

Minutes of the XXIX IOF Ordinary General Assembly

Date Saturday 6 October 2018
Venue Prague, Czech Republic

1 Opening of the General Assembly

The President of the IOF, Leho Haldna, opened the XXIX Ordinary General Assembly.

He noted that the General Assembly this time was being held separately from the World Orienteering Championships which he hoped would give depth to the discussions. He also pointed out to the delegates that new Strategic Directions and Focus Areas for the IOF would be decided at the General Assembly and he thanked the member federations for their input during the consultation phase.

2 Roll call

The Secretary General/CEO called the roll of those present (APPENDIX I).

3 Voting members present

The number of voting members present at the time of the roll call was 35, each having one non-transferable vote.

4 Presidium

Mikko Salonen (Vice President), was elected as Meeting Chair, Tom Hollowell (Secretary General) was elected as Secretary, and Leho Haldna (President) and Astrid Waaler Kaas (Senior Vice President) were elected Members, together constituting the presidium during the proceedings of the Ordinary General Assembly

5 Minutes witnesses

Eric Hully (BEL) and Susanne Söderholm (SWE) were elected to certify the minutes of the meeting.

6 Election of tellers

Majella Gooding (BAR), Naomi Ravid (ISR) and Lasse Arnesen (NOR) were elected tellers to count votes and observe elections.

7 Approval of agenda

The Council proposed that an item of urgency be added to the General Assembly agenda as item 13.9 for presentations regarding a newly approved IOF Policy on Preventing Sexual Harassment and Abuse in Orienteering, and to propose a resolution from the General Assembly regarding this topic.

LAT asked if it was necessary to deal with the item as a matter of urgency.

Tom Hollowell (TH) responded on behalf of Council that the item was related to a recent Ethics Commission ruling about ethical conduct at the Junior World Orienteering Championships. The Council wanted to be able to act to ensure that similar situations could be avoided at future events. Council was asking for Member support in this endeavour.

The item of urgency was approved by the General Assembly with the voting 34 FOR, 0 AGAINST, 1 ABSTAIN, and was added as agenda item number 13.9.

The agenda was approved.

8 Open sessions

It was agreed that the sessions should be open, and observers welcomed.

9 Approval of the minutes of the previous General Assembly

The minutes of the XXVIII IOF Ordinary General Assembly held in Strömstad, Sweden, on 26th August 2016, were approved as a true record of that meeting.

10 Report by the Council on the activities of the IOF since the last Ordinary General Assembly, and approval of same.

President Leho Haldna (LH) presented the report on the activities of the IOF in the period since the previous General Assembly in 2016, highlighting some of the key areas which were documented in the Biennial Report 2016-2018. They included the new way of thinking regarding the acquisition of and support for new Member Federations. LH also encouraged the Member Federations to support and participate actively in World Orienteering Day which had been an important activity during the period. Significant effort had been put into the high priority area of Visibility, with work put into relationships with international sports organisations and games, as well as making IOF Major Events more attractive to organisers. The report also included how the IOF's financial status had been stabilised during the last congress period. LH wished to make the statement that the IOF is a non-profit organisation, and that the goal was not to make significant profit, but that these funds should always be reinvested into the activities of the organisation. LH ended his report with thanking the IOF Council, Commissions and the Member Federations for their contributions during the last congress period.

DEN commented that LH had sounded rather pessimistic regarding the increase in WOC applications. They noted that this increase, albeit small, indicated that things were moving in the right direction, supporting the split WOC decision.

LH agreed and apologised for not coming across as more enthusiastic and said that he was in fact very happy about the number of bids received for WOC in the latest application rounds.

The General Assembly unanimously approved the report on the activities of the IOF since the XXVIII Ordinary General Assembly (2016–2018).

11 Auditors' report, approval of the accounts for the calendar years 2016–2017 and discharge of the Council

IOF Secretary General/CEO Tom Hollowell (TH) presented the accounts and Auditors' reports (Financial and Governance) for the financial years 2016 and 2017.

He noted that 2016 had been a difficult financial year which prompted significant cost reduction actions leading to the 2017 positive result and current more stable position.

He pointed out that there were now more details in the financial accounts in accordance with Swedish accounting standards and a desire from Council to provide more transparency. Finally, TH reported the effect of exchange rates (SEK/EUR) on the reported financial results.

LAT asked about the World Cup Consortium that had been presented previously, which was not represented in the accounts.

TH responded that this was in fact still in the final stages of negotiation with the involved parties and would not be initiated until 2020, which was why it was not present in the accounts. He explained that it would not be a separate legal entity and would from 2020 be represented in the IOF accounting if the final negotiations were successful.

FIN asked whether the IOF Governance Auditor had signed his Governance Audit Report, as the version presented in the Congress Binder bore no signature.

TH confirmed that the signed document was available and archived in the IOF Office.

GBR asked whether the IOF Auditors had set any requirements for the IOFs Equity reserves. TH responded that there was no specific requirement, but that the IOF followed the Swedish standard of practice in the matter.

The General Assembly approved the Auditors' reports and the accounts for the fiscal years of 2016 and 2017 voting 33 FOR, 0 AGAINST, 2 ABSTAIN.

The General Assembly discharged the members of the Council from liability for the fiscal years 2016 and 2017 voting 33 FOR, 0 AGAINST, 2 ABSTAIN.

The delegates from AUS and HKG abstained due to Conflict of Interest, both being Council Members.

12 Applications for membership and decisions regarding expulsions

New memberships

12.1 Singapore

New provisional memberships

12.2 Venezuela

Provisional members becoming members

12.3 Iran

TH presented the applications for membership which had previously been approved by Council during the Congress period.

All applications were confirmed and approved by acclamation and the new Member Federations were warmly welcomed.

13 Proposals to the XXVIII IOF Ordinary General Assembly

A. Proposals from the Council

13.1 Amendments to the Code of Ethics

Vice President Mikko Salonen (MS) presented a report on the activities of the IOF Ethics Commission and thanked the commission member for their work in establishing a strong body and for their review of IOF processes and policy documents.

A written report from the Ethics Commission had been made available to the General Assembly delegates.

MS also presented the proposed updates to the IOF Code of Ethics. One minor change in wording had been made following the discussion at the Pre-General Assembly the evening prior to the General Assembly. This involved striking the word "bribes" from Code section 4.3 as its meaning in the context was difficult to understand.

DEN commented that the written report from the Ethics Commission did not include the fourth case ruled upon by the Commission during the Congress period, the previously mentioned case from the Junior World Orienteering Championships 2018.

MS confirmed this replying that the ruling had only been made very recently, after the written report had been prepared.

DEN, commenting upon the proposed new section 3 in the Code which described the Ethics Panel, questioned whether the power of the Ethics Panel should include both to adjudicate upon violations to the Code and being able to impose sanctions. DEN quoted from the International Olympic Committee's (IOC) Ethics Panel documents noting that this body did not have both adjudication and sanctioning powers, and that by approving the proposed amendments to the Code of Ethics, the IOF Ethics Panel would be much stronger than that of the IOC. DEN therefore asked the General Assembly to consider the need for an IOF Ethics Panel with the authority to both adjudicate and sanction.

Furthermore DEN, commenting upon section 6.2 of the Code, which states that the IOF Council has ownership of the Code, also asked whether this was appropriate when the Ethics Panel should be an independent body reporting directly to the General Assembly.

MS replied to DEN's first question by saying that the new section 3 was simply a copy of the description of the Ethics Panel from the IOF Statutes to make the document more complete. The General Assembly had approved this description and working method already at the General Assembly in 2016.

Answering DEN's second question MS noted that Ethics Panel was a truly independent body per the Statutes and that appropriate restrictions on the Ethics Panel power were in place in the Code.

DEN further stated the opinion that it was an example of poor governance and Conflict of Interest to have "political" delegates from Member Federations on the Ethics Panel. They also reiterated that it was not appropriate to give the Ethics Panel the combined powers of judgement, sanctioning and ruling upon appeals.

MS responded that Conflicts of Interest were avoided by the practice of appointing a Hearing Panel on a case by case basis. He suggested that more significant changes to the IOF Statutes and Code of Ethics as proposed by DEN could be proposed for the next General Assembly.

DEN once again questioned that the IOF Council should have ownership of the IOF Code of Ethics. They reiterated that there should be no "politicians" on the IOF Ethics Panel, and that they did not support giving the powers of adjudication and sanctioning to the Panel.

HKG here wished to bring to the attention of the General Assembly §12.2.2 of the IOF Statutes, the Ethics Panel remit “To adjudicate upon violations of the Code of Ethics.” and “To report findings to the Council or GA and impose sanctions for violations of the Code of Ethics.”. They wished to make clear that the vote at hand was in fact not on whether to award such powers, as they were already in place, but to align the IOF Code of Ethics with the IOF Statutes.

LAT stated their support for DEN’s idea to separate the two powers of the IOF Ethics Panel, acknowledging that this was not possible at the current time, but should be considered for the next General Assembly. They gave the example that in legal courts one party investigates and another one makes rulings.

DEN accepted that the proposal was to align the IOF Code of Ethics with the IOF Statutes, however reiterated their recommendation to vote against the proposal, announcing that they would submit a proposal to remove and/or separate the powers of the IOF Ethics Panel at the next General Assembly.

AUS also noted that the current vote only pertained to the alignment of the IOF Code of Ethics with the IOF Statutes, however agreed with DEN that the Panel’s remit should be investigated and potentially adjusted.

MS commented that the proposed changes to the Code of Ethics were based upon the past 2 years’ experience since the introduction of the Code and through the Ethics Commission work. MS asked the General Assembly to hear some remarks by Jan Exner (JE) (CZE) who had been Chair of the Ethics Commission for the past 2 years and was present as an Observer.

The General Assembly unanimously allowed JE to speak.

JE wished to make it clear that the IOF is not a state, and that the IOF Ethics Panel is not a court of law, and that Sports Arbitration differs from such institutions. In Sports Arbitration, the same body investigates, prosecutes and rules, with decisions appealable to the Court for Arbitration in Sport (CAS). In this, the IOF actually follows international common practice.

The General Assembly approved the proposed amendments to the IOF Code of Ethics in voting 25 FOR, 1 AGAINST, 4 ABSTAIN.

13.2 Amendments to the IOF Statutes

Vice President Mikko Salonen (MS) introduced the item and explained that the Council was proposing amendments to the Statutes in seven (7) areas. Each of the areas would be debated and voted upon separately. MS also noted that for changes to the Statutes a 3/4 majority of votes expressed was required.

I. Amendment regarding the aims of the IOF reflecting the new mission

In order to align the statutes with the new Strategic Directions, Council proposed to change the aims of the IOF in §2.1.1 to the following:

“To promote the global growth of orienteering and develop competitive and recreational orienteering”.

The proposal was carried unanimously.

II. Amendment regarding working towards gender equality.

The Council proposed in §7.10.1 to increase the minimum requirement of each genders represented in Council from two to three and have a Vice President of each gender elected, nominations permitting.

DEN stated that they found gender quotas to be undemocratic. They believe in equal representation, but not by quotas, but rather by cultural change. They acknowledged the IOC recommendations noted by Council in their proposal, however noted that they did not include a recommendation on quotas. DEN noted also that a similar proposal from Council had been rejected by the General Assembly in 2016. DEN recommended that the IOF Council appoint a taskforce to deal with the issue instead.

NOR disagreed with DEN, stating that sometimes good intentions are not enough to bring about change, and that firm actions were needed to address the issue. They also stated that they did not agree with the last part of the proposed wording, i.e. "nominations permitting", feeling that this undermined the strength of the proposal.

BLR commented that gender equality was already addressed in the IOF Statutes, and questioned whether it was important enough to increase the quota.

MS replied that the IOF Council felt that it was.

LAT mentioned that they believed that LAT had the highest percentage of women in CEO positions in the EU without need for quotas, and that there may be other ways to do things, for example that strong women should be able to take power for themselves.

ITA commented that, looking at the nominations for Council, it was clear that good intentions had not had enough effect. They were in support of the proposal.

HKG wished to point out that the discussion was focusing solely on the inclusion of women. However, there is already a quota in place for the number of Council members from federations outside of Europe. Thus, the exception to the increase in the gender quota on the basis that quotas are undemocratic is hypocritical and sexist.

The proposal was voted upon with the result 26 FOR, 7 AGAINST, 2 ABSTAIN. The proposal was not carried as it did not reach the required 3/4 majority.

III. Amendment regarding easing the decision-making requirements in special situations

Council had proposed to update the following in the statutes, i.e. reducing the requirement for a 3/4 majority to 2/3 majority in two places.

§7.9.6 An amendment to the Statutes shall require a two thirds majority of votes expressed.

§7.10.11 A two thirds majority of votes expressed shall be required for the election of Honorary Members or appointment to the position of Honorary President.

The proposal was carried with the voting 32 FOR, 1 AGAINST, 0 ABSTAIN.

IV. Amendment clarifying Remits of the IOF Council

Council had proposed to give the IOF Council the mandate to find an organiser and a place of the next Ordinary General Assembly, and to elect a Senior Vice President, two tasks previously unassigned, as this was according to current practices. The proposal was also to give the Council the remit to determine the seat of the IOF.

DEN wished to comment that they believed that more Member Federations would be able to afford sending a delegate to the General Assembly if it were to take place in conjunction with the World Orienteering Championships (WOC). They noted that the organisers of this General Assembly had coped very well with organising it together with the World Cup Final, and they thought it ought to be organised together with WOC in future.

MS responded that the proposal from Council allowed for this.

The proposal was carried unanimously.

V. Amendment regarding reorganising chapters for Honorary President and Honorary Members.

Council had recommended a simplification of the Statutes in this area.

The proposal was carried unanimously.

VI. Amendment regarding Handling of Appeals

Council had proposed to add the following article:

§ 8.4.2 Should a member consider a decision of a Jury of an international orienteering event to violate the IOF Code of Ethics, an appeal may be presented to the Ethics Panel.

The proposal was carried with the voting 32 FOR, 0 AGAINST, 1 ABSTAIN.

VII. Other minor changes

Council had proposed several minor changes based upon member feedback and the introduction of the Ethics Panel.

NOR noted that they had made a proposal regarding an Independent Chairperson for the IOF General Assembly, to be dealt with shortly.

The proposal was carried unanimously.

B Proposals from Member Federations

13.3 NOR: Amendment to the IOF Statutes regarding gender balance in the IOF Council

NOR presented their proposal that Statutes §8.10.1 be amended with an additional phrase "There shall within the IOF Council at all times be a Vice President of each gender".

MS presented that the IOF Council were in favour of the proposal.

HKG noted that without the addition of "nominations permitting" or equivalent wording, there would be a risk of an empty chair.

NOR answered that if there were not enough candidates, the IOF Council should seek candidates.

DEN stated that they were against quotas because of the risk of appointing completely incompetent women to the IOF Council, giving the example of a waitress at the hotel where the General Assembly was taking place being appointed Vice President of the IOF merely because of her gender. They also asked for a broader discussion about the composition of the Council.

NOR took offence at the insinuation by DEN that all potential female candidates were inherently less competent. On the contrary, they believed that there were many competent women, and that the proposed quota would encourage these that they have a place on the Council.

BLR enquired as to the possibility of adding a voting option including the addition "nominations permitting".

HKG noted that based upon the discussion they for future elections for IOF Council would consistently nominate female candidates.

Senior Vice President of the IOF Astrid Waaler Kaas (AWK) told the General Assembly how she at the time of her own election to the IOF Council had asked herself whether she was good enough. Now she does not need to ask herself the same question, because she knows for sure that she is. However, she believed that her male counterparts did not face this internal and external scrutiny to even closely the same extent. Therefore, she believed that quotas were needed.

GBR stated that they took extreme offence at the comments of DEN. They pointed out that "if you always do as you always have, you'll always get what you always have", meaning that nothing would change unless action was taken. They also pointed out that neither the IOF Statutes nor the discussion at hand took into account persons of a non-binary gender identity. Finally, they shared that in their experience, gender quotas had proved successful.

AUS again raised the topic of a change in culture. Looking around the room, they observed that most delegates were representative of a Christian western male dominated norm, which should be considered as a factor in the discussion. Therefore, AUS felt that a cultural change needed to be pushed, and that the IOF General Assembly needed to take an activist approach to the matter.

BLR made a counterproposal, adding the text ", nominations permitting" to the amendment proposed by NOR.

The General Assembly was asked whether to allow the counterproposal from BLR. The vote was 18 FOR, 4 AGAINST and 9 ABSTAIN, meaning that the addition of this counterproposal was allowed.

The NOR proposal was voted upon first, with the result 16 FOR, 17 AGAINST and 1 ABSTAIN. The proposal was not carried.

Voting for the BLR counterproposal was 30 FOR, 2 AGAINST and 2 ABSTAIN. The counterproposal was carried and the Statutes §8.10.1 would be amended with the additional phrase "There shall within the IOF Council at all times be a Vice President of each gender, nominations permitting".

13.4 NOR: Amendment to the IOF Statutes regarding an Independent Chairperson for the IOF General Assembly

NOR presented their proposal to amend the IOF Statutes so that the Chairperson of the IOF General Assembly be a non-Council Member and non-Delegate.

MS presented that the IOF Council were in support of the principal expressed in the proposal from NOR and supported that this principle should be instituted for future General Assemblies. However, they did not support adding the requirement to the IOF Statutes.

DEN supported the proposal as they believed that there had been problems with this in the past, for example they felt that the Chairperson of the previous General Assembly had had a Conflict of Interest. The arguments from Council for not adding this to the Statutes were not strong enough.

SRB asked about the election process, and what would happen if the proposed Chairperson was not approved.

LAT stated that they were not in favour of the proposal but suggested that maybe one of the Honorary Presidents might be suitable to chair the General Assembly.

FIN noted that it could be difficult for the General Assembly to judge the suitability of the nominated Chairperson if they were someone unknown. They also added that in companies, it is not included in the statutes but in common practice that the Chairperson of the Annual General Meeting (AGM) is independent.

DEN stated that the task of finding an independent Chairperson for the IOF General Assembly would be with the Council and found that the suggestion of an Honorary President was good.

The proposal was not carried with the voting 7 FOR, 22 AGAINST, 5 ABSTAIN.

13.5 NOR: Program change proposal for the Junior World Orienteering Championships

NOR presented their proposal to fix the JWOC programme as follows

“The Junior World Orienteering Championships is an annual event. The programme shall include a single-race Sprint competition, a Sprint Relay in the format WMMW, a single-race Middle distance competition, a single-race Long distance competition and a Relay as well as an opening ceremony, a closing ceremony and adequate rest and model events. The programme shall be kept within no more than 7 days.”

Council Member Nik Suter, presented the Council counterproposal noted that it supported the NOR proposal to add Sprint Relay into the JWOC programme but felt that the overall programme must be reviewed, taking into consideration the current competition formats, and that the overall length of the JWOC programme in days should remain as it was at the current time. Council therefore proposed that the GA give Council the mandate to determine the JWOC programme, taking consideration of the above, and report back at the Presidents' Conference in 2019.

NOR wished to add that they did not support the possibility of a longer week, and that they did not think that Sprint Relay would be a more complicated task for an organiser than the Middle Qualification.

DEN strongly supported the NOR proposal. They also wished to note that they had read all the documents prepared on the matter. They did not want to risk the quality of the JWOC being reduced by any potential Council decision. They also wanted to voice their support for a fixed program of competitions during the JWOC. They supported taking the decision now and reviewing the result later.

NS added for consideration that the proposal from NOR would lead to increased specialisation from the athletes, leaving it up to each whether this would be desirable or not.

GBR stated their strong support of the proposal from NOR.

BUL also stated their support of the proposal. Because of the split WOC, they felt it would be good for the Juniors to have a more equal balance of both forest and Sprint races.

BEL stated their support that the mandate should be 5 medal races across 7 days. Therefore, they supported the NOR proposal.

The General Assembly voted whether to allow voting on the Council's counterproposal. The voting was FOR 9, AGAINST 13, ABSTAIN 12. The counterproposal was not added.

The NOR proposal was carried with the voting FOR 28, AGAINST 4, ABSTAIN 3.

13.6 DEN: Regarding IOF Anti-Doping work

DEN presented and clarified their proposal regarding the Anti-Doping work of the IOF. The proposal had been split into 6 parts to be voted upon separately. Denmark had made the proposal as it considered the anti-doping work of the IOF of the utmost importance and asked for more transparency, particularly regarding which athletes were tested by the IOF and National Anti-Doping Organisations (NADO). Denmark had understood that some of the proposals could have a large impact on the finances of the IOF and member federations and felt that the clarifications which had been worked out in cooperation with the Council addressed some of these concerns.

Mike Dowling (MD), Vice President, presented the IOF Council's view on each matter. Council appreciated the interest and focus on the anti-doping work and the opportunity to respond. MD pointed out as a general comment that detailed General Assembly decisions about anti-doping work could cause problems if they came into conflict with future changes in the World Anti-Doping Code.

- I. Proposal that all Member Federations should encourage their NADO to sign an agreement with the IOF.

Council were in support of this proposal.

The proposal was carried with voting FOR 28, AGAINST 0, ABSTAIN 5.

- II. Proposal that more athletes should be included in the IOF and NADO Registered Testing Pools

MD briefly explained the work already being done on the matter. Furthermore, he made clear that inclusion of orienteering athletes on NADO testing lists is fully at the discretion of each respective NADO, and not a matter for the IOF. In conclusion, the Council were not in support of the proposals, however felt that the overall goal of the proposal was already being met.

The proposal was not carried with a clear majority AGAINST.

III. Proposal that the IOF will not award events to Federations with a Non-Compliant NADO

MD explained that this was in fact already in place in accordance with the provisions in the World Anti-Doping Code, and that there was therefore no need to vote on the matter. DEN confirmed that no vote was required.

IV. Proposal that nominations for IOF Council should not be accepted, and appointments to IOF Commissions should not be made, from Member Federations with a Non-Compliant NADO.

Council were in support of this proposal and proposed that it be implemented by way of an amendment to the IOF Statutes.

BLR expressed their support for the proposal, however questioned whether it should apply also to the commissions, as this would potentially involve the loss of many highly qualified individuals in the IOF organisation.

ISR asked what would happen to council and commission members already appointed if their NADO were to become Non-Compliant.

MD replied that they would stay for the duration of their term.

DEN responded to BLR that it was a matter of taste but that they thought it should also include commission appointments.

ITA asked to which countries it would currently apply.

TH responded that at the time of the General Assembly, the only Non-Compliant NADO was that of Mauritius which was not an IOF member.

The proposal was carried with voting FOR 24, AGAINST 1, ABSTAIN 6.

V. Proposal that National Teams from federations where the NADO is Non-Compliant should be subjected to a higher frequency of doping control

MD explained that this was already covered in the IOFs compliance to the World Anti-Doping Code, where this was one factor which was considered in the Code mandated risk assessment, and that there was no need to vote on the matter. DEN confirmed that no vote was required.

VI. Proposal that all member Federations shall instruct their top Athletes in doping issues and prevention including the understanding of Fair Play

Council fully supported this proposal.

The proposal was carried with a clear majority FOR.

13.7 DEN: Regarding IOF work with sub-regional bodies

DEN presented their proposal to the General Assembly concluding with a statement that they were withdrawing the proposal.

13.8 DEN: Regarding VIP services concept for the World Orienteering Championships

DEN presented their proposal to the General Assembly concluding with a statement that they were withdrawing the proposal.

C. Additional proposal from the IOF Council

13.9 Presentations and Resolution regarding IOF Policy on Sexual Harassment and Abuse

Secretary General/CEO Tom Hollowell (TH) introduced the topic describing the background. Shortly prior to JWOC 2017 a participant had been in contact with the IOF regarding historical practices which they felt were not in line with the ethical values of the IOF and could potentially be considered sexual harassment. Actions had been taken by the IOF in connection with JWOC 2017 and some member federations had worked with ethical values education following the event. However, in connection with JWOC 2018, similar practices were once again encountered and a report regarding potential violations to the Code of Ethics had been addressed to the Ethics Commission.

Jan Exner (JE), IOF Ethics Commission Chairperson, was invited to present its ruling on case 3-2018 regarding the potential breach of the IOF Code of Ethics at the Junior World Orienteering Championships (JWOC) 2018. JE explained that the Commission had in fact found that violations had occurred, but that the Commission had chosen not to apply sanctions. It had instead encouraged the Council to complete its work with a Policy regarding the Prevention of Sexual Harassment and Abuse and work with information and education.

DEN stated their disappointment in the ruling of the Ethics Panel, expressing their opinion that there should have been sanctions imposed on member federations as this work is within their responsibilities.

IOF Senior Vice President Astrid Waaler Kaas presented the IOF Policy on Preventing Sexual Harassment and Abuse in Orienteering recently approved by the Council.

BLR enquired as to the number of Guidelines listed in the presentation. AWK explained that there had been a typographical in the presentation, accidentally numbering 1-4 and 6-10 instead of 1-9. The policy document which had been made available to delegates was correct.

The Council proposed that the General Assembly adopt a resolution regarding the Prevention of Sexual Harassment and Abuse in Orienteering with the wording:

The members of the International Orienteering Federation resolve to:

- Uphold the orienteering values of inclusiveness and ethical behaviour by encouraging our own members to show respect for individual differences and preferences.
- Abide by the IOF Policy on the Prevention of Sexual Harassment and Abuse and educate our own members about the same.
- Adhere to the IOF Code of Ethics and embrace the good governance of our sport.

The resolution was carried with the voting 34 FOR, 1 AGAINST, 0 ABSTAIN

14. Membership fees, budget and activity plan for the two calendar years following the General Assembly.

14.1 Strategic Directions for the period 2018 – 2022

IOF Senior Vice President Astrid Waaler Kaas (AWK) presented the proposed Strategic Directions for the period 2018-2022.

FIN wished to thank the Council for the process followed in preparing the draft, as they welcomed the consultation with the Member Federations and at the 2017 Presidents' Conference.

LAT expressed their positive attitude to the resulting proposal, finding it to be precise and concise.

The Strategic Directions for the period 2018 – 2022 were unanimously approved.

14.2 Activity Plan (Focus Areas) for the Congress period 2018 – 2020

AWK continued to present the proposed Activity Plan (Focus Areas) for the Congress Period 2018-2020.

ISR asked if council could give some examples of what was meant by simplification.

LH replied that there were a number of examples, for example in the creation of the rules for the new Knock-Out Sprint format, in the creation of the new standard for school maps, previous proposals regarding introducing kilometre speeds as qualification methods, and hindering access to the sport.

AWK added that there were numerous opportunities for introducing simpler forms of orienteering to recreational participants.

LAT advised that they had been successful in cooperating with Rogaining and Adventure Sports and noted this as an opportunity.

ITA wished to congratulate the IOF and the Czech Orienteering Federation on the organisation of the General Assembly and express their thanks to the Council Members and in particular Maria Silvia Viti. They also asked whether there were any projects to do with school orienteering.

AWK replied that the IOF Regional and Youth Development Commission had established a school orienteering network, and that the IOF had a Memorandum of Understanding with the International School Sport Federation.

The General Assembly unanimously approved the Activity Plan and Focus Areas for the Congress Period 2018-2020.

14.3 Membership fees and budget for the years 2019-2020

Vice President Mike Dowling (MD) presented the Council proposal for Membership Fees for 2019-2020.

The proposed Membership fees were approved in voting 30 FOR, 0 AGAINST, 4 ABSTAIN.

Secretary General/CEO Tom Hollowell (TH) presented the Council proposal for the IOF budget for 2019-2020.

The Budget was approved unanimously.

15 Appointment of auditors for 2018 and 2019

The auditing firm Ernst & Young, Karlstad, Sweden, were appointed financial auditor for the fiscal years 2018 and 2019. Further, the General Assembly determined that Ernst & Young, Karlstad, Sweden provide the substitute auditor for the said financial period.

Matthias Kalle Dalheimer, SWE/GER, was appointed Governance Auditor for the said period.

16 Appointment of up to five members to the Ethics Panel

TH presented the proposed members of the IOF Ethics Panel. Four of the five current members of the Ethics Commission had agreed to continue serving on the Ethics Panel. JE had decided to retire from the Panel due to potential Conflict of Interest. As a replacement an external candidate was being proposed, Secretary General of the International University Sports Federation (FISU) Eric Saintrond.

DEN wished again to note their position against the inclusion of “politicians” in the Ethics Panel.

The General Assembly in voting 31 FOR, 1 AGAINST, 2 ABSTAIN approved the appointment of the following persons to the IOF Ethics Panel

Robert Dredge (GBR)
Kirre Palmi (FIN)
Michel Ediar (FRA)
Anna Samelius (SWE)
Eric Saintrond (SUI) FISU Secretary General

The chairperson was to be elected by the Ethics Panel itself.

17 Election of the IOF Council

Two nominations had been received for the position of Vice President, with two positions vacant. Thus Michael Dowling (AUS) and Tatiana Kalenderoglu (RUS) were elected as Vice Presidents of the IOF.

Seven candidates had been nominated for the three member seats available.

Stefano Bisoffi (ITA)
Yunus Emre Ikinici (TUR)
Hannu Kottonen (FIN)
Tamer Mehanna (EGY)
Graham Teahan (NZL)
Dusan Vystavel (CZE)
Dominic Yue (HKG)

Election took place by way of secret ballot.

Result of the vote:

Hannu Kottonen (FIN)	26 votes	elected
Dominic Yue (HKG)	26 votes	elected
Dusan Vystavel (CZE)	23 votes	elected
Stefano Bisoffi (ITA)	15 votes	
Yunus Emre Ikinici (TUR)	6 votes	
Graham Teahan (NZL)	5 votes	
Tamer Mehanna (EGY)	4 votes	

18 Announcement of place and approximate dates of the XXX IOF Congress and Ordinary General Assembly in 2020

It was announced that the XXX IOF Congress and General Assembly would take place in the Triangle Region, Denmark in the period 7 – 11 July 2020, in connection with the Sprint World Orienteering Championships 2020.

18 Awards of Honour

President Leho Haldna awarded IOF silver pins to Mikko Salonen (FIN, no. 56), Henning Spjelkavik (NOR, no. 57), Astrid Waaler Kaas (NOR, no. 58)

President Leho Haldna awarded IOF bronze pins to Maria Silvia Viti (ITA, no. 102), Tatiana Kalenderoglu (TUR/RUS, no. 103), Karel Jonak (CZE, no. 104), Aron Less (HUN, no. 105), Roland Hellberg (SWE, no. 106), Lenka Klimpova (CZE, no. 107), Håkan Blomgren (SWE, no. 108), Nermin Fenmen (TUR, no. 109), Jaroslav Kacmarcik (CZE, no. 110), Martin Fredholm (SWE, no. 111)

19 Closure

Vice President Mikko Salonen thanked the General Assembly delegates for the conduct of the meeting and since he was now stepping down from the Council thanked the member federations for their work and wished the IOF success for the future.

President Leho Haldna directed special thanks to the Czech Orienteering Federation and especially Dusan Vystavel for their support in organising the General Assembly and related meetings.

Leho Haldna formally closed the XXIX IOF Ordinary General Assembly and declared the new Congress period open.

Leho Haldna
President

Tom Hollowell
Secretary General/CEO

Mikko Salonen
Chairperson

Minutes verified by:

Eric Hully

Susanne Söderholm