



## **43<sup>rd</sup> Inter-Agency Games**

**11 – 15 May 2016**

**Malaga, Spain**

### **Minutes of the Control Commission (CC)**

**1<sup>st</sup> Session, Palacio de Deportes, Wed, 11 May, 3.00 pm**

**Present: (Annex 1 for a complete list)**

IAEA:	Marielle Wynsford-Browne (MWB) Ammar Habjouqa (AH)
(Vice-Chair)	Imed Zabaar (IZ)
ICAO:	Barbara Strike (BS)
ICC/ICTY/OPCW:	Jones Lukose Ongalo (JLO)
IFAD:	Jill Baskins (JB) - 2 <sup>nd</sup> session
ILO:	Bill Ratteree (BR)
ITU:	Leroy Brown (LB) Mark Woodall (MW)
MONUSCO:	Paul Ketner (PK)
UNDP Mozambique:	Helena Mutemba (HM)
UNESCO:	Rovani Sigamoney (RS)
UNFCCC:	Thomas Trimborn (TT)
UNHCR:	Peggy Brown (PB)
UNIDO:	Steven Eales (SE)
UNMISS:	Gina Michel Legros (GML) Ghulam Khan (GK) Derrick Culbreath (DC) - Observer
UNNY:	Cristina Silva (CS)
UNON:	Francis Gichomo (FG)
UNOV/UNODC:	Daniel Bridi (DB)
UNWTO (and Chair):	Samiti Siv (SS) Peter Janech (PJ)
WHO:	Arnaud Devilliers (AD)
WMO:	Jalil Housni (JH)

IAG Secretariat:       Jalil Housni (JH)  
                              Leroy Brown (LB)  
                              Bill Ratteree (BR)  
                              Arnaud Devilliers (AD)  
                              Daniel Bridi (DB)  
                              Mark Woodall (MW)

For purposes of voting during the CC meetings in the absence of their CC members, CTBTO, ESCWA and OSCE gave their proxies to Daniel Bridi of UNOV/UNODC.

### **Item 1. Opening of the Session – President of the IAG Secretariat**

The President of the Secretariat (JH) opened the meeting, welcomed members and noted that many had not yet arrived. JH introduced the Chair of the UNWTO Organizing Committee, Samiti Siv (SS) and expressed the sincere thanks of the members for organizing the 2016 IAG on very short notice. Members present introduced themselves. JH also introduced the members of the IAG Secretariat.

### **Item 2. Election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chair of the Control Commission of the 43rd IAG**

LB nominated Samiti Siv (SS), Chair of the UNWTO Organizing Committee, seconded by IAEA (MWB). SS was accepted as Chair by acclamation.

JH nominated Imed Zabaar (IZ) as the Vice-Chair, seconded by (DB); IZ was accepted as Vice-Chair by acclamation.

### **Item 3. Approval of the agenda**

On the proposal of FG, BR, GK and OC the agenda was amended to include a new point 14. “Review of the 2014 IAG Financial Situation and Reimbursements”. Point 14 became point 15 and amended further: “Review of the 2015 IAG Financial Statement and Report (by ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee Chair/Treasurer) and Reimbursements”. Points 15-26 were renumbered to points 16-27. On the proposal of GML, point 27 was amended to include the following sub-point:

- a. Special leave for the IAG – update of the 2005 UN memorandum

A UNESCO representative requested discussion of the football draw and possible new rules prior to beginning of the competition. JH suggested that this could be taken up as part of the report back from the captains’ meeting, item 13.

The agenda was adopted as amended (Annex 2).

### **Item 4. Welcome Address, Chairperson of the UNWTO Organizing Committee**

The Chair of the UNWTO Organizing Committee (SS) welcomed all CC members and Games participants. He noted the challenges faced by UNWTO and others in the organization of the 2016 IAG under extreme time pressures and given that 2015 was the very first time that UNWTO had participated in the IAG. He thanked the CC members, focal points and in particular the Secretariat for all their efforts to try and make the 2016 IAG a success. The Secretariat had provided considerable support at all hours and sometimes under duress. The weather in Malaga was not cooperating at present with heavy recent rains, but hopefully would improve. Problems with hotel assignments and transport were in the process of being worked out. The UNWTO organizing committee had worked

hard to ensure a successful IAG and he hoped that all participants would enjoy their stay in Malaga and participation in these Games. CC members and participants were welcome to seek help for any questions from members of the organizing committee.

### **Item 5. Approval of the minutes of the 2015 IAG (42<sup>nd</sup> edition) in Salou, Tarragona, Spain**

The Chair and Secretariat noted that the minutes and the separate document summarizing decisions of the CC had been sent in March 2016 to all CC members who were present at the meetings in Salou. Copies had been sent to new members who had requested the draft minutes. No comments or requests for changes had been received. Any final revisions could only be entertained from those CC members who attended the Salou meetings. Adoption of these minutes did not prejudice consideration of the amended agenda just decided by the CC. The minutes and decisions were then approved by the CC without further changes. They would be available on the website at <http://cc.interagencygames.org> after the IAG concluded.

### **Item 6. Report on the list of participants by the IAG Secretariat/UNWTO Organizing Committee and (certified lists presented) followed by CC members to appoint as sub-committee for verification**

The Secretariat noted the importance of the agenda item in accordance with IAG General Rule 13 requiring human resource (HR) dept. signed, dated and stamped lists certifying eligibility to participate in accordance with IAG rules of the participants from each organization or in the case of registrars at country level for the participants and organizations they registered. Most organizations had sent digital versions to the Secretariat or to UNWTO in advance as requested and others had presented the original lists at this CC session. A number of organizations or national-level registrars had not yet submitted a list or submitted only a partial list: MONUSCO (list to be submitted later, some names submitted by UNON); UNDP/UNFPA Angola; UNDP Mozambique (original list subsequently presented by HM); UNDP Nigeria; UNAMID; UNMIK; UNOG (copy of the original list subsequently presented by OC); UNON (partial list submitted for several Nairobi-based organizations).<sup>1</sup> Original lists would be collected by MW of the Secretariat who had also volunteered to be a member of the Verification sub-committee. The lists would have to be cross-checked against the registration database.

IZ noted that he had the complete list of registered participants provided by DB and would assist in the process of checking. In the past, the captains at the meeting to follow this session had been advised that if non-eligible participants were confirmed it could lead to sanctions against individuals and teams.

The Secretariat noted the need for a sub-committee to verify participants drawn from different duty stations. The CC appointed the following members who had volunteered: MW (ITU, Geneva), IZ (IAEA, Vienna), RS (UNESCO Paris), DB (UNOV/UNODC, Vienna also for the database). JH

---

<sup>1</sup> Following the last CC meeting on 14 May and at the request of the Secretariat, between 24 May and 19 October 2016, the following organizations submitted either complete or supplemental digital versions of the HR-certified forms, signed memos from HR officers or arranged for individuals to provide HR employment attestations certifying their employment with the organization during the dates of the IAG: FAO; ITC; IOM Nairobi; MONUSCO; UNAMID; UNDP/UNFPA Angola; UNDP and UNICEF Nigeria; UNHCR; UNICEF New York and Zimbabwe; UNISFA; UNMIK; UNMIL; UNMISS; UNNY (FAO registered player); UNOG; UNON; UNOPS Nairobi; WFP Kenya.

emphasized the importance of checking the lists quickly if possible prior to the beginning of the competitions the next day. BR called for a decision on what to do with organizations that had not presented lists, including a deadline for reception of the lists; he proposed the deadline be set at Fri, 13 May, 18h00. LB asked what would happen for the lists of individuals already in hand prior to the beginning of the competitions; IZ responded that the sub-committee would endeavour to check and provide a list of non-verified participants by email before the next morning. In addition, BR prepared copies of the list of organizations that had submitted HR certified lists for use by CC members to inform the captains' at the meetings to follow. PJ and BS called for a more liberal approach to accept in good faith those participants who were present and allow them to participate without threats of sanctions against individuals or teams. The Chair noted that better procedures were needed; AH recalled this had already been discussed in 2015. CS objected to the liberal approach since many organizations made efforts to prepare and submit these lists.

The CC agreed: 1) that its representatives to the captains' meetings would use the Secretariat-prepared table of organizations that had not submitted HR certified lists of eligible participants to advise captains of potential problems with non-verified participants, which could result in a CC decision to sanction individuals or teams later in the IAG; 2) to fix a deadline for receipt of any missing HR certified lists at close of operations on Friday, 13 May.

#### **Item 7. Election of the Sub-Committee for Appeals**

JH noted the responsibility of the Sub-Committee on Appeals to meet and decide on any disputes or complaints within disciplines and make a report to the CC. Complaints could be made by participants, captains, discipline coordinators or CC members. The sub-committee should have at least four CC members from different duty stations, members should recuse themselves if a dispute should involve individuals or a team of their organization and they should endeavour to be fair and equitable in their consideration of any cases brought to their attention. The CC agreed to nominate JH (WMO, Geneva), DB (UNOV/UNODC, Vienna), CS (UNNY) and GK (UNMISS, South Sudan) to the sub-committee.

#### **Item 8. Election of the Auditors for the IAG Secretariat Financial Statement**

JH remarked that the auditors from different duty stations needed to do an audit with the IAG Secretariat Treasurer of the Secretariat Financial Statement for presentation to the CC, and this by Thurs., 12 May as the Treasurer, AD, had to leave the IAG early. The CC agreed to nominate SE (UNIDO, Vienna), PB (UNHCR, Geneva) and PJ (UNWTO, Madrid) to audit the financial statement.

#### **Item 9. Organization of the 43rd Games – administrative matters and disciplines (Organizing Committee)**

The Chair recalled the massive logistical challenges faced by the host organizing committee involving 9 hotels, 14 disciplines at 13 venues, with especially concerns for some outside disciplines, notably tennis and beach volleyball. There was no "plan B" for tennis or Petanque since Malaga had no indoor facilities for either. An alternative for beach volleyball indoors existed if necessary. Transport was organized from hotels to all sports venues and related information would be updated on message boards situated in the main lobbies of hotels each day. Unfortunately, no plans had been made to cover transport for members to the CC meetings, even though attempts to find a solution at the last minute had not proven successful because of costs and logistics. He apologized for this oversight, which would have costs for the members attending meetings. CS suggested that CC members with cars could help provide transport to others; individuals and hotels were indicated. AH suggested that the timing of CC meetings after disciplines had concluded would be crucial.

## **Item 10. Participation of other organizations/individuals in the 43<sup>rd</sup> IAG (report by the IAG Secretariat)**

The Secretariat reported that on request from UNESCO it had taken a decision in accordance with its mandate from the CC to authorize the participation of respectively two basketball and one volleyball player from two non-member organizations, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and European Space Agency (ESA) in Paris. Since the exception for OECD had now been granted for the 4<sup>th</sup> time in the last five IAGs, the Secretariat proposed that the CC take a decision on permanently admitting or not OECD and any other organization such as ESA, which did not meet the criteria for IAG membership (either on the Directory of UN and affiliated organizations on the UN website or a member of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund - UNJSPF), under item 19 of its amended agenda, tentatively scheduled for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Session on Thurs., 12 May.

## **Item 11. CC members selected to attend Captains meetings (immediately following the CC's 1<sup>st</sup> session in Palacio de Deportes, 4.30 pm)**

The Vice-Chair noted the 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, which must come back to and be decided by the CC before any new rules were applied at the competition, to inform the captains of gaps in the HR lists and eligibility of players, and to assist captains and disciplines throughout the Games in assuring a good spirit and fair play so as to avoid disputes if possible. The designated members would make an initial report back to the full CC after the captains' meetings. The following members were appointed by discipline:

**Athletics:** Arnaud Devilliers (WHO)

**Badminton:** Ghulam Khan (UNMISS)

**Basketball:** Bill Ratteree (ILO), Cristina Silva (UNNY)

**Beach Volleyball:** Derrick Culbreath (UNMISS) (CC observer)

**Chess:** Jalil Housni (WMO)

**Cricket:** Steven Eales (UNIDO)

**Darts:** Marielle Wynsford-Browne (IAEA)

**Football:** Paul Ketner (MONUSCO)

**Golf:** Francis Gichomo (UNON), Mark Woodall (ITU)

**Petanque:** Rovani Sigamoney (UNESCO)

**Swimming:** Ammar Habjouqa (IAEA)

**Table Tennis:** Imed Zabaar (IAEA), Barbara Strike (ICAO)

**Tennis:** Leroy Brown (ITU)

**Volleyball:** Danny Bridi (UNODC/UNOV)

**Item 12. Control of identity for all discipline participants – discipline coordinators and/or CC members**

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, either the discipline coordinator or the CC representative as just decided, or both. In 2015 this responsibility was shared by the discipline coordinator and the CC representative. DB proposed that both do this, especially as the local coordinator would not know any of the participants whereas the CC representative would know many participants. AH noted differences last year between Table Tennis and Athletics and wondered about how strict a CC representative should be? DB and SS noted that checks could be going on as the competitions proceeded and could also be done on the buses on the way to the competition. The CC decided that both the discipline coordinator and the CC representative to the discipline would check ids and that in accordance with the rules a photo id would be proof of identity.

The meeting adjourned at 4.30 pm.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Session, Palacio de Deportes, Wed 11 May, 6.00 pm**

**Item 13. Report back on the results of the Captains Meetings by CC members (item 11), including discipline rule changes if any, followed by the Opening Ceremony at 19:00**

Present: In addition to those present at the 1<sup>st</sup> Session:

UNIDO: Eric Appiateng (EA)  
UNOG: Oliver Combe (OC)  
Overall Sports  
Coordinator: Raviindra Chopra (RC)  
MONUSCO: Paul Ketner (PK) not present for the report back from the captains meeting  
UNMISS: Derrick Culbreath (DC) not present for the report back from the captains meeting

**Athletics:** AD (WHO): No change for these Games, but the Captains would make proposals for changes in 2017.

**Badminton:** GK (UNMISS): Women players wanted more equal treatment so that for the 2016 IAG and in the future the requirement for team composition of 3 men and 1 woman should be changed to 2 men and 2 women. In addition, in case of tie, mixed doubles should decide the outcome, not singles. A written copy of the proposed rule changes with the signature of the captains (12 of 13 captains approved without reservation) was submitted to the CC. DB opposed the rule changes as a permanent change, noting that except for 2015 and 2016 there had been a shortage of women players, and if in the future there was again a shortage of women, this would pose a problem for the number of matches. There could also be issues with the ability of men players to participate in more than two matches. He proposed that the rule changes be applied in 2016 on an exceptional basis and the outcomes evaluated before applying these changes in future IAG. BR noted that the CC representative to the discipline had to certify if the proposed rule changes affected the organization of the discipline and facilities, in which case the host organization would need to confirm if possible to apply them. DB and GK confirmed that the proposed rule changes would only affect ties and would not imply extra transport or other costs. The Chair noted the proposal to accept the rule changes for 2016 and the Secretariat should assess the outcomes and propose application or not of the changes in 2017 and afterwards. The CC so decided. GK also proposed a change to reduce the points needed to decide

matches in view of the large numbers of teams in 2016 and proposed to have a written confirmation from the coordinator. The CC agreed to accept this exceptional change for 2016 if needed, provided a written confirmation was furnished by GK. No such confirmation was provided.

**Basketball:** BR (ILO): There were 6 teams, some 60+ players of which 10 women. There would be a slight change in the announced schedule as the side event of an “All-Star” game would not likely take place and the women’s 3 x 3 event would be reprogrammed, but these would not necessarily affect the transport or overall organization. The basketball teams were not so happy that buses would be collecting participants as early as 8 am but would make do with the arrangements for the first day. CS as the CC representative would take care of controlling ids at the beginning of the competition.

**Beach Volleyball:** There was no report from the designated CC representative; OC and the Chair noted there would be an alternative venue because of the rains; an announcement of the new location would be made during the opening ceremony and details posted at hotels; transport and logistics would be arranged.

**Chess:** JH (WMO): There would be 4 teams with 4 players each and play according to the Swiss system; the captains present had agreed; some Afghanistan players might still arrive & the schedule of play changed again; the players were unhappy with the change of venue but they would adapt to the new venue; the Secretariat recalled that the changed team composition and schedule of play had been worked out in advance due to the exceptional circumstances in 2016 with many visas not issued to chess players and the CC had been informed in advance that this would likely be necessary.

**Cricket:** SE (UNIDO): No one came to the captains meeting; GK reported that UNMISS players had arrived, but would come later. The Secretariat and RC, as overall sports coordinator, noted that as for Chess, changed team composition and schedule of play had been agreed in advance in view of the exceptional circumstances with visas. The CC representative was requested to liaise with the cricket captains, discipline coordinator and participants to determine clearly which teams would be awarded medals in view of the reduced number of participants and teams.

**Darts:** MWB (IAEA): Everything was ok, lots of participants.

**Football:** The CC representative did not report back. PJ noted a high competitive spirit. There were two requests to change rules: reduce the time of play; and make substitutions “on the fly” without timeouts, both for the 2016 IAG only. No written request for rule changes was submitted by the captains or coordinator. There were questions of the football draw, which would need to be done in the future in the presence of captains. The captains would need to get together to refine the rules for the future to reflect a division between stronger and weaker teams. JH noted the issue of an extra (13<sup>th</sup>) player for UNESCO since one player was injured; the CC was asked to approve the exception. CC members asked about the opinion of other team captains. On proposal of the Vice-Chair, UNESCO was advised to only align 12 players on the team roster.

**Golf:** FG (UNON): There were 11 teams; questions of the certification of participants by HR depts. and the eligibility of retirees were raised; captains had been warned that if participants were ruled ineligible because HR lists were not presented, the teams could be disqualified; the coordinator reported that handicaps had been presented for all players; the sub-committee on verification was requested to provide the list of names of those who had not been certified by organizations.

**Petanque:** RS (UNESCO): There were 30 teams in 4 groups; 1 participant had issues with transport; JH and SS noted the difficulties to place all participants of a discipline in one hotel due to the shortage

of hotel rooms in Malaga during these dates and the challenges in meeting all requests for changes by participants.

**Swimming:** AH (IAEA): The number of teams was not confirmed, but would be worked out when everyone was present; the captains wanted to confirm the rule change to alter the order of one event in line with international rules; DB noted that the present rules reflected the request of captains some years ago; AH proposed to clarify this with captains and as long as there were no complications for the schedule and transport the host organization and the CC agreed; there was one request to switch from swimming to athletics, agreed by the Athletics coordinator, and this request was accepted.

**Table Tennis:** BS (ICAO): There were 6 women's table tennis teams formed. One women's team questioned why a third person from another organization, who they did not know, had been imposed upon them without consultation when they had signed up as a 2-person team from one organization, and the rules clearly specified that 2 players were allowed per team as a minimum. The team asked why more teams were not created considering the number of women players registered. The discipline coordinator had replied that it was easier to organize the women's competition with only 6 teams. The women's team was not happy with the answer but did not press the issue further. DB questioned the problems since the rules specified 2 players per team as a minimum and he understood that the women's competition would be organized in view of the number of tables available. BS further reported that there were more men's table tennis teams than women's teams. One male player was concerned that there should be independent referees for each match. The discipline coordinator replied that both the men's and women's teams would referee their own matches, but gave assurances that he would settle any disputes.

**Tennis:** LB (ITU): There were 8 teams and the captains had agreed on a round robin format, which had become the practice in recent years; the number of games might be reduced if the weather was not good since there were no indoor courts available and the tournament would be played with a "super tie-break" formula so instead of best 2 of 3 sets to decide a match, if teams were tied 1 set apiece, then the match would be decided by a tie break on the basis of 2 points; there were 7 courts, but there might be a possibility to play extra games on an 8<sup>th</sup> court at one of the hotels and the participants would make their own arrangements to get to that court if used. BR requested that the tennis captains submit revised rules to the CC so that tennis played its competition according to CC agreed rules and not according to "tradition" as was now the case. LB acknowledged that this should be done and noted that such rule changes had already been formulated.

**Volleyball Men and Women:** DB (UNOV/UNODC): there were 3 men's and 3 women's teams and they were ready to play.

### **Opening Ceremony**

The Chair announced that many organizations did not have flags so they would parade in behind the organization names affixed to poles.

The meeting adjourned at 7 pm.



### **3rd Session, Palacio de Deportes, Thurs, 12 May, 6.30 pm**

#### **Present: (Annex 1 for a complete list)**

IAEA:	Marielle Wynsford-Browne (MWB) Ammar Habjouqa (AH)
Vice-Chair:	Imed Zabaar (IZ)
IFAD:	Jill Baskins (JB)
ILO:	Bill Ratteree (BR)
ITU:	Leroy Brown (LB) Mark Woodall (MW)
UNDP Mozambique:	Helena Mutemba (HM)
UNESCO:	Rovani Sigamoney (RS) Noé Nougboe (NN)
UNHCR:	Peggy Brown (PB)
UNIDO:	Steven Eales (SE) Eric Appiateng (EA)
UNNY:	Cristina Silva (CS)
UNOG:	Olivier Combe (OC)
UNON:	Francis Gichomo (FG)
UNOV/UNODC:	Daniel Bridi (DB)
UNWTO (and Chair):	Samiti Siv (SS) Peter Janech (PJ)
WHO:	Arnaud Devilliers (AD)
WMO:	Jalil Housni (JH)

Overall Sports Coordinator: Ravindra Chopra (RC)

IAG Secretariat: Jalil Housni (JH)  
Leroy Brown (LB)  
Bill Ratteree (BR)  
Arnaud Devilliers (AD)  
Daniel Bridi (DB)  
Mark Woodall (MW)

#### **Item 14. Review of the 2014 IAG Financial Situation & Reimbursements**

The Chair noted that the IAG Secretariat Treasurer was meeting next door with the auditors about the IAG Secretariat Financial Report.

OC explained why he had requested the agenda item 14 to be included and noted the previous discussion on the IAG 2014 debt; it was necessary to re-examine means to help the UNNY organizing committee resolve their debt. FG also noted that he had requested consideration of reimbursement for one UNON participant following contact with CS.

CS explained that the UNNY organizing committee was still paying creditors from their own personal funds and \$70,000 of debt remained to be paid. She had asked the Secretariat for discussions to help and the Secretariat requested financial accounts and an audit. The UNNY organizing committee felt this was too much to request. She was prepared to discuss this issue in private with the Secretariat, but not to share all the papers requested. In response to questions, she explained that the committee was unable to secure any more funds from sponsors, make adjustments in payments to service providers or

secure any support from the UN administration and no tax-exempt status had been granted by the UN administration.

JH recalled decisions of the CC in 2015 to postpone repayment of the Secretariat loan and the payment of 2015 participants' fees to the Secretariat, as well as to authorize the Secretariat to consider measures to help. He noted that with the current schedule of repayment the UNNY organizing committee members will be in debt for a long time in the future. The Secretariat has suggested measures to help, but there was a need to have some justification. The Chair urged the CC to be positive in its approach and invited brainstorming on how to resolve the issue.

BR noted that the discussion focussed on the review of the financial situation and explained the previous Secretariat proposals to help UNNY, including use of participant's fees to help draw down the UNNY debt provided more financial justification was provided. He proposed that the suggestion from CS of a meeting should be followed up while in Malaga to work out what is minimally required for financial auditing or financial justification based on what the CC decided would be needed. On this basis it might be possible to decide on substantial multi-year contributions from members' fees.

FG proposed a levy from membership fees in addition to the annual fee provided that the necessary financial justification was provided based on a meeting with the Secretariat. OC noted a positive reaction from UN colleagues to raise a special levy from IAG participants to pay off the UNNY debt in addition to the possible use of IAG participants' fees normally going to the Secretariat. The UNNY organizing committee had done their best, but they had not succeeded; solidarity was now needed from other UN colleagues. OC agreed there was a need to have complete financial transparency and he trusted the Secretariat to satisfactorily work this out with UNNY. At the same time the CC should agree on organizing a separate, special levy from IAG members for this purpose and he was willing to help organize this.

DB supported a meeting between CS and the Secretariat, but he was not in favour of a special levy above participants' fees. This was a question of credibility within the UN system, would be opposed by certain administrations and would put the UN system in a bad light. CS agreed that there were questions of credibility and image and renewed her proposal to meet with the Secretariat to try and work out a solution.

AH noted that too many issues were being mixed together. He understood the desire not to share sensitive financial documents other than on a "need to know" basis. Since the CC trusted the Secretariat to represent it he supported a meeting between CS and the Secretariat for purposes of sharing the necessary information and seeking a solution to help the UNNY Organizing Committee. The Secretariat should then make a report after the meeting to the CC by 2017; he was not in favour of a special levy to pay back the debt.

IZ recalled that past committees had not necessarily shared information on either surpluses or losses. He proposed more transparency in the future so that auditors of IAG financial statements could confirm surpluses if realized and such surpluses could be donated to resolve debts of other IAGs.

As Chair, SS noted the desire of the CC to help resolve the 2014 IAG debt. He also did not support the idea to organize a special levy, noted the interesting suggestion to share surpluses to cover future debts and supported the meeting between the Secretariat and CS in order to find means to help now, not to postpone this to the future.

FG proposed a vote on the various proposals, including a special levy, use of participant's fees and application of future surpluses to cover debts. The Chair suggested this was not helpful at this point, rather the Secretariat should meet with CS and evaluate the situation based on the available documentation she could provide then report back to the CC with its proposals on the way forward. On the proposal of DB and the Chair, the CC decided that the Secretariat should meet with CS before the end of IAG to consider solutions and report back to the CC by Friday, 13 May.

On the question of reimbursements, IZ proposed that Secretariat funds be used to reimburse US\$250 for 1 UNON member as requested by FG. DB made another proposal that the Secretariat consider this with the Treasurer and report back to the CC with a recommendation. The CC so agreed.

### **Item 15. Review of the 2015 IAG Financial Statement and Report (by ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee Chair/Treasurer) and reimbursements requested by participants**

FG noted that he wanted the question of reimbursements discussed as UNON participants were owed approximately US\$2,595 in reimbursements. Several requests had been made to the Secretariat and to the 2015 IAG Organizing Committee; requests included those of the family of a football participant who had died.

LB as Chair of the ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee made an oral report on the 2015 IAG Financial Statement. A shorter written report would be made available later on developments in the last 12 months. He recalled that ITU had been chosen as the host since duty stations in Rome had declined their turn. It was the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the ITU and the ITU administration and staff council supported hosting the IAG as part of this anniversary. He noted the principal members of the organizing committee. Following offers from several potential venues in Italy, Switzerland and Spain, Port Aventura and Salou had been chosen and the Spanish enterprise, Always Sports, engaged by the host organizing committee as the event organizer. An initial site visit was organized in October 2015 that included meetings with the Mayor and staff of Salou, the regional tourism board, local and regional security authorities and Port Aventura theme park management that was responsible for corporate events. The host organizing committee was assured of all the necessary sports facilities and technical support to organize the IAG. With the assistance of the events' organizer, various sponsors supported the IAG in the provision of transport and entertainment along with the ITU 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary committee.

The questions related to reimbursements would be addressed later. Some issues related to "lessons learned" that could be valuable for future organizers should be highlighted. One was the "5 per cent" retainer that was withheld from the payment to the event organizer on satisfactory completion of its contractual engagements. Second, the hotels should provide the actual lists of the participants who stayed with them during the official dates. There was a problem with "no-shows": about 113 people did not come to the IAG without providing any notice; many of these also requested refunds after the deadline even though all participants had clearly been advised that no refunds would be granted beyond a certain date. The organizing committee had some leeway to respond to such requests on an individual basis (for reasons of deaths in the family, missions, etc.) because of agreements with Port Aventura on cancellations in a situation where one of the two main hotels was opened only for the IAG, despite the fact that many of the 100+ no-shows had not paid. Negotiations were difficult to resolve the issue through October 2015 but finally a compromise reached, including paying for the costs of the no-shows for opening and closing ceremonies; this explained why the organizing committee did not immediately respond to requests for refunds so as to be sure that all issues had been

resolved, including avoiding legal processes. Only in January 2016 could the organizing committee be sure of that all expenses and issues had been settled.

Although the balance of funds might permit 100% reimbursement in all cases as the Treasurer's report would show, the committee did not feel that it was justified to do so for people who had not come to the IAG and given no prior notice. Another principal 10 points on lessons learned would be saved for a later agenda item.

IZ thanked LB for the report and efforts to negotiate satisfactory arrangements with the hotels, but he questioned the losses on such items as opening and closing ceremonies in relation to the overall balance.

The 2015 IAG Treasurer, AD, confirmed that the hotel issues had been settled and the last sponsorship funds had been received in Oct 2015. The organizing committee had first paid all the bills to all providers, now it would proceed to reimburse participants and organizations. Unfortunately this took time because the committee had received more than 200 individual requests for reimbursement, including for example those who had registered directly at hotels without the knowledge of focal points who did not realize they had obtained visas. A decision had been taken to reimburse everyone once all bills had been paid so a few more weeks were needed to settle the reimbursement requests. In response to the Chair's question, an estimated US\$50,000 in total had been requested by those who wanted reimbursements. The organizing committee did not consider that they were obligated to do so, but had agreed to repay 100% to those registered participants who had cancelled before the announced deadline and hoped to reimburse 90% for others. With this plan, the 2015 IAG should avoid a deficit, and perhaps realize a surplus.

OC noted the painful process of settling outstanding bills and reimbursement from the 2013 IAG, which had only been completed in November 2013. This was typical of challenges faced by organizers who must wait to know the full financial picture before reimbursing even those who had given notice before the deadlines. He renewed his previous request to the Secretariat to look into the feasibility of insurance to cover the unforeseen costs of IAG cancellations. CS agreed, noted that the 2016 organizing committee had been more strict in applying deadlines, but also that such insurance would not necessarily cover all issues like penalties imposed by providers, special requests from participants and even internal administration interventions (for example the UN Ombudsman) over visa issues in the UNNY case.

LB agreed that deadlines should be respected, but in some cases organizing committees wanted to try and help participants as much as possible where circumstances called for flexibility; but for a few cases, not 100+ cancellations or no-shows. Concerning OC's suggestion, travel insurance only covered medical or family emergencies so would not resolve all of the issues faced by IAG organizers, notably denial of visas. The Secretariat could look into such insurance though.

FG noted some countries and regions visas were often denied and in the context of deadlines to confirm payments before decisions on visas were known. He supported OC's suggestion to examine insurance, but as insurance companies could be reluctant to provide such insurance he requested the Secretariat to examine the possibility of establishing a dedicated IAG fund to which participants would contribute as a means of reimbursing those who had to cancel even after payment deadlines.

SE recalled UNIDO's experience in 2011 whereby the host organizing committee had "miraculously" managed to balance the IAG accounts, but only much later in 2012. Among other means the committee had relied on EU law that required hotels to prove financial loss in order to claim payments

from participants who had cancelled; the contracts with hotels had been checked by the UNIDO legal department. Hotels had threatened arbitration over these cases, but eventually backed down because they did not actually suffer losses. The lesson was that organizing committees should be assisted in the future by those committees and the Secretariat who had experience in these matters.

In response to a question about whether the CC agreed to defer receipt of a written financial statement on the IAG 2015, BR proposed, supported by IZ, that LB should submit a short, but full written report to the CC before the end of the 2016 IAG <sup>2</sup>and provide a full financial statement electronically to all CC members within some weeks. The CC so decided.

### **Item 17: Report of the Treasurer (by IAG Secretariat)**

The Chair agreed with the Secretariat proposal that in the interests of time and the need for the IAG Treasurer to make his report before leaving Malaga, agenda item 17 would be taken up before agenda item 16.

Written copies of the Treasurer's Report, Financial Statement and Secretariat Budget Proposal for 2016 were distributed (Annex 3).

AD summarized the Financial Statement contents, including the starting balance of US\$8,832.68 and revenues from bank interest and IAG 2013 participant's fees maintained in the UNFCU account for a total of US\$7,148. Expenses included web site hosting and IAG 2016 assistance as agreed by the CC in 2015, which consisted of travel for three Secretariat-designated members to conduct a site visit with the UNWTO host organizing committee. The total expenses came to US\$1,145.62. The balance was US\$14,835.87. The auditors had reviewed the Financial Statement.

SE presented the auditors' report. The transactions had been verified against the background material. Traditionally the Financial Statement had been audited and accepted without comments from the CC. As UNIDO representative he requested the CC to authorize the auditors to look at the statement in more detail and make a full report with recommendations to the CC on ways to improve the process that would make it easier for the Secretariat and the CC, for instance by changing the methods of auditing and making suggestions on a better structure. For example there were no Secretariat statutes or financial rules and regulations to guide its work yet and there were considerable reserves on hand. A better framework was desirable to make this exercise more efficient in the future. The auditors could make such a report within a few days and report back to the CC.

As one of the auditors, PJ made three concrete suggestions including reducing transaction fees, which were sometimes huge, for instance by using e-banking, second to reduce exchange rate losses with a second currency account, for instance in Euros, and third to create a petty cash amount for the Treasurer to pay some expenses. SE summarized the auditor's proposals: 1) to change the traditional way of auditing the financial statement from simply noting the recorded transactions by making a proper auditor's report with recommendations and observations; and 2) for the auditors to make a more detailed report to the CC in the course of the year.

The Chair agreed on the auditor's proposals, especially to create a better framework for this work through Secretariat statutes and a baseline for its future work in addition to the existing terms of reference. OC regretted that his suggestion in 2015 to reduce transaction costs (bank charges) by creating a Euro account had not been followed up. The Chair wondered about creating accounts in

---

<sup>2</sup> No such report was provided by the close of the IAG.

two currencies and possible additional fees; OC replied that this was already done in some accounts and eliminated many fees. DB noted that the current UNFCU account was in USD and did not permit a separate Euro account, but was the cheapest. AD reminded that UNFCU was the cheapest for establishing an account, but the most expensive for bank charges. DB supported the proposal for the Secretariat to look into a 2<sup>nd</sup> currency account since in Vienna local banks permitted different currency accounts. AD recalled the decision to establish the account with the UNFCU in part so as to avoid again changing the Secretariat's account if the Secretariat changed in the future as it could easily be based in New York, Nairobi or other main duty stations. IZ noted that UNFCU was the only bank within the UN system to permit an account in the name of the Secretariat without it having a legal identity.

JH suggested a working group to study the auditor's proposals on a new financial structure and framework. After further discussion, on the proposal of the auditors as formulated by SE, the Chair requested a decision and the CC decided: 1) to accept the auditor's report on the current Financial Statement; and 2) the auditors should make a fuller report with their recommendations to the CC for future improvements.

AD presented the Secretariat Budget proposal for 2016 based on last year's proposal. On the proposal of the Chair the CC agreed to defer consideration until after the Secretariat's report had been presented.

#### **Item 16. Report of the Secretariat (by IAG Secretariat)**

JH presented the Secretariat report (Annex 4), summarizing the main contents of the document before the CC. The highlights included: organizing the consultation and the decision concerning Nairobi as a venue; organizing the bids for an alternative venue, won by UNWTO; support to the UNWTO Organizing Committee for the 43<sup>rd</sup> IAG (the most ever engagement by a Secretariat in support of a host committee); consulting the CC and updating rules, now available on the IAG CC website; following up 2014 and 2015 IAG organizing committee financial situations; and responses on eligibility of participants and organizations. The Budget proposal was submitted separately. Secretariat tasks that remained to be completed included finalizing the Secretariat's statutes and a financial framework, making improvements in the credentials process and proposing improvements to future IAGs. The current Secretariat's mandate would conclude in 2017 and elections would be held for a new Secretariat mandate of 4 years. He thanked the Secretariat for all the hard work and complimented the UNWTO Chair and organizing committee for successfully organizing the 43<sup>rd</sup> IAG only since January 2016.

The Chair also reiterated the UNWTO organizing committee's full gratitude to the Secretariat for its assistance to the committee in meeting all challenges; the host committee could not have otherwise organized the 43<sup>rd</sup> IAG.

AD presented the Secretariat Budget proposal. It was based on an estimated 1,000 participants at IAG 2016. The proposal included expenses for bank charges, web site hosting, Secretariat office supplies even if not used to date, IAG supplies, changes in the web site, Secretariat assistance to the IAG 2017 host committee as previously budgeted, possible gifts and a savings fund. The Budget was a proposal for CC consideration.

The Chair and JL proposed coverage beyond just 2016 by modifying the title, for instance "2016-2017" or "from May 2016 to April 2017" as for the Financial Statement. AD noted that the latter proposal would be difficult since we did not know the dates of the next IAG. FG insisted on the need

for a change in the period of coverage because the CC could not agree to approve expenses for 2016 since almost half of the indicated 2016 financial year had already passed, therefore expenses in 2016 were illegal if the budget proposal had not been passed. He also questioned some items, proposing that: line items on IAG supplies and Secretariat office supplies be combined; the line item on a new website be eliminated since it had not ever been used; and the line item on Secretariat assistance to the IAG 2017 host committee be reduced since actual 2016 expenses of US\$900 were much less than US\$4,000 and the expected 2017 assistance to Vienna would also be less. OC also questioned the lack of precision in the budget proposal on Secretariat assistance; better estimates were needed.

LB and JH responded on the rationale for the proposals. The higher amount for 2016 had been calculated when it was assumed that Nairobi would be the venue. Less had been spent on the site visit in 2016, which was essential to our principal goal of ensuring success of the IAG for all participants, because the UNWTO organizing committee had offered hotel costs for the Secretariat delegation. All these costs could be higher in the future. The Secretariat could not be very precise about all expenses given the uncertainties of dates, venue and organization issues. More than one site visit could be needed next year or expenses could be higher than foreseen; they were not fixed in advance. The amount of the Secretariat assistance item needed to be high enough to cover all eventualities so as to avoid the requirement to come back to the CC for approval of an additional amount.

DB wondered why this scrutiny since all expenses would have to be justified anyway. IZ explained that when the Secretariat had been established, it was mandated to present a work programme on which the budget proposals would be based; without a work programme it was difficult to adopt the budget proposal. As Chair, SS nevertheless proposed that AD and JH provide some additional information to be more transparent, perhaps revise the proposal, and for the CC to re-consider the item at its next session. SE commented that the proposals were caps and actual expenses would be audited next year. The Secretariat should nevertheless present a work programme throughout the year as it did when it stood for election and the auditors would go through the programme and compare with the expenses; on this basis he proposed CC approval of the budget proposal now before it. SE's proposal to approve the budget proposal as it stood did not achieve a consensus.

FG noted that the current proposal was not well thought out and there was no need to rush to approve the budget at this session. MWB remarked that Vienna as proposed hosts for IAG 2017 would not know the venue before the end of the current IAG so there would be no greater clarity on proposed costs tomorrow or Saturday.

On the proposal of the Vice-Chair (IZ), replacing the Chair, the CC decided to defer consideration of the Secretariat budget proposal until a later session at which more information could be provided by the Secretariat in response to the questions on a range of budget items.

AD raised questions about cups for Men's Athletics since the failure to show of many MONUSCO and UNHCR participants meant that there were only three men's teams left in the competition. Second, he noted an additional participant from UNESCO Kabul who was not in the registration database. On the first point, DB and AH noted that there were only 3 Men's Volleyball and Swimming teams also and in accordance with the Rules it was up to the host organization to decide on awarding cups when less than 4 teams in the competition. On the second point, DB noted that the participant in question had been added to the database on 11 May.

The meeting adjourned at 8.45 pm.

## **4th Session, Palacio de Deportes, Fri, 13 May, 6.00 pm**

### **Present: (Annex 1 for a complete list)**

IAEA:	Marielle Wynsford-Browne (MWB) Ammar Habjouqa (AH) Imed Zabaar (IZ)
IFAD:	Jill Baskins (JB)
ITU:	Leroy Brown (LB) Mark Woodall (MW)
UNDP Mozambique:	Helena Mutemba (HM)
UNESCO:	Rovani Sigamoney (RS)
UNIDO:	Steven Eales (SE) Eric Appiateng (EA)
UNMISS:	Gina Michel Legros (GML)
UNNY:	Cristina Silva (CS)
UNOG:	Olivier Combe (OC)
UNON:	Francis Gichomo (FG)
UNOV/UNODC:	Daniel Bridi (DB)
UNWTO (and Chair):	Samiti Siv (SS) Peter Janech (PJ)
WMO:	Jalil Housni (JH)

Overall Sports Coordinator: Ravindra Chopra (RC)

IAG Secretariat: Jalil Housni (JH)  
Leroy Brown (LB)  
Daniel Bridi (DB)  
Mark Woodall (MW)

### **Competition update (item not on the agenda)**

The Chair noted issues related to some disciplines. IZ proposed that the Sub-Committee on Appeals should immediately begin to take up these issues. JH noted that one of these issues concerned a physical aggression and dispute in Football, which involved the discipline coordinator who was also a player. OC requested that the individual involved in the alleged aggression should be immediately suspended. Questions were raised about the details, the referees report and whether the team in question should also be sanctioned. The advice of the overall sports coordinator was solicited. The Chair proposed that the views of all concerned should be heard and the Sub-Committee on Appeals should make a full report to the CC. A visit to the football competition site the next day was envisaged. OC also reported that the captain of the team in question was prepared to meet with the Sub-Committee to provide details. RC, the overall sports coordinator, requested that the CC agree to a suspension of the player concerned until the CC made a decision. The CC so agreed.

### **Item 18. Accreditation of CC members (letters presented to the Secretariat – new CC members)**

IZ noted that there were issues with confirming that CC members and focal points were authorized by an IAG organizing committee or other entity such as a staff council or HR dept. to represent organizations and participants at the IAG. This issue was not new and also related to the host organization. The Chair noted the lack of guidelines and criteria for deciding on who legitimately



represented organizations and participants. DB and AH wanted to know who the Secretariat should contact for IAG issues. The related agenda item 22 could eventually help to clarify the situation but this will take time. IZ proposed, seconded by EA, that the Secretariat send a survey to CC members requesting contact details on who appoints them to the CC. LB noted that such a survey was being developed by JH and should be sent out soon. He wondered what to do about members who could not or would not seek to obtain accreditation. The Chair noted that this was an issue of transparency.

### **Item 19. Participation of other organizations in the IAG (criteria and processes)**

LB reported that some organizations, notably OECD, had been authorized to participate in recent years because they worked closely with UN organizations, but now the CC needed to decide if they should be permanently accepted or not as eligible organizations for the IAG. DB recalled that the exceptions had been made for several years for only a few participants without any formal request from the organization to be included. This was not an acceptable way to proceed. Such exceptions should not be allowed. UNESCO should be able to find other means to form its teams.

RS noted that UNESCO had made this request to accept OECD and also ESA participants in UNESCO teams since 2011 because UNESCO had suffered a severe budget and staff reduction and found it difficult to present teams in basketball and volleyball without these other organizations' participants who regularly trained with the UNESCO players and considered themselves part of the UNESCO teams. She raised the question of the OSCE's acceptance as an IAG organization even though it was not a UN-affiliated organization. In response to DB's comments, she noted that UNESCO not only incorporated OECD participants in its basketball team at the 2016 IAG, but also included players from 5 other UN organizations so was being very inclusive in its approach.

EA noted that the IAG was a rule-based organization and as such should not accept these exceptions. The IAG could however amend the rules to allow it. GML agreed that such exceptions should not be allowed, noting that in UNMISS, many contractors were excluded from participation because they did not meet the eligibility criteria. The sports coordinator, RC, also agreed that such exceptions would lead to further problems.

DB responded on the question of the OSCE, which had officially requested to be part of the IAG, had provided indications that it worked closely with the UN and the CC had officially approved its inclusion as an IAG member organization based on the organization's closeness to the UN. The OECD case was not the same; simply because some OECD officials played together with UNESCO teams was not a sufficient reason to agree to its inclusion in the IAG. LB noted that the OSCE had been accepted even though it was not a UN organization and allowed to continue under a sort of "grandfather clause" because already accepted. UNESCO was one of the founding members of the IAG and was the only Paris based organization in the IAG, in comparison to multiple organizations in Vienna and Geneva, so should be allowed an exception in view of the difficulties to present participants in the present conditions, even if such a large organization as OECD should not necessarily be admitted per se to the IAG. IZ agreed with DB on the process by which OSCE had been admitted to the IAG, which had involved a thorough investigation of the OSCE's close relationship to UN organizations in missions like Kosovo. SS supported the idea that the proposed exceptions were not desirable and raised the question of the IOM. LB and JH noted that IOM met the criteria for inclusion by virtue of their membership in the UNJSPF.

IZ requested the Secretariat's advice on the question. DB reminded that this was not a case for the Secretariat's advice since the organization in question, OECD, was not requesting inclusion, rather UNESCO was requesting an exception to the rules on behalf of a few OECD officials.

The Chair and DB proposed that in view of the discussion the CC should decide if OECD participants should be accepted or not on an exceptional basis in the future.

Those voting against the proposed exception to allow OECD participants in future IAGs: 12

Those voting in favour of the proposed exception to allow OECD participants in future IAGs: 4

Abstentions: 1

JH and LB commented that unfortunately in the past some other organizations had been exceptionally admitted to the IAG: OSCE and ICC. WTO had originally been accepted also some years ago, but was considered eligible because it had since concluded an agreement with the UN and now figured in the UN Directory. JH also raised the question of possible future participation by organizations like CERN in Geneva if exceptions were granted. IZ proposed that any organization which did not meet the CC-decided criteria of being a part of the UN Directory or the UNJSPF and which wished to join the IAG should present a formal request to the CC through the Secretariat.

#### **Item 20. IAG General Rule changes (IAG Rule 2 request for amendment by UNON)**

The Chair recalled that UNON (FG) had requested a change in IAG General Rule 2 concerning IAG venues and security in light of the CC decision in September 2015 not to accept the UNON proposal to host the 2016 IAG in Kenya. The Secretariat noted that the letter from UNON with the proposed amendment to the Rules had been sent in advance to the CC.

FG stated that it was a huge disappointment that the IAG was not allowed to take place in Nairobi. The UNON Director-General had asked him to convey a message to the CC that no one had been asked to go to places like Somalia or Goma, DRC, rather to Nairobi, one of the four main UN headquarters worldwide, therefore she was very surprised that CC members had voted against coming to Nairobi. She wanted to thank those who voted in favour and did not let themselves be persuaded by other issues affecting Nairobi. He had no good words to say to the 17 CC representatives who voted against holding the IAG in Nairobi. The UN's core business was to help the less fortunate and it was very surprising that CC representatives would vote not to come to Nairobi whereas more than 2,000 UN staff and their families, as many as 5,000 people, worked, went to school and lived in that city. As many as 1,500 UN staff had been expected to come for the IAG in Nairobi, which was considered a kind of paradise for those who worked and even retired there. After the CC decision, the UNON administration had urged the UNON IAG committee and participants to boycott the IAG this year, initially refusing to provide any subsidies. After discussing the issue with participants, FG concluded that UNON should still participate and not give credence to the kind of attitude shown by the 17 CC representatives who voted against Nairobi. The DG had finally indicated that she wished UNON participants to go to Malaga and for FG to convey her message of disappointment and protest over the CC decision.

FG recalled that if a similar situation occurred in New York the current IAG rules would oblige the CC to refuse the hosting of the IAG in the UN's headquarters city, which was not acceptable. Therefore he proposed the amendment to IAG Rule 2 so as to exempt the four UN Headquarters worldwide in the future.

The Chair noted that this was a delicate situation touching upon security. Many IAG members had to carefully consider this issue as had his organization, UNWTO – security was a number one priority for all UN member organizations. IZ commented that most CC members had been supportive of expanding the cycle of the Games to include Nairobi and New York when the decision was finally taken some years ago. Consultations in IAEA had been extensive over this issue, involving both UNDSS and the internal IAEA security representatives, both of whom said that they would not approve the venue. Therefore the IAEA CC representatives had no choice but to decide against Nairobi since they could not take the risk and assume the liability if something should go wrong.

GML asked the question of what would happen if the security situation was similar in Paris. Would UNMISS participants be told they could not go there? LB replied that the CC would have to obtain a security assessment from UNDSS.

AH raised a point of order: the issue was not the CC's 2015 decision, rather the amendment to the rule proposed by UNON.

EA noted there were good reasons why Nairobi was not accepted and the decision was made in good faith. The UNIDO staff council had extensively debated the issue and taken a decision based on security grounds, not on any ill will towards Nairobi, which was very much appreciated as a UN duty station. The Chair requested that FG convey to his DG that all CC members supported Nairobi as a possible IAG venue, but the decision in 2015 was taken in good conscious by a majority of members on security grounds. IZ suggested that CC members or even the CC itself should consider sending letters of support to the DG of UNON.

The Secretariat (LB and JH) recalled that it had considered the issue and made another proposal for amending Rule 2, which had been sent to all CC members 9 days ago with the draft agenda.

CS wondered if the UNON amendment would apply to New York if there were another major security risk along the lines of 2001. DB noted that the amendment did not oblige the holding of the IAG in a duty station like New York, but that it opened up the possibility for the four duty stations even if there was a high security risk.

The Vice-Chair (IZ), replacing the Chair, proposed first to take up the UNON amendment which was as follows:

"No location for the IAG shall be considered if the UNDSS has designated the country, or any area within that country, a security risk, unless the location is one of the four UN Headquarters worldwide."

Final comments in favour and against were entertained. There were none in favour. AH opposed the amendment as IAG participation was a decision to participate in a sporting event, not an official mission, which might be required as part of a UN staffers' job, therefore such participation could not be justified if a security threat like a terrorist attack would affect UN staff or families; it could destroy the IAG forever. The amendment would not solve the problem since many organizations would not authorize their staff to travel under such conditions.

Those in favour of the proposed amendment: 2

Those opposed to the proposed amendment: 10

Abstentions: 4

The amendment was not adopted.

The Vice-Chair (IZ), replacing the Chair, then proposed to take up the Secretariat amendment. On behalf of the Secretariat JH recalled that UNON had the right to organize the IAG, but in a safe area and for this reason the Secretariat proposed the following amendment:

“No location for the IAG shall be considered if the UNDSS has designated the country, or any area within that country, a security risk, **unless the relevant UNDSS representative affirms in writing to the host organization and the IAG Control Commission through its Secretariat that the security risk in the country is of a level that it would not unreasonably compromise the safety and security of any IAG participant or supporter.**”

The Secretariat felt that the matter should be left in the hands of UNDSS, which could also change its assessment even days before an IAG such that the event might have to be cancelled. The IAG format was different from the security assurances provided for other major organizational events in a duty station such as Nairobi. In response to a question from SE, JH acknowledged that UNDSS had not been consulted on the recommended amendment.

IZ noted that the amendment put forward by the Secretariat turned around the question of the security level. He supported a clarification of Rule 2 on this point. DB supported reliance on the UNDSS assessments, which could be multi-dimensional, for example in the case of Nairobi last year the overall assessment was medium risk whereas the specific terrorist risk was high. MWB supported maintaining the current Rule 2 so as to avoid undue pressures on organizing committees from administrations or political decision-makers to organize or maintain the IAG despite high security risks.

The Chair proposed a vote on the Secretariat amendment. Several members questioned the need to vote since the Secretariat was merely making a recommendation that would be confusing the issue in the absence of information from UNDSS that it would even be applied.

FG objected to this discussion. He had decided to participate in 2016 because he felt that his presence would be in the spirit of sportsmanship, but he now questioned the support of others to this ideal. The Chair reiterated that the issue was clearly security and not a negative view of Kenya as a possible venue. OC and IZ reminded the CC that the IAG scheduled to be held in Tunisia had been cancelled in 2003 by decision of the IAEA staff council because of the security situation in neighbouring Algeria. CS commented that one of the duty stations scheduled to organize the IAG after 2017, for instance Paris in 2018 or Geneva in 2019, might agree to switch their dates and permit Nairobi to host the IAG sooner than 2022, as UNNY and UNOG had done in 2013 and 2014.

The Chair suggested that the Secretariat proposal to amend Rule 2 was generally not accepted and the discussion should be concluded; the CC did not object.

## **Item 21. Cycle of the Games**

- a. IAG 2016 Nairobi (IAG Rule 2 and Sept 2015 CC consultation: Nairobi could not host. UNWTO, Madrid won the bid to host instead)**
- b. IAG 2017 Vienna**
- c. IAG 2018 Paris**
- d. IAG 2019 Geneva**

- e. **IAG 2020 New York**
- f. **IAG 2021 Rome**
- g. **IAG 2022 Nairobi**
- h. **IAG 2023 Vienna**

JH noted that the item was an opportunity to have advance information from the designated duty stations on preparations for future IAG and for the CC to know if a duty station would not be able to organize the IAG in the designated year.

IZ outlined the IAEA's intention to host the 2017 IAG in celebration of the organization's 50th anniversary. The Staff Council was keen to do this. No venue had been selected yet, but several were under consideration. They hoped to learn from the experiences of the 2016 and other recent IAGs and make further improvements for 2017.

RS confirmed that UNESCO intended to organize the 2018 IAG. They were considering France, Portugal and Brazil as possible venues. UNESCO had a very large office in Brasilia and they had already begun to look at facilities and logistics, including the implications for organizing the IAG outside of Europe.

## **Item 22. Making the IAG an official event – draft resolution to the General Assembly**

DB provided context for the agenda item. It had not arisen as a result of any Secretariat initiative though the Secretariat was apprised of the initiative; for this reason, the CC was not informed at the time. In 2015, DB represented the UNODC Staff Council at the Coordinating Committee for International Staff Unions and Associations (CCISUA) General Assembly (GA) in Bangkok at which some delegates spontaneously raised the question of why the IAG was not an official UN event. A resolution was then prepared for consideration by CCISUA and its eventual submission to the UNGA in an attempt to get the executive heads of UN organizations to recognise the IAG as an official event and provide protocol support. As the Federation of International Civil Servant Associations (FICSA) President was present at the CCISUA GA, it was suggested to submit the resolution to FICSA for its endorsement, thereby providing a stronger base of support before the UNGA. This has not yet occurred, but he proposed that the CC discuss this initiative. There were certain advantages to the resolution if adopted by the GA: visa support from organization visa units could be enhanced; administration support could be obtained since an official event, especially for host organizations; tax waivers on goods and services could be secured, an advantage that CS and the UNNY committee would certainly endorse; laissez-passers would be recognized since IAG would be considered official travel – now laissez-passers were sometimes recognized for entry into Spain for example, but not systematically since the IAG was not an official event; and it would facilitate recognition and the registration work of focal points.

The Chair noted that the Secretariat had raised the issue of whether such a resolution would apply to the specialized agencies, which were autonomous in decisions of this kind. DB acknowledged this to be the case, but a UN decision would be a start and cover a large body of UN family organizations.

OC wondered how such an initiative had been prepared without the knowledge of the Control Commission Members, and if the IAG as a collection of volunteers dedicated to organizing a voluntary event would be well served by such a resolution. Having worked at the Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) for a year, he was concerned that such a resolution would undermine the present agreement by organizations to give staff some days leave with pay in the present climate

of cuts to many UN functions. Moreover, it was not clear that involving administrations through such an approach would benefit the IAG – it would complicate staff requests to obtain internal administrative approval for such an official mission in such matters as travel and DSA. The administrations could also impose on the IAG members their desires concerning organization. For these reasons, he requested a thorough study of all the pros and cons of such a resolution before the CC endorsed it. AH also objected to involving the administrations in IAG matters as this would undermine the flexibility and commitment that had enabled the IAG to survive and achieve excellence for 43 years.

There were requests to distribute the draft resolution. DB noted he had requested that CCISUA put this resolution on hold until the CC could discuss it. IZ remarked that for the moment only one staff council federation – CCISUA – supported this and the concerns expressed by CC members should be considered. EA supported the proposal that FICSA and the Federation of United Nations Staff Associations (FUNSA) should be associated with the resolution before it was submitted to the UNGA. When the three federations had agreed, the CC should establish a working group to recommend a position for the CC.

Based on the discussion the Chair concluded that more study was needed. IZ suggested that DB take the concerns expressed by the CC to CCISUA for its consideration. DB noted CCISUA was prepared to wait for the CC's views before submitting the resolution to the UNGA. SE proposed that the CC actively engage with the three union federations on the issue at the level of the CC itself. The current and future Chairs of the CC should take the lead on this. The CC so agreed.

#### **Item 14. Review of the 2014 IAG Financial Situation & Reimbursements (continued)**

DB reported that members of the Secretariat (DB, JH and LB) had met with CS, Chair of the UNNY 2014 IAG Organizing Committee and Mark Anthony, member of the committee, to discuss solutions to the 2014 IAG debt situation as decided by the CC. In the meeting it was agreed that the UNNY Organizing Committee would share documentation with the Secretariat, including for example contracts the committee had entered into. Based on this documentation, the Secretariat would make a recommendation to the CC to decide on support measures to help the UNNY committee reduce its debt. LB and DB added that there was agreement for the Secretariat to make a concrete proposal to the CC on measures on the basis of determining from the shared documents and certifying that the documentation was clear and the UNNY committee had done all it could to resolve the debt problem at this time. The CC would need to decide what measures could or could not be taken to assist. These measures did not have to be decided right now.

The Chair proposed that the CC agree to entrust the Secretariat to examine the documentation and make the certification to the CC so that it could then decide on the concrete measures to help UNNY. The CC so decided.

#### **Item 24. Report of the Sub-Committee on Appeals**

In the case of the football dispute IZ proposed that if the Sub-committee determined that the individual alleged to have aggressed another participant had actually done this in violation of IAG norms, the CC should authorize the Sub-committee to immediately apply sanctions on behalf of the CC, namely that the individual would be barred from further participation in the current Games and could possibly be barred from future IAG participation as set out in the Secretariat's 2011 guidelines, "Penalties for breach of agreed norms", available on the Control Commission website. The CC would

need to decide if sanctions should also be applied to the concerned team and whether the results of this team could be applied to determine the discipline outcomes.

AH wanted clarification that although the individual could be suspended immediately, the concerned team could be allowed to continue in the competition pending a CC decision on the team. OC wanted clarification if the ban on the individual concerned covered all IAG events or just the competition. DB considered that the ban only concerned the discipline competition though the Secretariat guidelines were not clear. PJ noted that a ban on the individual concerned would mean forfeit of the team, which would no longer have enough players to compete. A discussion ensued on whether the team in question could co-opt any other participant to complete its roster but PJ insisted that the team in question (UNWTO) would not agree to this.

SE and MWB were concerned that the CC did not have all the facts and the Sub-committee should not be given a blank check mandate to make a decision on its behalf. At best the individual should be suspended, but the team should not be sanctioned.

On the proposal of the overall sports coordinator, RC, the Chair concluded that no action should be taken until the Sub-committee on Appeals had made its report.

#### **Item 6. Report on the list of participants and Report of the Sub-committee on verification (continued)**

RC raised the question of how to verify participants and teams in view of the need to confirm the cup winners at the last CC session on Sat. Although discipline coordinators had been requested to confirm team composition so as to compare with the HR lists and the report of the Verification Sub-committee, not all had done so. IZ stated that the CC would confirm the team results once it had the report of the Sub-committee on Verification. Verification had not yet been finalized.

The Chair concluded that the matter would be decided at the 5th session tomorrow.

The meeting adjourned at 9 pm.

### **5th Session, Palacio de Deportes, Sat, 14 May, 2.00 pm**

#### **Present: (Annex 1 for a complete list)**

IAEA:	Marielle Wynsford-Browne (MWB) Ammar Habjouqa (AH)
Vice-Chair:	Imed Zabaar (IZ)
IFAD:	Jill Baskins (JB)
ILO:	Bill Ratteree (BR)
ITU:	Mark Woodall (MW)
UNDP Mozambique:	Helen Mutemba (HM)
UNESCO:	Rovani Sigamoney (RS) Noé Nougbo (NN)
UNIDO:	Steven Eales (SE) Erick Appiateng (EA)
UNNY:	Cristina Silva (CS)
UNOG:	Olivier Combe (OC)
UNOV/UNODC:	Daniel Bridi (DB)
UNWTO (and Chair):	Samiti Siv (SS)

WMO: Peter Janech (PJ)  
Jalil Housni (JH)

Overall Sports Coordinator: Ravindra Chopra (RC)

IAG Secretariat: Jalil Housni (JH)  
Bill Ratteree (BR)  
Daniel Bridi (DB)  
Mark Woodall (MW)

**Item 23. Suggested improvements for future games and actions by members and the Secretariat (IAG Secretariat – instructions or guidelines on how to organize the IAG).**

The Secretariat noted this item was designed to allow CC members to comment on any aspect of the current IAG with an idea to learn from successes and mistakes so as to improve future Games.

DB requested that in the future all participants in a discipline be lodged in the same hotel, as well as placing the organizers and CC members in the same hotel, preferably where the CC meetings would also be held, rather than the wide-spread dispersion of participants and organizers that occurred in this IAG.

The Chair noted that this point and others should be consolidated in a comprehensive set of guidelines prepared by the Secretariat in the future, rather than have bits and pieces of information communicated to the host organizing committee at different points of the preparatory phase. JH noted that much information on how host organizing committees prepared for and organized the IAG was not systematically shared even though this was done on an ad hoc basis between host committee chairs in recent years. CS noted that guidelines needed to be updated and shared but this was different from sharing contracts. The decision to allow a choice of hotels for the first time in 2016 had complicated the grouping of CC members in one hotel.

IZ reminded that the details set out in IAG General Rule 12 applied to all host organizations. These should be further elaborated in a set of guidelines drawing on the comments made by the CC. The Secretariat had to ensure that lessons learned were recorded and the institutional memory preserved for use by the CC, for example by putting all the decisions of the CC in chronological order on the website. DB noted that minutes were already there, but agreed this part of the website needed to be improved.

BR noted that the Secretariat had not prepared a full set of guidelines as requested by the CC in 2015. The checklist of what was to be done and when was not sufficient to cover such matters as placing all CC members in one hotel with meeting facilities, organizing disciplines according to rules and needs of the discipline, etc. A clear decision was needed from the CC that the Secretariat should draw up these guidelines as a matter of priority and to share them with future organizing committees. The CC needed to indicate the main points to be elaborated in such guidelines in the main areas of concern to the IAG – venue, costs, hotels, transportation and sports facilities – faced by all organizing committees. The Chair requested to defer such suggestions to an electronic consultation. No decision was taken on the Secretariat establishing guidelines as a priority work item.

JH recalled that the CC had agreed in the past that the host organizing committee may carry out a survey of all participants to know their views on the IAG's organization. This had not been done in recent years, but perhaps the Secretariat could carry out such a survey? AH remarked that this



question had been discussed last year. He noted the need for a simple set of questions drawing on successful experiences of private enterprises if such a survey were carried out.

RC recommended that future organizing committees should base their decisions on sports facilities on the discipline coordinators checklists shared in advance, bearing in mind of course the overall costs.

EA suggested for consideration an independent evaluation of the IAG organization by the discipline captains in the future.

IZ stated that three years ago it was agreed that the Secretariat would verify the HR-certified lists of participants in advance. He noted that some years ago the Secretariat had verified 85% of participants in advance and insisted on this becoming again a matter for the Secretariat to take up as part of its work in advance of each IAG.

#### **Item 24. Report of the Sub-Committee on Appeals (continued)**

JH reported that members of the Sub-committee (JH and CS) had interviewed the UNNY participant playing with the UNOG team involved in the football dispute and his captain. He outlined the details of the incident as reported by the referee and players which involved physical contact, alleged spitting and verbal insults and exchanges with the player from the UNWTO team (who was also injured). There was no evidence from others of deliberate aggression by the UNNY participant or spitting by the UNWTO participant. The Sub-committee had agreed to allow the UNNY participant to play one match after his one match suspension. DB noted that the views of the other participant from UNWTO were rather vague and he doubted the allegation of a punch from the UNNY participant. CS and JH expressed some reservations about the UNWTO participant who also was the discipline coordinator and was reported to have been arrogant in his scheduling of the competition, with complaints expressed about this by other football captains. Further consideration of the dispute was deferred until the UNWTO player could be heard by the Sub-committee, which would then present its final report and recommendations to the CC.

At the end of the session, DB reported on the interview with the UNWTO player who stated that the UNNY player punched and kneed him while on the ground, probably causing his injury, whereas he denied spitting on the UNNY player. In response to questions, the Sub-committee reported further that there were no sanctions applied by the match referee. Informed that the UNNY player felt remorse and wanted to apologize for his actions in person, the UNWTO player indicated that he would accept an apology and was willing to meet with the UNNY player for this purpose. Considering that there were probably truths on both sides, the Sub-committee recommended that the 2 players meet at the closing ceremony for purposes of the apology from the UNNY player, which hopefully would settle matters. However, a complaint had been filed by the UNWTO player with the police, who were seeking to question the UNNY player about the incident, with possible consequences of a fine and interdiction to leave the country in the short term. Following discussion on the Sub-committee report, the CC decided that the UNNY player should apologize while SS would request the UNWTO player to withdraw his complaint.

#### **Item 25. Report of the Sub-Committee on Rules of Procedures (written report of the Sub-Committee from the 42<sup>nd</sup> IAG).**

As there was no report, the item was not considered.

## **Item 26. Review and announcement of final results of the 2016 IAG**

As the overall sports coordinator, RC announced the results by discipline in alphabetical order (Annex 5). In addition, an individual medal was awarded to M. Davainis (IAEA), winner of the Chess Blitz competition.

RC informed the CC that in the Cricket competition, whereas 8 players had been expected to form 4 teams in accordance with the CC's decision to exceptionally waive the rules on team composition in 2016, only 5 UN players participated. In order to form 3 teams for the competition, 1 local player had been co-opted to play with no UN status by a decision of the discipline coordinator, in violation of the IAG rules and without informing the CC. He noted that this resulted in part from the lack of coordination between the team lists and the verified list of eligible participants, an issue he had raised at the 4<sup>th</sup> Session. There were unconfirmed reports that non-eligible players had also participated in Cricket in 2015. IZ recalled that discipline coordinators did not have the authority to deviate from the rules; only the CC could make such exceptions, for example in cases of injuries that left a team without enough players. The Cricket situation was unacceptable.

BR recalled the special efforts made by the Secretariat and the CC to exceptionally allow Cricket to continue as a medal discipline in 2016 despite the reduced number of participants due to the short organizational deadlines and visa issues. In spite of these efforts, Cricket had violated the IAG rules and he moved, seconded by AH, for the CC to decide not to award medals in Cricket in 2016 in view of the few players and the discipline's violation of the rules. The CC so decided by consensus.<sup>3</sup>

BR further moved that in view of this violation of the rules and the clear indication that there were not enough eligible participants to form a meaningful competition, the Secretariat should be authorized to review the status of Cricket and possibly recommend that the CC take a decision to discontinue Cricket as a medal discipline in favour of other disciplines such as Beach Volleyball, which had proved popular this year. Disciplines had been periodically removed and added in the past, so there was precedence for such a decision by the CC, which would not prevent a host organizing committee to propose Cricket as a non-medal discipline (or demonstration event) in the future. RC noted that in 2015 there had been a similar decline in the number of Cricket participants just prior to the Games; moreover finding a discipline coordinator and organizing a venue had become increasingly difficult.

DB considered that such a decision could not be taken in advance since next year more interest might be expressed, rather, he proposed that the host organizing committee take such a decision based on registration of participants for the discipline at some point prior to the start of the 2017 IAG. The issue should be resolved through better registration database management and as a function of registration interest. IZ added that IAEA would attempt to approach all focal points prior to IAG 2017 to determine interest in proposed disciplines. The CC decided by consensus to adopt DB's proposal.

---

<sup>3</sup> Following the close of the CC session, the CC's decision not to award trophies in Cricket was overturned by a decision taken by the members of the Sub-committee on Appeals at the request of UNMISS CC representatives. The sub-committee decided that 1st and 2nd place awards would be given to the teams finishing 1st and 3rd in the competition, and the team finishing 2nd in the competition would be disqualified because it played a non-UN player in violation of the IAG rules. Some members of the CC were informed on an individual and informal basis of this decision by the CC's sub-committee during the closing ceremony.

RC and AH recorded the excellent organization and spirit in Swimming. The CC had a discussion about certain names proposed for the teams in Men's and Women's Swimming and as proposed by DB, the agencies composing the teams would be recorded.

RC raised a question about the validity of results and awarding trophies in Women's Volleyball since only 2 teams competed; the CC should be consistent with its decision in Cricket. As sports coordinator he had been informed only after the competition had begun that the 3rd team "failed to show". BR also recalled the special efforts and exceptions granted in the case of Women's Volleyball because of registration deadlines and visa issues. As there was no violation of the rules and in view of the traditionally strong participation in the discipline, the CC should decide to award trophies to the two competing teams. The CC representative to the discipline confirmed that there had been no violation of the rules in Women's Volleyball as there had been in Cricket. The CC decided to award trophies to the 2 Women's Volleyball teams.

#### **Item 6. Report on the list of participants and Report of the Sub-committee on verification (continued)**

IZ noted that 73 participants in many disciplines and from many organizations had not been verified. He wondered if the CC would continue to request HR-certified lists while turning a blind eye to actually applying the rules, which required supplying the lists in advance and the originals to the CC, not on the last day. MW added that on the original lists presented for verification, excluding copies or digital versions, only 640 participants could be verified.

BR noted that the focal points had been requested to supply digital versions of the HR lists in advance and reminded that originals were to be presented in Malaga, but clearly this procedure was not sufficient to obtain lists for all organizations. Moreover, the multiplication of focal points and registrars who registered participants at country or regional duty station level without reference to headquarters organizations made it difficult to cross-check by organization HR lists. New focal points and registrars were progressively being admitted. There was no coherence in the current system. Amendments to the IAG rules and/or mandating the Secretariat to develop better operating procedures were required so as to obtain the HR lists well in advance of the official IAG dates. CS wanted to know if there were ways to centralize the procedure and align with HR management practices to avoid focal points registering participants without headquarters knowledge. DB stated that the registration database was not set up to do this. AH recommended that some procedure be adopted that made it clear that the registrars could not confirm participants' registration unless they guaranteed an HR-certified list.

On the immediate issue of what to do about the unverified participants, AH suggested that in the interests of time the compromise adopted last year could again apply and action would be taken against non-verified participants and their teams only in the case of medallists. DB pointed out the difficulties at this point with checking the unverified participants against teams, medallists or not.

IZ proposed that the minutes should record the 73 non-verified participants by names, disciplines and organizations.<sup>4</sup> MWB proposed that the focal points/registrars concerned be informed of the names on the list. SS insisted on recording the names in the minutes plus warning the focal points/registrars of future sanctions, including exclusion from the Games, so as to establish more credibility. One of the

---

<sup>4</sup> The list of names was subsequently revised after receipt of HR-certified lists or attestations/contracts of employment concerning many of the individuals and their organizations as noted above, footnote 1. The revised list of those still not verified as eligible to participate in IAG 2016 is being sent separately to the CC

issues was the lack of responsibility of the focal points themselves. IZ insisted on targeting action at the focal points; individual participants sometimes did not even know that they were not on a list. HM insisted that both individuals and focal points be informed since the individuals would then be pressured to ask the focal points why their names were not on the list.

EA reiterated his proposal that the Secretariat develop a better procedure and report back to the CC; the issue could not be solved today. IZ gave assurances that the 2017 organizing committee would work closely with the Secretariat to make sure that the procedure would be improved next year.

#### **Item 16. Report of the Secretariat (by IAG Secretariat) - IAG Secretariat Budget (continued)**

OC requested further clarifications on line items related to IAG Secretariat assistance (US\$4,000 for travel) and changes in the website; if there were no concrete proposals to make changes, the line item should be eliminated. BR recalled the reasons for higher line items on travel and Secretariat assistance related to the expected 2016 venue in Nairobi. Finally, 3 Secretariat designated persons had undertaken the one site visit to Malaga, resulting in the much lower expenses reported in the Financial Statement. Since IAEA had confirmed its intention to organize IAG 2017 there might not even be a need for a Secretariat site visit and/or the expenses even less. On behalf of the Secretariat he agreed that the line item could safely be reduced to US\$2,000. MW reminded the CC that this was still only a budget proposal and did not imply actual expenses. IZ disagreed with a cut in the proposal since it would reduce the Secretariat's flexibility. In any case the actual expenses would be audited and it was better to maintain the Secretariat's capacity to respond to the organizing committee's needs. After a further discussion about why it was necessary to have the higher figure, OC reiterated that he did not find it necessary, especially since there were no financial rules to guide Secretariat actions. The suggestion to cut the line item to US\$2,000 was not agreed by the CC.

Concerning the line item on a new website, BR indicated that only DB could respond. OC agreed to withdraw the request to cut this line item.

As a result, the Secretariat Budget proposal was adopted as presented by the Treasurer.

#### **Item 27. Any other Business**

##### *a. Special leave for IAG – update of the 2005 UN memo*

IZ noted that because of the diverse procedures and decisions of those responsible for IAG matters in UN organizations and specialized agencies, it would not be possible to develop a coherent policy for all. BR recalled that the item concerned the UN's 2005 memorandum, which applied to UN organizations, even if it did not make the IAG an official event – the question was whether something could and should be done to enhance the policies at least for the UN organizations and dependencies. OC considered that the existing letter, not a memo, could in fact be helpful as a model for all organizations, even specialized agencies, based on the experience in communicating the letter to other organizations; once HR departments had become aware of the letter, some had changed their leave policies. It was not realistic to expect the Chief Executive Board (CEB) to take action, but he volunteered to look into an update with UN management through the High level Committee on Management (HLCM) and report to the Secretariat. EA and IZ supported this initiative especially in the context of the possibility discussed earlier of staff federations submitting a resolution to the UNGA.

*b. Sanctions against registered participants but only tourists*

As a result of discussions on verification, CC members wished to discuss the issue of registered participants who did not actually participate in a discipline. JH, MWB and other members noted that in several disciplines such as Darts, Football and Petanque, some teams had failed to show because the participants simply engaged in tourism rather than participating in the disciplines for which they registered. Sometimes participants might turn up on the first day of competition then disappear thereafter. BR recalled that this was a recurrent item of discussion by the CC and went beyond the issue of HR verification, since many of these “non-participants” were duly registered and certified. Establishing a “black list” of such non-participants had been suggested in the past but not implemented.

IZ proposed that discipline coordinators be asked to furnish the list of those registered to participate, but failed to show for the discipline and communicate these names to the HR departments of their organizations. BR noted difficulties with coherent checks between registrars and discipline coordinators.

SE outlined his internal checks to verify participants with discipline captains of UNIDO. This underlined the need for clear terms of reference for focal points. MW cautioned about suggesting registrars did not do their work. BR insisted, and further supported by SS, that while most registrars were serious about what they did, some were clearly not, citing as an example abuses by Afghanistan participants registered by UNAMA focal points, who did not take their role seriously in view of the large number of people who tried to register and the known cases of Afghanistan participants who failed to show for competitions. MWB confirmed cases of UNAMA participants not showing for darts competitions. The Chair concluded that many new focal points did not understand what the role implied and proposed, seconded by SE, the establishment of clear terms of reference for focal points/registrars. SE further proposed that the CC decide that focal points/registrars be advised that if they did not adhere to these guidelines, they would be denied registrar status and access to the database. The CC so decided.

*c. Tennis competition*

The Chair wished to discuss the situation of the tennis competition. He raised questions about the tennis competition organized differently in a round robin format by captains on their own following actions by the original discipline coordinator, LB, who had resigned prior to the beginning of the Games. This schedule of play differentiated from the one produced before the IAG began by the local coordinator in the absence of the external coordinator and taking account of other events happening at the venue. Although LB had reported that the captains agreed to the revised format, apparently not all captains had so agreed. The revised format required more courts and logistical arrangements and extra transport had been requested. Despite indications from the host organizing committee that such changes had cost implications, the tennis captains had persisted in their changes, essentially organizing their own tournament outside the framework of the IAG. As Chair of the host organizing committee, he considered that these actions were not in good faith and unsportsmanlike. He proposed that the CC decide that Tennis should not be given medals in 2016.

RC reported that LB as Chair of the 2015 IAG host organizing committee as well as discipline coordinator had submitted tennis requirements in advance of the 2016 IAG in accordance with past practice. The host organization had indicated its constraints to meet all of the requirements, the existing rules did not require such and it was clear that host organizations could not always provide all

of the facilities desired by coordinators. LB had insisted on meeting these requirements otherwise he could not organize the competition, and subsequently resigned as discipline coordinator. In light of these facts, RC agreed that the approach adopted by the tennis captains was not appropriate.

BR sympathized with the feelings of the host organizing committee Chair but proposed that instead of not giving medals in Tennis, the CC should agree that if there were any additional costs incurred by the renting of extra courts or additional transport, the tennis captains should collectively assume all these costs. SS confirmed that the host organizing committee had decided not to cover any of these costs, but he requested CC action regarding the tennis captain's organization of the competition different from the schedule of play agreed in advance as provided by the host organizing committee. IZ recalled that the CC's representative to the discipline captain's meetings had been reminded to bring back any requested changes signed by all the captains for decision by the CC. SS replied that such a request had been submitted at some point. MW asked if all teams in Tennis had been involved in the revised format and considering that these issues were known in advance, the proposal not to award trophies was excessive. SS noted that the host organizing committee had not been kept in the loop on these changes. He was also upset with unjustified complaints made by the tennis captains against the event organizer partner.

OC also sympathized with the host organizing committee Chair's views; it was not the first time that such issues had occurred in Tennis. He proposed that the minutes record this exchange of views and that a letter should be sent to all Tennis captains that their actions were not appropriate. The CC so agreed, mandating the Chair of the Secretariat to send the letter. On behalf of the Secretariat, BR added that in the event of any internal disagreements within the Secretariat over the CC decision, the matter would be referred to the Chair of the host organizing committee for his appropriate action.

MWB further added that it was very irresponsible for a member of the Secretariat to have acted in such a way; he was in effect taking advantage of his position in the Secretariat, and the Secretariat should take this up as an internal matter.

*d. Registration database and participants*

OC wished to take up the registration database in relation to the HR-certified lists. He noted that in the case of UNOG, the responsible HR unit had refused to use the IAG form because a different logo was on the form, hence another list had to be produced. RC raised the concern of standard policy on database access policy, to be provided (or denied) uniformly to all sports coordinators irrespective of duty station, barring some exceptional cases. BR clarified that access had been shared at the request of some discipline coordinators, but with no intention to create confusion; however the procedures should be reviewed. MW insisted that access to sensitive personal information of participants should be restricted including for an event organizer. It was agreed that the Secretariat should review procedures on database access, working to address these issues with IZ as the expected Chair of the 2017 IAG.

CS made a special request to the Chair to issue attestations for all UNNY participants that they had participated in the 2016 IAG in Malaga to satisfy UNNY HR management practices. The Chair indicated that he would look into this matter (and subsequently issued nominal attestations via CS for all UNNY participants).

In closing the last session, the Chair noted the important discussions that had taken place over several days in the CC meetings and thanked all those who attended the sessions for their contributions. JH also thanked the Chair for his participation in all meetings and wished Vienna success in organizing

the 2017 IAG. OC equally thanked the Chair and UNWTO organizing committee for hosting these Games to the best of their ability and for doing so very well; not everything was perfect but this was normal.

The meeting adjourned at 4.30 pm.

## **Annex 1. Control Commission, IAG secretariat, and UNWTO Organizing Committee members present at CC meetings**

### **Control Commission**

IAEA:	Marielle Wynsford-Browne (MWB) Ammar Habjouqa (AH)
Vice-Chair:	Imed Zabaar (IZ)
ICAO:	Barbara Strike (BS)
ICC/ICTY/OPCW:	Jones Lukose Ongalo (JLO)
IFAD:	Jill Baskins (JB)
ILO:	Bill Ratteree (BR)
ITU:	Leroy Brown (LB) Mark Woodall (MW)
MONUSCO:	Paul Ketner (PK)
UNDP Mozambique:	Helena Mutemba (HM)
UNESCO:	Rovani Sigamoney (RS) Noé Nougbodé (NN)
UNFCCC:	Thomas Trimborn (TT)
UNHCR:	Peggy Brown (PB)
UNIDO:	Steven Eales (SE) Eric Appiateng (EA)
UNMISS:	Gina Michel Legros (GML) Ghulam Khan (GK) Derrick Culbreath (DC) – Observer
UNNY:	Cristina Silva (CS)
UNOG:	Olivier Combe (OC)
UNON:	Francis Gichomo (FG)
UNOV/UNODC:	Daniel Bridi (DB)
UNWTO (and Chair):	Samiti Siv (SS) Peter Janech (PJ)
WHO:	Arnaud Devilliers (AD)
WMO:	Jalil Housni (JH)

### **Overall Sports Coordinator**

Ravindra Chopra (RC)

### **IAG Secretariat**

President:	Jalil Housni (JH)
Vice-President:	Leroy Brown (LB)
Treasurer:	Arnaud Devilliers (AD)
Secretary:	Bill Ratteree (BR)
Ex officio/Technical Adviser:	Daniel Bridi (DB)
Ex officio/Assistant Secretary:	Mark Woodhall (MW)



## **Annex 2. Revised Agenda of the Control Commission**

**Venue: Palacio de Deportes José María Martín Carpena, Sala de Prensa (Press Room)**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Session: Wednesday, 11 May at 14:30**

1. Opening the Session - President of IAG Secretariat
2. Election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chair of the Control Commission of the 43<sup>rd</sup> IAG
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Welcome address - Chairperson of the UNWTO Organising Committee
5. Approval minutes of the 2015 IAG (42<sup>nd</sup> Edition) in Salou, Tarragona, SPAIN
6. Report on the list of participants by the IAG Secretariat/UNWTO Organising Committee (certified lists presented) followed by CC members to appoint as sub-committee for verification
6. Election of the Sub-Committee for Appeals
7. Election of the Auditors for IAG Secretariat Financial Statement
8. Organization of the 43<sup>rd</sup> Games – administrative matters and disciplines (Organizing Committee)
9. Participation of other organizations/individuals in the 43<sup>rd</sup> IAG (report by IAG Secretariat)
10. CC members selected to attend Captains' meetings (Immediately following the CC's 1<sup>st</sup> Session, the Captains' meetings will be held at the Palacio de Deportes José María Martín Carpena on Wednesday, 11 May at 16:30)
11. Control of identity for all discipline participants - discipline coordinators and/or CC members

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Session: Wednesday, 11 May at 18.00**

12. Report back on the results of the Captains' meetings by CC members (item 11), including discipline rule changes if any, followed by the Opening Ceremony at 19:00.

### **3<sup>rd</sup> Session: Thursday, 12 May at 18.30**

14. Review of the 2014 IAG Financial Situation & Reimbursements
15. Review of the 2015 IAG Financial Statement and Report (by ITU/Geneva Organizing Committee Chair/Treasurer) and reimbursements requested by participants
16. Report of the Treasurer (by IAG Secretariat)
17. Report of the Secretariat (by IAG Secretariat)
18. Accreditation of CC members (letters presented to the Secretariat - new CC members)
19. Participation of other organizations in the IAG (criteria and processes)

### **4<sup>th</sup> Session: Friday, 13 May at 18.00**

20. IAG General Rule changes (IAG Rule 2 request for amendment by UNON)
21. Cycle of the Games
  - a. IAG 2016 Nairobi (*IAG Rule 2 and Sept 2015 CC consultation: Nairobi could not host. UNWTO, Madrid won the bid to host instead*)
  - b. IAG 2017 Vienna
  - c. IAG 2018 Paris
  - d. IAG 2019 Geneva
  - e. IAG 2020 New York

- f. IAG 2021 Rome
- g. IAG 2022 Nairobi
- h. IAG 2023 Vienna

- 22. Making the IAG an official event – draft resolution to the General Assembly
- 23. Suggested improvements for future games and actions by members and the Secretariat (IAG Secretariat - instructions or guidelines on how to organize the IAG)

**5<sup>th</sup> Session: Saturday, 14 May, at 14:00**

- 24. Report of the Sub-Committee for Appeals
- 25. Report of the Sub-Committee on Rules of Procedures (written report of the Sub-Committee from the 42nd IAG)
- 26. Review and announcement of final results of the 2016 IAG
- 27. Any other Business
  - a. Special leave for IAG – update of UN 2005 memo
  - b. Sanctions against registered participants but only tourists
  - c. Tennis competition
  - d. Registration database and participants

## Annex 3. IAG Secretariat Financial Report

### 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:

<b>OUTSTANDING REVENUES</b>	
1. IAG 2014 Loan Repayment	5,000.00
2. IAG 2014 Participant's Fees (948 participants)	9,480.00
3. IAG 2015 Participant's Fees (~1300 participants)	13,000.00
<b>OUTSTANDING EXPENSES</b>	
1. IAG 2016 Assistance (Sports Coordinators Allotment)	
<b>Reconciled Balance (US \$)</b>	<b>42,315.87</b>

#### **Financial Statement**

For the period from May 1st, 2015 to April 30, 2016  
(Currency: US\$)

Starting Balance as of May 1st, 2015	8,832.68
<b>REVENUES</b>	
1. Bank Interest	30.81
2. IAG 2013 Participant's Fees [6,473.50 €]	7,118.00
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>7,148.81</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>	
1. Web Site Hosting [179.53 (165.77 EUR) + 35.00 (Wire Fee)]	214.53
2. IAG 2016 Assistance (Visit to Malaga) [286.36 (247.18 € Daniel Bridi) + 256.51 (228.86 CHF Leroy Brown) + 283.22 (254.15 CHF Ravindra Chopra) + 3 * 35.00 (Wire Fee)]	931.09
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>1 145.62</b>
<b>Ending Balance as of April 30, 2016</b>	<b>14,835.87</b>

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

- Peggy BROWN, UNHCR (Signed)

- Steven EALES, UNIDO (Signed)

- Peter JANECH, UNWTO (Signed)

*Date: 12 May 2016*

## **Budget Proposal for 2016**

(Currency: USD)

### **ESTIMATED REVENUES**

Item	Description	Amount
1	IAG 2016 Participant's Fees (based on 1,000 participants)	10,000.00

**Total Revenues**

**USD 10,000.00**

### **ESTIMATED EXPENSES**

Item	Description	Amount
1	Bank Charges	50.00
2	Web Site Hosting, Domain Name Registration and Software Charges	250.00
3	Secretariat Office Supplies (letters, stamps, ...)	300.00
4	IAG Supplies (flags, ...)	400.00
5	New IAG Web Site (consulting, development, software)	2,000.00
6	IAG 2017 Secretariat Assistance (visits from IAG Secretariat members to IAG 2017 Organizing Committee: travel, transport, accommodation, other support ...)	4,000.00
7	IAG 2017 Gifts Prices for IAGOC (flowers, ...)	1,000.00
8	Savings Fund	2,000.00

**Total Expenses**

**USD 10,000.00**

## **Annex 4. Report of the Secretariat to the Control Commission, May 2016**

### **REPORT OF THE UN-IAG Secretariat MAY 2015 – April 2016**

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-2015 (Port Aventura/Salou, Spain).

The CC is invited to comment on the contents of the report and make recommendations and proposals for the work of the next IAG-2017.

---

#### **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 2015**

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 43rd IAG. Some highlights are included below:

- a. Held regular meetings of the IAG-Sec (4 times);
- b. Organized a consultation of CC members concerning a decision on IAG 2016 in Nairobi, Kenya to be hosted by the UN organizations in Nairobi (not accepted by the CC), and a further consultation with CC members concerning a decision on IAG 2016 to be hosted by UNWTO in Malaga or UNIDO in a venue to be determined (UNWTO bid accepted by the CC after UNIDO deferred to the UNWTO bid);
- c. Updated the list of IAG focal points and CC members through correspondence with member organizations, confirmed new focal points and CC members and corresponded with CC members on organization of the meetings at the 43<sup>rd</sup> IAG;
- d. Reviewed, provided input and consulted CC members on IAG General and Discipline Rules; discussed related issues and revised the CC website accordingly;
- e. Assisted the UNWTO organizing committee in organization of the 43rd IAG, including briefs on planning and organization, invitation letters, focal point and CC member contacts and correspondence, establishment and management of the registration database, discipline requirements and coordinators, 1 site visit, and other organization details;

- f. Followed up with IAG host committee Chairs for the 2014 and 2015 IAG regarding financial matters;
- g. Responded to inquiries from UN Agencies particularly on rules and eligibility for IAG participation.

### **3. The 42<sup>nd</sup> Edition of IAG (29 April - 3 May 2015, Port Aventura and Salou, Tarragona, Spain)**

The minutes of the CC meetings have been sent for comments by the CC and once approved in Malaga will be posted at <http://cc.interagencygames.org>

### **4. Budget**

The following documents are presented separately:

- Secretariat Financial Statement 2015
- Secretariat Treasurer's Report 2015
- Secretariat Budget Proposal for 2016

### **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. Follow up on all CC recommendations and decisions from the 43rd IAG meetings;
- c. Continued development of the relevant internal manuals or information packages related to Secretariat processes and tools;
- d. Development and implementation of an introductory programme for new coordinator representatives;
- e. Organization of the elections for a new Secretariat mandate of 4 years in the first quarter of 2017.

### **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 organization of this 43<sup>rd</sup> IAG and all their efforts in making it a success, most especially to Mr. Samiti Siv, 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.

## Annex 5. Inter-agency games 2016 results

	<i>1<sup>st</sup> Place</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> Place</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> Place</i>
<i>Athletics (Men)</i>	<b>Kenya Male Athletics Team (UNON/UNEP/WHO)</b>	<b>IAEA</b>	<b>UN New York/UNOPS</b>
<i>Athletics (Women)</i>	<b>UNON/UNEP/UNDP</b>	<b>UN City Copenhagen (UNOPS/ UNFPA)</b>	<b>UNOG/WHO</b>
<i>Badminton</i>	<b>UN City Copenhagen</b>	<b>CTBTO/UNON/UNIDO/ UNOV/UNODC</b>	<b>IAEA 1</b>
<i>Basketball</i>	<b>UN Geneva</b>	<b>Vienna</b>	<b>UN New York</b>
<i>Beach Volleyball</i>	<b>UN ICC/UNOG</b>	<b>WFP/WMO</b>	<b>UNFPA/UNODC</b>
<i>Chess</i>	<b>IAEA</b>	<b>WHO/IFAD/ ICC/UNODC</b>	<b>UNOG</b>
<i>Cricket<sup>5</sup></i>	<b>UNMISS 1</b>	<b>UNMISS 3/UNHCR</b>	<b>–</b>
<i>Darts</i>	<b>IAEA</b>	<b>UNIDO</b>	<b>FAO</b>
<i>Football (Men)</i>	<b>UNMISS</b>	<b>IAEA</b>	<b>UNESCO</b>
<i>Golf</i>	<b>IAEA 1</b>	<b>UNOG</b>	<b>WHO</b>
<i>Pétanque</i>	<b>UNOG 1</b>	<b>UNOV 1</b>	<b>UNHCR 3</b>
<i>Swimming (Men)</i>	<b>UNEP/WHO/ UNOG/WFP</b>	<b>UNESCO/ICC</b>	<b>IAEA/UNODC</b>

<sup>5</sup> No 3<sup>rd</sup> place awarded; only 3 teams competed; the team finishing 2<sup>nd</sup> in the competition was disqualified for use of ineligible players and the 2<sup>nd</sup> place awarded to the team finishing 3<sup>rd</sup> by decision of the Sub-committee on Appeals of the Control Commission

<i>Swimming (Women)</i>	<b>IAEA</b>	<b>ITU/WIPO</b>	<b>UNESCO</b>
<i>Table Tennis (Men)</i>	<b>UNIDO/UNODC/IAEA</b>	<b>UNOG/ITC/UNOPS</b>	<b>UNESCO</b>
<i>Table Tennis (Women)</i>	<b>IAEA/UNON</b>	<b>ILO/UNEP</b>	<b>FAO</b>
<i>Tennis</i>	<b>UNOG</b>	<b>ICC</b>	<b>FAO/ICC/UNHCR/ FAO-Kenya/ UNHCR/IAEA/IMO</b>
<i>Volleyball (Men)</i>	<b>IAEA/UNIDO</b>	<b>UNESCO/WIPO/ UNEP/ITU</b>	<b>UNMISS/UNICEF/ ITU/IAEA</b>
<i>Volleyball (Women)<sup>6</sup></i>	<b>IAEA/UNIDO/UNOV</b>	<b>ITU/UNICEF/UNDP/ WHO/UNESCO/ UNMISS</b>	<b>–</b>

---

<sup>6</sup> No 3<sup>rd</sup> place awarded as only 2 teams competed