sport he considered that to define this concept was an impossible task and that we must think in terms of a process when trying to clarify the specificity of sport as regards the application of EU law to sport.

Ms Vassiliou concluded by taking note of the request for more legal certainty as regards the application of EU law to sport. She referred to education, health and social inclusion as

common priorities mentioned by most participants. She also took note of messages in favour of social dialogue, good governance and better participation of athletes in decision-making in sport. Regarding the structured dialogue she recognised the need to ensure an appropriate permanent dialogue with sport stakeholders which must involve those that are affected by the specific themes to be tackled.

Sport Stakeholders represented at the 2010 EU Sport Forum:

Agencia Estatal Antidopaje	FIBA Europe
Asociación de Futbolistas Españoles	Football Supporters' Europe
Asociación de jugadores de Fútbol sala	Group Club Handball EEIG
Association Professional Cyclist	Handball Players Association
Baloncesto Malaga	International Federation of Basque Pelota
Basketball Players Association	International Olympic Committee (2 members)
Comité Paralímpico Español	International Mountaineering and Climbing Federation UIAA
EU Athletes	International Sport and Culture Association
European Association for Sport Management	International Triathlon Union
European Association of Sports Employers	Olympic Sports Association
European Capitals of Sport Association	Real Madrid
European Committee for Sport History	R.C. Deportivo
European Confederation of Sport and Health	Right to Play - International Office
European Club Association	Royal Spanish Archery Federation
European Gay and Lesbian Sport Federation	Royal Spanish Athletic Federation
European Handball Players Union	Royal Spanish Shooting Federation
European Hockey Federation	Slovak Olympic Committee
European Network of Academic Sports Services	Spanish Cricket Association
European Observatoire of Sport and Employment	Spanish Football League
European Olympic Committees (EOC)	Spanish Olympians Association
European Professional Football Leagues	Spanish Olympic Committee
European Softball Federation	Spanish Rugby Federation
European Speleological Federation	Spanish Sports Council
European Sponsorship Association	Spanish Team Track and Field Athletes Association
European Team Sport Association	The European Fair Play Movement

European Traditional and Sports Games
Association
European Union of Associations of Basketball
Coaches
Eurored del Deporte
Federación Española de Deportes de Hielo
Fédération Internationale de Basketball (FIBA)

UISP (Italian Sport for All Association)
Union Basketteurs d'Europe
Union of European Leagues of Basketball
Youth Sports Foundation