



42nd Inter-Agency Games

29 April – 3 May 2015

Port Aventura/Salou, Tarragona, Spain

Minutes of the Control Commission (CC)

1st Session, Hotel Caribe, Wed, 29 April, 3.30 pm

Present: (Annex 1 for a complete list and email addresses)

CTBTO:	Olga Boemeke (OB) Glenda Wolstenhome (GW)
IAEA:	Ammar Habjouqa (AH) Marielle Wynsford-Browne (MWB)
ICC/ICTY:	Jones Lukose Ongalo (JLO)
IFAD:	Jill Baskins (JB)
ILO:	Bill Ratteree (BR)
ITU (and Chair):	Leroy Brown (LB) Ravindra Chopra (RC)
OSCE:	Nizar Zaher (NZ)
MINURSO:	Asif Khan (AK)
UNESCO:	Rovani Sigamoney (RS)
UNIDO:	Anja Sedic Hamad (ASH) Steven Eales (SE)
UNMISS:	Gina Michel Legros (GML)
UNNY:	Cristina Silva (CS)
UNOG:	Olivier Combe (OC)
UNON:	Francis Gichomo (FG)
UNOPS/UN City Copenhagen	Ane Scheel (AS)
UNOV/UNODC:	Daniel Bridi (DB)
UNWTO:	Samiti Siv (SS)
WHO:	Arnaud Devilliers (AD)
WIPO:	Natalia Deblue (ND) Emma Connolly (EC)
WFP:	Kenzo Kawaseki (KK)
WMO:	Jalil Housni (JH)

ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee:	Mark Woodall (MW)
Sports coordinators: Football:	Gabor Piski (UNOG)

Item 1: Opening of the Session – President of the IAG Secretariat

The Chair of the Secretariat (JH) opened the meeting and welcomed members who introduced themselves. JH also introduced the members of the IAG Secretariat.

Item 2: Election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chair of the CC of the 42nd IAG

The Chair of the Secretariat (JH) nominated Leroy Brown (LB), Chair of the ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee, seconded by UNOV/UNODC (DB). LB was accepted by acclamation.

In the absence of Francis Gichomo (FG), Chair of the proposed Host Committee for the 43rd Games in 2016, who would traditionally be nominated as the Vice-Chair, LB proposed that JH of the Secretariat be accepted as Vice-Chair for the 1st Session. FG joined the meeting later on.

Item 3: Approval of the agenda

The Agenda was approved as presented (Annex 2).

Item 4: Welcome Address, Chairperson of the ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee

The Chair of the ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee (LB) welcomed all CC members and Games participants. He noted some minor problems with hotel assignments but promised that all participants would receive proper accommodation. The ITU Geneva committee had worked hard to ensure a successful games and he hoped that all participants would enjoy their participation and stay in these Games.

Item 5: Report on the list of participants by the ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee and Secretariat

The Chair (LB) noted that a number of organizations had sent lists by email. LB and DB requested and collected print copies of certified (stamped) lists from those members who had submitted by mail or were present at the meeting (CTBTO, IAEA, ICAO, ILO, UNESCO, UNIDO, UNNY, UNOPS, UNWTO, WHO), as this was required to certify participation. No decision was immediately taken on organizations which have not presented a list electronically or in print.

LB noted the need for a sub-committee to verify participants drawn from different duty stations. The CC appointed the following members who had volunteered: ND (WIPO, Geneva), SS (UNWTO, Madrid), RS (UNESCO, Paris), JB (IFAD, Rome) and OB (CTBTO, Vienna).

Item 6: CC members selected to attend Captains meetings, Hotel Caribe, 5 pm

LB, BR, JL and DB noted roles and responsibilities of CC members to represent the CC in support of captains at the meetings for disciplines, notably any requests for rule changes to be decided by the CC (posted on the websites of the CC and the current IAG, though not all were up to date on both sites), and to assist captains and disciplines throughout the Games, for example any disputes that might arise. The designated members would make an initial report back to the full CC after the captains' meeting. If there were requests for rule changes at the captain's meetings agreed by a majority or unanimously, a statement signed by those requesting the rule changes should be signed and submitted to the CC. Where rule changes followed international federal changes it should be applied; where rule changes

differed from such recognized international bodies and especially were specific to the IAG, they must be approved by the CC. The following members were appointed by discipline:

- Athletics:** Arnaud Devilliers (WHO), Cristina Silva (UNNY)
- Badminton:** Danny Bridi (UNODC), Ane Scheel (UNOPS – UN City Copenhagen)
- Basketball:** Bill Ratteree (ILO), Anja Sedic Hamad (UNIDO)
- Chess:** Jalil Housni (WMO)
- Cricket:** Asif Khan (MINURSO)
- Darts:** Marielle Wynsford-Browne (IAEA)
- Football:** Jones Lukose Ongalo (ICC); Nizar Zaher (OSCE)
- Golf:** Francis Gichomo (UNON)
- Petanque:** Glenda Wolstenholme (CTBTO)
- Swimming:** Emma Connolly (WIPO)
- Table Tennis:** Ammar Habjouqa (IAEA)
- Tennis:** Leroy Brown (ITU)
- Volleyball:** Olga Boemeke (CTBTO)

Item 7: Approval of the minutes of the 2014 IAG in New York

LB proposed the adoption of the revised minutes of the 2014 Games, which had been sent to CC members present at the meetings in New York in advance of the Salou IAG. No requests for changes had been. The minutes were approved without changes. They would be available on the website at <http://www.cc.interagencygames.org/> after the IAG concluded.

Item 8: Election of the Sub-Committee on Appeals

LB noted the responsibility of the Sub-Committee on Appeals to meet and decide on any disputes or complaints within disciplines. CC agreed to nominate ASH (UNIDO, Vienna), JH (WMO, Geneva) and KK (WFP, Rome).

Item 9: Election of the Sub-Committee on Rules of Procedures

LB noted that the sub-committee needed to complete a set of rules of procedures for the CC to follow in its work, these rules done in draft in 2014 but the written version had not yet been sent out and approved. The CC nominated the following to complete this work: LB (ITU, Geneva), JH (WMO, Geneva), DB (UNOV/UNODC, Vienna), MWB (IAEA, Vienna), AH (IAEA, Vienna), KK (WFP, Rome) and SS (UNWTO, Madrid).

Item 10: Participation of other organizations/individuals

The CC decided to postpone this item to a further meeting.

Item 11. Control of identity for all discipline participants

BR noted that a decision needed to be made on who would check the identities of all participants prior to the beginning of each competition as done at previous Games. NZ suggested that this needed to be done prior to warmups for collective sports like football. FG and DB noted that in the absence of a UN badge, a photo id could be accepted. The CC decided on the recommendation of the Secretariat that the identification will be made by the discipline coordinator assisted by the CC representatives to the disciplines.

Information from the Organizing Committee

LB informed CC members on the location of sports facilities in Salou and on buses to discipline sites. Buses had been calculated based on the number of participants and schedules revised since the last site visit by the Organizing Committee.

AD requested an update on participant cancellations in order to adjust hotel room confirmations.

2nd Session, Hotel Caribe, Wed 29 April, 6.30 pm

Item 12. Report back from Captains Meetings

Athletics: CS (UNNY): everything was ok though there were challenges to make the teams in view of larger than expected participation.

Badminton: DB (UNOV/UNODC) reported that the majority of captains agreed by vote to change the rules for encounters finishing in a draw (discipline Rule 5) in accordance with international rules and the tight schedule, namely to decide the winner by the number of sets won, then points, before proceeding to a deciding single men's game. The change was requested only for the 2015 IAG given the large number of teams. The CC agreed unanimously to apply this rule change for 2015. DB provided the written amendment. There were also questions about the venue; RC provided a clarification on the venue, which should be an improvement on the previous one.

Basketball: BR (ILO): there were 8 teams in principle, but 2 teams were not sure to compete because of late arrivals & the captains do not know all team members; the captains agreed on a possible adjustment of the competition schedule; a request was made to change the first day bus schedule; there were no requested rule changes but captains have agreed on a reinterpretation of basketball rules to be applied by the referees concerning female players to encourage more equitable competition; there would be no all-star game; the same question as for volleyball had arisen with a basketball player who arrived late without being formally registered and it was proposed to apply the same conditions as for volleyball, namely that if he found someone with whom to share a room and secured certification from his organization, he should be allowed to participate;

Chess: JH (WMO): there were no issues other than the composition of teams, the captains would work out the team composition prior to the start of the competition.

Cricket: AK (MINURSO): only 3 captains were present at the meeting but those present agreed there would be no requested rule changes for 2015; they will propose changes for 2016; it was also agreed that there would be no sharing of players among teams to maintain more than 3 teams; a request was made concerning the timing of the first day bus schedule.

Darts: MWB (IAEA): the captains had requested three rule changes: 1) change discipline rule 14 in accordance with international darts rules concerning scoring of darts; 2) to add a new discipline rule 21 affirming that participants knew the rules of darts and had their own set of darts; and 3) to add a new discipline rule 22 which would specify 2 new trophies in the future to recognize outstanding male and female performances. MWB provided texts of the requested changes signed by the majority of captains. DB noted that a decision on extra cups & trophies was to be made by the host organization, therefore could not be considered as a rule change; LB recalled that some disciplines provided extra trophies purchased themselves and these were not presented at the awards ceremony. LB & RC noted that extra trophies would establish a precedent for other disciplines and impact on the time allotted to the closing ceremony. DB opposed the proposed rule 21 change as it could establish a precedent affecting other disciplines. SE supported by another member suggested that a general rule along these lines should be drawn up. BR and FG opposed such rule changes at this time although if necessary the rule changes could be considered by the CC for future Games. DB proposed an amendment seconded by AH to specify that equipment should be provided in the case of darts and table tennis and provided a written text. LB opposed any rule changes and suggested to let the disciplines work out solutions on a voluntary basis. JB questioned why teams would not be willing to share equipment; explanations were provided by the CC representative, MWB. The CC decided that it would consider these changes later if time permitted, if not, prior to the next IAG.

One injured volleyball player requested to switch to darts; the captains had agreed. The CC unanimously agreed.

Football: JLO (ICC/ICTY) and NZ (OSCE): With 17 teams, the majority of captains requested rule changes for the 2015 IAG to allow the tournament to finish on time by: 1) allowing fewer substitutes but enabling them to re-enter at any time (discipline Rule 1); 2) shortening game times (discipline Rule 8) and 3) fixing the time for declaring a forfeit in the event that a team was not present at the start of the game (10 minutes). On the proposal of the Chair (LB), JH and RC, the CC agreed by 6 votes in favour and 3 opposed that these changes would be applied for 2015 only; any permanent changes in the rules for the future should be resubmitted in written form.

SE requested a redrawing of the schedule to avoid all 3 Vienna teams in one group and if necessary a decision to do so by the captains before the competition began. The discipline Coordinator (GP – UNOG) explained the reasons for the classification, which had been agreed in advance, and unfortunately resulted in 3 Vienna teams in one group. The CC decided not to change the group classification.

Golf: FG (UNON): the meeting included 11 captains; there was some discussion of changes in the handicap between the first and second day of competition, but finally captains agreed that there would be no change.

Petanque: GW (CTBTO): the captains requested application in 2015 of rules agreed by them already in 2013 concerning the playing terrain (discipline Rule 5), organisation of groups (discipline Rule 6), tie-breakers (discipline Rule 7), length of games and when a game stops (discipline Rule 8) and the points determining classification of teams (discipline Rule 9). The CC did not take a decision on the request.¹ There were also questions of transport; LB and RC confirmed that buses & times would be

¹ Accordingly, the CC should take a decision on the requested rule changes prior to the 2016 IAG (General Rule 4).

posted in hotels given that some participants were staying in different hotels in the course of the Games; in essence buses would now stop at all hotels.

Swimming: EC (WIPO): 9 men's teams were registered; 8 captains had not yet arrived and the competition would be adjusted on the basis of arrivals; facilities were limited & there were questions about the warm-up schedule and transport; the captains agreed on a rule change on the order of races for individual medleys in accordance with the international rules of FINA, since the rules on the website were not correct. Discipline Rule 4 (last bullet point) should therefore read "100 meters individual medley (in the following order: butterfly, backstroke, breaststroke and freestyle)". The CC unanimously agreed to the rule change.

Table Tennis: AH (IAEA): in the spirit of the Games and allowing maximum playing time for participants, also given that the number of male participants had been reduced because of injuries and visa issues, the captains agreed to continue playing games even if a match had been decided provided that tables & times permit (discipline Rule 3) although this did not imply a rule change; the coordinator had organized the competition very well and had given assurances on the number of tables as well as concluding the tournament on Friday as planned; questions had been raised about transport & starting times, lunch close to the venue, water and parking. LB and RC provided responses, including confirmation that there would not be a regular shuttle from the venue to the hotels but 2-3 buses would make a circuit of all venues between the drop-off in the morning and pick up at the end of each day. Buses had been calculated on the number of participants per discipline.

Tennis: LB (ITU): the captains were trying to work out an 8 team competition with 48 men and 24 women players and it was expected that this would be done satisfactorily.

Volleyball Men: OB (CTBTO): there were 4 men's teams, 1 of which was short of players and had requested to add 2 players to the team from participants from Afghanistan who had not yet registered but wished to play and to share rooms with those having single rooms. LB said that this could be agreed if the participants could find someone willing to share a room, since there were no other available rooms: however, they would need to be certified by their organization; this was a general problem with UNAMA participants.

Volleyball Women: OB (CTBTO): there were 6 teams but because of injuries 1 team now only had 5 players and they requested that someone from another discipline be allowed to play so that the team could remain in the competition. The Chair (LB) and DB noted that if the injury occurred in Salou, it could be possible for the CC to authorize a player from another team or the competition be reorganized to have 5 teams by distributing the players from the incomplete team among the others.

Item 5: Report on the list of participants by the ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee and Secretariat (further consideration)

Prompted by the question raised about non-certified volleyball players, the CC reconsidered the issue of the deadline to receive certified lists of participants. On the proposal of the Chair (LB), seconded by BR with a request to decide on warnings to captains and sanctions if no list received, the CC decided to extend the deadline for receipt of certified lists to close of operation Fri, 1 May and that all captains should be advised before the start of competitions that the CC could pronounce a disqualification of the concerned individuals and/or their teams if the certified list was not received. The CC further decided to take up at a later meeting the kind of sanction in the case of uncertified participants.

The meeting adjourned at 8.25 pm

3rd Session, Hotel Caribe, Thurs. 30 April, 6.30 pm, followed by continuation at dinner offered by Hotel Caribe

Present:

CTBTO: Olga Boemeke (OB)
Glenda Wolstenholme (GW)
IAEA: Ammar Habjouqa (AH)
Marielle Wynsford-Browne (MWB)
ICC/ICTY: Jones Lukose Ongalo (JLO)
IFAD: Jill Baskins (JB)
ILO: Bill Ratteree (BR)
ITU (and Chair): Leroy Brown (LB)
Ravindra Chopra (RC)
OSCE: Nizar Zaher (NZ)
UNESCO: Noé Nougboe (NN)
UNHCR: Peggy Brown (PB)
Mercedes Taboada (MT)
UNIDO: Anja Sedic Hamad (ASH)
Steven Eales (SE)
UNNY: Cristina Silva (CS)
UNOG: Olivier Combe (OC)
UNOV/UNODC: Daniel Bridi (DB)
UNWTO: Samiti Siv (SS)
WFP: Nicola DiFoggia (NDF)
WHO: Arnaud Devilliers (AD)
WIPO: Natalia Deblue (ND)
Emma Connolly (EC)
WMO: Jalil Housni (JH)

ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee: Mark Woodall (MW)

The Chair (LB) welcomed members and proposed changes in the order of the agenda to ensure discussion of important financial matters. A final report on the 2013 Financial Statement would be taken up first. The CC agreed to these modifications in the agenda.

Item 13: Review of the 2013 and 2014 IAG Financial Statements and Audit Reports

Review of the 2013 Financial Statement and Audit Report

OC reported that the final deficit for the 2013 IAG in Marina d'Or was 1,600.Euros for an overall budget of more than 400,000 Euros. The final payment of the contribution fee of 10 Euros for 817 participants to the Secretariat would be reduced accordingly. The Treasurer (AD) confirmed the figures. OC stressed that the financial aspects of the IAG were the most difficult to successfully realize because the host committee was unable to predict exactly how many participants would finally come, given the uncertainties for all announced participants to obtain visas. To be fair, UNOG had reimbursed more than 20,000-25,000 Euros mostly to those who paid but did not receive visas. This was a heavy burden and OC suggested adopting insurance measures to cover such costs in the future.

LB raised questions about the validity of cancellation insurance for reasons such as visa denial. AH suggested investigating higher premium cancellation insurance to cover such reasons. DB raised the possibility of a collective cancellation insurance to be negotiated with an insurance company on behalf of 1500 potential participants.

The Chair also clarified the reasons for the 10 Euro, or 10 US\$ participants' fee since 2014, based on decisions of the CC to provide a financial reserve for Secretariat operations and support to future organizers.

BR thanked OC for the information; it would be appreciated to have the information he presented in written form to the extent this was not already available to the Secretariat. The Secretariat had discussed the financial report in advance of the CC meetings. Since removing children from the count of participants for purposes of the contribution fee and the amount to be paid would represent 80% of the expected amount, the Secretariat recommended that the CC accept the final payment of UNOG and a final deficit of between 1,500-1,600 Euros for the financial statement of the 2013 IAG. The Chair fully supported the proposal in light of the explanations and noted how the same issues of late registration and participation were affecting the 2015 IAG. The Chair and JH also noted that acceptance of this proposal would mean that the CC decided for all further IAG, including 2014 in New York, that children would no longer be counted in the participants expected to pay the fee. The motion from the Secretariat was seconded by SE.

The CC decided by 21 votes in favour, 0 opposed and 1 abstention to accept the Secretariat's proposal and a final deficit of between 1,500-1,600 Euros for the financial statement of the 2013 IAG.

Report of the 2014 IAG Financial Statement

On behalf of the UNNY Organizing Committee for the 2014 IAG, CS submitted a financial statement and underlined a deficit of US\$121,608. The 2014 deficit was due largely to the last minute cancellation of hotel room reservations for participants who did not show up and resulting heavy penalties for expensive NY hotel room costs with half-pension included. Examples were cited of individuals requesting and obtaining visas for the IAG but who went instead to the state of California or to Canada, resulting in difficulties for others to obtain IAG visas. Extra expenses were also incurred by the need to hire an additional bus transport company at the last minute. The UNNY Organizing Committee has made efforts to resolve the deficit through approaches to sponsors; the UNFCU had responded by absorbing some costs but this represented only a small amount. There was no possibility for a UN Staff union contribution since there were 2 competing unions and neither wished to support the IAG effort. Attempts had also been made to get reductions on VAT for IAG services from the UN administration and from the relevant government authorities, but both had refused, the UN administration decision coming at the last minute and the government refusal because the UNNY Organizing Committee did not have NGO status. Moreover, sponsor promises to make contributions yielded much less than expected, including for example a large organization in Geneva. The UN administration had only made a token contribution of US\$3,000. The result was that the UNNY Organizing Committee members were personally paying monthly contributions to reduce deficits to creditors and avoid legal actions against them including possible seizure of homes and goods. The Committee was working on other ideas such as raffles, money generated from summer sports competitions, sales of t-shirts, etc. but was running out of solutions and sought CC help to resolve the dilemma.

JH pointed out that part of the deficit included the start-up loan for US\$5,000 that the Secretariat contracted with the UNNY Organizing Committee, which was supposed to be repaid prior to the start of the 2014 IAG but remained unpaid.

OC was shocked by the large deficit and considered it unfair that the UNNY Organizing Committee should personally be held responsible. He suggested approaches to the UNNY legal dept. and consideration of means to postpone some of the claims until perhaps UNNY could organize a future IAG and make up the deficit with additional revenues. The CC must find a collective solution.

AH, MWB and DB questioned the percentage of the deficit listed as due to room cancellations in relation to the overall deficit and the failure of the UNNY Organizing Committee to take actions to reduce other IAG costs like opening and closing ceremonies. CS explained that the last negotiated deadline for room cancellations was two weeks prior to arrival and this did not cover many last minute cancellations for very expensive rooms including extra fees for breakfasts and half board. In addition some deficits arose from participants indicating arrival dates in NY prior to the IAG which generated room reservations not actually used but which had to be paid. The amount of the budget deficit related to opening and closing ceremonies was due to the need to estimate high to cover all participants combined with withdrawals of promised donations and the last minute cancellation of VAT, for which the Organizing Committee was not prepared.

NZ noted that the Secretariat loan should also be entered as income not just as expenses. He offered assistance in redrawing the financial statement and responding to CC members' request for more clarification.

MW appreciated the financial statement but more details were required before the CC would be able to provide meaningful assistance other than the suggestion to seek UN legal assistance already made. SE added that host committees usually either worked through a staff union or the organization administration. In NY's case, the organization appeared to be the responsibility of a group of individuals, not the UN at all, hence the need for legal advice on a solution. SE also suggested for the future the necessity to adopt a policy of mandatory cancellation insurance paid for by the participants.

SS supported the need to obtain legal advice on for example looking anew at the question of the tax-exempt (VAT) status and also challenges to those sponsors who did not honour pledges agreed in contracts. CS explained that the NY staff union had tried but failed to get UN agreement on tax-exempt status; the sponsor pledges were through letters of intention not through enforceable contracts.

The Chair and JH proposed to assist in finding a solution to the deficit by 1) CC agreement to accept postponing reimbursement of the Secretariat loan of US\$5,000 by 2 years and reconsider this loan question in 2017; 2) reducing the part of the deficit attributed to participants' fees by excluding children from the fee count as previously decided for the 2013 IAG and postponing the payment of the revised amount to 2017; 3) the Secretariat looking into the implications and possibilities for legal assistance to the UNNY Organizing Committee. The CC unanimously approved the proposal.

MWB and JH proposed more detailed financial statements on the 2014 IAG and in the future, including comments or explanations on major items such as hotel and opening and closing costs in a one page statement to help the CC better understand the financial report and also assist future host organizations in their planning. AD questioned how much more detailed such a report could be. SE, supported by DB, suggested either a professional auditing be done or do not request more detailed statements.

The Chair stated the motion, seconded by DB, that the CC advised organizers of future Games to consider including a supplementary explanation of major items in the financial statement in their report to the CC. The CC adopted the motion by 12 in favour, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions. OSCE and UNOG did not participate in the vote having left the meeting prior to this point.

CC decided to continue discussion on this item at a future session.

Incidents & complaints concerning IAG participants

ND raised the issue of 200 participants who initially refused to pay the bill for a lunch in a Port Aventura park restaurant, claiming it was free; no names or organizations were given. The issue was raised by Antonio of Always Group and the DSG of the ITU staff association. The matter needed to be addressed as it gave the UN a very bad image. After questions and discussion LB agreed that the matter should be addressed but suggested first the need to obtain names and then consider sanctions of participants for future games if confirmed. CS also repeated complaints in some disciplines about aggressive or improper behaviour towards referees, for example the athletics referee who was upset with the late start of the discipline due to late arrival of buses. RC insisted on confirming the veracity of both sets of allegations before taking action.

The session was suspended at 20.10 and continued informally at one of the Hotel Caribe restaurants.

4th Session, Hotel Caribe, Fri, 1 May, 6.30 pm

Present:

CTBTO:	Olga Boemeke (OB)
IAEA:	Ammar Habjouqa (AH) Marielle Wynsford-Browne (MWB)
IFAD:	Jill Baskins (JB)
ILO:	Bill Ratteree (BR)
ITU (and Chair):	Leroy Brown (LB) Ravindra Chopra (RC)
MINURSO:	Asif Khan (AK)
UNDP Mozambique:	Helena Mateus Mutemba Mandlate (HMMM)
UNESCO:	Rovani Sigamoney (RS) Noé Nougboide (NN)
UNHCR:	Peggy Brown (PB) Mercedes Taboada (MT)
UNIDO:	Anja Sedic Hamad (ASH) Steven Eales (SE)
UNMISS:	Gina Michel-Legros (GML) Ghulam Khan (GK)
UNNY:	Cristina Silva (SC)
UNOG:	Olivier Combe (OC)
UNON:	Francis Gichomo (FG)
UNOV/UNODC:	Daniel Bridi (DB)
WFP:	Kenzo Kawaseki (KK)
WHO:	Arnaud Devilliers (AD)
WIPO:	Natalia Deblue (ND) Emma Connolly
WMO:	Jalil Housni (JH)

ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee: Mark Woodall (MW)

Item 15: Report of the Treasurer

AD presented the Secretariat's financial report including Financial Statement, additional Treasurer's Report and Budget Proposal for 2015 (Annex 3).

The Financial Statement included a small amount of revenue from bank interest and expenses for website charges and expenses in support of the IAG 2015 Organizing Committee. The balance on 30 April 2015 was US\$8,832.68. The 2014 starting balance is also shown in euros since the bank account was previously based in Vienna, and website charges were also in euros since incurred in Vienna. The US\$ figures now reflected the US\$ nature of the account based in Geneva, as decided by the CC in 2014. The transfer to the new account was completed in December 2014.

The Financial Statement has only been partially audited; one member of the auditing committee (NZ) was not present at the meeting.

The additional Treasurer's Report listed the outstanding revenues of which the unpaid Secretariat loan to the 2014 IAG Organizing Committee and the 2014 participant's fees, also not yet paid. The figures would be reviewed in light of the CC's decisions taken the previous day, notably the removal of children from the list for participant's fees. For the moment neither potential revenue is included in the Financial Statement but assuming these revenues would eventually be received in the account, the balance would be US\$ 23, 312.68 subject to the final review on participant's fees.

OC sought clarification on the account currency in US\$ at the UNFCU with its headquarters in New York when the Secretariat was based in Europe and most of the transactions were in euros. AD explained that the CC had agreed last year that there were advantages to having an account with UNFCU, which had offices in many of the main duty stations, including Vienna, Nairobi and New York, and that should the Secretariat change to another duty station such as Vienna or New York in 2017, it would not be necessary to again change the bank. The US\$ account did not prevent receiving payments in euros and some of the expenses such as the website fees were recorded in US\$ so the account had several advantages. AD and LB admitted some disadvantages, notably the length and difficulties to get the UNFCU account set up due to complicated paperwork requirements, but the initial explorations with Swiss banks in Geneva had revealed even more difficult obstacles related to certified residency in Geneva, so the Secretariat considered UNFCU the better option. OC nevertheless suggested creating more than one account either euros or Swiss francs to diversify transaction options according to the currency of payments. LB noted the difference between financial transactions encountered by IAG organizers and those of the Secretariat, which were not as restrictive in terms of payments. AD noted, however, that the Secretariat would continually review the charges associated with the new account and if need be propose a change to the CC.

MWB (IAEA) moved, seconded by CS (UNNY), to accept the Financial Statement and Treasurer's Report. By majority show of hands the CC approved the motion.

Item 14: Report of the IAG Secretariat

JH presented the Secretariat report (Annex 4). The report provided information on its regular meetings, review and input on IAG rules, revision of the website; assistance to the Geneva Organizing

Committee in the organization of the 2015 IAG, correspondence with and support with information to the Nairobi Organizing Committee in the organization of the 2016 IAG, opening of the UNFCU account and follow-up with the host committee chairs of the 2013 and 2014 IAG, correspondence on participation and eligibility with IAG members and inquiries from other agencies, a link on the website to the minutes of the 2014 IAG, preparation of financial statements and budget proposals, and various activities looking ahead to improvements in the IAG and support to the CC in the form of suggestions for future priorities that the Secretariat might pursue. Looking ahead, future work should or could include continued direct support to host organizations, developing procedures for CC credentials provided by the institutions or associations that nominate members, a matter which had been raised in previous CC meetings and it was hoped could be put into place by 2016 at the latest, video conferences between Secretariat and coordinators, and other improvements to enhance support to focal points and CC members. JH thanked various CC members, notably the past, present and future Chairs of Organizing Committees, and the IAG Secretariat, for their tireless efforts in support of the IAG movement.

DB and CS asked for clarification on who questioned the credentials of CC members and what was being asked in relation to the status of the representative and who appointed them, for example in relation to consultants vs. UN staff members. JH explained that the issue started with the UNFCU account procedures, followed by advice from organization legal units. The issue was raised as for other entities where normally the credentials of those presenting themselves as representatives of others were subject to certain procedures particularly when it involved their right to vote on matters affecting the whole organization. Some HR lists submitted to the IAG listed the focal points but this might not be sufficient and in any case was not universally done. For example the UNOPS/City of Copenhagen representative became a new CC member after indicating that she had the authorization from the various UNOPS offices. A survey to all CC members, present in Salou or not present could be done to obtain more information. This would also help in our list of focal points for IAG registration since we sometimes have emails that are no longer correct or changes in persons designated to represent organizations without any indication of how this was decided.

BR insisted that such credentials were long overdue and essential in a democratic organization like the IAG CC. Without verification that CC members legitimately represented their organizations to the IAG and in CC meetings, there was no basis for legitimising important decisions, including financial, by CC representatives. If there was no need for credentials of CC members, then there should be no need for certified lists of participants from organizations. Presumably there was a consensus that CC representatives were not self-appointed, yet perhaps only half of the current membership could show written credentials from an appointing body that they represented the organization. Admittedly we needed to find a practical means to verify credentials from a legitimate appointing body, particularly for relatively new organization representatives to the IAG and where internal institutions such as staff councils or sports bodies did not exist. He proposed a CC decision to authorize the Secretariat to develop a procedure requesting all member organizations to confirm in writing – letter, email, etc. – the name(s) of their representatives and the entity nominating them within the organization, whether staff council/association, sports body or even administration.

AH supported many points but insisted that the CC needed to be careful to ensure the objectives are met given the very different ways that each organization operated. OC agreed and raised the issue of overlapping mandates, especially within the UN. It was important to fairly include all focal points even if they nominally belonged to one organization, for example what to do about UNNY and UNOG or UNDPKO focal points who were all technically UN. To be inclusive, a procedure of this kind might have to accept more than one representative per large organization, and in any case had to

be carefully thought through. JML affirmed that there were particular challenges for DPKO units and representatives who frequently changed positions and whose nomination came from the field services union far removed from their place of work.

DB raised the question of how to decide if two representatives from organizations such as the ILO or FAO were nominated by competing authorities such as the staff council/union and the sports body? Such a problem did not exist in the present system, so why try to fix something that was not broken if it also risked to reduce the commitment of representatives who volunteered their time for the IAG? JML had similar questions about how to distinguish between headquarters based officials and those in decentralized offices of the same organization – a choice would need to be made between an organization and a country-based system of representation. CS noted complications in organizations such as hers where neither the administration nor the staff union recognized the IAG; she supported DB in that if the system worked now it should not be changed. FG also supported leaving the current flexible system as is, citing his organization's experience whereby the staff union recognized the IAG but left organization and representation totally to those elected by participants.

JH noted that the proposal was not to impose a credentials system that restricted engagement of people who made the IAG work. However, we should note that if all eligible organizations participated in the CC there would be 56 organizations and 102 representatives. The proposal was for better organization of communications with CC representatives with direct links to the organization through for example the administration that issued the certified list of participants or through the staff council/union. ASH asked whether staff union authorization as for her organization would be sufficient or accreditation would also be required from the administration.

MW supported accreditation but remarked that there was clearly not a consensus on this issue, so he proposed that the Secretariat be authorized to study the matter and present to the CC a plan that took account of the diversity of member organizations for the CC to make a decision. DB proposed that each organization undertake internal consultations on their credentials process or lack thereof and the CC discuss further on the basis of the results. BR questioned whether such a proposal would yield anything given the CC's inaction on the vast majority of issues that it discussed and again raised the issue of how important financial matters, including the use of participant's fees, could be decided when many members could show no basis for their representability other than self-nomination. MWB also supported developing a procedure that could be relatively simple; it was important that representatives were supported by their organizations. JB suggested that as for her organization, inclusion on the HR certified list of participants should be sufficient. Similarly, OC said that as long as the organization's CC representative was on the certified list of participants, what difference did it make who showed up at CC meetings? BR and JH insisted that determining representation for each organization mattered in terms of organizational coherence.

The Chair proposed and the CC decided to authorize JH as Chair of the Secretariat to communicate with all known CC members about this matter with a view to presenting a proposal at the next CC meetings for its decision.

OC requested the removal of his name from the IAG Secretariat; he had previously requested removal and had never been invited to the Secretariat mtgs. MW confirmed that OC's continued inclusion in the Secretariat seemed to result from an error as previous emails confirmed his request not to figure in the list. BR supported OC's right to withdraw his name. The Secretariat agreed to make the correction effective immediately.

DB moved, and it was seconded, to accept the IAG Secretariat report as amended (to remove OC's name and to note one pre-2015 IAG site visit, not two). The CC decided to accept the Secretariat report as corrected.

Item 15: Report of the Treasurer (continued)

The CC returned to item 15 to consider the Secretariat's Budget proposal for 2015. AD presented the proposal (Annex 3), which included revenue based on the estimated number of participants' fees from the 2015 IAG and expenses for bank charges, web site hosting and software, Secretariat and IAG supplies, a new IAG web site, Secretariat assistance (travel) to the 2016 IAG organizers hopefully in Nairobi so with higher travel expenses, 2016 IAG gifts and a savings fund. Last year's budget had shown limited expenses because of the uncertainty over revenues, but this year it was hoped that participant's fees paid to the Secretariat account by the 2015 Organizing Committee would be sufficient to cover more expenses in the budget.

BR asked clarification on whether the participant fee item was considered separate from the budget proposal and noted that the revenues were no longer certain, for instance UNNY would not be making a contribution for 2014 anytime soon. AD responded that the budget was prepared separately based on last year's decision to require a US\$ 10 participant's fee. DB suggested that we should be optimistic about the revenues. On behalf of the 2015 Organizing Committee LB noted that the 2015 contribution would be based on a budgeted 8 Euro fee, equivalent in 2014 to US\$10 but could be less than originally foreseen with the decline in the Euro. FG suggested that the budget proposal should be reduced accordingly. AD explained that any reduction in the revenue amount would be absorbed in the Savings Fund, which might be slightly less than the budgeted US\$ 6,000, maybe US\$4,000.

OC proposed that since the exchange rate might change again, it would be preferable to await the final IAG 2015 Financial Statement to know the exact amount of the revenue from participant's fees and adopt the budget by video-conference. FG supported this idea as nothing seemed to be urgent. If necessary, the focus should be only on the recurrent expenses, leaving development expenses such as a new website until after revenues were known and a budget proposal adopted accordingly. The Chair recalled that the discussion concerned a budget proposal which was approximate and if the CC meetings concluded without adopting a budget proposal, the Secretariat would not be able to do anything. Nevertheless, with the current balance in the account, all the expenses could be covered even if no revenue were received from the 2015 IAG. OC recommended that any development expenses should be devoted to improving the registration tool and cited examples of needed improvements.

In the interests of time and noting that the expenses foreseen in the budget proposal could be covered with existing funds in the account, BR moved and OC seconded that further consideration of the budget proposal be postponed until the Secretariat initiates consultation with all CC members and after 2 months from the beginning of the consultation the budget proposal should be modified, approved or rejected by the CC, no comments from CC members signifying assent with the budget proposal. The CC so decided unanimously. DB noted that once the number of participants were known within the next few weeks following the conclusion of the 2015 IAG, the Secretariat could initiate the consultation.

Item 16: Cycle of the Games

b. IAG 2016 – Nairobi

On behalf of UNON, FG presented proposals to host the 2016 IAG. An organizing committee (OC) had been set up since the agreement by the CC in 2013 to include Nairobi in the cycle and contacts had been established with potential discipline sites and with hotels. The UNON administration, especially the Director-General, strongly supported the proposal to hold the IAG in Nairobi. The OC was aware of security concerns as a result of attacks by Al-Shabab in Kenya. FG had personally talked to the Director-General, who was also responsible for security of the other organizations in Nairobi, and the Chief of Security at UNON, both of whom gave assurances that steps were being taken to improve security and the OC should not be anxious about this matter. The Government had taken measures with families to address radicalization of young people and stepped up security measures after the attack on the university in Garissa, which restricted Al-Shabab threats to the border region. By July or August there should be no more discussion of security threats. The UNON administration and the OC were confident that the 2016 IAG would be hosted without security worries. However, for the moment the OC was not publicising the event until the security situation was fully under the Government's control.

In response to a question from CS about other support from the UNON administration, including financial and regarding visas, as well as proposed dates for the IAG in relation to the weather, FG noted a budget proposal to the administration that included opening and closing ceremonies, medals and transport. The Director-General promised to speak to the heads of other Nairobi-based organizations to seek their financial contributions as well. The OC would also seek sponsors. The Foreign Minister of Kenya was a former Deputy-Director in UNEP and a friend of the OC; she would be willing to help on visa matters. The OC would try to adhere to the same period of time for the IAG as in the past but would be open to other suggestions.

On the security issue, DB noted the previous experience of Vienna (in 2003) in trying to organize the IAG in Tunisia. At the time the UN security chief in Vienna refused approval for Tunisia as a venue with only a Phase 1 security level in effect. At present, Kenya was between Phase 3 and 4 (O means no concerns, 5 is the highest level). The Vienna-based organizations wondered how the OC could ensure security under the present circumstances. The Chair (LB) and DB also noted General Rule 2 of the IAG which stipulated that the IAG could not be considered in any location if the UNDSS has designated the country, or any area within that country, a security risk. JH also noted the issue of security and the choice of dates could affect large numbers of individual or even whole agency decisions to attend and thereby compromise the organization and financing.

FG reiterated the assurances given by the UNON DG and Chief of Security, who recalled that many international conferences were held in Nairobi without any security concerns. Second, FG noted the suggestions made to consider an alternative venue from Nairobi, as ITU had done this time, but he could not comment on this possibility without agreement of the UNON Administration, which he did not have at this point. In response to a question from DB, FG felt confident that UNDSS would give approval to hold the IAG in Nairobi even though Nairobi was now rated Phase 3; the Games were actually being proposed in a venue that was at security Phase 2. The Chair (LB) confirmed that such approval would be crucial in regard to IAG Rule 2.

IAEA representatives (MWB and AH) raised concerns about organization administration officials and superiors refusing permission for leave to participate on security grounds. As it stood now, neither would authorize staff participation since it was considered a mission. It was the duty of the CC to make a decision that minimized the risks associated with holding the IAG especially in view of the large numbers of UN officials involved. A backup plan at least was needed. JH was concerned that a lot of time and money would be spent to organize the first IAG in Africa, which could be

compromised by large numbers of traditional participants refusing to participate or agency heads organizing against their official's participation. Even if approval were given by UNDSS, if an incident occurred one week before the IAG, it could cause many cancellations. A clear decision needed to be taken now by the CC otherwise the IAG might not take place in 2016.

AD noted that many international conferences continued to be held in Nairobi and no agency heads refused permission of their staff to attend such meetings; as FG had underlined the UNON DG strongly supported hosting the 2016 IAG and perhaps this view should be communicated to other agency heads, a suggestion supported by DB and endorsed by FG. AD also proposed that consideration be given to changing the IAG Rules on the security question.

GML wondered about alternative venues such as Namibia or Rwanda as backup, the latter being very safe right now. Nairobi was a very convenient venue for UNMISS and other African participants. RC asked if a backup plan had been considered by the OC in light of the security situation. FG reiterated that this had not been discussed with the UNON DG. AH noted that it would be much easier to organize the IAG in the country you lived in, so it was understandable that UNON wanted to host the first Games in Africa in Nairobi, but the security questions had top priority.

In response to a question, the Chair (LB) noted that the CC had the authority to refuse a venue in advance but only the host organization could cancel a scheduled IAG for example on security grounds.

The discussion revealed that organization policies differed widely on the issue. In some organizations administration approval for leave or travel if a mission was dependent on the security question, in other organizations there was no such barrier, although individual decisions could easily be affected by the security situation. The Chair suggested that all CC members enquire within their organization about the policies on granting leave and travel if the security situation was high in an IAG venue.

GML proposed that the CC accept the proposal by UNON to host the 2016 IAG unless the security situation worsened. RS suggested that as it was Africa's turn, the CC should approve Nairobi's proposal in the hopes that enough African participants at least would attend to make it viable.

The Chair, supported by DB, proposed that a first step should be securing written authorization by UNDSS to hold the IAG in Nairobi, and to have this authorization by a fixed date prior to the IAG to facilitate a decision, including an alternative venue if Nairobi was not feasible. Second, CC members in all organizations should enquire with their administrations if approval would be given for large numbers of staff to attend the IAG if the security situation was doubtful since all organizations had to approve staff leave with pay and this could be refused. JB raised the question of a UNDSS authorization now, one year ahead of the IAG; LB replied that this was all that could be approved now, and for reasons of organization it was important to have it.

MW asked for clarification on the decision concerning Nairobi as the 2016 IAG host. FG, noting that the strongest pressure to host the IAG in Nairobi came from the UNON administration, hence the impossibility at this point to know if an alternative venue could be supported, proposed a vote on the Nairobi proposal since the UNON administration needed a clear decision from the CC. The Chair considered that in the absence of an authorization from UNDSS and IAG Rule 2, the CC could not make such a decision. JH and RC proposed that the IAG Flag be handed over to UNON representatives at the closing ceremony on a provisional basis and that UNON would inform the CC of the UNDSS security assessment within two (2) months maximum so as to confirm the CC approval for hosting. The CC so decided.

Item 22: Any other business: Solidarity with Nepal

AD proposed that a small committee be established to set up a collection and fund as a solidarity action on behalf of Nepal, which had been dramatically affected by a recent earthquake. An announcement would need to be made at the gala event on 2 May. EC agreed to work with 2015 Organizing Committee members on this project.

The meeting adjourned at 8.20 pm.

5th Session, Hotel Caribe, Sat, 2 May, 4.20 pm

Present:

CTBTO:	Olga Boemeke (OB) Glenda Wolstenhome (GW)
IAEA:	Ammar Habjouqa (AH) Marielle Wynsford-Browne (MWB)
IFAD:	Jill Baskins (JB)
ICC/ICTY:	Jones Lukose Ongalo (JLO)
ILO:	Bill Ratteree (BR)
ITU (and Chair):	Leroy Brown (LB) Ravindra Chopra (RC)
OSCE:	Nizar Zaher (NZ)
MINURSO:	Asif Khan (AK)
UNDP Mozambique:	Helena Mateus Mutemba Mandlate (HMMM)
UNIDO:	Anja Sedic Hamad (ASH) Steven Eales (SE)
UNMISS:	Gina Michel-Legros (GML)
UNNY	Cristina Silva (CS)
UNON:	Francis Gichomo (FG)
UNOV/UNODC:	Daniel Bridi (DB)
UNWTO:	Samiti Siv (SS)
WHO:	Arnaud Devilliers (AD)
WIPO:	Natalia Deblue (ND) Emma Connolly
WMO:	Jalil Housni (JH)

ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee: Mark Woodall (MW)

Item 16: Cycle of the Games (continued)

c. IAG 2017 – Vienna

DB noted that on the occasion of the IAEA's 60th anniversary the IAEA would take the lead in organizing the IAG with support from other Vienna-based organizations. Venues had not yet been considered.

d. IAG 2018 – Paris

RS reported that although the Director-General had not yet been approached, UNESCO intended to organize the 2018 IAG.

e. IAG 2019 – Geneva

JL reported that most likely the ILO would organize the 2019 IAG in celebration of its centennial, but that in the absence of an ILO representative, the intention would need to be confirmed by the ILO at a later date.

f. IAG 2020 – New York

g. IAG 2021 – Rome

h. IAG 2022 – Nairobi

i. IAG 2023 – Vienna

The Chair decided that discussion on future sites should stop at 2019 but hoped that this 8-year cycle could be completed successfully. JH requested all future organizing committees to kindly respect a reasonable delay in advising the CC if the duty station was **not** able to organize the IAG for the year in question so that the bidding process could be opened in good order, at the latest the summer prior to the year in question. If a duty station could not organize the IAG, it should advise the CC at the earliest and in any case prior to the CC meetings the preceding year.

Item 15: Report of the Treasurer (continued)

AD reported that the 2014 Financial Statement previously considered and approved by the CC had been fully audited now, the third auditor (NZ), having signed. He thanked the Auditing Committee for their work.

Item 17: Organization of the 42nd Games – administrative matters and disciplines

LB as Chair of the Organizing Committee noted that there were some problems but overall the 2015 IAG was a success. A written report on what worked and what did not work at these Games would be drafted and shared. A number of issues that had to be confronted such as the terms of contracts and proposals for such required us to consult with representatives of other organizations who had experience with IAG organization, including Danny Bridi and IAEA representatives. It was clear that even at the Secretariat level a record of contracts and related information should be maintained so as to provide a guide for future organizers and avoid reinventing the wheel in terms of planning and relationships with hotels and event managers for example. The 2015 IAG Organizing Committee intends to leave copies of its records in the archives of the Secretariat for consultation by future organizers. LB had learned a lot from organizers of the 2013 and 2014 IAG, for example on difficulties with visas and policies on cancellations that depended on participants' visas. It was essential to share this information so such information and a report would be available to the next organizers. One of the most important questions was the cancellation policy for hotels and other services; this was a vital element in planning and successfully managing finances. A special thank you to the colleagues on the organizing committee in particular Mark who took care of so much, Arnaud for the finances, Ravi for the sports/discipline coordination, Natalia who took care of publicity, Thierry for hotels and Bill, who gave a helping hand even though not a member of the Organizing Committee. Thank you also for support of the ITU Staff Council President and Administration.

MW noted a lot of enthusiasm at the beginning, even if things got difficult later. LB had been invaluable as Chair of the ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee in view of his experience. He wished good luck to Nairobi and future organizing committees, and offered help if wanted.

CS commented that she had provided advice to Nairobi as an example of the essential nature of information sharing, even if seemingly minor – for example a bar requirement for the darts discipline. Other issues were important such as the structure and procedure for collective decision-making of the organizing committee. Information sharing on visa and transportation issues were also very important.

LB noted that these kinds of comments should be available in writing and added to the lessons learnt compendium. One needed to be discriminating about lessons learned as some might not be the right lessons, for example that of darts which might like to have a bar close by during its discipline but it was not an essential requirement.

JH offered to compile all notes on lessons learned. Some things were mandatory such as first aid, and in most cases available toilet facilities. The last two IAG Organizing Committees did not follow through with participant satisfaction surveys, so the Secretariat would commit to running such surveys in the future. In that respect, AH noted that effective surveys should have carefully formulated questions that were also simple and oriented along the lines of “would you recommend a friend to participate”, following the example of many private enterprises.

NZ commented on problems with the availability of a first aid kit in a very physical sport like football. The football Coordinator did not have one so it had to be bought from a local supermarket. Recent IAGs had experienced serious visa problems and as this was likely to also affect future Games, so means of improving the obtention of visas should be a priority, through approaches to relevant government ministries and staff associations as required. Transportation was also an ongoing problem.

LB agreed that the issue of visas was central to the future of the Games and invited sharing of experiences from the current and recent IAG to help clarify problems and possible solutions. Positive experiences would be added to the lessons learned compendium. In 2015 the Organizing Committee had learned from the experiences of UNOG in 2013 and UNNY in 2014. Assistance had been sought from the permanent mission of Spain to the UN in Geneva. Help was provided, problem areas were identified and methods to speed up the process of visa application were applied in various missions, consulates and embassies around the world. Special problem countries were identified and help requested in these cases. The Organizing Committee provided support for 600 visa applications but many had been denied in part because of previous abuses of participants who did not return to their country of origin after the IAG; this created difficulties for future years. In the case of Afghanistan 200 letters of invitation had been provided but only 50 participants were invited to interviews and given visas.

Other comments were:

- CS noted that the UNNY Organizing Committee sought the help of the USA permanent mission to the UN in 2014; it had proved to be a very tedious process with detailed letters prepared in more than 1200 cases. Organizers should also be aware that fraudulent intentions occurred in visa requests and she cited one case in particular; 20 individuals with IAG visas remained in the USA or Canada after the 2014 IAG.
- SE remarked on the Vienna experience in 2011, where efforts sometimes had to be made to micro-manage the process by direct contacts with embassies or consulates in some countries.

The rudeness of applicants represented one challenge and he cited an example where this had resulted in denial of visas to many others. It might be useful to include some guidelines on this issue in future letters of invitation.

- NZ suggested that consideration be given to having the local organizers or focal points manage the visa application process on behalf of participants in their countries.
- HMMM considered that the visa process was quite simple especially if a note verbale was provided. For the USA in 2014 and Spain in 2015 the announced processing time of 3 days was respected in each case. The UN handling was different in the two cases: in 2014 each individual staff member handled their own application but in 2015 UNDP Mozambique centralized the applications, sending them along with passports respectively to consulates in Uganda or Kenya, as well as assisting candidates to take flights for interviews. All the candidates were known and this process meant that people received their visas this year when some had been denied in 2014.
- ASH noted that this process of organizers personally contacting embassy or consulate officials would not work in Vienna since the officials in question wanted to personally see all applicants and check their ids with photos directly. Organizers could assist by insisting on supporting documentation from the HR dept. and urging staff to make correct applications well in advance, be polite, etc. Some countries might take 3 days, others 3 weeks or even 2 months to process visas where special background checks were required depending on nationality.

Item 19. Report of the Sub-Committee for Appeals

JH reported that one Cricket captain had enquired about the process for appeals, which was explained to him. JH offered on his own to act as mediator with other captains and it turned out that the matter only revolved around some heated verbal exchanges and finally the matter was dropped after captains shook hands

Item 20. Report of the Sub-Committee on Rules of Procedure

LB noted that the Sub-Committee did not meet this time, but had agreed to meet by email before the next IAG; LB will take the initiative to convene an electronic meeting.

Item 15: Report of the Treasurer (continued)

AD announced that he would be available 3 May from 10-11 am to handle minor reimbursements to participants so as to avoid bank charges. There were a number of organizations that had such claims.

Item 22: Any other business: Solidarity with Nepal (continued)

LB announced that there would be an appeal for donations to Nepal during the gala dinner. The appeal would be made by Nepal colleagues.

Item 5. Report on the list of participants by the ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee and Secretariat (certified lists presented) (discussion continued from 29 April)

On behalf of the sub-committee to verify participants appointed by the CC on 29 April, which had not actually been able to meet, ND reported that more than 10 organizations had not provided certified HR list of participants based on the payments list: ICTY, UNAMA, UNAMID, UNCTAD, UNDSS, UNICEF, UNICTR, UNLB, UNMIK, UNMIL, and UNTSO. Other organization lists were only

signed, not stamped; approximately 15% of the lists were not stamped. She was of the opinion that the CC might wish to amend IAG rules as it would be difficult to oblige all organizations to provide stamps for their lists because they did not use stamps.

CS confirmed that for UNNY it was not possible to obtain a stamp from the HR dept.

After a question from MWB, it was also confirmed that MONUSCO had not presented a certified list. JH noted that the focal point had not attended the IAG. LB noted that he had received an email from the MONUSCO and UNAMA focal points and he would arrange to print those mails and lists.

BR proposed that the CC proceed organization by organization to determine if the missing lists had an effect on any of the disciplines. GW recalled that this situation had happened before and the CC had considered that the player(s) in question were not at fault, rather the organizer should be held responsible. If the organizers remained the same year after year and the CC took no action against them, the problem would be repeated. ND agreed that the individual participants should not be penalized, rather the organizers to whom the invitations were sent should be sanctioned. DB stated that participants did know of the obligations to figure on an HR certified list through the official invitation, so sanctions against individual participants could be considered and this would put pressure on focal points/organizers to provide lists. ASH proposed that focal points be approached by the Secretariat who should inform them that they will be refused as focal points/registrars unless they can provide certified lists of participants for their organization. Noting that the same organizations failed to produce a list year after year, MWB similarly proposed that those organizations not furnishing lists in 2015 should be informed that their registrations will be refused in 2016 unless accompanied by an HR list.

LB defended UNAMA and UNAMID who had experienced great difficulties just to get confirmed lists of names, visas and travel for their participants.

JH noted that accepting any of the participants not figuring on a certified list, whether or not they were part of teams that finished on the podium, could throw into doubt the results.

MWB suggested in the future that in the absence of HR certified lists, participants be required to produce their individual contracts. BR said that this would be very complicated and would have to be applied to all organizations, otherwise it would be discriminatory. ASH did not find such proposals discriminatory but proposed that individual attestations be used instead if no HR certified list.

AH, supported by MWB, proposed that the CC decide that offending organizations should be denied registration. BR proposed an amendment for the CC to authorize the Secretariat to take decisions, in cooperation with DB who maintained the database, to fix a deadline for cancellation of registrations in the event that no certified HR list would be forthcoming from the organization focal point/registrar. The Chair announced that the Secretariat would continue to look into the issue. No decision was taken by the CC.

Item 21. Review and announcement of the final results of the 2014 IAG

As the overall sports coordinator, RC announced the results by discipline in alphabetical order (Annex 5). RC also announced some individual prizes (not recorded).

BR raised the question of any results being affected by the lists of organizations that had not provided certified lists of participants. LB informed that as far as he could determine, UNAMA and UNDP Afghanistan were ok.

LB claimed therefore that the only discipline that should be affected was Swimming (Men) because of the presence of a UNLB participant on the 3rd place team for which there was no certified list. The focal point was identified – Barbara Massa – but there was no indication of an email from her with a list. EC as the swimming coordinator confirmed that the id of the participant in question had been controlled prior to the beginning of the competition and proposed that this should be the basis for validating the results.

The Chair entertained a motion, duly seconded, to accept the report of the sports coordinator. The CC so decided unanimously.

Item 20. Any other Business, followed by a Group photo

MWB requested reconsideration of rule changes for darts. LB noted that this could be reconsidered after the IAG and the new rules if approved applied in 2016.

CS requested reconsideration of the UNNY financial situation and suggestions to help the Organizing Committee to repay the debt. DB noted that there were still 100 t-shirts left over as prizes for the survey that the previous Secretariat had organized, with IAG logo, and these could be sold with receipts donated to UNNY. LB wondered if IAG participants could be asked to make a special contribution to UNNY. LB did not support such an idea but suggested that a tombola could be organized by UNNY in the future to generate receipts. AH offered to make available thousands of photos that he had taken, which could be put on a cd and sold to help UNNY. LB noted that photos from the 2015 IAG would also be available from the Organizing Committee, perhaps for free. DB wondered whether any sales of photos or t-shirts should be explicitly tied to the UNNY situation. JH suggested that the Secretariat would not be able to produce cds of photos easily but this could be done in another way. The Secretariat was prepared to help in other ways. CS reminded the CC that all funds to help pay the NY debts were appreciated, some special means should be found to sell products even for a small amount, and in any case until more funds were available, the existing obligations to the Secretariat (outstanding loan and participant's fees) would have to be deferred. AK suggested that a special fee be applied to all future participants. AH reiterated that he was willing to make available photos to the Secretariat for use as it thought appropriate.

SS recalled that UNWTO was participating in its first IAG and CC. It had been a good experience and he thanked all those who had helped them. UNWTO wanted it known that, bearing in mind the 6-year rotation of host duty stations for future IAG as decided by the CC, the organization was interested to host and organize the Games at some point in the future, provided it could get support from those members who had previously organized the IAG.

On behalf of the Secretariat JH thanked all CC members and the Organizing Committee for their hard work in making the 2015 IAG a success.

The meeting was adjourned at 6.25 pm.

Annex 1. Control Commission, IAG secretariat, and ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee members present at CC meetings (With email addresses)

Control Commission

CTBTO:	Olga Boemeke (OB) olga.boemeke@gmail.com Glenda Wolstenholme (GW) glenda wolstenholme@ctbto.org
IAEA:	Ammar Habjouqa (AH) a.habjouqa@iaea.org Marielle Wynsford-Browne (MWB) m.wynsford-brown@iaea.org
ICC/ICTY:	Jones Lukose Ongalo (JLO) jones.lukose@icc-cpi.int
IFAD:	Jill Baskins (JB) j.baskins@ifad.org
ILO:	Bill Ratteree (BR) bratteree@gmail.com
ITU:	Leroy Brown (LB) leroy.brown@itu.int Ravindra Chopra (RC) ravindra.chopra@gmail.com
OSCE:	Nizar Zaher (NZ) nizar.zaher@osce.org
MINURSO:	Asif Khan (AK) khan-asif@un.org
UNDP Mozambique:	Helena Mateus Mutemba Mandlate (HMMM) helena.mutemba@undp.org
UNESCO:	Rovani Sigamoney (RS) r.sigamoney@unesco.org Noé Nougbodé (NN) n.nougboode@unesco.org
UNHCR:	Peggy Brown (PB) brown@unhcr.org Mercedes Taboada (MT) taboada@unhcr.org
UNIDO:	Anja Sedic Hamad (ASH) a.sedic@unido.org Steven Eales (SE) s.eales@unido.org
UNMISS:	Gina Michel Legros (GML) legros@un.org Ghulam Khan (GK) khang@un.org
UNNY:	Cristina Silva (CS) silva13@un.org
UNOG:	Olivier Combe (OC) olivier.combe@unctad.org
UNON:	Francis Gichomo (FG) francis.gichomo@unon.org
UNOPS/UN City Copenhagen	Ane Scheel (AS) AneS@unops.org
UNOV/UNODC:	Daniel Bridi (DB) daniel.bridi@unodc.org
UNWTO:	Samiti Siv (SS) ssiv@unwto.org
WFP:	Kenzo Kawaseki (KK) kenzo.kawaseki@wfp.org Nicola Di Foggia (NDF) ndifoggia@gmail.com
WHO:	Arnaud Devilliers (AD) devilliers@unicc.org
WIPO:	Natalia Deblue (ND) natalia.deblue@wipo.int Emma Connolly (EC) emma.connolly@wipo.int
WMO:	Jalil Housni (JH) jhousni@wmo.int

IAG Secretariat

President:	Jalil Housni (JH) jhousni@wmo.int
Vice-President:	Leroy Brown (LB) leroy.brown@itu.int
Treasurer:	Arnaud Devilliers (AD) devilliers@unicc.org
Secretary:	Bill Ratteree (BR) bratteree@gmail.com
Public Relations Officer:	Natalia Deblue (ND) Natalia.deblue@wipo.int
Ex officio/Technical Adviser:	Daniel Bridi (DB) daniel.bridi@unodc.org
Ex officio/Assistant Secretary:	Mark Woodhall (MW) mark.woodall@itu.int

ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee

Leroy Brown (LB) leroy.brown@itu.int
Mark Woodall (MW) mark.woodall@itu.int

Ravindra Chopra (RC) ravindra.chopra@gmail.com
Arnaud Devilliers (AD) devilliers@unicc.org
Natalia Deblue (ND) Natalia.deblue@wipo.int

Annex 2. Agenda of the Control Commission, 42nd IAG

1st Session (Hotel Caribe on Wednesday, 29 April at 15:30)

1. Opening the Session - President of UNIAG Secretariat
2. Election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chair of the Control Commission of the 42nd IAG
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Welcome address - Chairperson of the ITU Organising Committee
5. Report on the list of participants by the ITU/Secretariat Organising Committee (certified lists presented)
6. CC members selected to attend Captains' meetings (Immediately following the CC's 1st Session, the Captains' meetings will be held at the Hotel Caribe on Wednesday, 29 April at 5 p.m.)
7. Approval minutes of the 2014 IAG in Hofstra University in Hempstead, Long Island, New York, USA
8. Election of the Sub-Committee for Appeals
9. Election of the Sub-Committee on Rules of Procedures
10. Participation of other organizations/individuals in the 42nd IAG (report by IAG Secretariat and future criteria and processes)
11. Control of identity for all discipline participants

2nd Session (Hotel Caribe on 29 April at 18:00, or immediately following the Captains' meetings)

12. Report back on the results of the Captains' meetings by CC members (item 6), followed by the Welcome Ceremony and Dinner, place to be announced

3rd Session (Hotel Caribe on Thursday 30 April, time to be decided by the CC)

13. Review 2014 IAG Financial Statement and Audit Report
14. Report of the Secretariat (by IAG Secretariat)
15. Report of the Treasurer (by IAG Secretariat - continuation of the contribution fee, its amount and the currency if maintained)
16. Cycle of the Games
 - a. IAG 2015 Rome (*Rome informed that it could not host. Geneva won the bid to host instead*)
 - b. IAG 2016 Nairobi
 - c. IAG 2017 Vienna
 - d. IAG 2018 Paris
 - e. IAG 2019 Geneva
 - f. IAG 2020 New York
 - g. IAG 2021 Rome
 - h. IAG 2022 Nairobi
 - i. IAG 2023 Vienna

4th Session (Hotel Caribe on Friday, 1 May, time to be decided by the CC)

17. Organization of the 42nd Games – administrative matters and disciplines
18. Suggested improvements for future games and actions by members and the Secretariat (IAG Secretariat - instructions or guidelines on how to organize the IAG)

5th Session (Hotel Caribe on Saturday, 2 May, time to be decided by the CC)

19. Report of the Sub-Committee for Appeals
20. Report of the Sub-Committee on Rules of Procedures (written report of the Sub-Committee from the 41st IAG)
21. Review and announcement of final results of the 2015 IAG
22. Any other Business, followed by a Group photo of the CC members before the Closing Ceremony, place to be announced at 16:30

Annex 3. IAG Secretariat Financial Report

Financial Statement

For the period from April 24, 2014 to April 30, 2015

(Currency: US\$)

Starting Balance as of April 24, 2014 [7,664.24 €]	9,448.71
REVENUES	
1. Bank Interest	6.13
Total Revenues	6.13
EXPENSES	
1. Web Site Hosting and Software Charges [144.63 €]	182.65
2. IAG 2015 Assistance (Natalia Deblue's visit to Salou) [404.51 (375.26 CHF) + 35.00 (Wire Fee)]	439.51
Total Expenses	622.16
Ending Balance as of April 30, 2015	8,832.68

The Financial Statement was audited by (Name, Organization, Signature):

- Emma CONNOLLY, WIPO (Signed)
- Rovani SIGAMONEY, UNESCO (Signed)
- Nizar ZAHER, OSCE (Signed)

Date: 1st May 2015

TREASURER'S REPORT

The IAG Secretariat Financial Report comprises two documents:

- The Treasurer's Report
- The Financial Statement

Financial Statement

In addition to the information provided in the Financial Statement, the following outstanding revenues and expenses will modify the account balance:

OUTSTANDING REVENUES	
1. IAG 2013 Participant's Fees (817 participants) [8,170.00 €]	
2. IAG 2014 Loan Repayment	5,000.00
3. IAG 2014 Participant's Fees (948 participants)	9,480.00
Reconciled Balance (US \$)	23,312.68

Budget Proposal for 2015
(Currency: USD)

REVENUES

Item	Description	Amount
1	IAG 2015 Participant's Fees (based on 1,400 participants)	14,000.00

Total Revenues

USD 14,000.00

EXPENSES

Item	Description	Amount
1	Bank Charges	50.00
2	Web Site Hosting and Software Charges	250.00
3	Secretariat Office Supplies (letters, stamps, ...)	300.00
4	IAG Supplies (flags, ...)	400.00
5	New IAG Web Site	2,000.00
6	IAG 2016 Secretariat Assistance	4,000.00
7	IAG 2016 Gifts Prices for IAGOC (flowers, ...)	1,000.00
8	Savings Fund	6,000.00

Total Expenses

USD 14,000.00

Annex 4. Report of the Secretariat*

Report of the Secretariat to the Control Commission

April 2015

REPORT OF THE UN-IAG Secretariat

This report is submitted to the Control Commission (CC) with the purpose of providing information on the work carried out by the IAG Secretariat (IAG-Sec) since the last CC during IAG-2014 (Long Island, New York, USA).

The CC is invited to comment on the contents of the report and make recommendations and proposals for the work of the next IAG-2016.

REPORT OF THE UN-IAG Secretariat FOR THE YEAR 2014

1. INTRODUCTION

The IAG-Secretariat is composed of the following members:

Mr Jalil HOUSNI (WMO)	President
Mr Leroy BROWN (ITU)	Vice-President;
Mr Bill RATTEREE (ILO)	Secretary
Mr Arnaud DEVILLIERS (WHO)	Treasurer
Ms Natalia DEBLUE (WIPO)	Public Relations Officer
Mr Daniel BRIDI (UNODC)	Member (co-opted as technical adviser)
Mr Mark WOODALL (ITU)	Member
Mr Peter PATAK (IAEA)	President (Emeritus)

2. HIGHLIGHTS OF 2014-15

Activities accomplished by the IAG-Sec included, but were not limited to, the following: Sports-related matters, partnerships/linkages, rules and procedures for the CC and the IAG, and organization of the 42nd IAG. Some highlights are included below:

- a. Held regular meetings of the IAG-Sec (2 times);
- b. Reviewed and provided input to IAG Rules; discussed related issues and revised the CC website accordingly;

- c. Assisted the Geneva organizing committee in organization of the 42nd IAG, including 1 site visit, invitation letters and all organization details - 4 members of the Secretariat were key members of the committee, 1 other member ran the database and 1 other member was a discipline coordinator
- d. Provided guidelines and corresponded with the organizing committee for the 2016 IAG scheduled to be held in Nairobi
- e. Completed opening of the United Nations Federal Credit Union (UNFCU) account and followed up with IAG host committee Chairs for the 2013 and 2014 IAG regarding financial matters;
- f. Responded to inquiries from ~~other~~ UN Agencies particularly on rules and eligibility for IAG participation;

3. The 41st Edition of IAG (23-27 April 2014, Hofstra University in Hempstead, Long Island, New York, USA)

The minutes of the CC meetings are available at <http://cc.interagencygames.org>

4. Budget

The following documents are presented separately:

- Financial Statement
- Treasurer's Report
- Budget Proposal for 2015

5. LOOKING AHEAD

To promote continuity, suggestions for further actions and priorities include, inter alia:

- a. Continued direct support to the Host Coordination Committee and implementing further improvements in IAG organization recommended by the CC;
- b. CC members/Coordinators representatives would be expected in the edition of the games to present credentials from the organization (staff association/council or sports coordinating body) that appointed them to the CC;
- c. Communication with all our coordinator representatives, as a priority, in using and involving the new Secretariat processes and tools (Video Conference);
- d. Continued development of the relevant internal manuals or information packages related to Secretariat processes and tools;
- e. Development and implementation of an introductory programme for new coordinator representatives.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The IAG-Sec would also like to convey its deepest gratitude for the hours of tireless work that the Host Coordination Committee put into making this 42nd IAG happening and all their efforts in making it a success, most especially to Mr. Leroy Brown, Chair of the Organizing Committee and his team who generously volunteered their time to organize this event.

Last, but not least, the IAG-Sec wishes to express its appreciation for the continued support of in particular, the CC members, to the various activities of the Secretariat.

Thus, to all, again our sincere thanks. We could not have accomplished our work without you. The IAG-Sec will need you as well – we are confident of your continued support.

*Corrected following CC discussion on 1 May 2015

Annex 5. Inter-agency games 2015 results

	<i>1st Place</i>	<i>2nd Place</i>	<i>3rd Place</i>
<i>Athletics (Men)</i>	UNEP/UNON/WHO	IAEA	ICC/WFP
<i>Athletics (Women)</i>	IAEA - 1	UNIDO	UNON/UN HABITAT/UNNY
<i>Badminton</i>	UN Copenhagen City	IAEA - 1	IAEA - 2
<i>Basketball</i>	Geneva	Vienna - 1	Team Kenya
<i>Chess</i>	IAEA	UNOG/IFAD	ITU/WHO
<i>Cricket</i>	UNMISS	UN Afghanistan	UN Geneva
<i>Darts</i>	IAEA - 1	UNIDO	FAO
<i>Football (Men)</i>	DPKO/IFAD/ILO/ OCHA/UNOHCHR/ UNCTAD/UNJPF UNNY/UNOG	UN Kenya	UNESCO
<i>Golf</i>	UN Kenya	Vienna – 2	Geneva - 1
<i>Pétanque</i>	UNOG - 1	UNIDO - 1	ILO - 1
<i>Swimming (Men)</i>	UNIDO	WFP	WHO/UNLB/ UNMISS
<i>Swimming (Women)</i>	ITU/WIPO	IAEA	WHO
<i>Table Tennis (Men)</i>	UNOG/ITC	UNIDO/UNODC/ UNHCR	IAEA
<i>Table Tennis (Women)</i>	IAEA/MONUSCO	UNOHCHR/ILO	UNESCO

<i>Tennis</i>	UNNY	ILO/FAO	CTBTO/IAEA/ UNOPS
<i>Volleyball (Men)</i>	IAEA/UNIDO/ CTBTO	ILO/WIPO/UNOG	UNESCO/UNAMA
<i>Volleyball (Women)</i>	ILO/IMO/ITC/ UNOG/WIPO	UNESCO	IAEA/UNIDO/ CTBTO/UNODC