



**42nd General Assembly
17 April 2018 - Bangkok, Thailand**

MINUTES

OPENING OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1. The **President** opened the 42nd ASOIF General Assembly (GA) by welcoming the ASOIF Full and Associate Members. He thanked them for their participation in the working meeting the previous day. He informed that the GA was open to observers and the media and welcomed everyone.
2. The **President** thanked the SportAccord administration for arranging to host everybody in Bangkok and offered special thanks to FIG and its President Mr. Morinari Watanabe for supporting an excellent ASOIF annual dinner at the Mandarin Oriental the previous evening.
3. He wished to congratulate the IF Presidents and General Secretaries who had been elected or re-elected since the GA in 2017 in Aarhus, Denmark:
 - David Lappartient elected President of UCI
 - Tamás Aján re-elected President of IWF
 - Thomas Weikert re-elected President of ITTF
 - Poul-Erik Hoyer re-elected President of BWF
 - Chungwon Choue re-elected President of WT
 - Marius Vizer re-elected President of IJF
 - Ugur Erdener re-elected President of WA
 - Jean-Christophe Rolland re-elected President of FISA
 - Hassan Moustafa re-elected President of IHF
 - Amina Lanaya confirmed as Director General of UCI
 - Thierry Weil appointed Chief Executive Officer of FIH
 - UWW Nenad Lalovic elected to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) Executive Board
 - FEI Sabrina Ibañez elected Chair of the newly formed Association of Paralympic Sports Organisation (APSO)

ROLL CALL AND APPOINTMENT OF SCRUTINEERS

4. All 28 of the Summer Olympic International Federation (IF) member federations were confirmed as present as well as the 5 Associate Members.
5. The **President** proposed, on behalf of the ASOIF Council, to appoint two scrutineers for the meeting: Mr. Klaus Schormann, President of UIPM, and Mr. James Carr, ASOIF Head of Administration and Projects.
 - The scrutineers as proposed were unanimously **approved**.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 41st ASOIF GENERAL ASSEMBLY, AARHUS, 4TH APRIL 2017

6. The minutes were unanimously **approved**.

REPORT OF THE ASOIF COUNCIL

7. Before giving the floor to the Executive Director (ED), the **President** referred to some of the key issues of the past twelve months and thanked the members for their significant work and contributions during that period highlighting:
- The vision of the Council was for ASOIF to become an active provider of added value to the Olympic Movement believing that the best qualified and experienced people in sport were within the IFs. He said that the growing challenges faced by the IFs enabled them to develop skills which were robust and unique.
 - The success of several ASOIF projects confirmed it as a recognised international entity and leader in sport. He thanked the ASOIF members for their cooperation and mentioned that they were the first to become aware of the need for better governance in sport and that everyone should move to adopt principle and regulation but also to cover behaviour and practice in the next period.
 - Doping had remained high profile topic and a report on the new WADA compliance program would be presented later on. He informed that the IOC had invested in International Testing Agency (ITA) and that this new entity would allow the majority of IFs to have compliant and effective programs at an efficient cost while ensuring an appropriate level of independence without perceived or real conflict of interest.
 - He reiterated that the total IF revenue share figure from the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Games would be an item to be discussed during the 18th April joint meeting with the IOC. More money was needed as some important matters were pending. He reminded, however, that revenue groupings would remain untouched for at least another cycle but that adjustment for FIG and FINA were needed to bring them to the right level.
 - He mentioned that the IOC had been addressing the lack of candidates for future Games and amended the bid procedure. He mentioned the “New Norm” presented by the IOC and said that the aim of this document was to bring the cost of the Games down and that ASOIF would support the IOC in this and the IFs in order that they would maintain the necessary degree of control and involvement due to the changes.
 - He reminded that a symbolic but important step by ASOIF had been the successful amendment of the Olympic Charter at the 2017 IOC Session in Lima, Peru, to correctly describe the IFs as the bodies that “govern” their sports worldwide rather than “administrate” them as had formerly been the case.
8. The **Executive Director (ED)** took the floor, reminding that the report of the ASOIF Council had been distributed in writing in advance, and highlighted some of the key issues:
- The ongoing attention on the governance of sport continued and recent media coverage of individual cases showed that this would not diminish; therefore, the ASOIF-led project on the governance of sport remained a high priority for the Council.
 - He drew attention to the issues subsequent to the Russian doping cases following Rio 2016 and Sochi 2014 Olympic Games. He reminded that the IFs were faced with a number of individual athlete cases which he said should come under close scrutiny of each IF to see which cases could be followed up and successfully prosecuted.

- One of the major pieces of work during the last year had been the follow up of the Games Sports Delivery Plan (SDP) which was linked to a new system for delivering the Games involving the IFs much more at the three stages of bidding, preparation and delivery. There was now the addition of the IOC's "New Norm - Olympic Games Delivery" which had been presented in PyeongChang during the IOC Session, which aimed to reduce the cost of the Summer and Winter Games by USD 1 billion and 0.5 billion respectively. Many members had reacted as the context was unclear and they felt that the level of consultation had been insufficient to date. The objective of the "New Norm" being to save further on the cost of the Games, it was clear that the IFs would need to play a major part. Following a discussion in the ASOIF Council it was mentioned there were a number of other areas the IOC had to look into in terms of the cost of the Games, such as easing constraints on the OCOG program in commercial areas and improving communications on the true Games costs.
- The **ED** welcomed the senior team from the Organising Committee (OCOG) of Tokyo 2020 and said they were essential in putting the SDP into action.
- Following the Rio 2016 Olympic Games ASOIF members had received their final tranches of their revenue shares. The increase in the total summer IF revenue share between the Beijing 2008 and Rio 2016 Olympic Games had been 82% while the longer-term average dependency of IFs on their share of the revenues had fallen by 12% from 45%, following the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games, to approximately 33% following the Rio 2016 Olympic Games. The **ED** recognised that the IOC had done a great job of increasing the revenues but noted the IFs also had increased their own revenues significantly. The estimated revenue share total from the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Games would be requested in the joint meeting with IOC the following day with the aim for Council to prepare the future distribution to develop a proposal for next year's GA.

9. The **ED** listed some of the current Council priorities notably:

- the new IOC IF Engagement in Games bidding, the preparation and delivery model through the SDP and now the IOC's "New Norm";
- the follow up of the IOC-led Sport Data Warehouse project which now showed good progress;
- the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Games preparation, the delivery and issue tracking which remained a very important priority for Council;
- the important work on the IF Governance Task Force Assessment follow-up and the establishment of a new Governance Monitoring Unit (GMU);
- the research into innovation opportunities and the future role of IFs. The Council believed that the rate and nature of changes was altering the landscape in which IFs operate and there was a need for them to be better informed and equipped. An intensive focus from now on was required to establish and support an agreed and accepted future role of IFs in the world of sport;
- addressing the issues surrounding the proliferation of multi-sport Games events was a need that would be taken forward to the IOC joint meeting the following day following the Working Meeting held the day before.

10. The **ED** reported that the ASOIF President had, on behalf of the Council, communicated to the IOC President that the size of the Olympic Games should be contained within the athlete quota set out in the Olympic Charter. The IOC had written to the members to set out the OCOG proposal process for the addition of sports/events for the Paris 2024 and Los Angeles 2028 Olympic Games. He stated that the 28 IFs from the Rio 2016 Olympic Games had been confirmed for 2024 and that for 2028 the decision would be taken in 2021. He said that no formal discussions on OCOG proposals for 2024 had taken place so far but quoted an IOC communication which stated that “if Paris 2024 expressed an interest in potentially submitting proposals in the future, that the IOC Programme Commission would review the process and timelines in summer 2018”. In a separate communication it was expressed that the event programme and athlete quotas for Paris 2024 would be finalised in December 2020 and this would remain on agendas as IFs prepare for Paris and Los Angeles.
11. The **ED** excused Buenos Aires 2018 Youth Olympic Games (YOG) from presenting in the meeting due to lack of time given the remaining months left before the YOG. A video presentation would be sent to Members via email separately.
12. The **ED** mentioned that two interventions would take place, notably Mr. Choue, President of World Taekwondo on the humanitarian work done by WT, and Paris 2024 Olympic Games who wished to address the meeting briefly.
13. He thanked the seven ASOIF Consultative Groups for their excellent work during the year and the IFs for engaging with the projects and programmes of these groups. He mentioned that 50 senior IF staff were members of these groups. He gave a short resumé of the activity of each of the groups.
14. Lastly, he thanked ASOIF’s small but international staff for the great job they had done during the year.

FINANCIAL MATTERS

2017 Financial Report

15. The **ED** reported that ASOIF had ended 2017 with a positive financial outcome and that ASOIF assets remained well protected within a defensive investment strategy agreed by Council.

Auditors’ Report on the 2017 Accounts

16. The **ED** reported that the 2017 accounts had been approved by ASOIF’s auditors, PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), and that they had been endorsed by Council for presentation to the GA for its approval.

Approval of the 2017 Accounts

17. The 2017 Accounts were unanimously **approved**.

Annual Subscription 2018

18. The ASOIF annual subscription of CHF100 for 2018 remained unchanged and was unanimously **approved**.

Approval of the Revised 2018 budgets

19. The revised 2018 budgets were unanimously **approved**.

Approval of the draft 2019 Budgets

20. The **ED** explained how the 2019 budget was aimed to breakeven and that there was nothing special to report compared to previous budgets.

The draft 2019 budget was unanimously **approved**.

21. The **President** commented on the importance of the Central Projects budget work mentioning that there had been criticism that sport was not doing enough itself in areas such as anti-doping. The ASOIF IF analysis had been completed and demonstrated that the IFs' annual budget across the 28 sports had been the same as that of the WADA annual budget. However, it also showed that the expenditures were not evenly distributed and that 22 IFs were spending far less on anti-doping than the leading six. A conclusion had been the need for an ITA to help and support federations and enable them to have access to the necessary tools.
22. **Mr. Ugur Erdener (WA)** said that he fully agreed with this perspective and added that WADA, IOC and the IFs needed to cooperate and give a strong message by prosecuting the current athlete cases wherever possible.

IOC/ASOIF/ANOC RELATIONS

ASOIF Governance Task Force (GTF)

23. The **President** stated that the first priority of the ASOIF GTF was being achieved: to have better governance within the IFs. He invited Mr. James Carr, ASOIF Head of Administration and Projects and Mr. Rowland Jack of 'I Trust Sport' to present the report.
24. **Mr. James Carr** presented the background of the GTF, its purpose and key principles. He invited Mr. Rowland Jack to report on headlines and details of the new report (Annex 1).

Mr. Rowland Jack stated that after 2 years of data collection, there had been some significant improvement in IF scores. He concluded that progress had been made, however, significant differences still existed between the best performing IFs and the others.

Mr. James Carr presented the next steps and mentioned that the report was attracting interest from public authorities and media.

He informed that the International Partnership Against Corruption in Sport (IPACS) had the mission of strengthening and supporting efforts to mitigate the risk of corruption in sport and to promote a culture of good governance and that individuals from five IFs had been appointed to its different working groups.

He presented the mission of the Governance Monitoring Unit (GMU) which was being established by the ASOIF Council under the GTF.

25. The **President** informed that the written report and best practice examples would be distributed to the Assembly and made public online immediately. He mentioned that the next steps would be to move from adoption of rules to practice and implementation. ASOIF was happy to support the GMU and thanked the GTF members for their contributions to this project and stressed the importance of this work while underlining the encouraging results.

Role of the IFs & Future of Global Sport

The **President** introduced the project on the Role of the IFs and Future of Global Sport. He invited the ED to elaborate.

26. The **ED** gave an update on how the project was originally launched as an internal initiative to better understand the consequences of changes in the latter part of the 20th century and the impact on the future development of sport particularly for the period 2020-2040. These developments and new ones continued to have a major effect today and had clearly progressed, informed and shaped the sports industry in the 21st century. It had become clear that this was an ambitious project and that there was a lot of interest in it. A Steering Committee had been composed of representatives from the global sports industry, government, sports governing bodies and major event rights holders including the IOC.

REPORT FROM IOC ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE IFS AND THE OLYMPIC GAMES

27. The **President** welcomed and thanked **Mr. Christophe Dubi, IOC Olympic Games Executive Director, and Mr. Kit McConnell, IOC Sports Director**, who presented the new IOC project “Olympic Games Delivery: The New Norm” (Annex 2) which aimed to significantly reduce the cost of the Games.
28. **Mr. Tom Dielen (WA)** commented regarding the SDP being a central tool in the delivery of future Games and said that it was important to have a clear transfer of knowledge on the SDP between Games. He stressed the need for monitoring implementation rates and performance of the SDP in order to be able to work effectively with partners to keep track of the different elements and follow up on deadlines. He said it would be an important tool for future Games. **Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC)** responded that a change management process was being put in place with Tokyo 2020 and that part of that process would capture lessons for the future.
29. **Mr. Kelly Fairweather (ITF)** mentioned that it was challenging to implement change midstream of Games delivery and that the fundamental changes he believed come from an event-based approach and asked for more details on how this featured in the discussions with Paris 2024 and Los Angeles 2028 Olympic Games. How were they going to manage what was a big change in the structure of how OCOGs operate? **Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC)** responded that the event management model was part of the discussion with Paris 2024 and would be brought forward to the ASOIF Multi-Sports Games Group for further input.
30. **Mr. Tayyab Ikram (FIH)** asked if details could be given on the risk analysis and implication of any aspects of the IOC’s “New Norm” in the implementation phase for sports in order that the athlete experience not to be compromised. **Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC)** responded that the IOC was keeping the focus on athletes and sport and finding efficiencies and savings that could be reinvested elsewhere.
31. **Mr. Paul Hardy (IAAF)** proposed that the SDP milestones move from an Excel spreadsheet to a bespoke shared online tool. **Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC)** responded that he agreed that use could be made of better technology and that he would raise this with Paris 2024.
32. **Mr. Thomas Lund (BWF)** wondered if it was possible to have a more detailed view of where exactly the cost savings would be made. **Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC)** responded that full visibility on the costs was the goal going forward and a key part of the process was that all information would be available in future.

33. **Mr. Ingmar de Vos (FEI)** questioned, from a practical point of view, when and how a clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of the IFs would materialise and as from when this would start to be implemented. He also said that it would be good to have a clear view of the detailed budgets as IFs had great expertise and could contribute to budget efficiency if they had the detailed figures.
Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC) responded that decision making had already started with Paris 2024 to enable clarity.
34. **Mr. Patrick Baumann (FIBA)** congratulated the IOC for the work on its “*New Norm*” which he said was a step in the right direction. He mentioned that it seemed that many of the elements of the “*New Norm*” required further effort and work from the IFs in terms, for example, of expertise on the field of play, being asked to reduce expectations in terms of venues, to reduce athlete quotas, etc. This was good as IFs were keen to participate and determined to have successful Games. However, beyond these points, there were other elements in the business model of Olympic Games which could be tackled. For example, it could be questioned how the “*New Norm*” applied in terms of commercial contractual obligations and broadcasting in order to relieve the pressure that was on IFs and OCOGs.
Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC) responded that relations with the top partners, commercial domestic partners and broadcasters was also being reviewed.
35. **Mr. Matt Smith (FISA)** mentioned that sports were only one of the overall costs and that it would be interesting to investigate other areas such as security, and costs related to spectator provision. He wondered if these other aspects were in the overall scope of the reflection or not.
Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC) responded that spectators touched the visibility which was critical. The spectator experience was a big focus moving forward and there were some challenges being addressed for example in the debrief of PyeongChang bringing spectators in the discussion.
36. **Mr. Seb Coe (IAAF)** made a broader observation pertaining to external communications, which was a big challenge enabling distinction between a cost and an investment and that it was often a confusing landscape for the public and media. His second observation was the need to focus on the commercial constraints the OCOG was under, for example, in relation to the technology elements and the way OCOGs were asked to use IOC global partners rather than access the entire market place. He said it was important to review carefully so that perhaps commercial constraints could free up the OCOGs to increase revenue rather than only saving on costs.
Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC) responded that if overall savings were found they could be reinvested where the priorities were.
37. **Mr. Riccardo Fraccari (WBSC)** mentioned that the “*New Norm*” was the right way to go but he underlined that he hoped that the new policies could really be enforced with the OCOGs.
Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC) responded that a model was being introduced and would have the three parties involved in the same discussion in having clear outcomes.
38. **Mr. Walter Sieber (FIFA)** questioned the sports function within the OCOGs saying that perhaps it was time for the IF responsible sports person to be embedded in the OCOG in order to enable the IF experience to reach a higher level within the OCOG.
Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC) responded that every OCOG has a slightly different structure but what was encouraging with Tokyo 2020 and Paris 2024 was that they were engaging with IFs and that whatever the titles and structures were sport had to have a strong voice at the table where decisions were being made.
39. The **President** remarked that the “*New Norm*” was a very well-intentioned project but that there were still many duplications and that the skills of the IFs should be used better within the Games preparation and delivery to cut costs, that the IFs should be an arm of the IOC rather than a counterpart but that all efforts were appreciated given the complexity of the

issues. For the moment it seemed very difficult to change what appeared as very simple, to increase the involvement of the IFs.

Mr. Kit McConnell (IOC) responded that IFs being an “operating arm” was the direction and although an evolving process, the commitment was there to make it a very practical one.

40. **Mr. Christophe Dubi (IOC)** explained that event management had to be approached from a practical standpoint and it had to be clear who the operators were in the market and who could support delivery of the event using what was available without reinventing the wheel while understanding that the structure needed to be addressed.

He explained that interpretations of the “New Norm” needed to be tackled and that the understanding by the OCOGs needed to be the same as for the IFs in a collaborative effort. In the risk evaluation, every time that “turnkey” solutions were proposed, delivery was considered but also looked at the overall requirements making use of the appropriate reference points. He said that technology was a big cost for the OCOGs and that everyone would have to work together to understand the full impact. In the renewal of contracts, commercial relationships and business integration was being questioned as part of the budget and finding effective solutions. The goal had to be the best possible Games delivered in the most efficient manner.

REPORT FROM THE TOKYO ORGANISING COMMITTEE FOR THE OLYMPIC GAMES IN 2020

41. The **President** invited **Mr. Toshiro Muto, CEO of Tokyo 2020 Organising Committee** and **Mr. Koji Murofushi, Executive Director of Sports of the Tokyo 2020 Organising Committee (OCOG)** to present the report on the status of Tokyo 2020 Olympic Games preparations (Annex 3). He thanked them for their attendance and contribution to this Assembly.
42. The **President** stressed that the partnership with the IFs was most important and that optimal solutions should be found as the IFs were always dedicated to successful Olympic Games.
43. The **President** also thanked the Commonwealth Games Federation and the Organising Committee of the Commonwealth Games for the excellent games which had been held in Australia and mentioned that events like those games could be beneficial in providing advice and learnings concerning organisational aspects of the Olympic Games.
44. **Mr. Kelly Fairweather (ITF)** commented on the enhanced role of the IFs through the SDP and asked the OCOG to better use the experience, advice and guidance of the IFs. He asked for confirmation that the venue manager and sport manager would have an enhanced role within the organisation of the OCOG.
Mr. Koji Murofushi (OCOG) thanked for the advice and said that the OCOG looked forward to collaborating together on the SDP, separate the issues and categorise the responsibilities within the OCOG.
45. The **President** underlined that the SDP’s aim was to use the function and role of the IF in a more effective way to the advantage of the OCOG.
46. **Mr. Antony Scanlon (IGF)** thanked the OCOG for the high-level presentation and referred to the SDP and mentioned that the slippages observed had been related to service delivery providers with a lack of clarity as to what the service levels were going to be for each. The allocation of rooms, the quality and cost of accommodation were given as examples. The service delivery level needed to be coordinated and to be provided clearly to the IFs.
Mr. Koji Murofushi (OCOG) responded that on the service level, in case of a non-sports area issue, there was a service manager responsible. The OCOG would make sure it got the advice of the IF on how to move forward with service level issues.

47. **The President** asked the IOC Games Department to take note of all these questions and follow up.
48. **Mr. Tom Dielen (WA)** asked for clarification on exactly what was being outsourced for the test events and what would be the role of these outsourcing companies in the Games themselves. He also commented on the finances saying that in order to be cost effective, information was needed on the detailed cost of the event, as this was a partnership and the IF could assist in the best possible way only if the full information was shared.
Mr. Koji Murofushi (OCOG) responded on the outsourcing that that OCOG was categorising and would then make a plan to present to the IFs.
49. **Mr. Walter Sieber (FIFA)** commented that the entry point for an IF to the OCOG was through the Sports Manager and this person was in a relatively low position in regard to the operational structure. He encouraged the OCOG to make sure that when an issue was raised with the Sports Manager, a decision could be taken in the fastest way possible.
Mr. Koji Murofushi (OCOG) responded that the focus was on communication with the IOC to categorise the level of each issue and as much as possible rapidly raise it to the appropriate level.
50. **Mr. Antonio Arimany (ITU)** mentioned that it was important to have test events under similar conditions to Games time for a number of reasons including safety of the athletes and should involve the same people in test events as at Games time otherwise the event would suffer. He reiterated the request for the OCOG to cooperate with Tokyo Metropolitan Government on the water issues.
Mr. Koji Murofushi (OCOG) responded that for test events there would be an individual meeting with each IF to move forward. On the water issue he confirmed that the water would be clean and that the only risk was in case of heavy rain, but that together with Tokyo Metropolitan Government, the IOC and IFs, solutions for clean water would be found. There was also a contingency plan for the competition schedule and advice from the IFs would be valuable.
51. **Mr. Ingmar de Vos (FEI)** mentioned that service delivery was also a concern and that the decision-making process was perceived as sometimes complicated. He addressed a specific topic regarding an event of the FEI where spectator numbers would be downsized due to problems with transportation to the venue. He urged the OCOG to find solutions to allow more spectators at the venue in time for competition and perhaps to test transport solutions during the test event.
Mr. Koji Murofushi (OCOG) answered that transportation was a very complex matter in the cost planning in that there were many events to cover. The OCOG would appreciate advice on transportation issues in order to find a solution. Traffic management control was being discussed at the highest level in order to estimate the time and traffic management plans and a report would be published in March 2019.
52. **Mr. Andy Hunt (WS)** mentioned that for Sailing, the OCOG was one year behind and that the Field of Play and security plan had not yet been confirmed. The test event plan for 2019 was not acceptable and there was a serious gap in experience and understanding with the OCOG as to what was required to deliver an Olympic sailing competition. Mr. Hunt urged the IOC to take control of these issues and close them as a matter of urgency. He believed that a lot of good work had been done in the past years and was looking forward to resolving these matters in collaboration with the OCOG.
Mr. Koji Murofushi (OCOG) responded that further discussions would take place in the near future and some important issues were complicated because of Japanese law. The test event would be organised and the OCOG looked forward to discussing and learning more about the sport of sailing.
53. **Mr. Riccardo Fraccari (WBSC)** explained that his IF had proposed a format to guarantee a correct and fair participation and success for the Games and a format to satisfy the interest of media and fans but that so far, no positive responses had been received. He wanted to know

the procedure to decide on the format and schedule of the competition and stressed that the IF had cooperated to achieve cost reductions in many ways including agreeing to major changes concerning the venues.

54. **Mr. Paul Hardy (IAAF)** mentioned that the empowerment of the sport manager was very important in order to make the right decisions in a timely manner. The IAAF has great experience in the presentation of its sport and the consultation process would be important in view of the plan to mix sport and culture.

Mr. Koji Murofushi (OCOG) thanked for the contacts and for the advice from this experienced IF which was always welcome. He said that the outsourcing was being managed using outside consultancy.

55. **Mr. Marius Vizer (IJF)** said that a request had been made regarding holding the 2019 Judo World Championships in Tokyo which could be a good solution as a test event, however he had not received a positive answer. He requested that this decision be reconsidered.

Mr. Koji Murofushi (OCOG) said that for the World Championships the OCOG needed to discuss further how to be involved operationally particularly to satisfy Olympic test event requirements.

56. **Mr. Jon Wyatt (FIH)** said that the IFs were facing issues because the cost reduction and savings were having unforeseen impacts. Saving on costs should not impact the athlete experience and performance. If, for example, an IF was advised to start a session in early morning for cost related reasons, the overall impact must be discussed. Another question was that Tokyo 2020 presented a different model to previous Games with regards to legacy as it was in the hands of the Tokyo Metropolitan Government. He suggested that the OCOG take more of a lead on legacy related matters.

Mr. Koji Murofushi (OCOG) explained that the OCOG wanted to optimise cost reduction with each IF and to put "athletes first". For legacy, of course they were willing to be involved.

57. **Mr. Toshiro Muto, Tokyo 2020 CEO**, thanked the Assembly for the diversity of its questions and replied to various questions with the following comments:

Sports Manager empowerment:

The OCOG was aware that there had been problems related to delayed information delivery to the IFs. To address this point the OCOG had installed three deputy executive directors responsible for different geographically linked venues and instructed sports managers to report to these deputy executive directors when faced with challenges. The deputy executive directors could quickly convey and discuss the problems. The executive director's office had been instructed to develop an IF issue tracker to follow progress, to determine urgency and prioritise the issues.

In summary, the problems which were faced at the front line could be fully identified at the executive level and this level would be advised and if necessary would be able to respond in an urgent manner so the issues escalated even to the CEO level could be addressed as soon as possible.

Budget and cost saving issues:

For specific sport issues regarding test events for example, the OCOG would come back to each IF individually. With regard to budget, the OCOG had been trying to reduce costs from the start and from the perspective of IFs, on the service level issue, close consultation would take place with each IF taking into account IOC consultation.

Sport specific issues

For accommodation related issues, negotiation concerning the exchange rate was taking place with the IOC and an accommodation plan would be submitted to the IOC Executive Board meeting in May 2018. As soon as approval had been received, consultation with IFs would start immediately. For concrete matters discussions would take place on an individual basis and he confirmed that the number of rooms required by each IF would be secured.

Scheduling and format of specific sports.

Regarding the question of Mr. Riccardo Fraccari (WBSC), a solution to the problem of the venue still had to be found and discussion would continue. Regarding format, a thorough consultation would take place with the IOC in order to move the matter forward.

Test events

The OCOG was looking forward to advice and guidance from the IFs.

PRESENTATION FROM WADA

58. **The President** welcomed **Mr. Craig Reddie, President of WADA**, and invited him to report on WADA's strategic priorities (Annex 4).
59. **Mr. Patrick Baumann (FIBA)** asked what the correct position for IFs was concerning event bids from Russia as RUSADA was currently non-compliant. He had a second question about compliance as the WADA Code stated that IFs could only accept bids from NADO's who were compliant with the Code and the complication thereof for IFs to, for example, step away from commitments already undertaken.
Mr. Craig Reddie (WADA) confirmed that the situation was in legal terms very clear and stipulated that no sanction could be imposed based on a non-compliance that existed before the start of the new standard and Code and therefore fell back on the Code provision in place at the time which requested IFs not to award World Championships to Russia. For the rest of the situation he mentioned it did not only affect IFs, but also major event organizers, who were invited not to award major competitions to countries where the NOC or NADO was not compliant with the Code.
60. **Mr. Hassan Moustafa (IHF)** asked what the difference was between the treatment of individual sports and team sports from the point of view of the WADA regulations.
Mr. Ben Cohen (WADA) clarified that the differences were slight. Team sports were not fundamentally treated differently from individual sports. The only real differences concerned whereabouts for out-of-competition testing which would follow a club for team sports rather than an individual athlete. A meeting was planned with team sports and IHF was encouraged to attend.
61. **Mr. Matt Smith (FISA)** asked if WADA had comments on the news of the past week regarding IBU. Also, in trying to close the outstanding individual athlete cases, he asked WADA to help organize meetings with their lawyers to help federations understand the basis for decisions to avoid unnecessary legal costs.
Mr. Craig Reddie (WADA) responded that concerning the current outstanding cases, the IFs with difficulties with the technical problems would be contacted and WADA would help in any way they could. Concerning the IBU, WADA had operated on information received and unfortunately the media had handled the situation incorrectly.

ASOIF STATUTES REVISION

62. The **President** invited **Mr. Antonio Arimany (ITU), Chair of the ASOIF Legal Consultative Group (ALCG)** to present the proposed ASOIF Statute revisions (Annex 5).
63. **Mr. Hassan Moustafa (IHF)** asked for an additional amendment that the IOC Executive Board ASOIF representative be elected by ASOIF and this should be reflected in the Statutes. The **President** responded that ASOIF could not change the Olympic Charter but in case the ASOIF President was not an IOC member an election would take place to nominate an ASOIF candidate who would be proposed to the IOC for election to its EB.
64. The ASOIF Statute revisions were unanimously **approved by 27 members with one abstention.**

ELECTION – COUNCIL MEMBER

65. One candidate was standing for one place for the remaining three-years of a four-year term;
 - Mr. Nenad Lalovic (UWW)
66. A vote was held by a show of hands in accordance with the Statutes as there were no IFs requesting a secret ballot.
67. The candidate was duly elected as Council Member in accordance with the Statutes:
 - Mr. Nenad Lalovic (UWW)
68. **The President** congratulated the new Council Member, Mr Lalovic, on his election.
69. **Mr. Nenad Lalovic (UWW)** thanked the meeting and members for their confidence.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

70. The **President** invited **Mr. Chungwon Choue (WT)** to present on the Taekwondo Humanitarian Foundation and his initiatives regarding North and South Korea reconciliation. (Annex 6)
71. The **President** invited the representative of Paris 2024 Olympic Games, **Mr. Tony Estanguet, President Paris 2024**, to address the Assembly.
72. The **President** invited **Mr. Matthieu Reeb, CAS Secretary General**, to present the CAS memorandum for a permanent CAS Anti-doping Division (Annex 7).
73. **Mr. Nenad Lalovic (UWW)** raised a concern regarding recent cases of government intervention preventing athletes from attending international competitions of a number of sports. He said that politically motivated actions against free access for all to compete internationally by different countries should not be tolerated. This issue appeared to be growing in magnitude and this was damaging athletes, organisers and IFs often through restrictions on the issuance of visas, restrictions on national uniforms, flags and anthems, or even by preventing athletes from a country to compete against those of a political rival. He asked for reinforcement and a united front from the Olympic Movement to ensure adherence to the Olympic charter in this respect.
74. The **President** agreed and said that ASOIF would immediately review the situation to establish which IFs had regulations in place to enable them to enforce policies of non-discrimination.

ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED AT THE JOINT MEETING WITH THE IOC EB

75. The IOC-ASOIF joint meeting would take place the following day on 18th April 2018 and the President said that the issues that would be raised would include the following:
 - Report on existing ASOIF projects and what was planned for the future including ASOIF undertaking to support IFs facing external challenges;
 - Report on the Tokyo 2020 Games preparation from the IF point of view with specific concerns;
 - Report on anti-doping issues with WADA and the concerns over the new compliance regulations and processes;
 - Report on finance including requesting the IOC President to provide a provisional total figure for the 2020 Tokyo Games IF revenue share which would enable Council to begin work on a distribution model to be presented to the GA in 2019;

- Report on the IF elections, the ASOIF Council and the changes in the ASOIF Constitution.
76. The **ED** informed the Assembly that the ASOIF 2019 annual dinner would be supported by a combined IF team of UIPM and WT, and in 2020 by IAAF together with UCI.
77. **Mr. Hassan Moustafa (IHF)** mentioned that following his IF's compliance meetings with WADA, it had been requested to submit to significant additional work which was costly and perhaps IOC could help.
The **President** replied that IFs were free to raise their specific problems during the joint meeting with the IOC the following day. He reminded that the IOC was already providing substantial financial support to the fight against doping, funding WADA, ITA, etc.
Mr. Patrick Baumann (FIBA) mentioned that the IFs were fortunate that the IOC had put substantial money in the anti-doping fight, notably in supporting setting up the International Testing Agency which would help IFs but nevertheless the anti-doping fight would continue to increase in cost.

CLOSING

78. The **President** thanked the Council members for their dedicated work and also all the IFs and delegates for their support during the year and the meeting.
79. He also thanked the ASOIF staff and the interpreters for their great support to the Council and members and for their contribution to a successful GA.

The meeting ended at 17h00.

Annexes:

Annex 1	Second Review of IF Governance
Annex 2	IOC Olympic Games Delivery – The New Norm
Annex 3	Tokyo 2020 Presentation
Annex 4	A Look at WADA's Strategic Priorities
Annex 5	ASOIF Statutes revision (annexed to GA papers)
Annex 6	Taekwondo Humanitarian Foundation
Annex 7	Permanent CAS Anti-doping Division (CAS ADD)