

# **PRESIDENT'S REPORT 2005**

**Alan Blackshaw, October 2005**



**UIAA**



# UIAA PRESIDENT'S REPORT 2005

Alan Blackshaw, October 2005

<b>CONTENTS</b>		<i>Page</i>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		2
1.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	3
<b><i>PART ONE: SOME WIDER ISSUES FOR A STRONG UIAA</i></b>		<b>5</b>
2.	THE STRENGTHS OF THE UIAA	5
3.	SOME RECENT SUCCESSES	7
4.	THE UIAA'S 75 <sup>th</sup> IN 2007	8
5.	THE FUTURE OLYMPIC OPPORTUNITIES	8
6.	OTHER FUTURE POSSIBILITIES	10
7.	A UIAA EUROPEAN FORUM	11
<b><i>PART TWO: ORGANISATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES</i></b>		<b>13</b>
8.	THE INCREASING DEMANDS ON UIAA MANAGEMENT	13
9.	VOTING AT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN NEW DELHI, 2004	14
10.	A CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE WITH THE DAV	16
11.	A CONTROLLING MAJORITY IN THE UIAA BOARD	18
12.	REMOVAL AND REDUCTION OF KEY STAFF	19
13.	A POSSIBLE MOVE OF THE UIAA OFFICE	21
14.	A 3-SPLIT UIAA?	22
15.	THE BOARD'S DEFAULTS ON THE SINGAPORE AGENDAS	23
16.	THE CHALLENGE FROM THE BOARD OF UIAA CLIMBING	26
<b><i>PART THREE: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?</i></b>		<b>28</b>
17.	THE BASIC CHOICE	28
18.	THE CONCERNS OF FEDERATIONS AND COMMISSION PRESIDENTS	29
19.	DISRUPTING THE HARMONY AND BEST INTERESTS OF THE UIAA?	31
20.	OTHER INITIATIVES	32
21.	A PERSONAL VIEW	33
<b><i>NOTES AND SOURCES</i></b>		<b>35</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

My first Report as President of the UIAA for the term 2005-08 is longer than usual in order to give the membership a full account of developments during the year as a matter of good communication and transparency.

- **Part One** discusses the forward work of the UIAA, as foreseen at the 2004 General Assembly, which is the basis of the mandate given to me as President.
- **Part Two** addresses some of the organizational and constitutional issues arising, including the emergence of an adverse majority group in the Board wishing to split the UIAA and abolish the Council.
- **Part Three** identifies the choice between allowing the UIAA to evolve as a strong and unified International Federation, broadly on present lines, or to take the uncertain alternatives proposed by the majority group in the Board.

I have put forward the following proposals in Section 20 of the Report:

- **A STRONG UIAA** There should be a small Council working group on future organisation to report in time for the May 2006 Council, on the basis that the UIAA will continue to expand and progress on the lines suggested in Part One.
- **SUPPORT FOR THE UIAA COMPETITION SPORTS** We need advice from experienced contacts in the Olympic Movement on how best to develop our relationship with the Olympic Movement; and develop an all-UIAA campaign to gain the two-thirds majority in the IOC for our competition sports to enter into the Olympic Games programme.
- **THE HARMONY AND BEST INTERESTS OF THE UIAA** Should we extend the existing criteria of acceptable conduct to internal UIAA bodies and post-holders with a system to resolve disputes?
- **UIAA STATUTES** There should be a report on changes to the UIAA statutes to the General Assembly 2006. And,
- **UIAA STAFF** The UIAA staff should be maintained at all times during the remainder of my term as two persons working part-time (a specialist and an administrative secretary), with temporary replacements of equivalent capability to fill any gap.

However, the scope for such initiatives will depend fundamentally on whether or not the General Assembly will wish to prevent the present majority on the Board from continuing to disrupt the work of the President, and from splitting-up the UIAA, in the ways noted in Part Two.

*Note: This Report will be presented at the General Assembly on 15 October 2005, but there is no requirement in the Articles of Association for it to be voted on.*

# **Section 1. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY**

I am very pleased to present my first Report as President of the UIAA for the term 2005-08, an honour that I very much appreciate. It gives me the chance to say something about the future, and the progress that I hope we can achieve together in the interests of the worldwide mountaineering and climbing community, while I am President.

## **A STRONG BUT SIMPLE UIAA**

My view is that the UIAA, with its long-term support from mountaineering and climbing Federations worldwide and the strength of its competition sports, should be a strong and successful International Sports Federation (IF). Our aim during the rest of my Presidency, over the 3 years to 2008, must be to achieve this; but on the basis of the example and experience of other successful IFs with Olympic achievements or aspirations. This is the basis of Part One of this Report.

## **THE UIAA GENERAL ASSEMBLIES**

Within these objectives, my main responsibility is to ensure that the General Assembly (GA) functions successfully as the democratic centre of gravity of the UIAA. The other UIAA bodies (the Council, Board, Commissions and Competition Councils) must support its decisions, and always operate within the UIAA statutes and Articles of Association and on a basis of established fact and ethics. The UIAA has a duty to its members, and the other international organisations it works with, to meet the highest standards of self-governance; and I propose in S20 below that we should consider extending the existing UIAA criteria of acceptable behaviour to the UIAA as a whole.

In addition to respecting the UIAA Articles of Association and the authority and decisions of the GA, it is also important that if there are any misunderstandings or disputes that these are resolved in a reasonable and fair way. I propose in S20 establishing a procedure for resolving disputes.

## **CO-ORDINATION OF THE UIAA BODIES**

I also have to co-ordinate the operational effectiveness of the UIAA, on which I have important triple duties as Chair of the GA, Council, and Board. These bodies must operate together in a unified way, based on their respective powers and duties as set out in the Articles of Association, and the Swiss Civil Code.

## **THE BOARD**

As regards the UIAA Board, I have a duty as Chair to ensure the proper discharge of the Board's activities, which at present are limited to:

- Preparing for, and following-up, the meetings of the GA and the Council, including the preparation of the agendas in each case (Article 16(d)).  
And,
- Ensuring the functioning of the administrative office and employing the staff, within the budgets (Article 16(f)).

## Section 1. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

I see both of these as sets of duties giving the Board the opportunity to contribute to the effective operation of the UIAA, and the achievement of the tasks agreed by the Council and GA.

### **THE UNEXPECTED PROBLEMS IN 2005**

Unfortunately, I cannot say that my first year as President has been without problems. Essentially, these problems seem to derive from two main sets of circumstances:

- The fact that the preparations for the term 2005-08 were in the hands of a different Candidate for President (Josef Klenner, DAV). The 2003 GA had shown its support for Josef Klenner and invited him to form a Working Group to review the structure of the UIAA and make proposals. However, he withdrew his candidacy for UIAA President on 22 May 2004, but continued to lead the Working Group. Federations were notified about his withdrawal, and invited to make nominations for the officers and Board for circulation by 20 August. With such a short time period to the GA I had to accept in good faith the existing arrangements and assumptions in place before I was nominated. And,
- It has come to light (since June 2005), that UIAA Climbing had much more of an influence than might have been expected on the selection of, and voting for, a cohesive group of candidates for the UIAA Board in the interests of competition climbing (not of the UIAA as a whole); and to the exclusion of other candidates for the Board (S9 below).

At first the Board worked well on the usual basis of consensus and towards the tasks that had been agreed by the GA. But since April 2005 the Vice-President and the 4 Board Members have voted together as a majority group to push forward decisions that I did not feel were in the best interests of the UIAA, or in accordance with the mandate I have been given by the GA.

This group seems to have ideas of their own for the future of the UIAA, which were not explained when they were elected, and for which therefore they have no remit, mandate, or other democratic authority from the membership.

This inevitably produces a conflict between them, with their unidentified objectives, and myself as President, seeking to pursue the well-known mandate on which I was elected by the GA.

This is explained further in Part Two, and some of the steps needed to resolve the problem are in Part Three.

### **THIS REPORT**

This Report is longer than usual, as I believe it is important that the GA is aware of these problems. I am publishing it in booklet form and on the UIAA website.

## **PART 1: SOME WIDER ISSUES FOR A STRONG UIAA**

*“The UIAA encourages, develops and supports the practice of all forms of mountaineering and climbing in the international field. It seeks solutions to all fundamental problems of international importance and is committed to provide leadership to the world mountaineering community on all matters of common international concern.”*

**UIAA Article 3(a)**

Part One of the Report discusses the current and forward work of the UIAA, broadly as foreseen at the 2004 GA in New Delhi. It is in line with the broad policies being followed by the UIAA at that time, and thus of the mandate given to me as President for the term 2005-08.

### **S2. THE STRENGTHS OF THE UIAA**

When I am asked about the UIAA and whether it is a strong organisation, I usually say that it is much stronger than might appear for a body with only two employees working part-time.

#### **WORLDWIDE NETWORKING AND EXPERTISE**

The UIAA is strong in its worldwide membership of mountaineering and climbing federations and other organisations that meet annually in the GA.

It is also strong through the worldwide support, expertise and networking that the members provide to the Commissions and Competition Councils; and the professionalism and commitment of key volunteers.

#### **THE UIAA AND THE OLYMPIC MOVEMENT <sup>(1)</sup>**

The links between mountaineering and the Olympic Movement go back to the launch of the modern Olympic Games in the 1890s, when Baron Pierre de Coubertin insisted that there should be an Olympic Prize for Alpinism. Perhaps he saw mountaineering as an example of the Olympic motto of either ‘*Faster, Higher, Stronger*’ or even, according to some sources, ‘*Faster, Higher, Braver*’ (“*Citius, Altius, Fortius*”).

Nowadays, the UIAA is recognised by the IOC as an International Sports Federation (IF) with long experience in all forms of mountaineering and climbing, and strong developing Competition Sports in the form of UIAA Climbing and Ski Mountaineering, and now Ice Climbing. In addition, the UIAA also has an uncommon ability to contribute to wider Olympic objectives, such as sport for education, health, development, peace and protection of the environment, shared with the United Nations.

#### **THE UN’S GLOBAL MOUNTAIN PARTNERSHIP <sup>(2)</sup>**

The UIAA’s membership of the UN Global Mountain Partnership brings us together with Governments, Agencies and other relevant bodies as a follow-up to the International Year of the Mountains 2002.

## PART 1: SOME WIDER ISSUES FOR A STRONG UIAA

The UIAA Summit Charter 2002 <sup>(3)</sup> was launched at the 2001 GA in Austria. It mentions all the long-term policies and themes the UIAA has been pursuing, and our over-riding interest in maintaining the freedoms of mountain access, while conserving the fragile mountain environment; the need for greater economic benefits for local communities; and possible eventual recognition of a Human Right of the Enjoyment of Nature. The themes include sociological and educational value, culture and heritage, equal opportunities, youth development, and the aspiration of the competition sports to be included in the Olympic Games.

The Second Global Meeting of the Mountain Partnership in Cuzco in October 2004 has led to important initiatives concerning the Andes, Asia and Europe; especially concerning the environment, mountain tourism, and policy and law.

### **CONTINENTAL FORUMS**

The UIAA already has the benefit of collaboration with Continental groupings in Asia (UAAA) and South America (UPAME). A paper concerning Continental representation was presented to the 2003 GA, which decided not to deal with the issue then, but wait for any proposals from the Review Working Group led by Josef Klenner (minutes item 8).

I very much hope that in the near future UIAA can develop Continental groupings in each of the Continents (including Europe – S7 below). They would promote networking on issues of concern in each Continent, and the opportunity to bring together issues relating both to the Olympic Movement and the Global Mountain Partnership.

The American Alpine Club has submitted a proposal that the existing provision for the GA to elect two Honorary Vice-Presidents from different continents (Article 16(g)) should be extended to all continents including Europe (S18 below). It may be that such Vice-Presidents might have a role in bringing together Continental Forums in each case.

### **THE UIAA COMMISSIONS**

The final report of the Review Working Group 2003-04 <sup>(4)</sup> led by Josef Klenner recommended a review of, and reduction in the number of, the UIAA Commissions. However, it is difficult to reach a conclusion pending clarification of the UIAA's longer-term objectives as outlined in this Part of the Report.

Meanwhile, the 2004 autumn Council approved the membership list for all the Commissions for the current term, and at the Council meeting in Arnhem on 14 May 2005, the Commission Presidents made their first reports of the term and outlined their plans for the future. The annual reports of the Commissions are on the agenda of the 2005 GA.

Some Commissions noted that the DAV and OeAV have withdrawn members of Commissions who had previously been making valuable contributions to their work. I hope that this can be discussed further as both of these Federations have been major supporters of the UIAA and its work. The future of UIAA Commissions appears to be a matter of interest to the Club Arc Alpin, of which

## PART 1: SOME WIDER ISSUES FOR A STRONG UIAA

Josef Klenner is currently the President, and it has been suggested that this should be discussed in a UIAA seminar dealing with European issues next spring (S7 below).

### **THE UIAA STAFF**

It is also the case that the UIAA long-term staff of two (an Administrative Secretary - Julia Sporri, and a Sports and Development Director - Roger Payne), working part-time and supported by temporary staff as necessary, provide a highly effective solution to the UIAA's need for high-calibre, wide-ranging and flexible staff support, based on a profound knowledge of the UIAA and other International Sports Federations.

Hence, the UIAA pays only for 0.9 persons for the central staff of two, thus conforming with the UIAA's budgetary constraints.

I hope that these staff (or equivalents) may be retained during my time, as I believe that the UIAA is very fortunate to have such an excellent, committed and knowledgeable staff who can self-evidently deal successfully with the quite complex issues arising in the UIAA.

It may be seen from later in this Report that this is one of the key areas in which problems have emerged with a major Federation (S10) and with the UIAA Board (S12).

I should also mention and thank the Swiss Alpine Club for handling the bookkeeping under the guidance of the Treasurer (Juerg Schweizer); and also mention and thank the UIAA Journal Editor Peter Farkas, and webmaster Vlado Linek.

### **S3. SOME RECENT SUCCESSES**

The Competition Sports of Climbing and Ski Mountaineering continue to improve and expand their activities with notable success, which they will report to the GA.

2005 was particularly significant because of the inclusion of Climbing for the first time in the 8<sup>th</sup> World Games <sup>(5)</sup> and, later this year, in the 1<sup>st</sup> Asian Indoor Games <sup>(6)</sup>. Like the UIAA Climbing World Championships, the World Games were held in Germany in July 2005, and UIAA Climbing and the Federations concerned must all be congratulated.

In addition, the new Commission for Ice Climbing Competitions has made a promising start with a first UIAA Ice Climbing calendar for 2006, and a review of rules and regulations. The Commission for Ice Climbing has asked for the support of Federations that wish to enter climbers in the first series of UIAA ice climbing events to be held in 2006.

We can also take some encouragement from the easing of tensions in the Siachen Glacier area, and the UIAA's contribution to help achieve this. This highlights the value of developing policy positions and then promoting them with focus events <sup>(7)</sup> and activities.

## PART 1: SOME WIDER ISSUES FOR A STRONG UIAA

I am also pleased to be involved in an initiative by the Himalayan Environment Trust, meeting this year in India and next year in Nepal, to make progress on mountain tourism and youth-related issues, including codes of good practice, a field in which the UIAA has considerable experience.

By contrast, it is a matter of concern that the draft Guidelines for the Huascarán National Park in Peru are proving to be more restrictive than we had hoped, and that our current staff shortage (see S12) prevents us from taking the remedial action through our membership of the UN Global Mountain Partnership that would otherwise have been possible.

### **S4. THE UIAA'S 75<sup>th</sup> IN 2007**

As 2007 approaches, we can look forward to an important anniversary to celebrate. The UIAA was formed in 1932 in Chamonix at the International Alpine Congress, which was held to coincide with the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the first ascent of Mont Blanc. The Congress agreed specific tasks for the UIAA, and these included encouragement of mountaineering for the young, development of international grading standards and trail markers, raising awareness about safety, and the provision and protection of mountain shelters.

The Swiss Alpine Club proposed the first UIAA President who was Count Egmont d'Arcis (who I met in 1960), and the operational base of the UIAA was established in Geneva. At the invitation of the Italian Alpine Club, the first UIAA assembly was held in Cortina d'Ampezzo in 1933. *'From Chamonix to Kathmandu'* by Pierre Bossus is the history of the first 50 years of the UIAA, and the text is available on the UIAA website.

Our host at the GA in 2007 is to be the Japanese Alpine Club. They themselves achieve their Centenary this year, an achievement on which, in the name of the UIAA GA, I warmly congratulate them.

### **S5. THE FUTURE OLYMPIC OPPORTUNITIES**

#### **COMPETITION CLIMBING**

The UIAA has been hoping that Climbing might be considered for the Summer Olympic Programme by about 2016. Following the recent review of the Olympic Programme, the IOC decided in July 2005 those sports to be included in the 2012 Olympic Games. Two sports were dropped from the programme (baseball and softball) but none of the five short-listed sports (golf, roller sports, rugby sevens, karate, and squash) got the necessary two-thirds vote to be added.

It follows that those sports already short-listed will now need to wait until at least 2016. We hope nevertheless that UIAA Climbing may still have an opportunity to be considered to gain entry in that year: and we need to be ready to seize any earlier opportunity.

### **SKI MOUNTAINEERING AND ICE-CLIMBING.**

For sports practiced on snow or ice, the review of the 2006 winter Olympic Games will create an opportunity for sports and disciplines to be added to the programme for 2014. Hence, in the coming months, there is the prospect that UIAA Ski Mountaineering may be considered for short-listing in the review.

In the longer-term, and depending upon progress towards the IOC criteria for inclusion in the Olympic Programme, there may also be a possibility for UIAA Ice Climbing for 2018. In the meantime the winter Universidad <sup>(8)</sup> and the Winter Asian Games <sup>(9)</sup> will be important targets for both UIAA Ski Mountaineering and Ice Climbing.

### **THE OLYMPIC PRIZE FOR ALPINISM**

As noted in S2 above, this Prize was instituted by Baron de Coubertin in 1896 when the Olympic Games were reintroduced. It was to be awarded on the recommendation of the Alpine Clubs during the ceremony for each Olympic Games.

At the first winter Olympic Games in Chamonix in 1924, the first Medal was awarded to General Bruce and other members of the 1922 British Mount Everest Expedition. Baron de Coubertin suggested that one of the Olympic Medals should be placed on the top of Everest. The British undertook to do this, but that pledge has never been redeemed.

Subsequent medals were awarded in 1932 to the Schmidt brothers (for the first ascent of the North Face of the Matterhorn in 1931) and in 1936 to Gunter and Mrs Dyrenfurth (for Himalayan explorations).

The Medal was suppressed in 1946 on the advice of the IOC Executive Committee, but it does not seem that the UIAA was consulted. The two issues now are:

- Should anything be done about placing one of the Medals on Everest, as pledged in 1924? And,
- Would it be a good idea to seek to revive the Medal either with its original objects or some wider ones?

I would welcome comments from any Federation on these issues.

### **A CAMPAIGN BY THE UIAA AS A WHOLE**

As noted above, in order for the UIAA Competition Sports to get into the Olympic Programme, at the time of the decision, a positive two-thirds vote will be needed by the International Olympic Committee (IOC).

Fortunately, we have good links with other international federations including those already in the Olympic Programme and others, such as the World Squash Federation, that are also seeking entry into the summer Olympic Programme.

I hope that all of the UIAA Federations can help our Competition Sports to achieve their Olympic Programme aspirations: by strengthening their own links with

## PART 1: SOME WIDER ISSUES FOR A STRONG UIAA

their respective National Olympic Committees; by emphasising how important mountaineering and climbing are in their countries; and by explaining how they can contribute to wider Olympic objectives of using sport for the benefit of the community. We in the UIAA centrally must also continue to develop our links with the Olympic Movement, with strong staff support, in the interests of the UIAA as a whole, not just of one or other of the Competition Sports.

The American Alpine Club has suggested making some leading competition athletes Honorary Vice-Presidents of the UIAA (S18 below), and I hope we can do this, and everything else possible to get the best performers better known in the wider mountaineering and international sports communities.

Given the status that the UIAA now enjoys within the Olympic Movement, as well as the progress it wishes to make within the Olympic family in the coming years, it is crucial that the UIAA is seen to meet the standards that are expected of a reputable international sports body. Issues of transparency, democracy and accountability are of vital importance.

It may be seen from S9 and S16 below that there are grounds for concern in some of these areas; and I am seeking external advice and assistance from the IOC Ethics Commission.

### **COMMENTS BY MY PREDECESSOR**

I was pleased to see that the previous UIAA President, Ian McNaught-Davis (or 'Mac') has distilled his experience of the Olympic and other competition issues into a summary paper 'The UIAA, Integration of the Competition Sports, and the Olympic Movement.'<sup>(10)</sup>

In Britain, the President of the Alpine Club has, since the 1880s, been expected to make a '*Valedictory Address*' at the time of his departure. These provide some of the best articles in *The Alpine Journal* and I would expect Mac's article to fit in well with this long and splendid tradition. I wish him and his colleagues well, also, for the celebration next year of the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the first ascent of the Muztagh Tower.

## **S6. OTHER FUTURE POSSIBILITIES**

If we can continue to build on all of the strengths and opportunities I have mentioned, there is certainly a bright future for the UIAA as the worldwide body for the practice of all forms of mountaineering and climbing.

When the UIAA works together in a unified and cohesive way, with the necessary staff support, its value is so much greater than the sum of the individual parts.

### **FUTURE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES**

The fact that our General Assemblies are so well attended is evidence of the vitality and potential of the UIAA.

However, the GA is costly in time and other resources to our membership, and we have a duty to ensure that it provides value for money to them. I cannot say that the Agenda for the 2005 GA, with its preoccupation with procedural and

## PART 1: SOME WIDER ISSUES FOR A STRONG UIAA

organisational issues, advances the cause of mountaineering and mountains as much as it should do.

I very much hope that we can improve on this in the future, in Canada (2006), Japan (2007) and Iran (2008), with more networking on issues of concern to the host Countries and Continents, broadly in line with the proposals that I put to the UIAA Council in May 2005<sup>(11)</sup>. It may be seen from S7 below that I very much hope that we may also have in May 2006, in Turin, a European Forum, which will give the opportunity of discussing the inter-face between the UIAA and the Club Arc Alpin (CAA) within a wider European context.

The 2006 GA is to coincide with the celebration of the Centenary of the Alpine Club of Canada; and this should provide the opportunity for important perspectives on the development of mountaineering, in all its forms, in Canada and North America.

Meanwhile, I am pleased to have the opportunity of attending the UAAA meetings in Singapore this year, to discuss Asia issues and help to start the groundwork for the Japan GA in 2007.

### **SEMINARS**

I hope also that we can hold, and publish Reports on, seminars on topics that are important to mountaineers and climbers generally.

I am therefore pleased to note that, thanks to Council Member Mike Mortimer with the support of the Mountain Protection Commission, a seminar about Climate Change and Glaciers is to take place just before the GA in Banff, in October 2006.

### **S7. A UIAA EUROPEAN FORUM**

As mentioned in S2, I hope that the suggested UIAA European Continental Forum might meet during 2006, perhaps at the UIAA Council meeting in Turin in May 2006. It would give the opportunity of discussing a range of issues on a wider European basis.

### **ALL-EUROPE ISSUES**

These might include the implications of the Europe Initiative of the Global Mountain Partnership (e.g. the question of a Convention for the Carpathians, or even possibly a European-wide mountain focused Convention); promotion with the World Conservation Union (IUCN) of transboundary protected areas for cooperation and peace (e.g. a Balkans Peace Park); working with other organisations promoting mountain protection of the mountain ranges in Europe; lobbying the European institutions (e.g. Council of Europe, European Parliament and European Commission) for policy and law favourable to mountain protection and responsible access for climbing and mountain recreation; coordination of European wide activities and events (e.g. youth events and competitions) and increasing public and media awareness about these; and, promoting the use of European environmental standards (EMAS) for events and facilities.

## **RELATIONS WITH THE CLUB ARC ALPIN**

One major issue could be the UIAA's relationship with the Club Arc Alpin (CAA), which has a principal interest in promoting the Alpine Convention, alpine huts and other infrastructure, and other issues affecting the Alps. The CAA is an organisation of some 8 Alpine Clubs in the Alpine Countries; is based in Innsbruck; and is chaired by DAV President, Josef Klenner.

I am keen to ensure good relations between the CAA and UIAA and with other Board members had a meeting in March 2005 with the CAA President and General Secretary. I was pleased that Josef Klenner accepted my invitation to make a short information presentation to the UIAA Council on 14 May 2005, when he said, "*that the work of CAA is complementary to the work of UIAA, and that by working together both bodies can be stronger*" (minutes item 5).

Subsequently, at another meeting in August, it seemed that the CAA may consider in the future whether to open its doors to non-Alpine countries, with the prospect of a considerable expansion in its membership (perhaps up to 20 in total), which may raise some risk of duplication with the UIAA.

The CAA seems to consider that the UIAA should limit its activities outside Europe mainly to Competition issues, thus perhaps curtailing, for example, our important work for the UN Global Mountain Partnership discussed earlier. The CAA is also in process of developing its own Commissions in place of some of the UIAA ones, from which the DAV has already withdrawn its support.

The CAA has in the past been keen to eliminate the post of UIAA Sport and Development Director, although this is properly an internal matter for the UIAA as a whole, and not for an external body such as the CAA (see S10 below).

At the time of the Berchtesgaden meetings in October 2003, Josef Klenner reported that there had been a discussion in the CAA "*which had agreed its support for the UIAA*" (Council minutes item 5.9) and that should set the tone for the discussions now proposed.

## **PART 2: ORGANISATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES**

*“Because sport is based on ethics and fair competition, the governance of sport should fulfil the highest standards in terms of transparency, democracy and accountability.”*

**Dr Jacques Rogge, IOC President** <sup>(12)</sup>

Part Two of the Report discusses some of the organizational and constitutional issues perceived to be facing the UIAA; and how they have been addressed in practice by the UIAA Board since I became President.

It explains that the adverse majority group in the Board has insisted on taking a number of decisions for which their mandate is not clear, and which are, in the case of the proposal to split the UIAA into 3 and abolish the Council (S14), contrary to the views of the 2004 GA.

There are also constitutional issues concerning a member Federation (S10) and the Board of UIAA Climbing (S16).

### **S8. THE INCREASING DEMANDS ON UIAA MANAGEMENT**

#### **SCOPE AND COMPLEXITY**

It is important to recognise the marked increase in the scope and complexity of the work of the UIAA over the last few years, in consequence of a combination of:

- **OLYMPISM.** The renewed recognition of the UIAA as an International Sports Federation in 2003, leading to an increased role within the Olympic Movement (e.g. the annual meetings of Sportaccord and its related bodies) and to the possibility of increased funding from the Olympic Movement (additional to the existing \$15,000 annually). The Olympic Movement is itself expanding e.g. through its increased emphasis on the environment, peace and community sport; and I hope that London 2012 may offer some new possibilities for closer association with the collaboration of the BMC. Meanwhile, the proposed application by UIAA Ski Mountaineering for the Winter Games 2014 is an urgent work priority.
- **OTHER TOP-LEVEL COMPETITION.** Greater involvement in world-level or Continental-level sport with the entry of Climbing into the 2005 World Games and the first Asian Indoor Games. There may also be a prospect of entering into other multi event sports (e.g. the Winter Asia Games 2011, summer and winter Universidad). This all comes with a need for more work and reliable systems (e.g. for anti-doping, discipline and appeals, etc.).
- **THE UN GLOBAL MOUNTAIN PARTNERSHIP.** The UIAA's role as a founder member of the UN's Global Mountain Partnership in 2003, leading to greater collaboration with, member Governments, UNESCO and other UN Agencies, the World Conservation Union (IUCN), and other international NGOs. We are involved in Partnership initiatives for the

## PART 2: ORGANISATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

Andes, Asia and Europe, especially on the environment, mountain tourism, and policy and law.

- **OFFICIAL ACTIVITY.** Increasing Government or other official activity affecting mountaineering and climbing (e.g. protected area management in national parks, World Heritage Sites, etc. and policy and law concerning access freedoms, equipment, and employment conditions).
- **CONTINENTAL FORUMS.** Progress with Continental Forums and organisations such as UAAA or UPAME, but interfacing also with Continental or regional official organisations.
- **UIAA GROWTH.** An increasing workload because of the UIAA's growing membership and expanding activities (e.g. additional youth events, a new calendar for UIAA Ice Climbing, etc.) each requiring administration, promotion, and some technical support. And,
- **UIAA INCOME GENERATION.** The need to increase income to provide better support for all of the UIAA's activities.

All this offers great opportunities for the UIAA, but there are also great risks if our work falls below the high technical standard and continuous networking expected at this level.

It will be a major challenge for me during the remainder of my term 2005-08 to ensure that this work is carried out. It also needs to be integrated with the work of the Commissions and Competition Councils, in an effective and economical way, to serve the best interests of mountaineering and climbing.

### **CONSEQUENCES FOR STAFFING**

This is a principal, but perhaps little-understood, reason why I rely on the continuing high-calibre support of Roger Payne (as Executive Consultant if not Sports and Development Director) and of Julia Sporri as the Administrative Secretary. Without such excellent support, much of this work would have to be abandoned or neglected to the detriment of the UIAA and our membership.

### **S9. VOTING AT THE GA IN NEW DELHI, 2004**

*'Members shall choose representatives to hold office within the governing body by democratic elections. ... The process by which such elections are conducted should be fair and reflect the views of those allowed to vote. Block voting should be avoided. The process for nominating candidates should be clear and transparent'*

**'The Rules of the Game'** <sup>(12)</sup>

### **THE MINUTES OF THE ICC PLENARY ASSEMBLY 2004**

In June 2005, I was surprised to see from the draft minutes of the ICC Plenary Assembly (the annual meeting of UIAA Competition Climbing) held in New Delhi on 15 October 2004, that a group of candidates for the election of UIAA Board members had been identified by UIAA Climbing, to the exclusion of other well-qualified candidates.

These candidates had then been recommended by Marco Scolari (President of ICC and now UIAA Associate Vice-President for Competitions) to the ICC Plenary Assembly to be voted for in the GA in the interests of “*sports development*” rather than the interests of the UIAA as a whole.

### **CONCERNS**

My concern was mainly whether it was appropriate that the ICC/UIAA Climbing, as an internal body of the UIAA, should seek to influence the elections to the UIAA Board, which itself has the responsibility for executing decisions of the Council or GA; and for co-ordinating the activities of the Commissions (Article 16(d)).

Was it fair or practical for UIAA Climbing to seek to put in place a particular group to dominate the Board for their own interest, when the Board has an equal duty towards all parts of the UIAA?

Moreover, under the Articles of Association (Article 15(b)(4)), it is the UIAA Council alone that has the responsibility to make recommendations for persons to be elected as Board members, and they are to be elected “*on a personal basis*” on the principle of acting independently (Article 16(c)).

One of the Council members (Mike Mortimer) also expressed concern about the recommendation made by UIAA Climbing, saying, “*I would hate to think that any single group would have the ability to subvert the democratic process and use the UIAA for its own benefit*” (letter of 22 June 2005).

By contrast, another Council Member (Josef Klenner) was of the view that “*The election of the Board during the last GA has been done in full accordance with the statutes and under democratic conditions. There is no evidence that the Board is not in the full power as provided by the Statutes of the UIAA*” (letter of 31 July 2005).

### **MY REPORT**

As Mike Mortimer had asked me to clarify the position, I have prepared a Report on ‘*The influence of the ICC on the elections for the UIAA Board at the UIAA GA 2004*’<sup>(13)</sup> which is in process of publication.

### **THE IOC ETHICS COMMISSION**<sup>(14)</sup>

There are a number of complicated issues, on which the relevant expertise seems to lie with the IOC Ethics Commission which is able to advise on the application of ethics and rules.

I acknowledge that the majority of the Board have asked me not to seek the help of the IOC on the grounds that it could do “*serious damage to the image of the UIAA*”. But on the other hand:

## PART 2: ORGANISATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

- If everything is correct and meets the standards expected of a recognised International Federation then the IOC will surely say so. While if not,
- It would be better for the UIAA's standing to deal resolutely with it, so that it is cleared up quickly, and not allowed to continue to cause problems or be repeated.

It would be against our long-term interest in the Olympic Movement either to ignore or to conceal this issue; and the hostility now being shown by the Board of UIAA Climbing (S16 below) is not encouraging in these circumstances.

### **S10. A CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE WITH THE DAV**

Recently, I have become aware of what appears to be a novel constitutional issue concerning the relationship between the UIAA and the representative of one its major Federations, the DAV, which has an automatic seat on the UIAA Council (Article 13(a)(1)).

The DAV representative, Josef Klenner, has played a significant role in the UIAA, not only on behalf of the DAV, but as the former Candidate-President (until May 2004 - see S1 above) and leader of the Restructuring Working Group (2003-04), and also as the President of the Club Arc Alpin.

#### **COMMENTS ON THE SPORTS AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR (SDD)**

On 31 July 2005, Josef Klenner wrote to the UIAA Council stating, as he had done previously, that: '*The GA 2003 decided to terminate the contract with the Sport and Development Director until the mid of 2004*'<sup>(15)</sup>.

However, when I checked the Minutes of the GA 2003, and the related Council minutes, there was no indication of any decision to this effect.

Instead, the Council had decided to recommend the option to continue the work of the SDD (Roger Payne) at a reduced level. Josef Klenner himself reported this to the GA on the following day as part of a package including a one-year subscription fee increase, and the setting-up of the Restructuring Working Group 2003-04 (Minutes, item 7.4).

By way of background, it seems that the Club Arc Alpin had asked the UIAA to terminate this appointment in September 2003, but this had not been agreed by the UIAA bodies concerned.

I explain in S8 above that in fact the work of the UIAA has become very much more complex since 2003 on account of additional commitments to the Olympic Movement and the UN Global Mountain Partnership, leading to a new situation in which I believe that the UIAA now needs the SDD for more general reasons.

#### **COMMENTS ON THE PREVIOUS PRESIDENT AND BOARD**

Josef Klenner has also claimed that '*the last Board and in particular the former President ignored*' the decision to dismiss the SDD at the GA 2003.

## PART 2: ORGANISATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

As there appears to have been no such decision, the former President has protested at this incorrect and misleading statement on behalf of himself and the then Board.

### **COMMENTS ON MYSELF**

In addition, Josef Klenner has made a number of criticisms of myself, including:

- (a.) *“The President of the UIAA obviously does not respect democratic decisions within the Board and he is continuing in opposing such decisions. This is a serious problem and we have to clarify this during the next GA to be held in Singapore.”*<sup>(15)</sup> And, with reference to the Board's Agenda for the GA in Singapore
- (b.) *“This is one more example of the sloppy work of the UIAA board under the guidance and responsibility of Alan Blackshaw”*<sup>(15)</sup>.

In the case of (a) there is no evidence that the Board's decisions referred to have any basis in ‘democracy’ (a function of the GA, which I chair); whereas in the case of (b) the Board's defaults on the Agendas for Singapore were despite my requests to the Board to act differently (see 15 below).

### **COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT, LAUSANNE**<sup>(16)</sup>

In the absence of any factual justification by Josef Klenner for any of these claims, or willingness to withdraw or amend them, I am approaching the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne to ask whether they could consider assisting with the clarification of these factual issues.

### **THE NOVEL ISSUE FOR THE UIAA**

Meanwhile, as I have explained in S19 below, it is the case that the UIAA articles provide that Member Associations:

- (a.) Are expected not to *“act in a manner disruptive of or contrary to ... the harmony and best interests of the UIAA”* (Article 23(b)). And
- (b.) *“shall comply with these Articles of Association and are obliged to comply with appropriate resolutions adopted by UIAA bodies.”* (Article 7).

I am writing to the General Secretary of the DAV as to whether they are content that the, apparently incorrect, claims by their representative above, may be reconciled with the DAV's formal obligations at (a) and (b) above.

The issue at (a) in particular is also one that the Council may wish to consider at Singapore, given that the DAV refer to the possibility of raising their criticisms of myself at the GA there.

## **S11. A CONTROLLING MAJORITY IN THE UIAA BOARD**

### **THE DIVISION IN THE BOARD**

In practice, it has now emerged that there is a cohesive majority of five in the Board (the Vice-President and the 4 Board members: Paola Gigliotti, Nico de Jong, Marco Sclaris and Li Zhixin). This group routinely votes down my various proposals, and pushes through their own, quite different objectives instead, claiming that their majority is “*democratic*”. I am in a minority, with the support or abstention of the Treasurer and General Secretary.

However, if the ICC/UIAA Climbing President and General Secretary had not aimed to influence the election to all 4 seats in the Board in the interests (as they perceived them) of competition climbing, thus excluding other nominations and candidates (S9 above), the balance within the Board might have been different, and more in line with the overall UIAA interest, which as President I am seeking to serve.

### **THE BOARD'S CLAIM OF ‘DEMOCRACY’**

As I explained in S1 above, the democratic base of the UIAA is the General Assembly, not the Board; and I am the Chair of the General Assembly and draw my mandate from it. Yet the majority on the Board frequently claim that they are exercising ‘*democratic*’ authority.

However, ‘*democracy*’ only works if the electors know what policies they are voting for, and as the ‘Rules of the Game’ conference put it in 2001 (see S9 above) “*The process for nominating candidates should be clear and transparent*”.

My understanding of the UIAA’s tasks and objectives, as broadly set out in Part One above, was well known to the General Assembly when it unanimously gave me the Presidential mandate for the term 2005-08. I also understood that all the candidates had been nominated by their federations to serve the overall interests of the UIAA, and not one particular group. Hence, it must be a matter of concern to member Federations that:

- The existence of this opposing group and their alternative objectives were not identified at the Council or 2004 General Assembly. And,
- The unidentified and unapproved policies of this group are being forced through the Board by majority vote, to the serious detriment of myself as President, and my hopes of fulfilling my mandate.

### **THE POLICIES OF THE MAJORITY GROUP**

It will be seen from my remarks later in this Report that the majority group seem to be following policies that help to strengthen their own position as a Board, while reducing other aspects of the UIAA. By use of their majority in the Board, this group has:

## PART 2: ORGANISATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

- Made undertakings that the UIAA would move the Office to Turin, despite statutory or policy uncertainties identified by member Federations (S13 below);
- Terminated the contract of the Sport and Development Director, despite my objections (S12 below);
- Taken over the responsibility for running the GA themselves without the support of experienced staff, with predictable damaging consequences as regards the Agendas, etc. (S15 below);
- Are proposing to split the UIAA into 3 parts with a reduction in the traditional UIAA roles (e.g. on the Global Mountain Partnership) which I have described earlier (and even though the split proposal had been rejected by the Working Group on Restructuring 2003-04) (S14 below).  
And,
- Are aiming to abolish the UIAA Council in favour of a more powerful Board, although the GA 2004 did not support this (S14 below).

It is hardly surprising that this has led to tensions between myself as President, seeking to fulfil my duties to the General Assembly and Council, and the mandate on which I was elected, and the majority of the Board, seeking collectively to impose this range of very different policies.

Josef Klenner, the previous Candidate-President, has firmly aligned himself with this majority of the Board and against myself as President (as noted in S10 above).

### **S12. REMOVAL AND REDUCTION OF KEY STAFF**

As noted above (S11), one of this majority's objectives has been to remove the Sports and Development Director (Roger Payne), with no replacement in prospect.

#### **A PREVIOUS UIAA COMMENDATION**

The present Board inherited a statement from the previous Board (3 December 2004, minutes item 8.3) recording that;

*“This Board at its final meeting before handover thanked Roger Payne for his hard work on their behalf which has done much to advance the interests of the UIAA, not least in improving the international standing of the organisation. In the light of certain comments made elsewhere the Board would like to take the opportunity to place on record and express its confidence in Roger Payne in the strongest terms and wish him well for the future.”*

## **MY POSITION**

I have always made it clear that I share this view, based on Roger Payne's work for the UIAA going back as far as 1991, when he started to assist me as Commission Secretary when I was President of the Mountaineering Commission.

Hence, I have proposed that the best solution would be for the UIAA to continue to employ him on a 50% basis for my time as President 2005-08, in view of the large amount of technical work falling on the UIAA and especially on myself as President (S8 above).

It is particularly important that his contract should not be terminated without staff of equivalent capability already being recruited in his place. If I were not to have his support, the volume of my work for the UIAA would be too great, and I would not be able to verify its technical validity.

## **THE UIAA BOARD'S CHANGING DECISIONS**

The Board's decisions have been:

- **5 MARCH 2005** - The Board decided that the Sports and Development Director should continue on the same basis as 2004.
- **13 MAY** - The Board decided that the contract should be terminated.
- **14 MAY** - In the face of opposition from Presidents of Commissions (see S18 below) and a possible motion of censure from Council members, the Board reversed this decision in an emergency meeting. And,
- **9-10 JULY** - The Board again decided to terminate the employment contract as from the end of August 2005, in the run-up to the GA.

It may be noted that the concerns of Federations have been expressed in some of the Motions tabled for the GA (S18 below).

## **THE JOSEF KLENNER VIEW**

It may be significant that Josef Klenner is of the view that, *'I have to state that I appreciate very much that the Board now executes decisions from the GA 2003 which the last Board and in particular the former President ignored. The GA 2003 decided to terminate the contract with the Sports and Development Director until the mid of 2004. It is high time to accept the decision of supreme body of the UIAA'*<sup>(15)</sup>.

However, as noted in S10 above, this view of the GA 2003 appears to be incorrect, and I am including it in the dossier for the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne in the hope that this will be recognised to be the case.

It is regrettable that this is one of the claims that seems incorrectly to have influenced the Board.

### **OTHER CRITICISMS**

There has also been a stream of purported criticisms from Marco Sclaris, each of which I have carefully investigated and found to be without substance <sup>(17)</sup>.

It is also the case that Vice-President Humblet has made criticisms of supposed administrative failures, but without explaining what they are supposed to be to me as the Line Manger concerned. As my requests to the Vice-President that he either justifies or withdraws these claims have been ignored, I am including them in the dossier for the Court of Arbitration also <sup>(15)</sup>.

The immediate cause of the Board's demand, without notice, for the termination of the SDD's employment at their meeting of 9-10 July was an email that he had sent to a UIAA colleague. This sought support for my suggested discussions with the UAAA in Singapore (S6 above); but also included the Board's position on some of the issues discussed in this Report.

As I explained to the Board, if they had been more supportive of the strong UIAA as outlined in Part One above, the incident would never have occurred.

### **THE POSITION NOW**

The removal of Roger Payne, for the reasons stated above, would have had such a catastrophic effect on my ability to carry out my work for the UIAA, and on the work of some of the Commissions, that I decided to re-engage him temporarily as an Executive Consultant until the end of October 2005; and informed the Council accordingly.

It will be for the Council and GA to decide whether or not to allow me to continue to retain his services (or staff of equivalent capability) for the remainder of the period 2005-08 so that I may continue to undertake the very considerable workload mentioned in S8 above.

In consequence of the reduction in the staff from the 1.7 persons in place when I was elected to the only 0.9 persons proposed (Roger Payne and Julia Sporri, both working part-time) the continuation of the present contract on a longer-term basis might be expected to be within the UIAA budgets foreseen.

### **S13. A POSSIBLE MOVE OF THE UIAA OFFICE?**

Another of the issues during the year has been the possibility of moving the UIAA Office to the National Mountaineering Museum in Turin. We had a good offer to move there, but also another good one to stay in Bern; and yet a third to move to Budapest.

I had seen the possible move to Turin as a means of bringing together both the UIAA and Competition Climbing in an integrated way, but the prospects of such integration have reduced with the deterioration in the relationship discussed below (S16).

It has also become clear that a number of Federations have reservations of various kinds, mainly about the statutes and the powers of the Board, but also about the need to carry out an open and transparent process by which proposals are invited, evaluated, and the final decision made.

## PART 2: ORGANISATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

Despite these reservations from members, and against my specific request, the Vice President wrote to the Turin City authorities in June 2004 incorrectly indicating that the UIAA had formally accepted their offer.

The position now is that:

- The DAV and the BMC have put forward Motions for the GA (S18 below), proposing that the question of a move be deferred. And,
- The Board have deferred the implementation of their earlier decision to move to Turin, but intend to implement it after the GA.

It will be for the GA in Singapore to say whether or not they are content for the UIAA Board to take the UIAA Office to Turin.

### **S14. A 3-SPLIT UIAA?**

#### **THE RESTRUCTURING WORKING GROUP**

During the work of the Restructuring Working Group (2003-04), a provisional proposal was made to reduce the number of UIAA commissions, abolish the Council, give more power to the Board, and split the UIAA with separate legal status for the Competition Sports. This concept was presented to but not adopted by the Council in May 2004.

After discussion of the final Working Group report in New Delhi in October 2004, the Council wisely recommended, and the GA agreed, that, within the broad strategy of the Working Group Report, the role of the Council should be reviewed and the competition sports should be more integrated. These two points had unanimous support in both the Council and GA.

#### **NO IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS REQUIRING REMEDY**

Note that it is not clear that there is any identifiable problem facing the competition sports that makes it necessary to change the existing structure.

Questions to Marco Sclaris about this have not produced any specific issue requiring resolution that would be assisted by these proposals. Marco Sclaris remains concerned that, formally, international representation remains the responsibility of the President of the UIAA, but the 3-split structure would not seem to alter this.

#### **THE VICE-PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL**

Nevertheless, Vice President Humblet now intends to present to the 2005 GA a model for a UIAA structure with the UIAA split into 3 bodies, the removal of the Council, greater power for the Board, and a new power-sharing body of representatives.

It seems from comments made by Pierre Humblet following the Council meeting in May 2004 that the idea is based on the constitution of federated states, with particular reference to Belgium.

## PART 2: ORGANISATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

Apparently, this concept has already been presented by the Vice President on behalf of UIAA to a meeting of the Club Arc Alpin in September 2005.

### **THE EXPERIENCE OF INTERNATIONAL FEDERATIONS**

It seems that the existing UIAA structure with a GA, Council and Commissions or Councils for each activity or discipline is broadly in line with good practice in International Sports Federations.

Many strong and successful International Sport Federations (e.g. the International Ski Federation (FIS) and the International Cyclists' Union (UCI)) have structures that unify their different sports under a Council that takes the main decisions within the policies set by their General Assemblies. To avoid potential conflicts of interest, they are also careful to separate and define responsibilities between those bodies that are decision-making (GA and Council), and those that implement or execute decisions (Committees and Executive).

I am therefore proposing that we continue to follow this example with a Council Working Group to develop it (S20 below).

### **AN UNUSUAL CONCEPT**

The main example of international sport working in a Confederation, as the Vice-President is now proposing for the UIAA, seems to be the World Confederation of Billiards Sports, where 4 parallel existing international bodies were brought together some 15 years ago under an umbrella body, while otherwise retaining their separate arrangements.

There seems to be no example of an International Federation that has been split apart so that the new bodies can form a new confederation, as now proposed by the Vice-President.

## **S15. THE BOARD'S DEFAULTS ON THE SINGAPORE AGENDAS**

### **THE BOARD'S OBLIGATIONS**

Under the UIAA Articles, the Board has a number of obligations concerning the Singapore GA, including:

- (a.) To ensure the adequacy of the arrangements for such meetings (Article 16(d)).
- (b.) To prepare the agendas (ditto). This is subject to the right of the GA to add items to the Agenda of any meeting subject to an affirmative vote of no less than two-thirds (Article 12(d)).
- (c.) To send "*the full agenda*" to the individual member associations at least 8 weeks before the GA (i.e. in the present case by 20 August 2005). This is normally assumed to mean all of the items plus information on motions, etc. And,

## PART 2: ORGANISATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

- (d.) To ensure that any amendments to the Articles of Association “*are fully described in the agenda circulated prior to the meeting*” (Article 11(g)) (see (c) above).

In order to facilitate this, there is an obligation on member associations to submit ‘*items for inclusion in the Agenda*’, normally assumed to be notice of the subject, at least twelve weeks before the meeting (i.e. in the present case by 23 July 2005).

As noted in S18 below, both the BMC and DAV submitted items for the Agenda before those deadline.

### **THE BOARD’S ACTIONS**

The General Secretary sent out an Agenda on 22 August 2005, thus almost meeting the target at (c) above. But this Agenda did not include the items and motions supplied by member Federations, so it was not the ‘*full agenda*’ as required.

The General Secretary said in an e-mail explaining the situation (22 August) that “*I do not alone find myself to be able to integrate these motions as some are quite tightly linked to the present agenda.*”

Then, after protests that Federations’ agenda items and motions had been omitted, the General Secretary authorised circulation of the motions on 24 August 2005. These were circulated incomplete (later rectified) and were not related to the Agenda. It therefore follows that the Board defaulted on its obligations:

- To issue a ‘full agenda’ as at (c) above, because the Agenda was late and incomplete and did not include details of the motions submitted. And,
- To ensure that any amendments to the Articles were fully described in the Agenda as in (d) above.

The Vice President Pierre Humblet and Josef Klenner have both said that the GA cannot vote on some items submitted by Member Federations because they were not circulated in time.

Hence, the errors and omissions by the Board cause considerable procedural difficulties for the GA.

The difficulty is increased because the information about some of items submitted by Member Federations has still not been added to the papers on the website (which is a routine administrative task).

### **INTENTIONAL?**

These defaults may have been intentional on the part of members of the Board because:

- The Board refused to collaborate with the Sport and Development Director after 10 July 2005 (S12 above) although he had arranged for the Agendas to be completed satisfactorily (and the website links to be established) as

## PART 2: ORGANISATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

in previous years; and they made no arrangement to replace this capability. And,

- Refused my requests that the Board meet on or prior to 20 August 2005 in order to ensure that the Agenda was completed on time <sup>(18)</sup>.

Instead, the Board met on 3 September 2005, too late to discharge its obligations concerning the Agendas for both the GA and Council.

In addition, Board member Nico de Jong made plain in July <sup>(18)</sup> that the Board would still be sending out additional material following the September Board meeting. Hence, the majority in the Board recognised at that time that the full Agenda would be late; and was unwilling to take the necessary steps to improve the position.

### **JOSEF KLENNER AND PIERRE HUMBLET**

It seems regrettably also to be the case that the one-time Candidate for President, Josef Klenner, and the UIAA Vice-President Pierre Humblet have been making unfounded criticisms of myself in connection with the Agendas.

The Josef Klenner criticism is as at (b) of S10 above, namely that, *'This is one more example of the sloppy work of the UIAA Board under the guidance and responsibility of Alan Blackshaw'*.

The Vice-President's position has been <sup>(18)</sup> that it was me as President who caused the delay. This appears to refer to a time back in July when I was away in Peru, but it had no bearing on the requirement on the Board to send the *'full agenda'* by 20 August.

All the correspondence shows that I repeatedly asked the General Secretary and Board to ensure adequate arrangements were made for the GA, and I did nothing to delay the circulation of either the draft agenda or the full agenda.

The criticisms by Josef Klenner and Pierre Humblet may be seen as an attempt to shift the responsibility for the serious administrative chaos resulting from the Board's defaults away from the majority group on the Board, where it correctly belongs.

The reality is that it is not at all difficult to produce the Agendas, etc. on time, and I had been advising the Board of how to do this as long ago as March 2005. Also, at the meeting on 13 May, when the Board made its first decision to terminate the contract of the Sports and Development Director, the Board were informed about and noted the relevant deadlines for the GA and autumn Council meeting (minutes item 8.1).

Neither Josef Klenner nor Pierre Humblet have provided any evidence for their claims, so I have suggested to them that these claims might be included with those to be put to the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne for factual assessment.

Again, this is explained further in my Paper on Factual claims requiring independent evaluation, September 2005 <sup>(15)</sup>.

## **S16. THE CHALLENGE FROM THE BOARD OF UIAA CLIMBING**

*“The UIAA supports and governs on an international level those competitions and mountaineering sports which are recognised by decision of its General Assembly. It represents those sports within other international organisations, including the GAISF and the IOC.”*

**UIAA Article 3(d)**

Another major concern during the year has been that I have not, it appears, succeeded in continuing a good mutual relationship with the President and Board of UIAA Climbing, which will be necessary if we are to make the progress for Competition Climbing towards the Olympic Games mentioned above (S5); and which I would still like to do.

### **THE ORIGINAL ‘CONCORDAT’**

Like my predecessor, Ian McNaught-Davis, I have a long history of supporting the UIAA Competition Sports. This goes back to when I was President of the UIAA Mountaineering Commission, and helped to bring all three Competition Sports into the UIAA.

At the time of my election as UIAA President, I was particularly anxious to make a new start with UIAA Climbing, and offered to resolve whatever may be the perceived problems between them and the UIAA in a positive way. In return I asked for positive collaboration in place of the former disagreements; and progress on integrating UIAA Climbing’s finance, administration and website, etc. with the rest of the UIAA. This informal Concordat worked well until April 2005, giving real hope for the future.

However, after the meeting of the Olympic Movement ‘Sportaccord’ in Berlin in April 2005, when I reported to the UIAA Council broadly on the lines of S5 above, the former problems re-emerged, but in more severe form.

### **THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF UIAA CLIMBING**

The deterioration reached a new low in August 2005, when the Board of UIAA Climbing circulated a report (also published on the UIAA website) for the ICC Plenary Assembly in Singapore. The report makes no mention of the concerns expressed within the UIAA about the influence of the ICC on the voting for UIAA Board members in New Delhi in October 2004 (S9 above).

Instead, it criticised individuals in the UIAA (which would be taken to include myself) by including the statements that:

- *“... a (not big) group of people, showing little respect for democracy and democratically-taken decisions, started to attack the Management Committee of UIAA Climbing, competitions, our sport.”* Note ‘*democracy and democratically-taken decisions*’. And,

## PART 2: ORGANISATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

- Accusing un-named individuals within the UIAA of '*hate*' (a word I have never seen used previously within the UIAA) against the sport of Competition Climbing and competitions.

Note that, to the extent that this referred to the issues discussed in S9 above, it had turned a necessary investigation into the activities of two members of the UIAA Board relating to voting procedures, into an attack on '*competitions, our sport*' instead.

As the Board of UIAA Climbing has not been able to produce any evidence to support their claim about '*hate*', and as everyone knows that I and others in the UIAA strongly support Competition Climbing, it seemed that the claim was likely to be fabricated or fictitious, and intended to cause a distraction from other issues.

Hence, I asked the Board of UIAA Climbing to withdraw or amend these comments, but they have refused to do so.

### **BREACHING THE UIAA STANDARD OF BEHAVIOUR**

As noted in S19 below, a basic standard for behaviour within the UIAA is defined in Article 23(b) in terms of avoiding acting "*in a manner disruptive of or contrary to the ... harmony and best interests of the UIAA*".

This is defined in relation to a Member Association, which may be expelled for such behaviour. But the principle should apply even more so to internal bodies, such as the Management Committee or Board of UIAA Climbing.

It means that, as the 5 members of the Board of UIAA Climbing are continuing, incorrectly, to publicise that there is '*hate*' in the UIAA against Competition Climbing, I can hardly continue to put forward any of them to represent the UIAA externally.

### **AN ISSUE FOR THE IOC ETHICS COMMISSION <sup>(14)</sup>**

In the circumstances, this appears to be another issue on which we could benefit from outside help, and I am including it in the dossier for submission to the IOC Ethics Commission mentioned in S9 above.

## **PART 3: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?**

*“The UIAA seeks durable relations with its associated member associations and their leading personalities in the spirit of friendly and close co-operation. It fosters this aim by encouraging meetings and activities, by stimulating understanding between mountaineers and by promoting knowledge concerning mountaineering.”*

**UIAA Article 3(b)**

This Third Part of the Report identifies the choice between allowing the UIAA to evolve as a strong and united International Sports Federation broadly on present lines (Part One above) or to take the uncertain alternatives proposed by the Board (mentioned in Part Two). It also makes suggestions as to the role that the Council may play in promoting a stronger and more effective UIAA, both at the Singapore meetings, and thereafter; including a possible new role on acceptable standards of behaviour (S19 below).

### **S17. THE BASIC CHOICE**

As this Report explains, there are many complicated issues within the UIAA at present. Underlying them, however, there is a basic choice to be made between:

- (a.) **A STRONG AND UNITED UIAA** evolving broadly on present lines as envisaged at the GA 2004. And,
- (b.) **A SPLIT-UP UIAA** on the lines now being put forward by the controlling majority in the UIAA Board, in conflict with (a).

This Report recommends (a) but it is for the membership at the GA to decide.

#### **A STRONG AND UNITED UIAA EVOLVING BROADLY ON PRESENT LINES**

This is the mandate on which I was elected at the GA 2004 for the period 2005-08, and is broadly as set out in Part One of this Report. It means a unified UIAA with:

- (a.) A continuing strong commitment to the UIAA's work with the Olympic Movement and the UN Global Mountain Partnership.
- (b.) Support for the aspirations of the 3 UIAA Competition Sports from the UIAA and the membership as a whole.
- (c.) Future General Assemblies and the related Continental Forums and Seminars concentrating so far as possible on mountain or sports related issues of interest and value to the membership as a whole.
- (d.) A stronger Council as is the norm in successful International Sports Federations with Olympic aspirations or achievements.
- (e.) Renewed remits for the Commissions to enable them to work within a unified UIAA in the most effective and productive way. And,

### PART 3: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

- (f.) Technical and administrative support and expertise from a small but high calibre staff of 0.9 (2 persons working part-time, preferably Roger Payne and Julia Sporri).

If the GA continues to support the above, it would be for the Council to make proposals to implement it (see S20 below), setting-up its own temporary Working Groups as necessary for this purpose.

#### **A SPLIT-UP UIAA**

This is the alternative being put-forward by the Vice-President, with the support of Marco Sclaris, as in S14 above. Note that:

- It seems to involve a weaker and more decentralised organisation for the UIAA, and complex voting systems in the GA.
- There would be no Council but the Board would be stronger.
- There is little practical experience of such a form of organisation within the Olympic Movement (the main example being Billiards Sports) so a change to this system would necessarily involve uncertainty.

#### **THE COST OF THE BOARD**

A subsidiary issue here is that the Board is proving more expensive to run than previously, about 50-60,000 CHF or about one-fifth of the UIAA budget in travel and other Board member costs alone, giving reduced value for money in terms of its effective output.

### **S18. THE CONCERNS OF FEDERATIONS AND COMMISSION PRESIDENTS**

The GA in Singapore will have an unusual number of expressions of concern from member Federations and Commission Presidents, and the Council may have a useful role in determining how to address these.

#### **THE COMMISSION PRESIDENTS**

These concerns emerged at a meeting of the Commission Presidents, attended by the Board, on 13 May 2005. This meeting was in the afternoon following the Board meeting at which the Board had decided to dismiss the Sport and Development Director, despite my concerns and objections (S12 above). The Commission Presidents were particularly concerned about the loss of the support of the SDD for their work. These and other concerns were expressed in an open letter (18 June 2005) from the Chairman of the meeting of 13 May 2005. Subsequent to the General Secretary announcing that the SDD's contract had been terminated some Commission Presidents have again expressed their renewed concerns about the need for some staff support for their work.

## **THE FEDERATIONS**

The following Federations submitted proposals reflecting their concerns about the work of the Board:

- **THE AMERICAN ALPINE CLUB (AAC).** This is in their letter of 19 August 2005, with proposals to amend Article 16 to replace the Board with an Executive Group of the Council, plus an increase in the number of Honorary Vice-Presidents for reasons of Sport or Continental representation <sup>(19)</sup>.
- **THE BRITISH MOUNTAINEERING COUNCIL (BMC).** Their letters and enclosures of 5 and 22 July and 18 August 2005 <sup>(20)</sup> express concerns about the activities of the Board, and make a proposal to censure the President of UIAA Climbing. And,
- **THE DEUTSCHER ALPENVEREIN (DAV).** Their letter of July 2005 <sup>(21)</sup> proposes that the UIAA should concentrate on resolving structural issues before considering the question of office location, which they see as a matter for the GA not the Board.

In addition, the Council Member for North America (Mike Mortimer) expressed concerns about the voting processes at the GA 2004, which may also require discussion on the basis of the separate Report <sup>(13)</sup> on this issue which I have prepared (S9 above).

## **A ROLE FOR THE UIAA COUNCIL**

As noted in S15 above, the Board's defaults in preparing and issuing the Agenda for the GA has led to an extremely confusing situation on the handling of the proposals made by Federations. However, under the UIAA Articles:

- Upon affirmative vote of no less than two-thirds of its voting power the GA itself may add items to the agenda of its meeting (Article 12(d)). And
- The Council has the responsibility to make recommendations to the GA on any proposed changes to the Articles of Association; and on the persons to be proposed as Board members (Article 15(b)).

I am hopeful therefore that the Council (of which I am Chairman) may advise the GA as to how to adapt its Agenda to deal with the AAC proposals concerning Article 16 and the BMC proposal to censure the President of UIAA Climbing respectively.

## **S19. DISRUPTING THE HARMONY AND BEST INTERESTS OF THE UIAA?**

### PART 3: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Under the UIAA Articles, it seems that a basic standard for behaviour within the UIAA is defined in Article 23(b) in terms of avoiding acting “*in a manner disruptive of or contrary to the ... harmony and best interests of the UIAA*”.

This is defined in relation to a member association, which may be expelled for such behaviour. But the principle must apply even more so to post holders and the internal bodies of the UIAA, such as the UIAA Board and the Board of UIAA Climbing, all of whom are ultimately accountable to the GA.

#### **THE ISSUES ARISING WITHIN THE UIAA DURING 2005**

It may be seen from earlier in this Report that a number of incidents have occurred in the present year that may deserve consideration in terms of breaching this basic standard of behaviour. In particular:

- (a.) The issues concerning the selection of candidates and the voting procedures at the 2004 GA (S9 above).
- (b.) The Vice-President’s confirmation to the Turin authorities that the UIAA had formally decided to move to Turin, when this is still a matter for consideration by the 2005 GA (S13 above).
- (c.) The apparently unfounded criticisms of the SDD by Marco Sclaris and Vice President Pierre Humblet (S12 above).
- (d.) The Board’s decisions to dismiss the Sport and Development Director with no replacement in prospect, knowing that this would severely damage the work programmes of the UIAA and of the President (S12 above).
- (e.) The Board’s defaults on the preparation and issuing of the Agenda for the Singapore GA (S15 above).
- (f.) The criticisms by the DAV representative and the Vice President against the President in relation to (e) (S15 above).
- (g.) The several statements by the DAV representative on the UIAA Council discussed in S10 above. And,
- (h.) The claims by the Board of UIAA Climbing that there is ‘*hate*,’ etc. against the sport of Competition Climbing; and their refusal to meet reasonable requests to withdraw or amend these claims (S16 above).

Of the above, I am raising (a) and (h) with the IOC Ethics Commission, and (f) and (g) with the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne.

## PART 3: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

### **A POSSIBLE REFORM**

An issue for the Council and possibly the GA to consider is whether a reform may be needed to:

- Clarify the UIAA position on what is acceptable behaviour by UIAA internal bodies and individual post-holders by, for example, extending to them the existing provisions concerning Member Associations (Article 23(b)), and establishing a code of conduct. And,
- Set up a UIAA dispute resolution procedure to enable such issues to be handled better in future.

I would be very pleased if there were fewer such incidents in the UIAA, and if they could be resolved internally without seeking external help.

### **S20. OTHER INITIATIVES**

I will not intrude further on the several issues between the Council and the majority on the Board, except to reiterate that I hope that it will be possible for the Council to have a stronger role in the future, as is the case in many other successful International Sports Federations (S14 above).

### **THE FUTURE WORK OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES**

As regards the UIAA's work during the rest of my term to 2008, my paper on *General Assemblies and Councils 2005-08: Issues, Themes and Seminars* <sup>(11)</sup>, which was endorsed by the Council in May 2005, is available from the UIAA website. I would be happy to revise this for the May 2006 Council in the light of the outcome of the Singapore GA.

### **PROPOSED COUNCIL OR GA INITIATIVES**

Particular proposals that I hope the Council or GA may consider include:

- (a.) **A STRONG AND UNITED UIAA** There should be a small Council working group on future organisation to report in time for the May 2006 Council on the basis that the UIAA will instead continue to expand and progress on the lines I have suggested above.
- (b.) **SUPPORT FOR THE UIAA COMPETITION SPORTS** We should seek advice from experienced contacts in the Olympic Movement and report to the May 2006 Council on how best to develop our relationship with the Olympic Movement; and develop an all-UIAA campaign to gain the necessary two-thirds majority in the IOC for the UIAA competition sports to enter into the Olympic Games programme (S5 above).

## PART 3: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

- (c.) **THE HARMONY AND BEST INTERESTS OF THE UIAA** Should we extend the existing UIAA criteria of acceptable conduct to the internal UIAA bodies and post holders; with a system to resolve disputes (S19 above)?
- (d.) **UIAA STATUTES** A Council working group should consider changes to the UIAA statutes, with at least a preliminary report to the GA 2006.
- (e.) **UIAA STAFFING STABILITY** The UIAA staff should be maintained at all times during the remainder of my term as two persons working part-time (a specialist and an administrative secretary), with temporary replacements of equivalent capability to fill any gap. I need Roger Payne to continue on at least a 50% basis during the remainder of my term unless and until an equivalent replacement is found (S12 above).

Subject to the UIAA being adequately staffed once more, the Council should initially give priority to making the UIAA work more efficiently in a unified way, to overcome the loss of momentum experienced recently. This includes more work to develop the potential of the *UIAA Bulletin* and website.

However, the scope for such initiatives will depend, more fundamentally, on whether or not the Council and GA will wish to prevent the present majority on the Board from continuing to disrupt the work of the President, and from splitting-up the UIAA, in the ways discussed earlier in this Report.

## **S21. A PERSONAL VIEW**

### **A GOOD FUTURE FOR A STRONG UIAA**

I am confident that all will be well for the future of the UIAA if we continue to work to our long-standing purposes and tasks, and develop our existing objectives, in a structure where the UIAA's interests and bodies are united.

The GA should be the main focus as the democratic coming-together of the UIAA community of Federations, etc. and of other UIAA bodies; and within the wider Olympic and Global Mountain Partnerships mentioned above.

As the American Alpine Club has suggested (S18 above), the Council itself could take responsibility for running the UIAA in a cost-effective way between the meetings of the GA, relying on some of the Officers and staff, and becoming more active and effective for this purpose.

### **STAFFING STABILITY**

I had made clear at the Council meeting on 14 May 2005 that if the majority of the Board were to terminate the employment of the Sport and Development Director without an equivalent replacement I would be unable to continue to discharge my responsibilities to the UIAA.

When they in fact decided to do this as from the end of August 2005 they were aware that this remained my position; and that therefore my continuation as President was put at risk.

### PART 3: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

By re-engaging Roger Payne on a temporary contract until the end of October 2005 as an Executive Consultant, I have been able to continue in post so that the Council and GA may have the opportunity of considering the range of issues involved.

I am confident that the proposal in S20 (e) above for greater staffing stability would be very much in the interests of the UIAA and of my contribution to it. Without both these members of staff, this would not be possible.

#### **THE ATTACKS ON THE PRESIDENT SINCE APRIL 2005**

I feel that a large number of people, of whom I am one, have put a great amount of productive work into the UIAA over the years.

Hence it would have been quite wrong for me to have allowed myself to be forced out of office in advance of the necessary consideration by the Council and GA of the very wide range of issues set-out in this Report.

#### **MY HOPE**

I hope that the Council and GA will now wish to continue on the basis which I have set out above, and for which I was given a unanimous mandate in Delhi last October; and that we can now build on this for the future after what has been a difficult experience for myself and the staff, and perhaps also for the UIAA more generally.

## NOTES AND SOURCES

The following notes are to assist Member Federations and colleagues in the UIAA seeking additional information or clarification. Copies of documents referred to can be obtained as indicated below or from the UIAA President [alan.blackshaw@uiaa.ch](mailto:alan.blackshaw@uiaa.ch)

**1. The Olympic Movement** ([www.olympic.org](http://www.olympic.org)). The UIAA is recognised by the International Olympic Committee as the International Federation for mountaineering and climbing. This recognition allows the UIAA to participate in some of the bodies of the Olympic Movement mentioned in 5. below. In 2002 the UIAA submitted a dossier of proposals to the IOC concerning 'Cooperation and Peace, Protection of the Environment and Sporting Excellent.' This dossier drew attention to the aspiration of the UIAA competition sports to be included in the Olympic Programme. The [text of the dossier](#) is available from the UIAA website.

**2. UN Global Mountain Partnership** ([www.mountainpartnership.org](http://www.mountainpartnership.org)). The UIAA was a founder member of the Mountain Partnership and helped to launch it during the United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa (Sep 2002). A short report on the [UN Global Partnership](#) was prepared for the meeting of the Council 14 May (agenda item 8.1) and is available from the UIAA website.

**3. UIAA Summit Charter** This was launched at the 2001 GA in St Johann, Austria, for the UN International Year of Mountains 2002. The Charter includes 10 key themes, 10 background points, and highlights 6 areas for collaboration with governments and international bodies to recognise and promote the contribution of mountaineering and climbing to sustainable development. The [text of the Charter](#) is available from the UIAA website, and an extract is included below.

### **Extract from the UIAA Summit Charter 2002**

Collectively the members of the UIAA seek the collaboration and assistance of Governments, Agencies, tourism organisations voluntary bodies, to promote the freedom of responsible access for mountaineering, climbing and trekking, linked with:

- Protection for the wild and natural characteristics of mountain terrain and cliffs, recognising their environmental value and fragility.
- The personal responsibility of the individual, supported by codes of good practice, and by programmes that encourage environmental awareness, excellence, safety and youth development.
- The growth of sustainable mountain tourism, with any charges for services and facilities to be reasonable and fair.
- Economic benefits principally for local communities, with encouragement

## NOTES AND SOURCES

also for mutual co-operation on, for example, training and sustainable facilities.

- No liability on landholders for accidents or damages arising from natural hazards on their land.
- Consideration to be given, as appropriate, to adjusting public policies on access to land, nature conservation, taxation, tax relief and subsidy, relevant to mountains, where this would be appropriate and beneficial to society.

The UIAA seeks to take these proposals forward through positive collaboration.

**4. Final Report of the Review Working Group** The Council recommended to the 2003 GA “That a working group is formed to examine all aspects of the activities, finances and management of the UIAA (including the Competition Sports Councils) with a view to reporting to, and proposing any necessary changes (including constitutional changes) to the 2004 GA” (minutes item 5.13). The 2003 GA adopted this recommendation and invited Josef Klenner as Candidate-President for 2005-08 to lead the Working Group. An interim report was made to the Council in May 2004 and the [final report](#) was submitted to the 2004 GA and is available from the UIAA website.

**5. The World Games and other bodies in the Olympic Movement** The UIAA is a member of the Association of Recognised International Sports Federations (ARISF - [www.arisf.org](http://www.arisf.org)) and through this became a member of the International World Games Association (IWGA – [www.worldgames-IWGA.org](http://www.worldgames-IWGA.org)). The UIAA is also a member of the General Association of International Sports Federations (GAISF - [www.agfisonline.com](http://www.agfisonline.com)) which brings all the Olympic and recognised sports together in one organisation. These organisations are part of the Olympic Movement.

**6. Asian Indoor Games** ([www.ocasiasia.org](http://www.ocasiasia.org)) *From the OCA website:* “The Olympic Council of Asia (OCA) has established the Asian Indoor Games, a competition that will take place every two years, in which will be composed by sports with TV broadcasting potential and not included in the Asian Games and Winter Asian Games Programs and are not Olympic sports. The sports program will comprise of six to eight exciting sports with strong television appeal, including extreme sports, aerobics, acrobatics, indoor athletics, dance sports, futsal, inline hockey, fin swimming, and 25 metres short course swimming.”

**7. Swiss Summit** This was a joint initiative by IUCN and UIAA to promote protection of mountains and cooperation and peace. Climbers from India and Pakistan climbed in Switzerland, in the first joint climb of its type, and were able to express their hopes for peace and protection of the Siachen Glacier. The initiative

## NOTES AND SOURCES

made an important contribution to changing public opinion in favour of the current peace initiatives in Kashmir. A [report](#) with photos is on the UIAA website.

**8. Universidade** The International University Sport Federation (FISU [www.fisu.net](http://www.fisu.net)) coordinates student world championships organized by International Federations (even years) and runs the summer and winter Universidade (odd years). The 2007 winter Universidade is in Turin, and the 2007 summer Universidade is in Bangkok.

**9. Asian Winter Games** The Olympic Council of Asia ([www.ocasias.org](http://www.ocasias.org)) runs a Winter Games. The next is in Chang Chun, China, in 2007. There is a potential for new winter sports to be added to the 2011 Asian Winter Games.

**10. 'The UIAA, Integration of the Competition Sports, and the Olympic Movement'** a personal view by Ian McNaught-Davis, UIAA President 1995-2004. Copies of this paper are available from the UIAA office in English, French, German, Russian and Spanish.

**11. General Assemblies and Councils 2005-08: Issues, themes and seminars.** A short [discussion paper](#) was prepared for the meeting of the Council 14 May (agenda item 9) and is available from the UIAA website.

**12. Conference 'The Rules of the Game'** (February 2001). This was Europe's first conference on the Governance of Sport and organised by the European Olympic Committee, Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile (FIA), and Herbert Smith. The IOC President Dr Rogge spoke at the Conference. The report and conclusions is available from [www.governance-in-sport.com](http://www.governance-in-sport.com).

**13. 'THE INFLUENCE OF THE ICC ON THE ELECTION OF UIAA BOARD MEMBERS AT THE UIAA GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2004'** a draft Report for consultation, 15 August 2005 by Alan Blackshaw. Final report in preparation.

**14. IOC Ethics Commission.** The IOC Ethics Commission has three roles including advising on the application of ethical principles and rules.

**15. Paper on 'Factual claims requiring independent evaluation', September 2005** – a file in preparation by Alan Blackshaw.

**16. Court of Arbitration for Sport.** The Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) is an institution independent of any sports organization which provides for services in order to facilitate the settlement of sports-related disputes through arbitration or mediation ([www.tas-cas.org](http://www.tas-cas.org)).

**17. Complaints about the SDD made by Marco Scolaris** – a report prepared by Alan Blackshaw.

## NOTES AND SOURCES

**18. Correspondence concerning the Agenda** – a file prepared by Alan Blackshaw

**19. AAC letter and motions** – copies are available from the UIAA office.

**20. BMC letters and motions** – Two of the motions are available on the UIAA website: [Office location](#), [The importance of integration of competition bodies](#), a third 'Motion of censure against the ICC President' is available from the UIAA Office.

**21. DAV motion** – see the Agenda and [papers](#) for the 2005 General Assembly



UIAA Office • Monbijoustrasse 61 • Postfach • CH-3000 Berne 23 • SWITZERLAND  
t: +41 (0)31 370 18 28 f: +41 (0)31 370 18 38 e: [office@uiaa.ch](mailto:office@uiaa.ch) w: [www.uiaa.ch](http://www.uiaa.ch)