



Expert Group "Good Governance" (XG GG) Report from the 3rd meeting – 9 June 2015

1. PARTICIPANTS

Experts from 21 Member States: Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Three MS members were absent: Bulgaria, Estonia and Greece.

European Commission: DG Education and Culture (DG EAC).

Representatives from 22 of the 26 organizations accepted as observers.

2. INTRODUCTION

The Expert Group on Good Governance (XG GG) held its third meeting on 9 June 2015.

The chairman, Darren Bailey (UK), welcomed the participants and stressed the importance of open dialogue and trust between the members and the observers. He then briefly recalled the main deliverables to be discussed and underlined the importance of working on the basis of EU added value, real culture change in these areas and, ultimately, a credible and workable document, useful for both Member States and sport organisations.

He then welcomed Antonio Silva Mendes, director responsible for sport and youth at the European Commission, who underlined the importance that this group had in the eyes of the Commissioner and for the institution, especially given the news coming from the world of football in recent days.

The Commission gave an update on the latest developments in the field of sport at EU level, notably the launch of the European Week of Sport's communication campaign, the Erasmus+: sport programme (applications and discussions on future developments), the ongoing preparations for the new presidency and the two studies launched this year by DG EAC. One of them in particular, on "Gender-based violence in sport", is particularly relevant for this Group.

The XG adopted the draft agenda without comments.

3. DISCUSSION ON DELIVERABLES - Guiding principles relating to democracy, human rights and labour right, in particular in the context of the awarding procedure of major sport events.

In the absence of lead expert Jan Loorbach (NL), the Chair led the discussion on the awarding procedure of major sports events.

Ahead of the main discussion, there was an exchange on the latest developments in the world of football and the importance of good governance principles. Although not a direct EU competence, it was important to ensure greater accountability in sports in general and to decide best how to monitor and enforce.

By way of general introductory comments to the draft deliverable, there were calls for sports organisations to draw from and commit to existing international best practices as well as guidance such as the UNGC initiative, ISO standards for sustainable event management and corporate social responsibility. Clarity on the definition of MSEs, as well as the actors and the framework of the event to be considered, was sought. The importance of sustainability throughout the process, as advocated during the recent G7 summit, was also highlighted.

The group examined in turn each of the three areas outlined in the draft document. Germany, Finland, EOC, EuropeActive, FIFA, FIFPro, ICSSPE, Play the Game and SportAccord had provided written comments prior to the meeting as well as best practice examples and information on during the meeting.

The awarding entity

There was a need to agree on a set of relevant minimum standards to which Sports Governing Bodies (SBDs) should adhere to. The group should consider which relevant existing standards to refer to.

There was general consensus that increased transparency was essential, although the need to take into account data protection and confidentiality issues was also mentioned.

With regard to mega sports events, both EOC and FIFA outlined some of the changes which have already been implemented in their award procedures.

The bidding / hosting entity

A key area for discussion set out by the Chair centred on the influence which could be exerted on the hosting or bidding entity by the sports' governing bodies and how far outside the event itself could that influence reach.

On the one hand, it was pointed out that this would depend on the country, and the timelines. More leverage should be sought at the beginning of the process, i.e. during the bidding process, and there should be some scope for exercising influence outside the direct environment of the event itself..

The benefits which might be gained would vary between countries; MSEs could be a useful tool for some countries which were trying to incorporate change. For others, the effect would be more limited to within 'the bubble' (and if the bubble was small, then the justification for the award would be further reduced).

The importance in having a relevant contractual mechanism in place, which would permit a possible change should standards go below an acceptable level, was raised. For this, there needs to be certain amount of flexibility built in to the contractual arrangements. For example, having minimum human rights / labour rights standard (or a plan to reach it) could even be a prerequisite.

Although not all sporting events would have the means to leverage change, mega sports events are extremely desirable and all available tools should be used in those cases. Another possible difficulty was the limitations that exist in ensuring a positive legacy after the event, although incorporating a sustainable event management approach throughout the life cycle of the event was recognised as a way to overcome this matter. However, notwithstanding the difficulties, it is important to be able to show that as much has been done as possible.

The legacy

The Commission explained that the social, economic and environment legacy aspects were being considered under the Expert Group 'Economic Dimension' and hence it would be important to avoid overlap and show that the matter was being considered in a coordinated manner.

The group agreed that it was important to consider legacy, primarily from the point of view of human and labour rights where possible, although recognising the interlinkages with social, economic and environmental

issues (as being currently discussed in the Expert Group 'Economic Dimension'). In terms of the award process, legacy should be a fundamental part which needed to be included from the beginning and in all stages of the process. Sponsors could also be included, in the context of the supply chain.

The group discussed how this could be monitored and what sanctions could be imposed, whether a case-by-case approach would therefore be more feasible, and what minimum standards could be applied throughout. Given the global context of major sports events, reference to international frameworks under UN, UNESCO, ILO etc. was again emphasized by several participants. The relevance of ISO standards (on sustainability and/or social development) was also put forward.

Conclusions

The lead expert will prepare a new version of the draft taking into account the discussions and the written submissions. The revised document would also cross-reference with relevant international conventions. The group was asked to submit examples of best practises, contract requirements, minimum rights requirements, etc.

4. DISCUSSION ON DELIVERABLES – recommendations or guidelines on gender equality in sport followed by a pledge board.

The lead expert, Cédric Chaumond (FR), stressed that the draft document for discussion was based on the existing document "Gender Equality in Sport – Proposal for Strategic Actions 2014- 2020". He also noted that different Member States and organisations have different starting points on the subject and that it was important to stress the underlying principle of the autonomy of sport.

Given that the final document should be concrete and practical, the expert explained he had kept 27 main measures from the original 56. For the same reason, the document listed both minimum standards and ways to go further.

Finland, EOC, ENGSO, EU Athletes, European Women and Sport, EuropeActive, FIFA, ICSSPE, SportAccord and UNI Europa had provided written comments prior to the meeting as well as best practice examples and information during the meeting. From the comments received in advance, the expert listed three convergence points:

1. The importance of gathering best practice and various useful statistics, as an annex (to be defined, possibly on Circabc). The reference documents would also be updated.
2. Gender Equality is a fundamental principle of good governance, and that should be stressed in the document, for example in the introduction.
3. The paragraph on the culture of sport organisations should be moved to the introduction.

Among the interventions from the floor, the point was raised (and shared by several organisations and MSs) that gender equality is an issue for both men and women.

The issue of representation and visibility of female role models (athletes and coaches, for example) was also highlighted.

Several observers stressed the importance of monitoring progress, for example via a pledge board, with evaluation and stock-taking every few years.

The group agreed that the document should list minimum standards that should apply to everyone, but also list priority actions for each discussion point, to make it more concrete and applicable. The annexed list of good practice should directly refer to these priorities.

There was also agreement that the media chapter is challenging, as media are by definition independent. However it was stressed that we should work on increased cooperation, capacity building and training of journalists from a young age. Cross-sector cooperation is also important in delicate issues such as gender-violence.

On the subject of decision-making, good governance and the election processes should be underlined.

It was also pointed out that governments should review legislations on professional athletes, to make sure that women and men are treated equally.

The group agreed that the issue of gender-based violence should indeed be part of this deliverable, despite the link with the issue of protection of minors.

It was also clarified that the figures are not quotas, but rather targets and that they would apply overall and not for each individual discipline.

5. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

The next meeting will be held in Brussels on Tuesday 10 November 2015.

Closing session: without observers:

6. MISCELLANEOUS

PT presented their initiative to create a national code of ethics in sport, and expressed their wish to create a network with other countries that have a similar code. MSs were invited to make comments and to share similar experiences, if existing.

DE mentioned their application for the 2024 Olympic Games and, as part of the process, the organisation of a meeting on how to take on board gender diversity in advertising. Part of the angle should also be on inclusion/diversity.

The pledge board was also mentioned, and the EC agreed to provide an updated document on how such an instrument could be set up and maintained. Although the original reference targets "mainly sport organisations", Member States should definitely also be willing to consider their contribution to pledge boards.

ANNEX 1: List of participants

European Commission

DG EAC: SILVA MENDES Antonio, LE LOSTECQUE Yves, PATERSON George, OTTONELLO Paola. Member of Cabinet: HORVATH Szabolcs.

MS Experts

AT	BAKALAR Hanna	Ministry of Defence and Sports
AT	KAINZ Martin	VIDC
BE	VERMEERSCH An	Ghent University, Flemish Community
BE	TRICARICO François	Min. de la Fédération Wallonie Bruxelles
CY	SOPHOCLEOUS Philippos	Cyprus Sport Organisation
DK	VOIGT TINNING Anders	Ministry of Culture
DE	WEIDEN Torsten	Federal Ministry of the Interior
DE	WITTE-ABÉ Kirsten	Deutscher Olympischer Sportbund (DOSB)
DE	SCHUMANN Andreas	Saxony State Ministry of Interior
FI	SULANDER Heidi	Ministry of Education and Culture
FR	CHAUMOND Cédric	Min. de la ville, de la jeunesse et des sports
HU	PETOSZ Judit	Ministry of Human Resources-
IE	CLARKE Emma Jane	Irish Sports Council
IT	PRESENTI Carlo	Presidency of the Council of Ministers
LU	HUSTING Alexandre	Sport Ministry Luxembourg
MT	BUSUTILL Luciano	Malta Sports Council
NL	KUPER Wendela	Min. van Volksgezondheid, Welzijn en Sport
NL	SLOT Geert	NOC * NSF
PL	BARAN Bartosz	Ministry of Sport and Tourism
PT	ALVES Rui	l'Institut portugais du sport et de la jeunesse
RO	PREDA Dragos	Ministry of Youth and Sport
SK	BABIKOVA Lydia	Min. of Education, Science, Research and Sport
SI	VEROVNIK Zoran	Ministry of Education, Science and Sport
SE	LINDMAN Mikal	Ministry of Culture
UK	BAILEY Darren (Chair)	The FA Group
UK	NATALE Lara	UK Perm Rep

OBSERVERS

EAS (European Athlete Student) Network
ECA - European Club Association
EHFA / Europe Active
ENAS - European Network of Academic Sports
ENGSO - European Non-Governmental Sports Organisation
EOC (European Olympic Committee) EU Office
EOSE – European Observatoire of Sport and Employment
EPAS - Council of Europe
EPFL- European Professional Football Leagues
EU Athletes
EWS - European Women and Sport
FIFA - Fédération Internationale de Football Association
FIVB - Federation Internationale de Volleyball
Golf Europe
ICCE - International Council for Coaching Excellence
ICSS - International Centre for Sport Security
Play the Game
SportAccord
Supporters Direct Europe
Transparency International Germany
UEFA - Union of European Football Associations
UNI Europa