



Human Rights Challenges in the Hosting of MSEs

Land and Housing
Construction
Temporary & Migrant Workers
Procurement and Supply Chains
Security

"Striving for Excellence"
Supplementary Resources
May 2014



Human Rights Challenges in Hosting Mega-Sporting Events

“Striving for Excellence” Supplementary Resources

May 2014

Background

The material in this report was originally written for the www.megasportingevents.org website to expand on and advance the research contained in IHRB’s report “Striving for Excellence: Mega-Sporting Events and Human Rights” (2013). It is accurate and up to date as of May 2014. The www.megasportingevents.org website has since been updated and the original content replaced. The original content has been archived into this series of short reports to maintain their usefulness as early contributions to the body of research on mega-sporting events and human rights.

Copyright: © Copyright Institute for Human Rights and Business (IHRB), January 2017. Published by IHRB.

All rights reserved. IHRB permits free reproduction of extracts from this publication provided that due acknowledgment is given and a copy of the publication carrying the extract is sent to the address below. Requests for permission to reproduce and translate the publication should be addressed to IHRB.

Institute for Human Rights and Business

Phone: (+44) 203-411-433

Email: info@ihrb.org

Web: www.ihrb.org

Cite as: Institute for Human Rights and Business (IHRB), “Human Rights Challenges in Hosting Mega-Sporting Events: (May 2014), available at: <https://www.ihrb.org/megasportingevents/mse-resources>.

Acknowledgments: The material in this report was written by Lucy Amis, IHRB Mega-Sporting Events Research Fellow.

Contents

Land Acquisition and Housing Rights	4
What's at Stake?	4
In-Depth Studies of Land, Housing, and Mega-Sporting Events	5
Challenges	6
Responses	8
Construction	9
What's at Stake?	9
Challenges	10
Responses	11
Recruitment of Temporary and Migrant Workers	15
What's at Stake?	15
In-Depth Studies of Migrant Workers and Mega-Sporting Events	16
Challenges	18
Responses	19
Procurement & Supply Chains	19
What's at Stake?	19
Challenges	21
Responses	22
Security	28
What's at Stake?	28
Challenges	29
Responses	29

Land Acquisition and Housing Rights

What’s at Stake?

Land is a key resource for communities, governments and companies. Organisers need access to land on which they can host and stage mega-sporting events (MSEs). Host governments want to create landmark monuments for the events as well as build and expand public infrastructure; developers want to build new facilities or residential homes. Amidst all this there are families who want safe places to live and do not want abrupt change in their lives. These competing demands are not always readily compatible.

Adequate housing is enshrined as part of the right to an adequate standard of living within the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights \(1948\)](#), and is protected under the [International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights \(Article 11\)](#). Ensuring access to adequate housing is more than just the provision of basic shelter and a connection with land. It is the right to live somewhere in security, dignity and peace. Housing or shelter must offer security of tenure, the availability of basic utilities – including access to drinking water and sewage, and be both affordable and accessible.

MSE host governments and the delivery authorities responsible for the construction of MSE sporting venues, facilities and related infrastructure, as well as the companies they contract, have all had to deal with individuals and groups – some of them indigenous, others not – who own, rent or have customary rights to the places where they live. They are present there, or have made their homes, on land that the governments have set for development. This is not unique to MSEs, indeed, such cases continue to be at the heart of debates concerning business and human rights. But the deadlines governing the staging of the MSE injects a sense of urgency.

If the acquisition or use of land is made responsibly, and with due diligence, it can represent an opportunity for economic development and poverty reduction. In Athens, the [2004 Olympic village](#) translated into 3,000 new units of subsidized housing, said to benefit 10,000 residents. Tracts of disused industrial land have been rejuvenated in [Sydney](#) and [London](#).

Good practice requires companies to adhere to the principles of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC). Under international law, the principles of FPIC are necessary when dealing with indigenous communities. To override any potential veto, governments have often invoked the notion of ‘*eminent domain*’ to take over land even if those already living there do not wish to move from the land. Land acquired by governments in this way has in many places been put to good uses – including for new social housing development, roads, highways and railroad projects, all of which support the public good. But often the eminent domain principle is invoked to acquire land for

private use, and not public purpose. An Olympic stadium serves public purpose, so does a new railway line. But land earmarked for hotels, while serving the public, are essentially private ventures, and may not meet the "public purpose" test.

Too often governments use force to take over land from communities and small business owners against their will. Sports governing bodies and companies have in the past seemed content to let MSE host governments acquire land, so that they can focus on their short-term commercial objectives.

A balance needs to be found. Stakeholder consultation is never easy, but guidelines such as the [IFC Performance Standards](#) on Social and Environmental Sustainability and Special Rapporteur's [guidelines on development-based evictions and displacement](#), provide governments and investors with guidance on responsible land acquisition and use, and how to act with due diligence. Effective consultations with stakeholders from an early stage may provide a pre-emptive remedy to ensure that rights are not undermined at any stage of land acquisition or use.

MSE in-depth Studies

In-Depth Studies of Land, Housing, and Mega-Sporting Events

The Impact of MSE on the Realisation of the Right to Adequate Housing

This 2009 [report](#) to the UN Human Rights Council [A/HRC/13/20], the UN Special Rapporteur on Adequate Housing, Raquel Rolnik, discusses the impact of major international sports events (mega-events) on the realization of the right to adequate housing, in particular, the positive and negative legacy of hosting the Olympic Games and the Football World Cup.

The report includes an overview of the practices and procedures of the International Olympic Committee and FIFA, including their bidding and selection process for host cities and countries. The report also offers insights on the role played by sponsors, as well as some examples of positive and negative practices of host cities and countries. The report concludes with a series of recommendations for both national governments and sports governing bodies. The UN Special Rapporteur has since released a proposal for a set of Guiding Principles on security of tenure for the urban poor.

Fair Play For Housing Rights: Mega-Events, Olympic Games and Housing Rights

This 2007 [report](#) by the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE) analyses the housing rights impacts of the Olympics and other mega-events; and highlights the need to integrate housing rights considerations into every stage of mega-event planning and hosting, including by future host cities as they plan to bid for MSEs. It

concludes with a set of ten “Multi-Stakeholder Guidelines on Mega-Events and the Protection and Promotion of Housing Rights”.

Challenges

A Short MSE History of Allegations of Forced Evictions and Housing Rights Abuses

The UN Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as well as a number of expert housing rights organisations, have over the years catalogued alleged housing rights abuses associated with the staging of MSEs. Well-established industrial nations and growing economies alike have encountered their share of difficulties. For example:

30,000 people were **forcibly evicted** in Atlanta before the 1996 Olympics, with 1,200 public housing units lost, and 15,000 **low-income residents** priced out of the city.

About 1.5 million people were **displaced** to prepare for the Beijing 2008 Olympics. Human Rights Watch alleged inadequate compensation and lack of due process, with reports of unannounced night raids.

Some 35,000 families were **evicted from public lands** in New Delhi for the 2010 Commonwealth Games.

As many as 20,000 residents were removed from the **Joe Slovo informal settlement** in Cape Town to impoverished areas at the city’s edge prior to the FIFA 2010 South Africa World Cup.

The planned demolition of up to 450 social housing units at London’s **Clays Lane Estate** went ahead amidst claims by some residents of delays in rehousing and inadequate compensation.

Designers, developers, financiers and builders or civil engineers all risk reputational damage, fines or legal action, in cases where project design, compensation schemes, and resettlement and livelihood restoration – or the community engagement that should accompany these actions – when things go wrong. To avoid this, they should explicitly take account of and address potential human rights impacts. Even in cases where the government alone can provide land for MSE venues, companies should ensure that the process of acquisition is consistent with human rights and that there are no negative human rights impacts from the land acquisition, or eminent domain process, and all that flows from such governmental actions.

Challenges do not arise only at the start of the MSE lifecycle. For example, in London the construction in early 2012 of a temporary basketball facility being built at a late stage on London Metropolitan Open Land (i.e. a public green space) in **Leyton Marsh**, prompted **community protests** and legal action in the final weeks before the

London Games. This underlines the need for ongoing human rights due diligence and dialogue with stakeholder groups.

Brazil – Raising Housing Rights Concerns

Since 2000, [Brazil’s Constitution](#) has included housing as a social right, making it, along with eight other rights, a fundamental right that has precedence over any other laws in the country. According to the research of [Reporter Brasil](#) about MSEs in Brazil, these guarantees have served, in many cases, to offer remedies which include compensation for the affected families, their rehousing elsewhere, or for payment of rent by the state until new housing projects are ready. There are concerns however that the amounts of compensation are generally low, and that the new housing being made available is frequently far from where the inhabitants used to live. There are also reports of communities being rehoused in areas that do not enjoy the same level of public services or amenities. These problems are accentuated by steeply rising house prices and rents as a direct result the ongoing recent expansion in the Brazilian real estate sector.

The [Joint Committee of World Cup Popular Committees](#) (Articulação Nacional dos Comitês Populares da Copa) – which brings together social movements, academics and civil society groups from across Brazil – campaigns to protect human rights during the MSEs. It alleges since 2011 that 170,000 people had been affected by the [forced removals](#) linked to the 2014 FIFA World Cup and Rio 2016 Olympics. In September 2013, [Amnesty International Brazil](#) put the figure closer to 220,000. These allegations prompted urban planner Raquel Rolnik, until recently the [UN Special Rapporteur on the right to housing](#), to call on Brazil’s federal, state and municipal authorities involved in World Cup and Olympics projects to engage in open dialogue with Brazilian society and affected communities. She also called on the Government to “guarantee that these two mega-events promote respect for human rights and leave a positive legacy in Brazil.”

Vila Autódromo, a poor community located on the shores of Lagoa Jacarépaguá in Rio de Janeiro, has been at the centre of much debate in the run up to the Rio 2016 Olympics. Vila Autódromo dates back to the 1960s, when the community formed a fishing village that grew with the construction of a racetrack. Over the years the surrounding area (Barra da Tijuca) has become a prosperous neighbourhood. Since 1990, municipal authorities have attempted to remove Vila Autódromo’s inhabitants on several occasions. The reasons given have included damage to the natural environment and the “aesthetic and visual” aspect of the city, although these have been [refuted](#) in a series of judicial disputes. In the early 1990s, the State Government granted tenure to families in the area, which strengthened the possibility of security to the residents of Vila Autódromo. According to community members however this has rarely resulted in proper consultations.

Since Rio was awarded the 2016 Olympics the debate has intensified. In 2009, statements from Rio’s mayor have reportedly stressed the need to remove the residents to accommodate the Olympic Park works. The initial plan was to build a Media Centre and other facilities on the site, but a revised plan from the authorities reportedly

suggested that the Vila Autódromo area would fall within the security perimeter surrounding the Olympic Park. More recently, the authorities have said that part of the Vila Autódromo should be removed to construct access ways to a nearby boulevard, being expanded for the Olympics.

Some [residents](#) have agreed to leave and move to apartments built by the government in a nearby area. This became possible after the State’s Public Defender Office (advocating in defence of Vila Autódromo community) relinquished part of the claims, and reconciled a request from the mayor’s office and allowing for the demolition of some of the houses. Others however have been more critical. For example a former [public defender](#), accused the Executive branch of political interference in the office. The [case](#) is ongoing.

Responses

Brazil Secretariat of Human Rights of the Presidency

Brazil’s federal government executive branch [responded](#) to calls from the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Housing and other concerned stakeholders over alleged forced evictions in the run up to the MSEs, by promising to establish “a Working Group to monitor the process of removals and also a federal protocol on this topic”. The [Working Group on the Human Right to Adequate Housing](#) was created in May 2012 under the auspices of the Secretariat of Human Rights of the Presidency. Although many welcomed this, some [critics](#) felt it was too slow in coming.

One focus of the new Working Group has been to monitor issues involving evictions in the host-cities of the World Cup. The Working Group made visits to six of the twelve World Cup host-cities and completed a [report](#) in September 2013. This includes specific recommendations to the executives’ branches of states and municipalities. For example, the Working Group called for a communications space and for social participation in the housing projects. In addition, the Working Group submitted general recommendations to the Federal Government, these included calls for changes in legislation to meet the needs of affected families and to ensure access to information about the evictions. One [Working Group director](#) described the situation in the cities as “extremely serious.”

Construction

What's at Stake?

Sporting venues and the infrastructure networks built for MSEs can leave a positive legacy in the host country. The construction phase itself may create a temporary surge in employment and contribute to economic and social development. Athlete villages are frequently transformed into housing, and in many cases social housing. The coverage, quality and accessibility of infrastructure networks, can directly benefit the economy, the environment, and the quality of life. These projects have to be implemented on extraordinarily tight deadlines, with no scope for overruns. In some cases this has led to tragic consequences, such as accidental deaths. As with any major construction and infrastructure project, there is a risk that people may suffer unnecessarily unless proper due diligence is carried out, and human rights and decent working conditions are made priorities from the outset.

The right to decent working conditions is enshrined in the [International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights](#) (ICESCR Article 7) and a series of [International Labour Organisation \(ILO\) conventions](#). This right is comprised of the rights to a fair wage, the right to safe and healthy working conditions, the right to equality of opportunity, and not to have to work excessive hours that are disruptive to a balanced lifestyle and family life. The ILO is an international body made up of representatives of governments, employers and workers and is a major proponent of the [Decent Work Agenda](#). The ILO has entered into strategic alliances with the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) with a view to promoting such social justice. The ILO is taking a close interest in the working conditions of migrant workers at construction of venues and infrastructure in Qatar ahead of the 2022 FIFA World Cup.

Beyond the health and safety considerations, other human rights issues frequently arise during the construction phase of the MSE lifecycle. These include discrimination in the workplace, the denial of union rights, and the exploitation of temporary workers. In many contexts, migrant workers are particularly vulnerable. Migrant workers face a number of common problems when employed in large overseas projects. These include denial of basic legal protection - in many instances their passports are taken away by their employers, they are forced to work without contracts, they face delays in receiving their salaries, and in the worst cases, they have endured debt-bondage and are at risk of human trafficking.

Communities living near large-scale construction and infrastructure projects such as those found during MSE preparation may benefit from rising property prices in the long term. In the short-term however, they often have to endure significant disruption. In the worst cases, impacts may include forcible evictions. Less serious, but common complaints include adverse impacts on access to energy, potable water, and housing, questions over pollution and emissions, and concerns around public and private security.

Challenges

A Decade of Construction Accidents on MSE-Related Projects

In the race against time to deliver MSE venues and supporting infrastructure, including vital road and public transport networks, the safety of workers has sadly sometimes taken a back seat. The past decade has seen several construction accidents, many of which have been fatal.

Fourteen people **died** and over 1,000 were seriously injured on Olympic sites for Athens 2004. These sites were mainly non-unionised, and most of the workers were migrants, from Albania, Romania, and Syria; many were denied injury **compensation**.

At the height of Beijing 2008 Olympics construction at least 10 people were reported to have **died** in industrial accidents associated with preparing facilities for the Olympics.

Nearly 50 workers were **killed** on construction sites for the New Delhi 2010 Commonwealth Games, with reports of additional fatalities and injuries on associated projects - including on **Delhi Metro Rail Corporation sites** - where some suggest work was **accelerated** to meet the Games **deadline**.

According to the **Building and Wood Workers’ International** (BWI) union, there were 20 deaths in construction for the UEFA Euro 2012 event in Poland and the Ukraine.

Between 2012 and 2014, according to findings by think-tank Reporter Brasil, there have been at least seven deaths in the construction of venues ahead of the FIFA 2014 World Cup, including in Brasilia, Cuiaba, Manaus and São Paulo.

From June to August 2013, 44 Nepalese migrant workers reportedly **died**, many from workplace accidents or heart failure in intense heat, on building projects in the run up to Qatar 2022 World Cup.

Exploitation of Temporary and Migrant Workers

In order to put on a MSE, thousands of construction workers may be needed to deliver the venues and infrastructure on time. In many countries construction firms find they need to recruit temporary workers to help. Often these are migrant workers, who have either travelled from abroad or from other provinces and districts of the host country. These workers are often acutely vulnerable to exploitation. Migrant workers who do not speak the host country language can also be put in unnecessary danger when health and safety training, or equipment instructions, are not provided in a language the workers understand.

During construction and infrastructure development in the run-up to the Beijing 2008 Olympics, some 17,000 workers complained of wage exploitation and contract denial. These workers were mainly **migrants** from other Chinese provinces.

Human Rights Watch [catalogued](#) instances of non-payment of wages, passport confiscation, and failure to provide employment contracts among migrant workers, including from Serbia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan, working to prepare venues and facilities in the lead-up to the Sochi Games. In one case, an Uzbek migrant worker alleged that he was being [unlawfully detained](#) for seeking to file complaints.

In September 2013, an inspection by Brazil’s Ministry of Labor and Employment and the Public Labor Prosecutor’s Office helped rescue 111 victims of [slave labour](#) found to be working on São Paulo’s Guarulhos International Airport expansion project. The airport’s capacity was being expanded by almost a quarter in time for the World Cup in 2014. All of the victims were internal migrants from the impoverished Northeast region of Brazil. Elsewhere in Brazil, 350 workers, including many Northeastern migrants, went on strike in 2011 against what they described as poor working and [unhygienic living conditions](#) at the works site of the Arena do Grêmio, a World Cup stadium in Porto Alegre.

A Guardian newspaper investigation revealed the [deaths](#) of 44 Nepalese migrant construction labourers in Qatar during June, July and August 2013 after having suffered inhumane [working conditions](#). The report also unearthed evidence that Nepali migrants in Qatar working on a 2022 FIFA World Cup-related infrastructure projects had endured forced labour, been denied their salaries to prevent them from leaving, and routinely had their identity documents confiscated – thereby reducing them to illegal alien status.

Construction Impacts on Local Communities

Construction of facilities for MSEs often adversely affects those living in neighbouring communities. Notwithstanding the worst-case scenarios where local residents are displaced or forcibly evicted from their homes, local people can also suffer health problems as a result of pollution and other construction related environmental effects.

Several villagers were reportedly charged for protesting the construction of a large natural gas-power station near a Sochi residential area, amidst fears over emissions and other adverse health effects. There were concerns that [preparatory construction work](#) was allowed to proceed before new Olympic legal requirements for an environmental impact assessment and public consultation had been met.

Responses

London’s Olympic Delivery Authority

Making Health & Safety a Priority

The workforce on the London Olympic Park and Athletes’ Village sites peaked at 13,000, with around 40,000 people having worked on the project by the time it was

completed. During its lifespan, the ODA set a new bar by completing construction of the Olympic Park and Village with no fatalities. The [Commission for a Sustainable London 2012](#) viewed this as an Olympic first. The Commission also found that the ODA’s accident frequency rate of 0.16, although above the target set of 0.1, was nonetheless significantly below the construction industry’s health and safety performance average of 1.0 and surpassed the national average for all workplaces.

The ODA complied with relevant UK and European regulation and standards. Success however was also achieved through a putting a range of standards, management systems and processes in place. The ODA’s [Design and Construction Health, Safety and Environment \(HS&E\) Standard](#) outlined the HS&E expectations and requirements for all staff, accountable directors, stakeholders and suppliers. This included performance targets, such as completing the Games’ construction without any fatalities. The ODA also integrated [health and safety requirements](#) in the tendering process for all contractors. [On-site occupational health service teams](#) were put in place. For the first time on a construction project of this size in the UK, these included both clinical and preventative teams working side by side to protect worker health. [Principles of Cooperation](#) agreed in 2008 between Trades Union Congress (TUC), ODA and LOCOG, additionally included health and safety provisions. In the view of the TUC, on-site union health and safety representation, and health and safety training also contributed to the good practice ODA achieved.

In its final recommendations, the [Commission for a Sustainable London 2012](#) urged the ODA to continue “to work with the Health and Safety Executive [an independent UK watchdog] to develop a programme to disseminate the learning on health and safety and worker wellbeing from the construction phase of the Games”. The Commission also called on the UK Government “to make this a requirement of all publicly funded projects” in order to help promote good practice and effective management of risk across UK industry.

Sustainable Procurement for Construction

Sustainable procurement in the construction of London 2012 Olympic venues was a priority from the start. To deliver on its ambitions, London’s Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) employed a range of processes, principles and tools. As early as 2007, the ODA made sustainability a board-level issue and published a [Sustainable Development Strategy](#). The Strategy was developed in consultation with a range of stakeholders from government, non-governmental organisations, and the local community. It aimed to be a catalyst for industry across the UK to deliver improved economic, social and environmental sustainability. The strategy set out 12 sustainability objective areas, including several with human rights relevance: land, air, water, noise; supporting communities; transport and mobility; access; employment and skills; health and wellbeing; and inclusion.

The Strategy was reinforced by the [ODA Procurement Policy](#). Both the Strategy and Policy were in place in 2007, before the ODA began to engage design teams and appoint contractors, and underwent feasibility testing. Having them in place at an early stage of the process, reportedly signalled to design teams and others that core sustainability challenges should be met alongside other performance criteria.

The Procurement Policy stated: “the ODA would seek to use its purchasing power to support sustainable development in London and the UK and the implementation of the ODA’s Sustainable Development Strategy, and would aim to ensure that sustainability is integrated into business cases, procurement plans and related contracts”. This was backed up by independent assurance delivered by the [Commission for a Sustainable London 2012](#), which provided credible commentary, constructive criticism, and monitoring of the sustainability of London 2012.

During the pre-procurement phase, the ODA and its delivery partner CLM (a joint venture between construction and engineering firms CH2M Hill, Laing O’Rourke, and Mace) engaged directly with potential suppliers. This included hosting ‘industry days’ to outline the sustainability opportunities and challenges, and to give suppliers a chance to present how they would respond. The ODA believed that this helped it identify examples of best practice, and fostered innovation both within the ODA and among the product manufacturers themselves. The tendering specifications and the ODA’s design brief also had sustainability requirements fully integrated.

At the pre-qualification stage bidding suppliers were required to produce a range of corporate policies such as sustainability, and equality and inclusion, before they could proceed further and be eligible for selection. The ODA also used this step to provide local business support to help SMEs meet sustainability standards, and ensure that smaller suppliers were not disadvantaged and deterred from bidding. A ‘Balanced Scorecard’ was used at the contract awarding stage to test all bidding companies. This ‘[Balanced Scorecard](#)’ applied to all ODA and Tier One procurements, and evaluation criteria went beyond traditional items such as cost, time and quality, to encompass themes like: health and safety, security, equality and inclusion, community engagement, and supply chain management. The ODA’s sustainability objectives and reporting regimes were built into resulting contracts.

After the Games, the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), and other UK government departments and agencies collaborated in producing learning materials to advance sustainable procurement within the UK construction sector. [The Legacy: Sustainable Procurement for Construction Projects - A Guide](#) (2013) highlights two key lessons. First, that “many environmental sustainability benefits go hand in hand with cost savings, and [second,] that with the right approach to projects of this scale it is possible to drive innovation in areas such as design and materials specification”.

The Commission for a Sustainable London 2012, in its final report [Making a Difference](#) published in March 2013, noted that there was some evidence that the ODA’s learning legacy tools were being used in the UK to improve the competence of the construction supply chain and create sustainable improvements. The Commission in particular commended the [UK Green Building Council’s](#) work to disseminate the learning legacy, and the emergence of the [Supply Chain Sustainability School](#).

The Supply Chain Sustainability School

The Supply Chain Sustainability School was founded in June 2012 on the back of

learning acquired by the construction sector on London 2012 Olympics projects. The School is a collaborative initiative involving fifteen major UK construction contractors and 5,000 members from their supply chains. The supply chain sustainability school involves self-assessments for firms, action plans, and an online resource library consisting of videos, interviews, reports and guidance. The School aims to increase knowledge and competence across 10 key sustainability areas, including health and safety, community impacts and ethical business issues like human rights, diversity and anti-corruption. The School is delivered by Action Sustainability, and in nine months professionals from 1,314 companies had joined the initiative. It has attracted interest from other sectors in the UK and abroad. The Chartered Institute of Procurement and Supply named the School Best Contribution to Corporate Responsibility in 2013.

Qatar Supreme Committee

Workers' Welfare Standards

In February 2014, Qatar's Supreme Committee (the local organising committee for the 2022 FIFA World Cup) published a set of Workers' Welfare Standards. This followed an ultimatum from FIFA for Qatar to deliver a report on improving migrant labourers' working conditions. The 50-page document sets out detailed standards giving the Qatar Supreme Committee the authority to penalise, and potentially terminate the contracts of contractors who violate the welfare of its construction workers. The standards set out detailed requirements on the payment of wages, accommodation, and welfare, and commit to introducing a tough new inspection regime. Under the standards, employers will also be forced to install a telephone hotline for workers to raise grievances and report concerns, ensure workers receive paid annual leave, and do not have to work longer than a 48-hour week, and receive rest days.

Critics however point out that the standards only apply to the construction of World Cup stadiums, and not to the wider issue of holding to account contractors and subcontractors working on the wider infrastructure projects that will underpin the World Cup, which may require a more systemic approach - working with the Qatar authorities - to resolve. **International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) General Secretary** Sharan Burrow said: "It promises employment standards but gives migrant workers no rights to collectively bargain or join a trade union".

An **ILO press release** noted that "some of the ILO comments [on an earlier draft] have been taken into account, for example in respect of prohibition of retention of workers' passports by employers, prohibition of the collection of deposits from workers, the protection of wage payments and some aspects related to working time...". However, it also made clear that "other ILO comments, in particular concerning fundamental principles and rights at work, including freedom of association and collective bargaining, as well as the adoption of a minimum wage or a living wage, are not reflected in the current text." Qatar has ratified five of the eight ILO Fundamental Conventions; it has not **ratified** those on Freedom of Association, Collective Bargaining, and Equal Remuneration.

In evidence before the European Parliamentary Committee hearing on sports and

human rights, ILO Deputy Director-General Gilbert Hougbo, acknowledged that whilst the Workers' Welfare Standard demonstrated some willingness to address the key issues at stake, the ILO still had two key concerns. Hougbo argued that the ILO insists, firstly, upon an integrated approach if the Standards are to be effective. "For instance, proposals by the Supreme Committee regarding the withholding of passports and the repatriation will not be effective unless the Government translates those into national legislation and puts in place national mechanisms to enforce the law." Hougbo also stressed the importance of allowing workers a voice without fear of retaliation. He noted that, "if workers do not have a way of expressing problems without fear, those measures [on ethical recruitment or health and security] will not be effective." He did however signal that: "with a clear commitment of the Qatari authorities, the ILO stands ready to work with all relevant stakeholders to overcome current challenges that can lead to success."

Recruitment of Temporary and Migrant Workers

What's at Stake?

Temporary workers, including in many cases internal or international migrant workers, underpin economic growth in many parts of the world and within many industry sectors. Those organising Mega-sporting events (MSEs) frequently rely on temporary workers employed in many of these same sectors, including construction, agriculture, and hospitality, among others.

Temporary workers, especially migrant workers, do not enjoy the same job security as other workers. In many cases they cannot join trade unions and they often do not enjoy the rights to and benefits of freedom of association, collective bargaining or worker representation. They do not have statutory employment benefits. Very often, they are not given contracts. This is increasingly true, for example, for agricultural workers such as those supplying the food products prepared and sold at MSEs, and those in the hospitality sector working in restaurants and hotels that service spectators, officials, sports participants, and others.

Migrant workers in particular are often denied basic legal protection and are vulnerable to many forms of exploitation, including in the worst cases what can only be described as forms of modern-day slavery. As Qatar gears up for the 2022 FIFA World Cup, the risks facing [migrant workers in Qatar's construction sector](#) there have become more visible and are well catalogued. As well as often being poorly paid, migrant workers

in construction and other industries frequently endure unsafe and unhygienic working and living conditions, sometimes with tragic consequences.

Much attention is placed, quite rightly, on the labour conditions facing migrant workers, but recently the role of intermediaries who facilitate their movement has also come under greater scrutiny. Human rights abuses at the hands of unscrupulous recruitment agents that supply workers include debt bondage due to excessive fees, loss of freedom of movement as passports are withheld in receiving countries, and the risk of ending up being trafficked into various forms of modern-day slavery, including sexual exploitation.

Both MSE local organisers and a number of the companies that provide the goods and services upon which the staging of MSEs depend, are becoming more aware of the role that recruitment agencies play in this flow of labour, and the need for more effective due diligence around the human rights impacts. Pressure is also growing for responsible recruitment agencies to lobby governments, regulatory bodies and industry peers to end abusive practices and adopt responsible recruitment practices.

Governments also have a duty to protect their citizens, and ensure social protection within a legal framework of proper enforcement of labour regulation. However, transparent regulation of the recruitment industry, and access to justice or remedy for victims is rarely available or affordable. Governments, including those hosting MSEs, need to ensure that temporary and migrant workers are not denied the rights and freedoms that other workers have and take for granted. Public authorities also need to ensure that laws governing migrant workers, regardless of whether they are from within the country or overseas, do not unfairly penalise these workers vis-à-vis other workers or place them in jeopardy, or create unnecessary hurdles in the way of their ability to report complaints or seek redress.

In-Depth Studies of Migrant Workers and Mega-Sporting Events

Building a Better World Cup: Protecting Migrant Workers in Qatar Ahead of FIFA 2022

This 2012 [report](#) by Human Rights Watch examines the human rights abuses associated with recruitment and employment that migrant workers face in Qatar. It highlights exorbitant recruitment fees, employers’ routine confiscation of worker passports, and Qatar’s restrictive Kafala sponsorship system, which prevents migrant workers from changing jobs or leaving the country without their sponsor company’s permission. Other obstacles workers face include absence of processes to report complaints or seek redress for abuses that are often going undetected by government authorities.

Revealed: Qatar's World Cup 'slaves': Abuse and exploitation of migrant workers preparing emirate for 2022

This 2013 Guardian [investigation](#) revealed that dozens of Nepalese migrant labourers had [died](#) in Qatar in the weeks leading up to the report's publication. The investigation also found that thousands more were enduring appalling labour abuses that amounted to modern-day slavery, raising serious questions about Qatar's preparations to host the 2022 World Cup. Some labourers said they had been forced to work long hours in temperatures of up to 50°C (122°F) without access to drinking water.

According to documents obtained by the Guardian from the Nepalese embassy in Doha, at least 44 workers had died between 4 June and 8 August 2013. More than half of them - mostly young men - had died from sudden heart attacks, heart failure or workplace accidents. Over 90% of Qatar's workforce is made up of immigrants, with [Nepalese migrants](#) comprising the largest single group.

The Guardian's investigation also alleged forced labour on a huge World Cup infrastructure project, and claimed that some Nepalese men had not been paid for months, and that employers routinely confiscated their passports.

The Dark Side of Migration: Spotlight on Qatar's Construction Sector Ahead of the World Cup

This 2013 [report](#) by Amnesty International highlights concerns over the treatment of construction workers in Qatar, and the risk of serious exploitation that migrant workers involved in the 2022 World Cup construction face. Qatar's original bid said it would build 12 stadiums, and to do so a wider infrastructure programme would be needed, including construction of thousands of new hotel rooms. Amnesty also cites an International Labour Organization (ILO) expert, who states this construction programme will require Qatar to recruit one million extra migrant workers over the next decade.

Amnesty has discovered that migrant workers' pay is withheld for months and that they are being paid less than what they were promised. Others are having their passports confiscated and employers prevent them from leaving the country. Some workers were reportedly forced to work excessive hours, in conditions that fail to protect workers' health and safety adequately, and to have been housed in squalid accommodation. During interviews, Amnesty researchers said they had encountered many workers in severe psychological distress due to the treatment they had received and felt powerlessness to resolve their own situations.

Challenges

The Construction Sector

In order to stage an MSE, thousands of construction workers are needed to deliver the venues and infrastructure on time. In many countries, construction firms find they need to recruit temporary workers to help. Often these are migrant workers, who have either travelled from abroad or from other provinces and districts of the host country. These workers are often acutely vulnerable to exploitation. Migrant workers who do not speak the host country language can also be put in unnecessary danger if health and safety training, or equipment instructions, are not provided in a language the workers understand.

During construction and infrastructure development in the run-up to the Beijing 2008 Olympics, some 17,000 workers complained of [wage exploitation and contract denial](#). These workers were mainly migrants from other Chinese provinces.

In the lead-up to the Sochi Games, Human Rights Watch [catalogued](#) instances of non-payment of wages, passport confiscation, and failure to provide employment contracts to migrant workers from Serbia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan, working on venues and facilities. In one case, an [Uzbek migrant worker](#) alleged that he was being unlawfully detained because he wanted to file complaints.

In September 2013, an inspection by Brazil’s Ministry of Labor and Employment and the Public Labor Prosecutor’s Office helped rescue 111 victims of [slave labour](#) reportedly found to be working on São Paulo’s Guarulhos International Airport expansion project. The airport’s capacity was being expanded by almost a quarter in time for the World Cup in 2014. All of the victims were internal migrants from the impoverished Northeast region of Brazil. Elsewhere in Brazil, 350 workers, including many [Northeastern migrants](#), went on strike in 2011 against what they described as poor working and unhygienic [living conditions](#) at the works site of the Arena do Grêmio, a World Cup stadium in Porto Alegre.

A Guardian newspaper investigation revealed the deaths of 44 Nepalese migrant [construction labourers in Qatar](#) during June, July and August 2013 after having suffered poor [working conditions](#). The report also alleged that Nepali migrants in Qatar working on 2022 FIFA World Cup-related infrastructure projects had endured forced labour, been denied their salaries to prevent them from leaving, and routinely had their identity documents confiscated – thereby reducing them to illegal alien status.

The UK Hospitality Sector

Temporary or agency workers, many of whom are migrant workers, are in high demand around the time of the MSE itself in the hospitality, cleaning, catering, transport and security sectors. Some contract workers are recruited directly by the local organisers, or by agencies acting on their behalf for work on official sites. Others are hired by businesses, such as hotels and restaurants that may have no formal or official

involvement in the event. Regardless, stakeholders are demanding new approaches to ensure the rights of these workers are protected.

The [Staff Wanted Initiative](#), a partnership between IHRB and Anti-Slavery, seeks to raise awareness within the UK hospitality industry of the steps needed to combat the exploitation of vulnerable workers, including human trafficking and forced labour. In particular the Initiative encourages UK hotels using agencies to recruit staff or outsource housekeeping operations to undertake effective due diligence on those agencies to ensure compliance with the law.

Drawing on the Staff Wanted experience, a [BBC Newsnight](#) television report revealed allegations of migrant worker exploitation among agency staff working at two hotels - one that hosted the Chinese Olympic delegation, and one that hosted Olympic referees - during the London 2012 Olympics. The television investigation alleged that a recruitment agency used by one of the hotels altered workers' hourly rates without warning, and threatened them with unfair dismissal. Another agency was said to have paid cleaners below the minimum wage.

Responses

LOCOG Registration Requirements

As well as asking suppliers and licensees to meet the provisions of the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) Base Code, and encouraging the paying of a [London Living Wage](#) where appropriate, [LOCOG's Sustainable Sourcing Code](#) also included provisions to minimise the risk of temporary workers being exploited. LOCOG asked firms using temporary or agency staff to "seek to ensure that any labour providers supplying such staff are members of the [Recruitment and Employment Confederation](#) (REC) and, if relevant, are licensed by the [Gangmasters Licensing Authority](#)."

Procurement & Supply Chains

What's at Stake?

Procurement departments of public institutions including those set up for MSEs by host governments, delivery authorities or local organising committees are often required to select suppliers based on cost considerations, with incentives for selecting suppliers offering the lowest price, best quality or can deliver to a tight deadline. In

such calculations, sustainability issues, including human rights, do not feature.

Human rights concerns around supply chains – such as children making clothes or stitching footballs - have been a major concern of the media and NGO campaigns for almost two decades. **Playfair** – an international coalition of NGOs and trade unions – has been a major force in lobbying MSE organisers, sponsors, licensees and suppliers to take steps to ensure that workers’ rights are respected in the manufacture of sporting goods and the building of venues. The Playfair campaign began in the run up to the Athens 2004 Olympics, and has been revived ahead of each Olympics and FIFA World Cup since.

The campaigners’ initial concerns were over labour rights abuses in the MSE supply chain focused on apparel and sporting goods industries, but since then scrutiny of other sectors has grown, including impacts in electronics and consumer goods industries, agriculture and food production, and construction. For example, Playfair affiliates in Brazil, including the Trade Union Confederation of the Americas, CUT, Força, UGT, in conjunction with the Brazilian campaign of the BWI (a global union federation for builders and woodworkers), are leading a campaign focused on the rights of construction workers ahead of the 2014 FIFA World Cup and Rio 2016 Olympics.

MSE organisers face a particular challenge when it comes to procuring sustainably. They are ‘phoenix operations’, meaning that while they operate in the same sphere as their predecessors in other MSE host countries, they have to develop their business operations and all supplier relationships from scratch, except for the global sponsorship arrangements established by the sports governing body. As a result, local organisers have a short window of time in which to exert leverage over their suppliers and licensees, and the factories further down the supply chain. This is a major handicap when seeking to address systemic labour rights issues in supplier countries with which the local organiser may not have a prior relationship.

MSE delivery authorities – like London’s Olympic Delivery Authority, Brazil’s Olympic Public Authority (APO) or Sochi’s Olympstroy – are publicly funded bodies. These are responsible for developing and building venues and related infrastructure for the MSE and any planned post-event use. The delivery authorities tend to be in a stronger position to positively influence supply chain labour standards than the event organisers (see below). Among other things, this is because they control the point of entry to the construction site, and can keep an eye on working conditions, union representation and wage levels. They are also in a position to monitor raw materials arriving onto the sites. Nonetheless, the supply chains are complex. There can often be three-to-four tiers of suppliers and sub-contractors between the delivery authority and the workers hired for ground crews, the concrete pouring and steelwork; in many cases with those furthest down the chain bearing the responsibility for procuring raw materials.

Event organising bodies - like the London Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (LOCOG) and the Rio 2016 Organising Committee – are responsible for ensuring the successful staging of the event, fitting the venues, ticket sales, merchandising and more. They are often privately run, with many of the actual business activities undertaken by the private sector. The revenue they raise comes from ticket sales and

the rights they sell, including sponsorship of the event, licensing agreements for the merchandise, and broadcast rights.

During the construction phase the event organiser grows slowly, before massively ramping up its staff and operations in the final two years before the event. LOCOG's procurement activity, for example, began in late 2009 and peaked between 2010-11. Due to this last-minute rush of activity, unless the event organiser fully understands and prepares for the complexities around sustainable procurement, including human and labour rights issues, they can enjoy only limited leverage over their supply base. Once the event organiser sells the rights to branded companies and manufacturers to sell toys, t-shirts and other merchandise through its outlets, even if it has integrated compliance with workplace standards into the licensing contract, it has limited ability to influence any outcome, once the deal is done. Event organisers who discover suppliers to be in breach of labour standards criteria, also do not have the same opportunities to seek continuous improvement over time at individual factories, or the luxury of switching merchandisers (since they will be unlikely to find a replacement in time).

Despite these inherent challenges, more and more MSE delivery authorities and organising committees have begun to understand the need to integrate human rights and labour rights criteria into their policies and procurement practices. Where they can establish supplier relationships early enough and help train managers around the benefits of a sustainable approach and human rights due diligence, there is good chance of making a positive difference in the lives of workers in factories, and in helping to raise the bar on sustainability by setting an example.

Sports governing bodies are starting to take sustainability and social issues more seriously. The IOC requires candidate bids to host the Games to outline how labour rights will be factored into their MSE procurement. FIFA has put in place labour rights stipulations for FIFA licensed football manufacturers. A number of experts believe sports governing bodies and the international sports federations could play an invaluable leadership role in advancing sustainable procurement. For example, the sports governing body could consider developing an approved list of suppliers. This would help establish longer-term relationships with suppliers and individual factories, and make continuous improvement a more realistic prospect.

Challenges

MSE Supply Chains - Labour Rights Concerns in Factories

Allegations of human rights abuses in MSE supply chains – including in the procuring of construction materials, fixtures and fittings, technology, sporting goods, uniforms (i.e. for squads and officials), merchandise, medals and food production – have surfaced repeatedly at Olympic Games and FIFA World Cups. Some examples:

In 2006-2007, Playfair published a report - [Playfair 2008: No medal for the Olympics on labour rights](#). This catalogued reported instances of child labour, employees working excessive hours, and disregard for health and safety, in the supply chains of several official Olympic licensees in the run up to the Beijing 2008 Olympics, including within several facilities in China’s Shenzhen province.

In 2011, the International Textile, Garment, and Leatherworkers Federation (now part of the IndustriALL global union) published an [Overview of Working Conditions in Sportswear Factories in Indonesia, Sri Lanka & the Philippines](#). This highlighted instances of contract workers reportedly being denied written contracts, intimidation of union members, and sexual harassment in 83 factories in Indonesia, Sri Lanka and the Philippines said to supply branded kit for London 2012 teams. Some of the brands implicated in the report vigorously denied the allegations.

In April 2012 the British newspaper [The Independent](#) reported cases including low pay, long hours, and problems with union recognition at nine Indonesian factories used by Adidas, a London 2012 sportswear partner. [Adidas](#) and LOCOG investigated separately. They found some claims (notably on low pay) could not be substantiated, but where problems were confirmed remedial steps were put in place. This was subject to monitoring and review by LOCOG.

A report by the Playfair campaign, [Toying with Workers Rights](#), investigated two factories in China reported to be manufacturing pin badges and merchandise toys for the London 2012 Olympics. Published in January 2012, the report alleged that among other things these factories were not paying workers the minimum wage.

Responses

[VANOC – Buy Smart Programme and Licensee Code of Conduct](#)

The Vancouver Organising Committee’s (VANOC) [six corporate sustainability performance objectives](#) included an explicit commitment “to care for our workforce, protect human rights and ensure health and safety.” VANOC’s procurement and licensing activities included a ‘Buy Smart’ programme, by which it put in place a set of procedures and activities designed to ensure that sustainability, ethical considerations and Aboriginal participation were taken into consideration.

VANOC supplemented these efforts by introducing a Licensee Code of Conduct, modelled on sponsor Hudson Bay Company’s code and other industry best practice. The VANOC Code of Conduct defined criteria for producing official merchandise. In response to stakeholder input, VANOC also introduced a Supplier Code of Conduct (2009) which regular suppliers were expected to review as part of the bidding and contracting process. VANOC said that between 2006-2010, 100% of its suppliers met Canadian human rights standards. Both codes were shared with the IOC and future Olympic hosts as part of the IOC’s knowledge transfer process.

LOCOG's Sustainable Sourcing Code - Integrating Labour Rights

The London Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (LOCOG) - the London 2012 event organising body - put in place a [Sustainable Sourcing Code](#) to help address the ethical procurement challenges linked to Games merchandise. This covered all contracts with suppliers and licensees, and was updated periodically to allow for the continuous integration of new learning. LOCOG also required its licensees, major direct suppliers and sponsors to register themselves and their production sites as a member of the [SEDEX ethical database](#) (this did not apply to IOC Worldwide Olympic Partners and approved suppliers of the International Sports Federations, with whom LOCOG had no direct contract).

There has been some criticism of LOCOG for being slow to act on labour issues. An [independent assessment](#) of LOCOG's labour risk management systems, found that its Sustainability Team was "largely unprepared for the more complex task of implementing the labour (versus environmental) provisions of the Code", but commended LOCOG's willingness to engage with stakeholders." For example, LOCOG incorporated the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) [Base Code](#) into its Sourcing Code on advice from the ETI, Playfair, and the Trade Union Congress (TUC). This integration of the ETI Base Code has since been replicated by both the Glasgow 2014 Organising Committee via its [Procurement Sustainability Policy](#), and the Rio 2016 Committee's [Sustainable Supply Chain Guide](#).

Factory disclosure – which potentially increases accountability - was not included as a contractual requirement for suppliers. However, some companies voluntarily revealed details of their supply chains. For example, Adidas committed to disclose its London Olympic suppliers in 2011 having done so previously at the 2010 South Africa World Cup. In February 2012, LOCOG and the [TUC signed an agreement](#) providing for production site disclosure. This saw LOCOG agree to urge further voluntary factory disclosure. Eventually, ten licensees (representing 72% of licensed products being produced for London 2012) shared this data.

The [Commission for a Sustainable London 2012](#) observed that LOCOG should have made requests for full factory disclosure sooner. On the same note, the independent assessor, [Verité](#), recommended that: "Future time-bound organisations should anticipate [resistance from commercial partners to disclose this data] and build longer lead times and firmer requirements for transparency into their approvals process." Among other things this would allow more time for training suppliers, and to familiarise SMEs with labour codes of conduct.

Procurement – LOCOG Complaint and Dispute Resolution Mechanism

The London Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (LOCOG), London 2012's event organiser, put in place a [Complaint and Dispute Resolution Mechanism](#) to deal with breaches of [LOCOG's Sustainable Sourcing Code](#) and provide potential victims with access to remedy. The Mechanism's design was based on criteria set out in the [UN](#)

[Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights](#). It was also backed up by a panel of expert stakeholders, the Oversight Group, who helped to ensure that the mechanism was accessible to, and served, those in need.

Viewed as groundbreaking by the [Commission for a Sustainable London 2012](#), the Complaint and Dispute Resolution Mechanism encountered some challenges over training and alerting factory workers in time to the mechanism’s existence. It also suffered from not being fully operational until April 2012. But after the Olympics, LOCOG made public many findings of how the Mechanism performed in practice. Several stakeholders close to the London Olympics, including civil society representatives, have commended LOCOG on the levels of public disclosure in relation to how the mechanism functioned in practice.

A parallel [games-time grievance resolution protocol](#) was developed with the TUC and the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS). This was intended for LOCOG’s UK-based workforce, including its contractors, and to help ensure that grievances arising during the Games were dealt with quickly, fairly, consistently and informally where that was possible.

London 2012 Olympics – Sustainable Procurement for Construction

Sustainable procurement in the construction of London 2012 Olympic venues was a priority from the start. To deliver on its ambitions, London’s Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) employed a range of processes, principles and tools. As early as 2007, the ODA made sustainability a board-level issue, and published a [Sustainable Development Strategy](#).

Sitting alongside the ODA Sustainability Strategy was the [ODA Procurement Policy](#). Both the Strategy and Policy were in place in 2007, before the ODA began to engage design teams and appoint contractors, and underwent feasibility testing.

The Procurement Policy stated: “the ODA would seek to use its purchasing power to support sustainable development in London and the UK and the implementation of the ODA’s Sustainable Development Strategy, and would aim to ensure that sustainability is integrated into business cases, procurement plans and related contracts”. This was backed up by independent assurance delivered by the Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 (CSL), which provided credible commentary, constructive criticism, and assurance of the sustainability of London 2012.

During the pre-procurement phase, the ODA and its delivery partner CLM (a joint venture between construction and engineering firms CH2M Hill, Laing O’Rourke, and Mace) engaged directly with potential suppliers. They convened ‘industry days’ to outline the sustainability opportunities and challenges, and to give suppliers a chance to present how they would respond. The ODA believed that this helped identify examples of best practice, and fostered innovation both within the ODA and among the product manufacturers themselves. The tendering specifications and the ODA’s design brief also had sustainability requirements fully integrated.

At the pre-qualification stage bidding suppliers were required to produce a range of corporate policies such as sustainability, and equality and inclusion, before they could proceed further and be eligible for selection. The ODA also used this step to provide local business support to help SMEs meet sustainability standards, and ensure that smaller suppliers were not disadvantaged and deterred from bidding. A '[Balanced Scorecard](#)' was used at the contract awarding stage to test all bidding companies. This '[Balanced Scorecard](#)' applied to all ODA and Tier One procurements, and evaluation criteria went beyond traditional items such as cost, time and quality, to encompass themes like: health and safety, security, equality and inclusion, community engagement, and supply chain management. The ODA's sustainability objectives and reporting regimes were built into resulting contracts.

In the last months in its role as a watchdog, the Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 convened a series of "[Beyond 2012](#)" roundtables with key stakeholders. These sought to evaluate the impact of the 2012 Olympics on sustainable practices, and to explore what could be done to build on the emerging body of good practice, and how it might be possible to address any issues London 2012 was unable to tackle fully. There were those who felt that public sector procurement in the UK should be used to catalyse the wider take up of sustainable construction practices.

London 2012 Learning Legacy - Procurement and Supply Chain Management

The Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) and the London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) developed a major web-based learning platform. This '[Learning Legacy](#)' was designed to capture lessons learnt from the construction of the Olympic Park, and the preparation and staging of the London 2012 Games, to help raise the bar within construction and event sectors in the UK and globally.

The Learning Legacy catalogues reports and related information under ten themes, including procurement and supply chain management. The [procurement](#) section comprises strategy documents, like the [Venues and Infrastructure Sustainability Strategy](#) and LOCOG's [Employment and Skills Strategy](#), and other guidance materials like the [Sustainability Guidance for Broadcasters](#), and [Sourcing Sustainable Materials](#). Also notable is An Independent assessment of LOCOG's [labour risk management systems](#) by Verité, and a series of case studies, such as LOCOG's [complaint and dispute resolution process](#) to deal with breaches of the Sustainable Sourcing Code, and [Establishing a Stakeholder Oversight Group](#) to support a supply chain grievance mechanism. These documents outline how challenges were approached and where lessons were learned and could be replicated in the future, within the UK and internationally.

Rio 2016 Organising Committee – Sustainable Supply Chains

The Rio 2016 Organising Committee published the first version of its [Sustainable Supply Chain Guide](#) (the Guide) in July 2012. Commentators familiar with London 2012 have indicated that the Rio 2016 Committee has set a clear, positive agenda and lessons from the London experience have been learned. Like LOCOG, the Rio 2016 Committee opened its door to dialogue with stakeholders from an early stage, and appears to have taken on board the suggestions that LOCOG got off to a slow start. The Rio 2016 Committee, for example, has integrated labour rights criteria into its supplier requirements from the beginning. The Guide demands that suppliers, sponsor and licensees ensure that the working conditions on manufacturing production sites “meet the minimum requirements set out in the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) Base Code.” The Guide also makes it clear that it regards compliance with the [ETI Base Code](#) as a minimum standard. It urges Rio 2016 commercial partners to exceed this standard, and where national laws and the Base Code cover the same ground, to apply whichever of the two affords the greater rights protection.

The Rio 2016 organisers also appear to have acted to avert the criticisms levelled at LOCOG in relation to factory disclosure. Rio 2016’s Guide specifies: “Where requested, suppliers, sponsors and licensees must disclose all information to Rio 2016 its representatives or auditors about the adopted venues or working conditions, and to grant access to their premises in the most transparent manner.” Rio 2016 Sustainable Supply Chain Guide also includes a “Diversity Manifesto”, and commitment to encouraging practices that expand the participation of micro and SMEs “from a wide range of segments and social groups” in its Supply Chain. This also expands on a concern raised during London 2012 that not enough emphasis was placed on using local suppliers. The Rio 2016 Committee is currently putting in place a dispute mechanism process for Chinese and Brazilian suppliers.

The Rio 2016 Committee is working closely with industry federations, chambers of commerce, and various bodies like [WBCSD](#) and [SEBRAE](#), to advance sustainable procurement within Brazil for the long-term. For example, it has entered into a strategic partnership with leading responsible supply chain specialist [Sedex](#) to support its responsible sourcing strategy. Under the agreement, Rio 2016 suppliers gain access to the Sedex database. Suppliers that Rio 2016 regards as critical are also required to enrol in Sedex, and will be monitored via the platform in relation to their supply chain standards management.

Since neither the Rio 2016 Organising Committee, nor the Public Olympic Authority (APO), is subject to independent assurance by a body like the [Commission for a Sustainable London 2012](#), stakeholders will need to look to civil society, unions and others to monitor the effectiveness of the procurement strategy.

Glasgow 2014 Organising Committee – Procurement Sustainability Policy

In 2013 the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games Organising Committee published a [Procurement Sustainability Policy](#). Among other things this requires suppliers, and sponsors who provide goods or services, to adhere to ILO Fundamental Conventions. The Policy also spells out that “where [we procure goods and services from outside the UK] we require our suppliers to adhere to the terms of the Ethical Trading Initiative’s Base Code and, if relevant, the Code of Conduct of the World Federation of the Sporting Goods Industry as a minimum.” The Policy also says that the Glasgow 2014 Organising Committee will pay a Living Wage and promote it through its supply chain.

The Glasgow 2014 Organising Committee published its [Approach to Human Rights](#) in December 2013 which drew heavily on the previously published [Procurement Sustainability Policy](#). Following the staging of the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games, the Glasgow 2014 Organising Committee released its Post-Games Update. This document provides a progress report on what was achieved in practice.

The [Post-Games Update](#) includes data on the percentage of principal suppliers who reported that they had adhered to the ETI Base Code, and paid a Living Wage. In line with its commitment to disclosure, the Glasgow 2014 Organising Committee additionally published the names and locations of all suppliers within its Licensing and Merchandising programme on the Glasgow 2014 website. Factory disclosure of this kind had been a final recommendation of the Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 in its closing report *Making a Difference* (2013).

FIFA Quality Programme and labour rights – Requirements for football manufacturers

FIFA is prepared to set mandatory labour rights standards for companies with whom it does business. The World Federation of the Sporting Goods Industry (WFSGI) introduced the [WFSGI Pledge](#) for the FIFA Quality Programme for football manufacturers in 1997. The scheme requires FIFA licensed brands to sign a pledge together with their suppliers, which has to be renewed yearly, confirming they are in compliance with the WFSGI Code of Conduct. When it began, the process was designed to combat child labour in Pakistan and India, but the WFSGI Code was updated in 2010, and now covers the core conventions of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), which [set standards](#) on child labour, forced labour, non-discrimination and freedom of association and collective bargaining rights.

FIFA licensees have to provide the WFSGI with an annual audit demonstrating their suppliers’ full compliance with the Code. Significantly, the WFSGI Pledge is mandatory for the production of FIFA licensed footballs, meaning that the Pledge has to be confirmed before licensees can proceed to the technical test phase for producing footballs to the correct specification.

Security

What’s at Stake?

It is important for all MSEs to be staged in a safe and secure manner. Adequate security that allows athletes to participate and spectators to watch the events in peace is critical.

But security and the potential human rights impacts span the full lifecycle of an MSE, from the preparation and construction phase through the event organisation itself. In a world where terrorism is a very real threat, security is a legitimate concern. Security is a high priority for those responsible for organising the event, as well as for the fans coming through the gates. The need to safeguard large numbers of Heads of State and leading politicians during the opening and closing ceremonies has to be carefully planned. Security threats at MSEs predate the attacks in the United States in September 2001. Besides the terror attack in Munich in 1972, the Centennial Olympic Park during the Atlanta Olympics Games in 1996 also faced a serious security incident.

The threats can take different forms depending on the context. In June 2013 during the FIFA Confederations Cup, Brazil experienced violent encounters between the police and a number of street protestors during a wave of mass demonstrations. The protests covered a wide range of issues, including event costs, across major cities in the country. Russia - host of the Sochi 2014 Winter Olympics and 2018 FIFA World Cup - faces a longstanding terrorist challenge, notably from Chechen separatist groups. Qatar meanwhile has to consider the possibility of discontent from among its migrant workers, who comprise over 90% of the country’s total workforce. Irrespective of the nature of the security challenge, a balance has to be struck between guaranteeing people’s safety, and the free flow of spectators and local residents, as well as the democratic right of people to protest. Human rights experts have expressed concerns over the growing trend of criminalisation of legitimate protests.

Each country has its own security operations which vary from others because of the context, political environment, room for dissent, terror threats, and so on. Under many constitutions, security is a state subject, and not a central one, which means many host governments do not control security at regional and local levels, and the authority in charge is the state or municipal government security agency or police service. London was the first modern Olympic Games to place security under the auspices of the local organising committee, although in the end it had to ask government to call up extra UK troops to meet a staffing shortfall.

The host government and local organisers have a responsibility to integrate the management of potential human rights impacts into the security planning for MSEs. The good news is that a number of standards exist to help local organisers, as well as the public or private security providers in meeting this challenge. Host governments and companies should take all appropriate measures to promote observance of applicable international law enforcement principles. The cornerstone is the principle

of proportionality of force. The [UN Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials](#) and the [UN Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms](#) apply to states to ensure that security procedures are consistent with human rights standards. The [Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights](#) apply to the extractive sector. They were established in 2000 and offer guidance to companies in maintaining the safety and security of their operations in the extractive sector. The spirit of those principles resonate beyond the extractive sector. Private security companies contracted to work on MSEs should also look to The [International Code of Conduct for Private Security Service Providers](#) for guidance.

Challenges

London 2012 Olympics – Staffing Shortfall

London 2012 was the first modern Olympic Games to place security under the auspices of the local organising committee event organiser, LOCOG. The London 2012 Olympics passed off without any serious security incident but did face challenges. Notably a [post-games evaluation](#) by the UK Parliamentary House of Commons Public Accounts Committee found that “the costs and scale of venue security were vastly underestimated before 2011, and could only be met from the Public Sector Funding Package due to underspends elsewhere”. It also showed how the contracted security provider, G4S, was not able to provide 10,400 security guards on time for 100 Olympic sites. This led LOCOG to ask the UK government to deploy an extra 3,500 UK troops to meet a staffing shortfall. G4S agreed to cut its management fee over the incident and reportedly took a [£88 million loss](#). While no major security incident resulted from this failure, future host governments and local organisers will need to consider the potential risks, including to human rights, as they plan their own MSE security provision. For example, in their commitment to meet the deadline, a private security provider must not deploy under-trained or untrained personnel to be security providers, because the risks to human rights can be significant.

Responses

LOCOG – Security Operational Policies and Procedures

The IOC sets strict criteria for ticketing, protocols for Heads of State, and the standards for venues and athlete accommodation for an Olympic Games, but security is delegated to the host government or local organising committee. In the case of the London 2012 Olympics, security was funded by a UK Government grant to London’s organising committee, LOCOG.

Two years before the London 2012 Olympics, LOCOG [called in a former expert](#) from the Office of Security and Counter-Terrorism to help oversee the development of LOCOG’s

policy and procedures for security operations. These covered a wide range of human rights-related issues, including questions around equality and diversity, accessibility, local recruitment and skills training for disadvantaged young people from local communities, and the paying of a London Living Wage to security personnel.

For every new policy and procedure, LOCOG said it undertook extensive consultation with experts and key stakeholders. It engaged directly with several UK government departments, including the Department of Culture Media and Sport, the Ministry of Defence and the Home Office, as well as the police and security industry, including the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure, BAA (the UK’s principal airport operating company responsible for security screening), and the G4S Security firm.

According to LOCOG, a key consideration for its security team was to develop appropriate equality and diversity security procedures. To achieve this LOCOG carried out regular impact assessments to inform any new individual procedure that were then tested at trial events such as music concerts ahead of the Olympics itself with a view to scaling up for a much larger audience. LOCOG worked directly with the police, and local religious and disability groups, to ensure that its new systems constituted good practice. For example, in relation to security screening, search procedures needed to take account of a range of sensibilities, such as the need for diabetics to carry syringe needles onto Olympic venues, and the religious practice of orthodox Sikhs to carry a ceremonial dagger as part of their faith. Existing good practice at security x-ray machines called for women to perform pat-down physical searches on women visitors, but LOCOG also needed to consider how to handle such searches for transgender guests. A priority throughout was to ensure that the spectator experience was fun and inclusive, whilst minimising risks and achieving the necessary levels of security.