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On behalf of the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG), it is my great pleasure to introduce *Sport for Development and Peace: Governments in Action*.

The 2003 UN Task Force Report *Sport for Development and Peace: Towards Attaining the Millennium Development Goals* urged governments to incorporate sport and physical activity into national and international development policies and agendas. This report further encouraged governments to consider the use of sport as a tool to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other broader development and peace objectives.

*Sport for Development and Peace: Governments in Action* responds to the UN Task Force Report by presenting national overviews of 34 different governments from around the world who are using Sport for Development and Peace to reach diverse development objectives. Findings presented in the national overviews highlight the unique approach that each government has taken in order to position sport as a tool for development in their country. Approaches range from including sport in national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, to recognizing the important social value of sport in national policies, to explicitly committing to “sport for all” as part of national development programming.

By providing key policy and program examples from a variety of national government contexts - from developed countries, countries-in-transition and developing countries - this report complements the policy recommendations presented in the SDP IWG's final report, *Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations to Governments*.

To produce the enclosed national overviews, the SDP IWG Secretariat, with assistance from dedicated volunteers and consultants, completed in-depth interviews with representatives from each of the 34 governments highlighted. Interviews were conducted throughout 2007 in a variety of languages – including English, French, German, Spanish, Russian, and Portuguese. As the overviews have been based directly on those personal interviews, they have been presented in the words of the respondents. Notably, the respondents also reviewed and approved their respective overviews, thus ensuring their true experiences were preserved.
Established in 2004 as a four-year initiative, the mandate of the SDP IWG is to develop policy recommendations to national governments to promote the integration of sport and physical activity into domestic and international development strategies and programs. The SDP IWG is comprised of more than 50 government ministers and working-level officials, as well as numerous representatives from key UN agencies and civil society organizations. The work of the SDP IWG has been made possible through generous support from Austria’s Federal Chancellery, the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, and the international humanitarian organization, Right To Play. Right To Play also serves as Secretariat to the initiative.

The work of the SDP IWG has also benefited from partnership with the United Nations system. This global partnership between governments, the UN, and civil society is an essential step towards realizing the potential contribution of sport to development and peace. In this regard, the strategic vision and dedication of Mr. Adolf Ogi, the Special Adviser to the UN Secretary-General on Sport for Development and Peace (2001 – 2007) has been fundamental to the increasing momentum gained over the last number of years. I feel certain that Mr. Wilfried Lemke, the incoming Special Adviser to the UN Secretary-General, will continue to move Sport for Development and Peace forward.

Sport for Development and Peace: Governments in Action will be particularly useful for government policy-makers and key stakeholders interested in national approaches to Sport for Development and Peace. As the findings demonstrate, there is a tremendous enthusiasm among Sport for Development and Peace proponents to fully harness the development power of sport. As head of the SDP IWG Secretariat, I am encouraged by the level of commitment that these governments demonstrate in using sport to this end.

As the President and CEO of Right To Play, an organization that delivers sport and play programs in 23 countries, I witness daily the importance of sport and play to children in disadvantaged communities around the world. I believe that the future of all children rests with national governments. National policies and programs that incorporate the concept of Sport for Development and Peace, investments in community initiatives, and efforts towards ensuring that sport is accessible to all, will ultimately create a healthier and safer world.

By learning from the experiences of the 34 governments presented in this report, it is my sincere hope that other policy-makers will be inspired to lead policy change in their own countries and, in doing so, will position sport as a tool for development at the national and international level. By embracing sport as an innovative tool for development and peace today, and by joining together in collaborative partnerships in the future, governments can strengthen their efforts to attain the MDGs.

JOHANN OLAV KOSS
Head of the SDP IWG Secretariat
President and CEO, Right To Play
Sport for Development and Peace: Governments in Action explores how governments from diverse regions of the world are harnessing the power of Sport for Development and Peace.

This report begins with a summary of the general ways that governments develop and implement Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs and is followed by 34 national overviews which outline each country’s respective approach to Sport for Development and Peace. In addition to highlighting how governments are using sport to attain development objectives, most notably, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs),¹ the key findings from this report were used to inform the content of Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations to Governments.²

The information contained within this report was gathered through interviews with key government informants. In determining which countries to interview, the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG) Secretariat targeted select countries that had demonstrated an interest in Sport for Development and Peace. Countries that participated in SDP IWG meetings and events over the past four years were among the first approached. Regional representation was also considered. Of the 34 countries interviewed, 2 are from North America, 3 from South America, 7 from Europe, 5 from Western Africa, 7 from Eastern Africa, 2 from the Middle East, 3 from Asia and 5 from Oceania. Developed countries, countries-in-transition, and developing countries were all targeted to ensure diverse representation across the development spectrum.

The results of the interviews revealed a number of key findings. Perhaps the most evident finding was that the process of developing, adopting and implementing Sport for Development and Peace policies and practices differs significantly from country to country. This process depends, among other factors, on the current country context, the history of the government’s involvement in the issue, the existing political framework, and the government’s public policy development process.

To complement the recommendations outlined in Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations...
to Governments, the findings from the national overviews have been summarized within the following four areas of activity:

1. Mobilizing government support and action for Sport for Development and Peace
   Raising awareness and building support among national political leaders and senior government officials were observed to be critical first steps in mobilizing government action around Sport for Development and Peace. In most cases, ongoing efforts within governments by policy-makers and Sport for Development and Peace proponents are required to build the support needed for the broad-based and integrated use of sport to advance development and peace objectives.

2. Developing Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs
   Governments typically pursue the development of their Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs through two primary avenues: 1) establishing a distinct national Sport for Development and Peace policy, related legislation and programming; or 2) integrating Sport for Development and Peace into existing policies, related legislation and programming. In some cases, governments were observed to pursue both avenues.

3. Implementing Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs
   Interview findings indicate that most governments believe Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs are effective when they are delivered as part of broad, integrated approaches that address diverse development issues. Many governments are therefore committed to working in partnership with diverse stakeholders, including other governments, departments and organizations.

4. Mobilizing resources to support Sport for Development and Peace activities
   Mobilizing resources to support Sport for Development and Peace activities appears to be a consistent challenge for governments. Finding ways to expand available resources and optimize their use is critical. Governments are mobilizing a broad range of resources through collaborations and partnerships internally across government departments and with external partners. They are also using existing fiscal mechanisms, capitalizing on mass sporting events, developing programs to facilitate access to low-cost sporting equipment, and seeking assistance from elite athletes.

The trends and examples noted within the summary of key findings are meant to be illustrative and not exhaustive. In addition to revealing key findings around these four areas of activity, success stories, challenges, and lessons learned are also presented in the national overviews, as are future visions for Sport for Development and Peace internationally. Readers are encouraged to refer to the national overviews for specific details.

---

2. Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations to Governments is the final report of the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group’s (SDP IWG) four-year policy initiative. For more information, please see SDP IWG Secretariat (Right To Play), Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations to Governments (Toronto, 2008).
Positioning sport as a means to achieve diverse development goals, most notably the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

The majority of governments interviewed from developing countries and countries-in-transition draw connections between their approach to Sport for Development and Peace domestically and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These countries include Angola, Azerbaijan, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lebanon, Mozambique, Palau, occupied Palestinian territory, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Samoa, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, Vanuatu, and Zambia.

Similarly, many of the donor-country governments interviewed have positioned sport as a tool for development and peace in their approach to international aid and development. Examples include Australia, Austria, Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom - all of which have made varying investments in Sport for Development and Peace internationally.

Positioning sport to meet social needs

A large number of governments have indicated that their interest and support for sport-based interventions stem from the recognition that sport can help address needs identified within their countries. The Governments of Angola, Burundi, Lebanon, and Papua New Guinea all cited a need for peace-building efforts after periods of conflict. Similarly, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Austria, Lebanon, Palau, Papua New Guinea, and Spain reported a need to address social cohesion. These countries cited diverse needs related to integrating youth from different religious backgrounds, integrating new immigrants and persons with disabilities into their respective communities, uniting dispersed populations, and bridging gaps between groups and communities in conflict.

The Government of Peru mobilized support for Sport for Development and Peace after census information identified
social needs related to economic and social development, as well as the need to promote peace and well-being.

Health needs, and their social ramifications, were also cited by a number of governments. Azerbaijan, Mexico, Spain and South Africa all reported a need to promote health and physical fitness and/or to meet health challenges related to HIV and AIDS. Mexico, in particular, noted that attention to sport was mobilized nationally after it was estimated that 80 percent of Mexican children and youth were not getting sufficient physical activity to reach minimum acceptable fitness levels. In Spain, government support for Sport for Development and Peace was mobilized after a Ministry of Health and Consumption study revealed that 10 percent of all children were obese and 25 percent were overweight. As a result, the government acknowledged that sporting interventions were needed.

Leveraging existing research evidence and knowledge resources

Australia, Benin, and Mozambique all credit research evidence with providing the impetus needed for their governments to make investments in Sport for Development and Peace. In Australia, research conducted by the Australian Sports Commission (ASC) provided compelling evidence on sport’s role in community development. In Mozambique, research from the Faculties of Physical Education and Sport Sciences at the Pedagogical University of Mozambique was similarly credited.

In Papua New Guinea, pre-existing resources (including the UN Inter-Agency Task Force Report on Sport for Development and Peace, Literature Reviews produced by the SDP IWG, and policy and program material from Australia) were used when positioning sport as a development tool within the government.

Using individual champions

Many governments indicated that individual champions were invaluable in mobilizing government support for Sport for Development and Peace by demonstrating the power of sport in highly personal and compelling ways. Champions cited included Heads of State, ministers and other government representatives, and high-profile athletes external to government.

Influential Heads of State cited by governments include President Ilham Aliyev (Azerbaijian), President Tommy E. Remengesau (Palau), former President Adolf Ogi (Switzerland), former President Benjamin William Mkapa and President Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete (Tanzania).

Examples of internal government representatives that were cited as being effective include Roy McMurtry, Chief Justice and former Attorney General of Ontario (Canada), the Minister of Sport and Recreation (South Africa), Walter Fust, former Director-General of the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation and Heinz Keller, former Director-General of the Federal Office of Sport (Switzerland), Sue Campbell, Chair of UK Sport and John Scott, International Director of UK Sport (United Kingdom).

Champions external to government credited with galvanizing government support include former Olympic champion Johann O. Koss of Norway and the many talented local sportsmen and sportswomen of Uganda.

Engaging multiple departments

Most governments reported the need to engage multiple departments in order to increase momentum around Sport for Development and Peace within the government. (For more information on these governments, please refer to the sections on policy and program design and implementation.) The Government of Zambia, for example, reported inter-departmental collaboration to be particularly valuable in mobilizing support. There, each Ministry designated one person to act as the key point of contact on Sport for Development and Peace issues, leading to increased interest in, and acceptance of, Sport for Development and Peace nationally.

Involving external stakeholders

Several governments (the Netherlands, occupied Palestinian territory, Palau, Sri Lanka, and the United Kingdom) credit working with external stakeholders including volunteers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), national sport bodies, sport federations, United Nations (UN) agencies, and private sector partners, with helping to mobilize support around Sport for Development and Peace issues within their governments.
In the Netherlands, for example, Dutch volunteers initiated small sport-based projects in South Africa while working with SCORE, a sport-based NGO, in the early 1990s. The success of these projects garnered the attention of the government, contributing to the impetus which prompted the development of a specific policy on sport development and cooperation.

**Exchanging knowledge and experiences with peers regionally and internationally**
Several governments interviewed reported that sharing knowledge and experiences with their peers internationally helped them to mobilize support for Sport for Development and Peace activities. For example, Australia credits working with a key proponent from the Government of South Africa with instigating joint programming between the two countries.

Governments also credited their relationships with regional proponents. The Federal Chancellery of Austria, for example, led discussions on using sport as a development tool at a number of high-level regional forums – including the informal European Union (EU) Sport Ministers and Sport Directors Meetings. As a result, the concept of Sport for Development and Peace generated great interest from other regional delegates.

**Leveraging participation in international networks and forums**
The 2005 UN International Year for Sport and Physical Education (IYSPE 2005) was a key international forum that mobilized a large number of governments to move sport onto the global development agenda. The Governments of Austria, Germany and Mozambique all report greater interest in Sport for Development and Peace at the national level as a result of the momentum generated through this international forum. Germany, in particular, noted that budget allocations for Sport for Development and Peace were made in 2004 in preparation for the IYSPE 2005 – and during 2005, the Ministry of the Interior initiated 24 Sport for Development projects internationally.

Governments also cited the influence of the SDP IWG. Ghana, Zambia and Sri Lanka all cite participation in the SDP IWG as a major impetus leading to their government’s interest in Sport for Development and Peace. Ghana and Zambia, in particular, reported policy change in support of Sport for Development and Peace as a direct result of their involvement.

The Governments of Canada and the Netherlands also reported similar effects through participation in international forums. In Canada, involvement in the Commonwealth Committee on Development through Sport was credited with increasing government interest in Sport for Development and Peace. In the Netherlands, government participation in forums organized by the International Olympic Committee (IOC) had similar results.

Governments also reported galvanizing interest amongst peer governments by utilizing international networks. In Switzerland, in 2003, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and the Federal Office on Sport (FOSPO), along with the UN Office on Sport for Development and Peace, organized the first International Conference on Sport and Development in Magglingen, Switzerland. The conference helped to legitimize the Sport for Development and Peace movement in the eyes of many participating governments. The Swiss government also helped to initiate the New York-based Group of Friends of the IYSPE (now known as the Group of Friends of Sport for Development), which includes UN Ambassadors and national Permanent Representatives to the UN from different countries.

**Building on public support**
Austria, Lebanon, Norway, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, and the United Kingdom all indicated that strong public support for, or cultural affinity to, sport has led to a natural interest in Sport for Development and Peace. The Government of Norway, in particular, credited public interest in Sport for Development and Peace as an important driving force behind the government’s decision to develop sport-related programs and policies.
How Governments develop sport for development and peace policies and programs

Ensuring a supportive legal framework
A number of governments have reported moving their Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs forward by creating, or relying on, a supportive legal framework. In many countries, the Constitution is the highest form of law superseding all state and provincial statues. Subsequently, some governments – namely Angola, Brazil, Cape Verde, Mozambique and Spain – have embedded sport as a right directly in their constitutions.

A number of governments have also passed special legislations to ensure that their national statutes consistently recognize and fulfil the right to sport. The Governments of Angola, Azerbaijan, Peru and Spain are among those that have passed special laws on sport.

Some countries have leveraged their existing policies to initiate legal change and/or provide legal frameworks to support Sport for Development and Peace. In Uganda, for example, the Physical Education and Sports Policy seeks to strengthen and provide a legal basis for developing physical education and sports under the Strategic Framework for Development, part of the government’s National Development Agenda included in Uganda Vision 2025.

Determining the need for a national sport policy or a distinct policy on Sport for Development and Peace
Many governments have established a national sport policy that incorporates the use of sport to achieve development and peace objectives. Azerbaijan, Brazil, Canada, Ghana, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Vanuatu, and Zambia have all adopted national sport policies (often aptly named “National Sport Policy”) that acknowledge and support the use of sport to attain development objectives in one form or another. These policies contribute to the achievement of goals in the areas of health, education, child and youth development, gender equality, inclusion of persons with disabilities, and/or peace-building.

Other government strategies and documents that fulfill similar policy functions include Argentina’s National Plan for Social Sport, Mexico’s National Program on Physical Culture and Sport, Norway’s Strategy for Culture and Sports Cooperation, South Africa’s White Paper on Sport and Recreation, and Uganda’s Physical Education and Sports Policy. In all of these cases, policies and strategies emerged out of a need to position sport, and Sport for Development, as a national priority. In many of these cases, these programs and policies also act as umbrella strategies that have enabled the development of sophisticated policy systems in support of Sport for Development and Peace.

Finally, some of the governments interviewed reported the need to develop a distinct policy on Sport for Development and Peace. Austria, Mozambique and the Netherlands are examples of governments that have adopted, or are working towards adoption of, policies that are specific to Sport for Development and Peace.

Incorporating Sport for Development and Peace into existing policies and programs
Not all governments have identified a need for a national sport policy, or a distinct policy on Sport for Development and Peace. Instead, many governments have recognized the value of incorporating Sport for Development and Peace into already-existing policies and programs. For instance, Burundi, Cape Verde, Palau, and the occupied Palestinian territory have all positioned sport as a development tool in existing youth policies and their related institutions.

Some countries with national sport policies have gone a step further to integrate Sport for Development and Peace approaches into additional policy streams. In these cases, the national sport policy acts as an umbrella strategy under which corresponding legislation and programs are influenced. For instance, although there is a national sport policy in place in Azerbaijan, Sport for Development and Peace has also been incorporated into the national legislation On Physical
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Culture and Sports in Azerbaijan, the National Program for the Development of Physical Education and Sport in Azerbaijan, and the State Program for the Development of Football. Papua New Guinea has taken a similar approach. In addition to their national policy on sport, Sport for Development and Peace is referenced in the Integrated Community Development Policy and the Sports Foundation Strategic Plan.

Integrating Sport for Development and Peace into international development and international sport policies and programs

Many donor governments reported integrating Sport for Development and Peace into their international development and/or international sport policies. Three main methods to achieve this were observed: formal adoption of international Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs; informal integration of Sport for Development and Peace into existing international policies and programs; and a mix of both formal and informal approaches.

The Governments of Australia, the Netherlands and Norway have all adopted formal international development policies based on the concept of Sport for Development and Peace. Conversely, Canada, Germany, and the United Kingdom have integrated Sport for Development and Peace into their international development and/or international sport endeavours in a less-structured fashion. Switzerland has taken a mainstreaming approach by embedding sport as a development theme within the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) on par with other development themes (such as education, health, water, sanitation, etc.). Finally, the United Kingdom has supported sport development, and human development through sport, under the International Development Assistance Program – although no formal self-standing policy on Sport for Development and Peace exists.

Integrating Sport for Development and Peace into Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and National Development Frameworks

In order to formalize their commitment to Sport for Development and Peace, and secure appropriate budget allocations, some developing countries have integrated sport directly into their Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) or their National Development Frameworks.

Currently, sport is included in Ghana’s Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy, Lebanon’s formal strategy for national development, Thailand’s Tenth National Economic and Social Development Plan, and the PRSPs of Mozambique, Sierra Leone and Uganda.

Some countries-in-transition reported a similar approach. For instance, Azerbaijan’s 2003-2005 State Program on Poverty Reduction and Economic Development contained references to sport.

Emphasizing the use of sport to achieve the Millennium Development Goals

The majority of countries interviewed draw connections between their Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Most frequently, developing country governments cited the contribution of sport to attain the following MDGs: MDG 2 – achieve universal primary education; MDG 3 – promote gender equality and empowerment of women; and MDG 6 – combat HIV/AIDS and other diseases – with 18 governments citing each of these three MDGs respectively.

Numerous developed and/or donor countries also explicitly acknowledge the links between sport and the attainment of the MDGs at a policy level. These countries include the Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

Acknowledging relevant international obligations and commitments

Two of the governments surveyed have explicitly acknowledged relevant international conventions and declarations in the formation of their Sport for Development and Peace policies.

Argentina’s National Plan for Social Sport is based on two United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) declarations: the 1999 Punta del Este Declaration
of the Third International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport; and the 2004 Athens Declaration of the Fourth International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport.

Norway’s Strategy for Culture and Sports Cooperation was also similarly influenced. The strategy was built upon the 2004 White Paper, Fighting Poverty Together, which specifically references the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Consulting key stakeholders
Numerous governments (Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Mozambique, Tanzania, South Africa, and Sierra Leone) facilitated consultations with stakeholders to assist in the development of their Sport for Development and Peace policies and/or to exchange ideas and approaches. Stakeholders cited were government representatives, NGOs, sport federations and organizations, UN agencies, and private sector representatives.

The Government of Brazil, for example, developed their National Sport Policy through a national engagement process involving 80,000 Brazilians at a five-day sport conference attended by delegates from each of Brazil’s 26 states.

The Government of Canada has also consulted stakeholders on policy development. In 2005, Canadian Heritage organized a Roundtable Consultation to provide insight into a prospective strategy on development through sport with key partners (including NGOs, the World Bank, and UK Sport).

Leveraging bilateral relationships
Many governments interviewed cited the important benefits of working with other governments when designing their policies and programs.

In 2003, the Governments of Angola and Brazil signed a bilateral agreement on Sport for Development to promote the exchange of knowledge and expertise. Angola also benefited from technical assistance provided by experts from the Governments of Portugal and South Africa. Similarly, Peru entered into cooperation agreements with Spain, Venezuela, Cuba, China and Korea to exchange expertise and to develop and improve management skills around sports development.

An agreement between the Governments of Australia and South Africa allowed Sport and Recreation South Africa (SRSA) to develop sports leadership programs with assistance from governmental staff in Australia. SRSA also worked with the United Kingdom to develop sports education programs, and in April 2007, SRSA signed a bilateral sports and recreation Protocol of Action for 2008 at the British High Commission in Pretoria.

Papua New Guinea’s Sports Foundation reported coordinating its activities closely with the Government of Australia. Specifically, Papua New Guinea and the Australian Sports Commission developed a pilot project in Papua New Guinea based on a similar project delivered in South Africa supported by the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and the Australian Sports Commission (ASC).

Building on the priorities of multiple departments and coordinating inter-departmentally
Many governments reported building on the priorities of multiple departments when developing their Sport for Development and Peace policies and/or programs. In Cape Verde, for example, the State Secretariat of Youth and Sports, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education and Higher Education, and the Ministry of Economy, Growth and Competitiveness all position sport as a tool to achieve departmental priorities.

Similarly, a number of governments also reported inter-departmental collaboration. Three types in particular were noted: formal (established by an official concept or memorandum, such as in Australia, Papua New Guinea and Switzerland), informal (where an official formalizing mechanism is absent, such as in the United Kingdom), and the mix of the two (where there is an official mechanism established, and informal collaboration is ongoing as well, such as in Norway).
In Canada, for example, although there is no over-arching policy guiding development through sport, several government departments have invested in development through sport. They include Canadian Heritage, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Department of National Defence (DND) and Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada (DFAIT).

Building on the best values of sport
All of the governments interviewed acknowledged the inherent potential benefits of sport and have developed policies and programs that capitalize on those benefits accordingly. Numerous governments (Angola, Australia, Austria, Cape Verde, Germany, Ghana, the Netherlands, Palau, occupied Palestinian territory, Samoa, Spain, Thailand, Uganda, the United Kingdom, and Vanuatu) referenced the best values of sport explicitly when describing the priorities and objectives of their sport-related policies and activities. These values include fair play, teamwork, respect for opponents, cooperation, inclusion and/or excellence.

Committing to full inclusion
The majority of governments interviewed have committed to the principles of full inclusion when designing their Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs. Some governments (Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Canada, South Africa, Spain, and Switzerland) promote social inclusion in a broad sense. Others promote the inclusion of specific groups such as persons with disabilities, girls and women, immigrants, elderly people, and indigenous people. Countries target specific groups in one of two ways: by ensuring that policies and/or programs are designed to include them; or by designing targeted policies and/or programs that aim to empower them as a group.

Countries that promote inclusion and empowerment of persons with disabilities through sport include Angola, Argentina, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Ethiopia and Mexico. Countries that promote inclusion and empowerment of girls and women through sport include Austria, Canada, Cape Verde, Peru, Sierra Leone, Uganda, the United Kingdom, and Vanuatu. Countries that target both groups include Australia, Azerbaijan, Ghana, Lebanon, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Norway, occupied Palestinian territory, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tanzania, and Zambia.

Some governments (Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom) also demonstrate a commitment to the inclusion of immigrants. Others (Argentina, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Burundi, Cape Verde, Mozambique, South Africa, and Tanzania) promote the inclusion of elderly people through sport. Finally, a number of governments (Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Ghana, Mexico, Norway, South Africa, Vanuatu, and Zambia) use sport as a vehicle to reach out to, and promote the inclusion of, indigenous people.

Drawing on a wide range of physical activities, sports and games (both popular and traditional)
Governments reported drawing on a wide range of sports – both popular and traditional – as a means to encourage participation. Popular sports (such as football) are promoted by nearly all of the countries interviewed. Numerous countries interviewed (Angola, Brazil, Burundi, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mozambique, Palau, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Thailand, and Vanuatu) also reported a commitment to traditional sport.

In many cases, commitment to traditional sport was cited not only as a means to encourage participation of hard-to-reach populations who would not be drawn by popular sports, but also to promote unity and cultural heritage. In Samoa, for example, the Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture affirmed traditional sport as an important element of national culture. Similarly, traditional sport is also being used to unite people internationally. In Thailand, for example, the Ministry of Tourism and Sports promotes traditional games as a tool to build friendship and mutual understanding between Thais and the populations of neighbouring countries.

Like traditional sport, indigenous sport is also being used by some governments to promote inclusion of hard-to-reach groups. By including indigenous sport in its programming, Ghana’s Ministry of Education and Sport has been able to reach diverse citizens who were previously inaccessible. The Government of Ghana reports that elderly Muslim women
Facilitating capacity-building
Many governments interviewed reported including a focus on capacity-building as they develop their Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs. They include Azerbaijan, Ethiopia, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, the United Kingdom and Uganda. The Government of Papua New Guinea, in particular, indicates that capacity-building is a priority under the Sport for Development Initiative (SFDI). Without this commitment to capacity-building, Papua New Guinea indicates that sustainable outcomes will not be possible.

Adapting lessons learned
Several governments reported incorporating lessons learned from other parties into their policies and programs. Some governments credited learning from peer governments, while others reported benefiting from lessons learned within their own countries. For example, the Government of Azerbaijan studied and incorporated the experience of Russia, Turkey, Ukraine, and Belarus when designing their policies and programs. Similarly, Lebanon adapted lessons learned from the Governments of France, Egypt, and Cuba. The Government of Australia, however, reported incorporating lessons learned from past experiences within their own government, with the experiences of early ASC projects informing the development of the recent Australian Sport Outreach Program.

HOW GOVERNMENTS IMPLEMENT SPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

Working in partnership with other governments
Many governments cited working with other governments to implement their policies and programs. This was particularly the case when describing programs administered jointly between donor countries and developing countries. Under the Australian Sports Outreach Program, for example, the Government of Australia is working in partnerships with key government ministries throughout the Pacific, Southern Africa, and the Caribbean. Similarly, UK Sport (the United Kingdom’s main sport body working internationally) is actively working with the Ministry of Education in Palau through the International Development Assistance Program to provide sport-related training opportunities in colleges and schools.

Developing mechanisms to facilitate coordination at the national level
Numerous governments (Argentina, Brazil, Germany, Papua New Guinea, Spain, Samoa, South Africa, Switzerland, Tanzania and the United Kingdom) reported developing mechanisms to bring various departments and/or stakeholders together at the national level in an effort to facilitate coordination of their Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs.

The Government of Argentina has mandated the Undersecretariat for Social Sport to oversee a policy-oriented body (the National Social Sports Congress) to bring together diverse stakeholders at the national level. In Papua New Guinea, a Steering Committee comprised of various stakeholders guides the implementation of the Sport for Development and Peace Initiative (SFDI). In Spain, the High Council for Sport (an independent organization attached to the national Ministry of Education and Science) works to coordinate policy and programs among all levels of government. In Switzerland, the Swiss Working Group on Sport for Development (although not currently active) was created to serve as a coordinating body between stakeholders nationally. And, in the United Kingdom, UK Sport manages the UK Sport for Development Alliance to link government departments, UK-based NGOs, and sport federations — about 30 partners in all.

The Governments of Brazil and Samoa are also working to develop similar mechanisms. In Brazil, a National Sport and Leisure System is being created by the Ministry of Sport to improve coordination and clarify roles across local, municipal, regional, state, and federal areas. And, in Samoa, a National Sport and Recreation Committee is being established to coordinate activities amongst governmental and non-governmental bodies.
Involving educational partners and systems to deliver Sport for Development and Peace programs

The majority of governments interviewed reported linkages between their sport and education sectors. Many of the governments interviewed indicated that Sport for Development programming was being promoted and/or delivered in schools. These countries include Argentina, Brazil, Burundi, Cape Verde, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Mexico, Mozambique, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, Vanuatu, and Zambia.

Involving local and municipal authorities

Many governments cited working with local and municipal authorities to implement policies and programming. They include Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Cape Verde, Lebanon, the Netherlands, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Spain, South Africa, Tanzania, Thailand, and Zambia.

In Brazil, involvement of local bodies was reported to be particularly significant. The Government of Brazil has written a City Leisure and Sport plan directly into most city statutes. The plans call on cities to work with local citizen-led management groups to develop sport-based programming on a continuous basis in response to local needs.

Involving external partners

The majority of governments reported working with external partners to implement their Sport for Development and Peace programs and projects. These partners include, but are not limited to, international and local NGOs, UN agencies, National Olympic Committees, sport federations, and labour unions.

Governments that reported working with NGOs to implement programs include Angola, Azerbaijan, Cape Verde, Ethiopia, Germany, Lebanon, Mozambique, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, occupied Palestinian territory, Sierra Leone, Spain, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, the United Kingdom and Zambia. In addition to fulfilling an implementation role, some governments noted that NGOs, both international and local, act as a liaison between the government and local community groups. In Thailand, for example, the Ministry of the Interior is currently working with Right To Play to deliver a sport-based outreach program to refugees. Notably, a total of ten governments reported working in partnership with this international humanitarian organization.

The Governments of Burundi, Mozambique, occupied Palestinian territory, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Uganda, the United Kingdom, and Zambia reported working with UN agencies to implement programs. These agencies include the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), to name a few. The national authority of Palestine, in particular, reported a significant amount of UN involvement. There, UNICEF operates the *Sports for Development Programme* in more than 250 schools in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Additionally, the UNDP supports the Palestine Olympic Committee and the Palestine Rowing Federation. Similarly, the Government of Brazil reported close collaboration with UNESCO around the evaluation of its national program, *Second Half*.

Many countries (Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Palau, occupied Palestinian territory, Sri Lanka, and Uganda) highlighted National Olympic Committees as key implementation partners. In Palau, the Ministry of Community and Cultural Affairs reports working jointly with the Palau National Olympic Committee (PNOC) to deliver most programs. The Government of Palau notes that the PNOC has strong community links, making it well-positioned to take the lead on coordination.

A large number of governments (Ethiopia, Germany, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda and Zambia) also reported working with national sport agencies and/or sport federations to deliver programs. Sri Lanka reported working with 54 sport associations in total. Spain noted that sport federations are key partners in terms of program implementation as they are well-positioned to provide coaches, facilities and equipment.

Finally, the Governments of Angola and Ethiopia also reported working with labour unions to increase sport and physical activity in the workplace.
**Sharing lessons learned with other Sport for Development and Peace practitioners and policy-makers**

Some governments have committed to working with other government policy-makers and/or practitioners in an effort to impart their knowledge. Austria’s current policy, for example, is to share and promote positive sport ideas and experiences on a bilateral level, particularly with nearby Eastern European countries. In September 2006, recognizing the importance of raising awareness about Sport for Development and Peace among development NGOs, the Federal Chancellery, together with the Vienna Institute for Development Cooperation, co-hosted the first Dialogue Forum on Sport for Development and Peace.

Canada has also committed to sharing lessons learned with practitioners and policy-makers. Internationally, the Canadian government participates in the SDP IWG, the forum of Commonwealth Sport Ministers Conference, the Commonwealth Advisory Body on Sport, the Conference of the Youth and Sports Ministers of French-speaking Countries (CONFEJES), and the United Nations Group of Friends for Sport for Development and Peace. Canadian Heritage also participates in informal consultations through conferences such as Magglingen and Next Step. Bilateral meetings at international sport events are also used strategically to share information.

**Azerbaijan, Samoa, Palau and Zambia all reported capitalizing on sporting events held within their countries to conduct health outreach. Azerbaijan and Samoa use high-profile sporting events to deliver HIV and AIDS prevention messages to young people, while Palau and Zambia use sporting events to bring information around healthy lifestyles and to encourage people to be tested for viruses and other health ailments.**

In Brazil, popular mobilization around sporting events has helped to celebrate Brazilian culture and further national social development. In Mexico, competitive sport events are used as opportunities to bring together athletes from diverse backgrounds, including persons with disabilities and indigenous Mexicans. Likewise, in Argentina, the Evita National Games are used to promote inclusion of youth with disabilities. Similarly, in Spain, the annual Integration Race, which reaches more than 1,000 people, is used to promote family participation, integration of immigrants and persons with disabilities.

**Deploying elite athletes as ambassadors and role models**

Many governments indicated that elite and popular athletes were utilized to promote Sport for Development and Peace. For example, the Governments of Burundi and Mozambique both use renowned athletes to deliver messages around HIV and AIDS prevention. Zambia also uses athletes to spread health messages in conjunction with government programs.

In Sri Lanka, the success of high-profile female athletes, in particular, is providing a positive example to girls and young women. The government reports that women are increasingly viewing sport as a healthy lifestyle choice as a result. Similarly, the Government of Uganda credits the influence of talented local sportsmen and sportswomen with helping to unite Ugandans of different religions and ethnic groups, while also encouraging people of all socio-economic backgrounds, particularly women, to explore their full potential.

**Facilitating access to low-cost equipment**

The majority of governments interviewed (Brazil, Burundi, Cape Verde, Germany, Ghana, Lebanon, Mexico, Mozambique, Peru, Samoa, South Africa, Spain, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, Spain, and Zambia) all provided interesting examples. 

**HOW GOVERNMENTS MOBILIZE RESOURCES TO SUPPORT SPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE ACTIVITIES**

**Capitalizing on sporting events**

Most of the governments interviewed reported using mass sporting events as platforms to educate and inform the public on key development issues and to promote the best values of sport. Although sporting events were found to vary significantly between countries according to scale and reach, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Canada, Mexico, Palau, Samoa, Spain and Zambia all provided interesting examples.
the United Kingdom and Zambia) reported a focus on facilitating access to sporting equipment.

Brazil, in particular, developed special programs to produce the low-cost sporting equipment needed to run national youth sport activities. These programs, *Painting Freedom* and *Painting Citizenship*, train prison inmates and individuals from disadvantaged communities respectively to produce sporting equipment in a supervised setting. The government reports that these programs have now supplied several million children with sporting equipment. Interestingly, a similar initiative was inspired in Angola as a result.

Utilizing available fiscal mechanisms to allocate funding towards Sport for Development and Peace initiatives

Many governments indicated that their resources for Sport for Development and Peace activities originated from general government revenues (Angola, Argentina, Brazil, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia). A number of governments – notably those of developing countries – noted that that their programs and projects were funded by donor agencies situated in developed countries. Additionally, some governments indicated that other mechanisms were in place to fund Sport for Development activities.

In Ghana, the Ghana Education Trust Fund, which receives 1.5 percent of all taxes accruing to the Government of Ghana, funds the development of sport infrastructure in schools. Similarly, in Papua New Guinea, the National Sport Trust Limited is used to support a variety of Sport for Development activities.

Taxation programs are used by several governments to fund Sport for Development activities. In Brazil, individuals may direct up to six percent of their income tax toward investments in sporting activities and projects. Legal entities such as companies and social clubs may direct up to one percent of their revenue-based taxes in a similar manner and some states have incentive laws that allow for the financing of sporting infrastructure, events, clubs and athlete sponsorship through consumption tax remittances. In Ghana, a new Sports Act (soon to be made law) is expected to provide tax exemptions to corporations that sponsor sport activities. In Mozambique, tax laws provide incentives to the private sector for supporting sport activities arranged through the Sport Development Fund. Similarly, the Government of Papua New Guinea is working to develop a tax incentive on all contributions made to the National Sport Trust Limited. In Sierra Leone, taxes and levies are expected to finance Sport for Development and Peace efforts once the National Sports Policy is implemented. In Sri Lanka, imported sporting goods receive a tax benefit and sponsors that fund sport activities through the Ministry of Sport receive tax concessions.

Finally, some governments indicate that lotteries have been developed, and/or harnessed, to support sporting activities. In Brazil, the government created Timemania, a lottery which allocates profits to supporting soccer clubs, sport management agencies, social security, and the Olympic and Paralympic Committees. In Ghana, the Ministry of Education and Sports is negotiating with the Department of National Lotteries to organize a National Sports Lottery with an annual target of USD 1 billion. In the United Kingdom, sport is considered to be one of five “good causes” eligible for funding through the UK National Lottery. As such, International Development Through Sport UK (the International Development Assistance Program’s charitable trust) has made several bids to the National Lottery for funding.

Partnering with the private sector

Many governments (Brazil, Burundi, Ghana, Peru, Mozambique and Spain) reported seeking sponsorships with the private sector to finance their Sport for Development and Peace activities.

In Burundi, sporting activities are supported by a variety of private sector companies and local businesses including banks, Engen Burundi Ltd. (an oil and gas refinery), and Brarudi, a large local brewery. The Government of Ghana receives approximately USD 5 million annually from the private sector for sport-related activities – citing the example of Nestle, which sponsors the monthly Walk for Life. To encourage corporate sponsorships there, the Government of Ghana has developed the National Sports Awards to recognize corporations for their contributions. In Peru, the Peruvian Sport Institute works closely with several corporations,
including Telefonica del Peru (the national telephone company which supports sport-specific training institutes), Banco de Credito del Peru (the national bank which sponsors volleyball seminars) and Coca Cola Ltd. which sponsors sport clinics aimed at health promotion. Coca Cola Ltd. also sponsors activities in Mozambique, as does Cadbury, Beers of Mozambique, and Mozambique Cellular (mCel) – the latter of which distributes balls annually across the country. Spain also reports funding from the private sector. For example, the Leche Pascual group has donated EUR 600,000 (USD 878,000) to the Play in School program.

Notably, the Government of Brazil indicates that private sector involvement is so important that the Ministry of Sport is now working to create a framework to guide collaboration with the private sector.

Finally, while private sector involvement is welcomed by most governments, some indicate that not all private companies make ideal partners. For example, the Government of Spain does not accept funding from companies whose products are considered to be counter-productive to their goals.

Looking Ahead

The summary of findings on government activities reveals an abundance of information that can help to inform policy design and program implementation moving forward. It is important to note, however, that the diverse experiences of governments cannot be captured through simple trend analyses. While some key trends are clear, others are contextual, representing the unique experiences and approaches of diverse governments. For example, while some governments reported that partnerships with other stakeholders were a successful part of their Sport for Development and Peace activity (Spain, Canada and Tanzania) other governments found partnerships to be challenging (Papua New Guinea, Uganda, and the United Kingdom).

Similarly, when asked to consider lessons learned, some donor governments (Norway and the Netherlands) reported a need for greater for local ownership – particularly within developing countries. Developing country governments, however, alluded to the challenges of local ownership by citing a lack of available resources (Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tanzania and Uganda) and sporting infrastructure (Tanzania).

Although enormous diversity exists, one thing that governments tend to agree on, regardless of their position along the development spectrum, is the need to share expertise internationally on Sport for Development and Peace. In fact, nearly all governments emphasized the value of multilateral efforts in promoting knowledge-exchange and sustaining momentum. Governments reported that their involvement in international forums (including the SDP IWG and the UN) provided them with an opportunity to learn from other governments, while also helping them to mobilize action in support of Sport for Development and Peace in their own countries.

Going forward, governments proposed innovative approaches to sustaining momentum. Some governments (Switzerland and Germany) recognized the need for a coordinated network to continue to synergize efforts. Others (Papua New Guinea) indicated that a body such as the SDP IWG was vital to coordinate academic research, showcase field-based studies, and bring together international stakeholders in support of collective learning and leadership. Still others (Ghana) proposed the development of a Global Sport for Development and Peace Games that would bring together all countries committed to Sport for Development and Peace in the spirit of fair play and inclusion.

To conclude, there is tremendous enthusiasm among Sport for Development and Peace proponents to fully harness the development power of sport. Subsequently, momentum in support of policy change is on the rise. To sustain the enthusiasm and momentum that has been built thus far, increased understanding and support for Sport for Development and Peace amongst policy-makers and key stakeholders is needed.
SUMMARY

It is therefore hoped that the information provided here, and in the national overviews that follow, will provide policy-makers and key stakeholders with the information needed to inspire and guide them in developing their own Sport for Development and Peace policies and programs. By learning from each other’s experiences, governments will be well-positioned to integrate sport into their own national and international strategies and in doing so, will contribute to the attainment of diverse development objectives – namely the Millennium Development Goals.