



General Assembly

Distr.: General
18 December 2009

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Thirteenth session

Agenda item 3

**Promotion and protection of all human rights,
civil, political, economic, social and cultural
rights, including the right to development**

Report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context, Raquel Rolnik

Summary

The present report, submitted in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 6/27, is the annual report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context.

In the report, the Special Rapporteur 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. She provides an overview of the practices and procedures of the International Olympic Committee and International Association of Football Federations, especially on their bidding and selection process for host cities and countries. In addition, she offers some insights on the role played by sponsors, as well as some examples of positive and negative practices of host cities and countries.

In her conclusion, the Special Rapporteur urges States to uphold their human rights obligations when organizing such mega-events and addresses some specific recommendations to States, the International Olympic Committee and the International Association of Football Federations.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1	3
II. Mega-events and their impact on city transformation.....	2–4	3
III. Mega-events and their impact on the right to adequate housing.....	5–31	4
A. A positive housing legacy.....	7–14	4
B. A negative housing legacy.....	15–29	6
C. Tensions surrounding mega-events: mobilization and negotiations.....	30–31	10
IV. International human rights framework applicable to mega-events.....	32–35	11
A. Protection from forced evictions.....	32–33	11
B. Right to participate in decision-making and local communities.....	34–35	12
V. Procedures and regulations of the Olympic Games and the Football World Cup and their relationship with the right to adequate housing.....	36–67	12
A. The Olympic Movement and the right to adequate housing.....	38–41	13
B. FIFA and the right to adequate housing.....	42–44	13
C. Bidding and selection processes.....	45–57	14
D. Role of candidate cities and countries in the bidding process: positive and negative practices.....	58–64	17
E. Role of sponsors, partners and other corporations in mega-events.....	65–67	18
VI. Conclusions and recommendations.....	68–92	19
A. Recommendations for States.....	69–81	19
B. Recommendations for the International Olympic Committee and FIFA.....	82–92	20

I. Introduction

1. The present report is submitted in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 6/27, and constitutes the second annual report submitted to the Council since the current Special Rapporteur, Raquel Rolnik, assumed her functions on 1 April 2008.¹ It focuses on the impact of sporting mega-events on the realization of the right to adequate housing. In the first part, the Special Rapporteur discusses the positive and negative legacies of the Olympic Games and World Football Cup on host cities and host countries, from the point of view of the right to adequate housing. In the second part, she outlines the relevant international human rights framework and obligations. The third contains an overview of the procedures and regulations of these events relevant to the right to housing. Lastly, the Special Rapporteur presents some preliminary recommendations to protect the right to adequate housing in all stages of the mega-event process, from the initial bid phase through to the planning and preparation phases and the staging of the event to the post-event legacy. The report draws on information provided by a range of sources, including the reports of previous mandate holders and the findings of a workshop organized in June 2007 by the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions with the participation of the previous mandate holder, Miloon Kothari, as well as remarks on earlier drafts from the International Olympic Committee.

II. Mega-events and their impact on city transformation

2. Until the 1930s, the Olympic Games and other international sporting events left few traces on the urban landscape. In 1932, the city of Los Angeles used the games as an opportunity to uplift the local economy, and built the first Olympic Village with characteristics of permanent housing.² After the Second World War, the Olympic movement gathered unprecedented force, attracting Government support under the framework of sport as a social goal, which included the construction of public sports infrastructure and promotion of sports activities. In the 1970s, the combination of staging international sporting events and processes of urban transformation became more evident, with a policy of building sports infrastructure in central areas as a strategy for urban renewal in city centres.³

3. In 1980, the International Olympic Committee adopted a philosophy of progressive incorporation of the private sector in the promotion of the Games. In the 1990s, organizing mega-events as a component of cities' strategic planning, with a view to repositioning them in a globalized economy, became the hegemonic practice. Staging international games as an economic development strategy, which includes urban infrastructure renewal and real estate investments, became the contemporary approach by cities and states to mega-events.⁴

¹ The first annual report presented by the Special Rapporteur focused on the impact of the financial crisis on the right to adequate housing (A/HRC/10/XX).

² Muñoz, F. "Historic evolution and urban planning typology of Olympic Villages", Centre d'Estudis Olímpics i de l'Esport, Barcelona, 1996.

³ Mascarenhas, Gilmar, "Globalização e governo urbano nos megaeventos olímpicos: os Jogos Panamericanos de Santo Domingo-2003. Diez años de cambios en el Mundo, en la Geografía y en las Ciencias Sociales, 1999–2008", Universidad de Barcelona, 2008.

⁴ See "Labor, economy and transparency in large urban projects", Alberto de Oliveira (UFRRJ), 2009, Congress of LASA Brazil, 2009; and "From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism", and Harvey D, 1989, *Geografiska Annaler*, series B 71(1) 3.

4. The 1992 Olympic Games in Barcelona signalled this new approach. The Olympic Games were used as a resource to implement a double agenda: modernizing infrastructure and promoting a new public image of the city by building innovative international architecture.⁵ Both elements are present, with more or less intensity, in contemporary relations between sport mega-events and their host cities, causing a great impact on the social and economic development of the city.

III. Mega-events and their impact on the right to adequate housing

5. Mega-events can be an opportunity to potentially enhance the right to adequate housing. The redevelopment processes undertaken in preparation of mega-events can promote infrastructural and environmental improvements for the host cities. This includes the enhancement of mobility, the cleansing of contaminated areas, the development of waste management and sanitation, the provision of social and cultural infrastructure, and the construction of new dwellings, or the rehabilitation of the existing ones, that may increase the availability of housing stock in host cities.

6. The impact of mega-events on the enjoyment of the right to adequate housing for all is, however, less clear. Numerous past experiences have shown that redevelopment projects adopted in preparation for the games often result in extensive human rights violations, particularly of the right to adequate housing. Allegations of mass forced evictions and displacement for infrastructural development and city renewal, reduced affordability of housing as a result of gentrification, sweeping operations against the homeless, and criminalization and discrimination of marginalized groups are frequent features in cities staging the events. The impact of these practices is mainly endured by the most disadvantaged and vulnerable sectors of society, such as low-income populations, ethnic minorities, migrants, the elderly, persons with disabilities, and marginalized groups (such as street vendors and sex workers).

A. A positive housing legacy

7. The staging of mega-events commonly serves as a catalyst for the initiation and implementation of housing development plans in host cities. Greater flows of public and private investment are allocated to the construction industry once a city has been designated to host the events. Thus, host cities normally experience unprecedented construction activities that translate into greater availability of jobs and housing stock. Given the number of dwellings needed to accommodate large numbers of visitors, the city is faced with large-scale redevelopment and urbanization. Urban development also often includes public plans for urban renewal, generally the “beautification” and “upgrading” of certain areas. Both central and peripheral areas of host cities are subject to transformation. Once the event is finished, the new dwellings may be available for the local residents, who will find their city transformed.

8. Examples of post-event use of venues for local housing include (a) in Moscow, the 1980 Olympic Games marked the culmination of a policy of construction of social housing with the transformation of the Olympic Village into 18 apartment blocks of 16 floors; (b) in

⁵ Stavrides, Stavros, “Urban identities: beyond the regional and the global. The case of Athens”, in Jamal Al-Qawasmi, Abdesselem Mahmoud and Ali Djerbi (eds.) 2008, *Regional Architecture and Identity in the Age of Globalization*, Proceedings of the Second International Conference of CSAAR, Tunis, pp. 577–588, 2005.

Athens, the Olympic Village constructed for the 2004 Olympic Games resulted in 3,000 new units of subsidized housing that benefited 10,000 residents;⁶ (c) in London, half of the 2,800 units in the Olympic Village are to become affordable housing after the Games, while current plans for the Olympic Park site are for around 10,000 new homes, around 35 per cent to be affordable housing.⁷

9. The staging of mega-events usually entails the redevelopment of public transit networks and transport systems, environmental upgrading and the increased availability of cultural venues, sport facilities and public open spaces for city dwellers. All these investments, if designed with an inclusionary perspective, benefiting the majority, can have a positive impact on the right to adequate housing.

10. To offer diverse and good-quality alternatives for circulation during the mega-event and incorporating them into the mobility strategies of the cities, most host cities build new highways and city ring roads, recuperate downtown streets, enhance railroad networks, expand underground and tramway systems, and enlarge airports or build new ones. Depending on the nature of these interventions, they can ameliorate housing conditions, providing more access for residents to economic, social and cultural opportunities.

11. Examples of infrastructural improvement include (a) in Barcelona, a new airport and a city ring road were built in preparation for the 1992 Olympic Games; (b) in Athens, a new tramway and a city ring road were constructed and the metro system was expanded in preparation for the 2004 Olympic Games; and (c) in Beijing, a new airport, new train and metro railways and two ring roads were built for the 2008 Olympics.⁸

12. Environmental concerns are also a big component of the preparation for hosting a sporting mega-event. This became more evident in the aftermath of the 2000 Olympic Games in Sydney. Pressured by environmental organizations and new parameters underlined by the International Olympic Committee, the organizing committee incorporated environmental concerns into the organization of the event. Since then, local host authorities include environmental strategies into their planning and take the opportunity to improve waste management facilities, reorganize garbage collection, clean streets and contaminated areas, build public parks and other green initiatives. They also embark in more complex campaigns, often resuming long-overdue plans for environmental upgrading, such as cleaning up polluted rivers and lakes, renovating or extending the sewage system, introducing systems to manage air pollution, upgrading systems for energy production (natural gas pipelines, dams, electric networks) and relocating polluting industries.

13. Examples of environmental upgrading include (a) in Tokyo, three sewage treatment plants were constructed in the run-up to the 1964 Olympic Games; (b) in Seoul, the polluted Hang River was cleaned and new systems to handle air pollution and collect garbage were created in preparation for the Olympics; and (c) in Beijing, 640 km of sewage pipes were renovated and two natural gas pipelines created in the run-up to the 2008 games.⁹

14. Hosting Olympic and football events has positive implications for the availability of sports facilities for the local population once the event concludes. A range of stadiums, training centres, sports fields and other amenities are constructed during this period to respond to the demands of the events. Social activities are also significantly enhanced by the development of new and improved cultural venues, designed to provide additional

⁶ "Fair play for housing rights. Mega-events, Olympic Games and evictions", COHRE, 2007. p.142.

⁷ Information provided by the International Olympic Committee.

⁸ "Fair play for housing rights", op. cit., p. 74.

⁹ Ibid., p. 74.

attractions for the visiting public. The arrangements for the events also often increase the number of open public spaces, green and recreational areas. In addition to the sport facilities built to host the games and afterwards made available to the public, examples of increased availability of cultural and sports facilities include (a) in Seoul, new cultural houses were built before the Olympic Games; (b) in Barcelona, theatres, museums and art galleries were renovated in preparation for the Games; and (c) in Athens, archaeological sites underwent preservation work in the run-up to the Olympics.¹⁰

B. A negative housing legacy

15. In the period between the designation of the host city and the staging of the event, cities normally undergo a series of transformations that not only affect their urban infrastructure, but also bring about economic, social and demographic changes that have long-term consequences for the local population. While analysis of the impact of these events usually focuses on the economic benefits for the host city, less attention goes into evaluating the effect on the lives of the residents, especially the most disadvantaged sectors of society. Regrettably, the legacy of hallmark events on the situation of these people has been far from positive. The alleged economic benefits of staging the games are not spread evenly throughout the local population. Instead, old disparities appear to be exacerbated as the processes of regeneration and beautification of the city usually focus on areas mostly populated by poor and vulnerable groups. The lasting consequences of mega-events often include disquieting patterns, as described in the section below.

1. Evictions

16. Displacement and forced evictions are common features of preparations for mega-events. The heightened demand for space to construct sports venues, accommodation and roads is channelled through urban redevelopment projects that often require the demolition of existing dwellings and the opening of space for new construction. The importance given to the creation of a new international image for the cities, as an integral part of the preparations for the games, often implies the removal of signs of poverty and underdevelopment through reurbanization projects that prioritize city beautification over the needs of local residents. As public authorities use the organization of mega-events as a catalyst for the regeneration of their city, residents of the affected areas may face mass displacement, forced evictions and the demolition of their homes. Displacement may also result from the measures taken by local authorities to quickly remove unsightly slums from areas exposed to visitors, even without being framed within larger redevelopment projects.

17. In most cases, alternatives to evictions are not sufficiently explored, displacement is not accompanied by prior consultation with the affected communities, and adequate compensation or alternative housing is not provided to victims. In addition, evictions almost never allow the return of former dwellers to newly built homes. Indeed, owners, tenants and squatters are often subjected to pressure by public authorities or private developers to leave the area, their rights are seldom recognized, and they receive no guarantees of return to the redevelopment site. In many occasions, evictions are carried out in a context of violence, harassment and assaults against the inhabitants. Time constraints are usually cited as the reason for disruptive and violent evictions and disregard for the rights of affected communities.

18. Examples of evictions due to the construction of sporting venues, accommodation for visitors and infrastructure improvements include: (a) in Seoul, 15 per cent of the

¹⁰ Ibid.

population was forcibly evicted and 48,000 buildings were demolished in preparation for the 1988 Olympic Games;¹¹ (b) in Barcelona, 200 families were evicted to make way for the construction of new city ring roads prior to the 1992 Olympic Games;¹² (c) in Beijing, nine projects related to venue construction, covering over one million square meters, involved relocation of residents;¹³ allegations of mass evictions were reported, sometimes conducted by unidentified men, in the middle of the night and without prior warning, and with residents and housing activists often subject to repression, harassment and arbitrary detention;¹⁴ (d) in New Delhi, 35,000 families were evicted from public lands in preparation for the 2010 Commonwealth Games;¹⁵ (e) in South Africa, the N2 Gateway housing project involving the construction of rental housing for the 2010 World Cup entailed the removal of over 20,000 residents from the Joe Slovo informal settlement, and local residents were moved to impoverished areas at the edge of the city;¹⁶ and (f) in London, the Compulsory Purchase Order, issued in preparation for the 2012 Olympic Games, and that grants powers to local authorities to assemble land required for major regeneration projects, forces residents to leave Olympic districts.¹⁷

2. Indirect displacement due to gentrification

19. Although not directly a consequence of the construction of facilities to host the games or the urbanization projects aimed at improving the image of the host city, mass displacement may also result from indirect processes, such as gentrification and escalating housing costs. Gentrification can be triggered by the redevelopment projects undertaken in preparation for the events. Once involved in regeneration processes, underdeveloped neighbourhoods attract high-income earners, who start moving into the area. The sudden interest of real estate investors in areas previously considered of low market value raises property and rental prices. This has an impact on affordability for local residents, and often results in their de facto expulsion from the area. In particular, tenants who have no means to rent the new premises are forced to resettle in other regions, and often receive no compensation, alternative housing or financial aid. Property owners are sometimes included in joint development programmes with private developers, which ensures them access to the new residences; in other cases, they are forced to sell and leave the area either as a result of increased costs or of intimidation from construction companies.

20. Consequently, gentrification and escalating prices have the effect of forcing out low-income communities in favour of middle- and upper-class residents. The community thus suffers a major change in its demographic composition. While middle- and high- income populations move into former poor areas and find housing increasingly available, former residents are pushed to the outskirts of the city, losing their communal ties and enduring further impoverishment owing to the reduction of employment and schooling opportunities, as well as the increase in their commuting costs.

¹¹ Solomon J. Greene; “*Staged cities; mega events, slum clearance, and global capital*” in *Yale Human Rights and Development Law Journal*, vol. 6, 2003, pp. 171, 179.

¹² “Fair play for housing rights”, op. cit., p. 197.

¹³ Information provided by the International Olympic Committee, based on Beijing Olympic Organizing Committee sources.

¹⁴ “Beijing 2008. Human rights and the Olympics in China” (2004); and “Demolished: forced evictions and the tenant’s rights movement in China”, Human Rights Watch, Vol.16, No. 4; 2004.

¹⁵ “Fair play for housing rights”, op. cit., p. 28.

¹⁶ Caroline Newton, “The reverse side of the medal: about the 2010 FIFA World Cup and the beautification of the N2 in Cape Town”, Springer Netherlands, vol. 2, No. 1, 2009, p. 9.

¹⁷ See the website of London Development Agency, at www.lda.gov.uk; and “Hosting the 2012 Olympic Games: London’s Olympic preparations and housing rights concerns”, 2001, COHRE p. 26.

21. Examples of displacement due to gentrification and escalating housing costs include (a) in Seoul, apartment prices increased by 20.4 per cent in the first eight months of 1988, and land prices soared by 27 per cent in 1988, the steepest rise since 1978;¹⁸ (b) in Barcelona, the increase in house pricing during the five-year period surrounding the Games was 131 per cent, while in the rest of the country prices increased by 83 per cent¹⁹; in 1993, a year after the Olympics, house prices only rose by 2 per cent;²⁰ (c) in Atlanta, around 15,000 low-income residents were forced out of the city as the annual rent increase rose from 0.4 per cent in 1991 to 7.9 per cent in 1996 in preparation for the 1996 Olympic Games;²¹ (d) in Sydney, the increase in house pricing during the five-year period before the Games was 50 per cent while in the rest of the country prices increased by 39 per cent;²² (e) in Beijing, around 1.5 million people were displaced from their homes to allow for urban renewal in the run-up to the 2008 Olympic Games,²³ (f) in London, property prices in the areas surrounding the Olympic site increased by 1.4 per cent to 4.6 per cent after the announcement that the city had won the bid, while in the rest of the city prices were down by 0.2 per cent.²⁴

3. Reduction in the availability of social and low-cost housing

22. The impact of redevelopment and beautification processes on housing accessibility and affordability is even greater when it affects neighbourhoods containing low income dwellings and social housing. Frequently located in poor areas of the city, social housing provides local residents with a low-cost housing opportunity, sometimes subsidized by the State. However, redevelopment projects executed in preparation for mega-events, for the most part undertaken in underdeveloped neighbourhoods, tend to target social housing dwellings in their demolition plans. Given the fact that many housing projects are State-owned, redevelopment projects tend to demolish them to open space for new developments. The availability of low-cost housing is thus dramatically reduced rendering these groups even more vulnerable to violations of their rights.

23. Examples of decreased availability of social housing include (a) in Atlanta, 1,200 social housing units for the poor were destroyed in preparation for the Olympic Games;²⁵ (b) in Sydney, reports suggest that around 6,000 people were made homeless in the run-up to the Olympics;²⁶ (c) in Vancouver, more than 1,400 low-income housing units were lost in connection to real estate speculation generated by the 2010 Winter Olympic Games;²⁷ (d) in South Africa, the Minister for Housing noted that plans to build hundreds of thousands of new low-cost homes could be affected by shifting budget demands in the run-up to the 2010 World Cup (A/HRC/7/16/Add.3, para. 69); (e) in London, the Clays Lane State, a historic social housing on the Olympic Park site where around 400 people lived, was demolished.

¹⁸ Solomon J. Greene; *op. cit.*, pp. 172, 179.

¹⁹ "2012 Home Games: a study of the housing and regeneration legacies of recent Olympic and Paralympic Games and the implications for residents of east London", East Thames Group, p. 14.

²⁰ "Barcelona. International events and housing rights: a focus on the Olympic Games", COHRE, 2007.

²¹ "2012 Home Games", *op. cit.*, p. 14.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ "One world, whose dream? Housing rights violations and the Beijing Olympic Games", COHRE, 2008, p. 6.

²⁴ "Hosting the 2012 Olympic Games: London's Olympic preparations and housing rights concerns", 2001, COHRE, p. 31.

²⁵ "2012 Home Games", *op. cit.*, p. 13.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

²⁷ "Cracks in the foundation", Pivot Legal Society, September 2006, p. 1, 3.

According to the London Development Agency, the site did not meet the Government's Decent Homes Standard.²⁸

4. Impact on informal settlements

24. The situation of people living in informal settlements is of particular concern in the context of preparations for mega-events. As a symbol of poverty and underdevelopment, these buildings are normally seen as ruining the image that the city intends to promote staging the Games. Regarded as unsightly and lacking security of tenure, informal settlements are the first to be demolished when a mega-event is to be staged in a city. The areas where these settlements are located are frequently used either to build sporting venues and accommodation facilities for visitors or to develop new dwellings for local residents. In many cases, informal settlements are displaced to build new infrastructure such as roads, highways and railways, or because they do not fit into the new urban landscape. Local governments usually fail to compensate adequately, or offer alternative adequate housing to, the displaced residents of informal settlements. Entire communities are forced to relocate, generally to the outskirts of the city or to rural areas, where they find no means of subsistence, few employment opportunities or little access to informal markets, and where they find themselves removed from communal ties. Residents of informal settlements often include ethnic minorities, migrants, low-income populations and other disadvantaged groups.

25. Examples of the impact of mega-events in informal settlements include (a) in Dallas, 200 to 300 people were evicted from shanty towns in preparation for the 1994 Football World Cup;²⁹ (b) in South Africa, the Elimination and Prevention of Re-Emergence of Slums Act was adopted with a view to eliminate slums and put homeless shack dwellers in transit camps in time for the 2010 World Cup;³⁰ (c) in Rio de Janeiro, the *Vila do Autodromo* and other several informal settlements are under threat of eviction owing to the construction of venues for the 2016 Olympic Games.³¹

5. Criminalization of homeless persons and informal activities

26. The situation of homeless people also deteriorates in the context of mega-events. Shortly before the events are staged, some local authorities take measures to remove homeless people from areas exposed to visitors. The homeless are sometimes offered incentives to leave these areas, but in most cases they are subject to forced removal and relocation during the events. Specific legislation is introduced, criminalizing acts such as sleeping in the street and begging. Similarly, street vendors and sex workers are targeted by laws that forbid them to carry out their activities in the city while the event is taking place. There are reported cases in which camps or large facilities have been used to accommodate homeless people and other "unsightly" groups during the duration of an event. In this context, some observers have highlighted a disquieting trend in host cities to introduce a "rationale of exception" in the management of public life in preparation for the event, where restrictions of rights and standards of due process are allowed, if considered necessary, to ensure the realization of the event.³² In addition, as displacement increases and the availability of social housing, informal settlements and temporary residences decreases, the number of homeless persons may grow.

²⁸ Information provided by the International Olympic Committee.

²⁹ "Fair play for housing rights", op. cit., p. 28.

³⁰ "Shack dwellers fight demolition in South Africa court", www.oneworld.net, 15 May, 2009.

³¹ "Plano olímpico para Rio-2016 prevê a remoção de favela", *Folha de S.Paulo*, 8 October, 2009.

³² "Fair play for housing rights" op. cit.

27. Examples of the criminalization of homeless persons and marginalized activities include (a) in Seoul, beautification efforts for the 1988 Olympic Games included the detention of homeless people in facilities outside the city;³³ in preparation for the 2002 Football World Cup, local authorities in Seoul created a list of places where homeless persons were banned;³⁴ (b) in Barcelona, the homeless were removed outside the city during the staging of the games;³⁵ (c) in Atlanta, homelessness and related activities were made illegal and over 9,000 citations were issued against homeless people.³⁶

6. Disproportionate impact on groups particularly vulnerable to discrimination

28. The negative legacy of mega-events is particularly felt by the most disadvantaged sectors of society. These groups are disproportionately affected by trends such as forced evictions, displacements, decreased availability of social housing, reduced affordability of housing, homelessness, dislocation from existing community and social networks, restriction of civil liberties and criminalization of homelessness and marginalized activities. Displacement and forced evictions due to beautification and gentrification tend to affect low-income populations, ethnic minorities, migrants and the elderly, who are forced to leave their homes and relocate in areas far from the centre of the city. Likewise, policies and special laws adopted to “cleanse” the city result in the removal of homeless persons, beggars, street vendors, sex workers and other marginalized groups from central areas and their relocation into special sites or outside the city.

29. Examples of the disproportionate impact on groups particularly vulnerable to discrimination include (a) in Athens, Roma communities were the main target of displacement;³⁷ (b) in Atlanta, displacement was predominantly experienced by African-Americans;³⁸ (c) in Sydney, aboriginal communities were displaced from areas close to the Olympic sites in an effort to beautify the city;³⁹ (d) in Beijing; most victims of evictions were migrant workers;⁴⁰ (e) in Vancouver, the city is funding private security guards to remove homeless persons and beggars from commercial areas (A/HRC/10/7/Add.3 para. 87).

C. Tensions surrounding mega-events: mobilization and negotiations

30. In many cases, affected communities and interest groups perceive that the initial proposal from the authorities for the organization of a mega-event may encompass violations of the right to adequate housing, such as the forced eviction of local residents, the criminalization of homelessness and other similar practices. In response, the affected population and social organizations mobilize to resist the proposal and demand its reformulation. In some cases, social resistance has resulted in negotiations with the concerned parties, the adoption of a different strategy and a redefined plan that incorporates the demands of the affected population and aims at protecting the rights of the local population.

³³ Ibid., p. 198.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 27.

³⁵ “2012 Home Games”, op. cit., p. 15.

³⁶ “Fair play for housing rights”, op. cit., p. 198.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 14.

³⁹ “2012 Home Games”, op. cit., p. 14.

⁴⁰ “Fair play for housing rights” op. cit., p. 199.

31. Examples of social mobilization and renegotiation in the organization of mega-events include (a) in preparation for the 1996 Olympic Games in Athens, the authorities planned to demolish a housing complex facing one of the most prominent Olympic routes, but, because of the strong resistance of the local residents and housing activists, the buildings were not demolished;⁴¹ (b) in the run-up to the 2007 Pan-American Games in Rio de Janeiro, the *Comite Social do PAN* intervened before local authorities to request the redirection of several plans for the event, including to prevent the eviction of the *Vila do Autodromo*;⁴² (c) in 2002, responding to the official plans for the 2010 Olympic Games in Vancouver, the *Impact of the Olympics on Community Coalition* advocated for a referendum on the Games and made a number of recommendations to the Vancouver 2010 Bid Corporation, which eventually led to the commitment of the authorities to community benefits from the Games and the *Inner-City Inclusive Commitment* statement, promises incorporated into the bid documents for 2010.⁴³

IV. International human rights framework applicable to mega-events

A. Protection from forced evictions

32. Forced evictions are *prima facie* incompatible with the requirements of the International Covenant for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and can only be justified in the most exceptional circumstances, and in accordance with the relevant principles of international law.⁴⁴ The obligation of States to refrain from forced evictions applies in all circumstances, including in the context of mega-events. States must at all times ensure that the law is enforced against its agents or third parties who carry out forced evictions⁴⁵ and provide everyone with security of tenure and legal protection against forced evictions.⁴⁶ The basic principles and guidelines on development-based evictions and displacement, drafted by the previous mandate holder, provide further guidance.⁴⁷

33. Where evictions are justified, they must be carried out in strict compliance with the relevant provisions of international human rights law and in accordance with general principles of reasonableness and proportionality. Particularly, the following procedural protections should be applied: (a) an opportunity for genuine consultation with those affected; (b) adequate and reasonable notice to be given to all affected persons prior to the scheduled date of eviction; (c) information on the proposed evictions and, where applicable, on the alternative purpose for which the land or housing is to be used, to be made available in reasonable time to all those affected; (d) especially where groups of people are involved, Government officials or their representatives to be present during an eviction; (e) all

⁴¹ Stavrides, Stavros “Urban identities: beyond the regional and the global. The case of Athens”, in Jamal Al-Qawasmi, Abdeselem Mahmoud and Ali Djerbi (eds.) 2008, *Regional Architecture and Identity in the Age of Globalization*, Procedures of the Second International Conference of CSAAR, Tunis, 2005.

⁴² See Lemos Marques, A; Barros de Moura, B., “Pan Rio 2007: manifestações e manifestantes”, XIII Encontro da Associação nacional de pós-graduação e pesquisa em planejamento urbano e regional, Brazil, May 2009.

⁴³ Elby David, “Still waiting at the altar: Vancouver 2010’s on-again, off-again, relationship with social sustainability”, Pivot Legal Society, June 2007.

⁴⁴ Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, general comment No. 4, para. 18.

⁴⁵ Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, general comment No. 7, para. 8.

⁴⁶ General comment No. 4, op. cit., para. 7.

⁴⁷ See E/CN.4/2006/41, appendix.

persons carrying out the eviction to be properly identified; (f) evictions not to take place in particularly bad weather or at night unless the affected persons consent otherwise; (g) provision of legal remedies; and (h) provision, where possible, of legal aid to persons who are in need of it to seek redress from the courts.⁴⁸ Even when evictions are justified and practiced according to the appropriate procedural protections, they should not result in individuals being rendered homeless, and the State must take all appropriate measures, to the maximum of its available resources, to ensure that adequate alternative housing, resettlement or access to productive land is available.⁴⁹

B. Right to participate in decision-making and local communities

34. In the context of mega-events, the right to participation and information of local communities becomes paramount. The events involve and affect the population residing in the host city, particularly those living in redevelopment areas and game sites. Public housing strategies should “reflect extensive genuine consultation with, and participation by, all of those affected.”⁵⁰ Furthermore, prior to any evictions, all feasible alternatives must be explored in consultation with the affected persons, with a view to avoiding the need to use force.⁵¹ Information concerning the alternative purpose for which the land or housing is to be used is also required, as is genuine consideration of the alternatives proposed by the affected population.

35. In keeping with the basic principles and guidelines on development-based evictions and displacement, development processes and urban planning should fulfil the following requirements: (a) appropriate notice given to all potentially affected persons that eviction is being considered and that there will be public hearings on the proposed plans and alternatives; (b) effective dissemination by the authorities of relevant information given in advance, including land records and proposed comprehensive resettlement plans specifically addressing efforts to protect vulnerable groups; (c) a reasonable time period for public review of, comment on, and/or objection to the proposed plan; (d) opportunities and efforts to facilitate the provision of legal, technical and other advice to affected persons about their rights and options; and (e) the holding of public hearings providing affected persons and their advocates with an opportunity to challenge the eviction decision and/or to present alternative proposals and to articulate their demands and development priorities (E/CN.4/2006/41, appendix, para. 37).

V. Procedures and regulations of the Olympic Games and the Football World Cup and their relationship with the right to adequate housing

36. As the two major sporting events in the world, the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup have the power to influence and set examples for other events, whether related to sports, culture or other fields. This analysis would also apply to other major events.

37. Although the Olympic Games and the World Cup are commensurable in terms of dimension and public attraction, it should be noted that the Olympic Games are staged in one city, while the World Cup involves multiple cities in one or even several countries.

⁴⁸ General comment No. 7, op. cit., para. 15.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ General comment No. 4, op. cit., para. 12.

⁵¹ General comment No. 7, op. cit., para. 13.

When the event is focused in one city, the pressure and demands upon its residents are more significant.

A. The Olympic Movement and the right to adequate housing

38. The Olympic Games are the biggest sporting event in the world. Games are held every two years, alternating between summer and winter Olympic Games. The Olympic movement links all organizations and individuals who agree to be guided by the Olympic Charter, in force since 7 July 2007, and who recognize the Movement's ultimate governing body, the International Olympic Committee.

39. The Olympic Charter regulates the organization of the Olympic Movement and the celebration of the Olympic Games. It codifies the "fundamental principles of Olympism" and has binding force on all members of the Movement. Fundamental principle 2 of the 2007 version of the Charter notes that the "goal of Olympism is to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of man, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity." The Charter also establishes the principle of non-discrimination (principle 5), endorses sustainable development and promotes the idea of leaving a positive legacy from the Olympic Games for the host city and the host country. In addition, the Olympic parties are bound by a code of ethics, which restates the obligation to respect the principles of dignity of the individual and non-discrimination.

40. In 1999, the International Olympic Committee adopted the Olympic Movement Agenda 21 "Sport for sustainable development", which, among other purposes, aims to combat social exclusion and promote sports infrastructure that are better suited to social needs.⁵² Agenda 21 pays particular attention to the fate of minorities and the most disadvantaged members of society. Moreover, it endorses the fight against poverty and the integration of disadvantaged social groups, as well as the adoption of development policies and practices. Agenda 21 also supports the promotion of a viable model for human settlements. It requires that sports infrastructures be harmoniously integrated into the local context, and that new constructions boost local housing strategies and integrate the poorest members of society. The greater involvement of the local population in the Olympic preparations through proper regulations and procedures is also encouraged.

41. The normative framework of the Olympic Movement has certain provisions pertaining to human rights. The right to adequate housing is not directly addressed in the Olympic Charter, but in Agenda 21, which is only a declaratory instrument; hence, the provisions are not readily enforceable. To ensure that the practices of the institution are in conformity with housing rights and standards, it is important that they be addressed clearly in binding norms.

B. FIFA and the right to adequate housing

42. Founded in 1904, the Fédération internationale de football association (FIFA) is responsible for the organization and governance of football's major international tournaments, most notably the FIFA World Cup. FIFA is ruled by its statutes, updated in June 2009, which provide the basic instrument for world football and sets out the functioning of the institution. The statutes are also accompanied by regulations governing

⁵² Agenda 21 was adopted in conformity with the Agenda 21 of United Nations Conference on Environment and Development.

their application. In 2004, the FIFA Executive Committee approved a code of ethics, which was subsequently amended in 2006. The code of ethics requests all FIFA officials to comply with the principles and objectives of FIFA. The supreme body of FIFA is its Congress, which elects the President and the Executive Committee. The FIFA Ethics Committee is its third judicial organ, alongside the Disciplinary Committee and the Appeals Committee.

43. The core values of FIFA are defined as authenticity, unity, performance and integrity. Among the general provisions of its statutes, FIFA incorporated a policy of “non-discrimination and stance against racism”, as well as the promotion of friendly relations in “society for humanitarian objectives”. In 2005, the FIFA Congress introduced a new pillar to the institution’s mission, summarized now as: “Develop the game, touch the world, and build a better future”. Understanding football as an “integrated part of society”, FIFA has a duty “to spearhead a concrete and positive contribution to sustainable development through football”. FIFA has also decided to play a socially responsible role and has committed itself to making a major contribution to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.⁵³

44. Overall, despite these recent commitments, it is difficult to find in FIFA procedures and regulations any standards to help the institution and its members integrate a human rights approach to its daily activities. Although the changes in the FIFA mission are commendable, it is necessary to translate them into practice. It is particularly important that international standards on the right to adequate housing be introduced in the procedures and regulations involved in the organization of the FIFA World Cup. This could be a first step towards the realization of a new mission for the federation.

C. Bidding and selection processes

45. The bidding or selection process is the first stage in the preparation for a mega-event. It is also a key moment to introduce the necessary standards to ensure that the protection of human rights, in particular the right to adequate housing, will be endorsed by all relevant stakeholders and guaranteed throughout the organization of the event.

1. International Olympic Committee

46. The procedures of the International Olympic Committee concerning the bidding and selection process are bound by the Olympic Charter and the code of ethics. In addition, the “Rules of Conduct applicable to all Cities wishing to organize the Olympic Games” (2007) are enforceable as soon as a city submits its application.

47. The bidding and selection process of the Committee is a fairly structured and formalized procedure with a number of stages, institutions and requirements involved. The stages include the selection of an applicant city at the national level, the procedure of acceptance of international candidatures, the candidature procedure and the selection of the host city. Once a city has been selected as host, it enters a host city contract outlining the rights and obligations of each party. The Committee can withdraw the bid of a city and revoke the permission of a host city to organize the Olympics. The Ethics Commission may also investigate complaints of infringement of the code of ethics. In addition, the Committee does not enter into agreements with organizations that do not comply with Olympic Movement principles. These procedures serve as an accountability and enforcement mechanism that can be used to ensure that the candidate or host cities comply with their commitments, Olympic principles and international human rights standards.

⁵³ “Football for Hope”, FIFA, Zurich, 2004, pp.8–9.

48. The requirements for the applicant and candidate cities are considerable. Firstly, applicant cities must submit letters of guarantee that the Games will comply with the Olympic Charter, and a short questionnaire with an overview of their planning project. Secondly, as part of the candidature procedure, they must submit a detailed candidature questionnaire pertaining to a range of issues (including plans for the development and use of sporting and accommodation venues, and binding international legal obligations affecting the organization of the event). Thirdly, they must undertake and submit an independent opinion poll concerning popular support for the Olympic project. Since 2008, a positive trend concerning housing has been introduced to the process, as cities are required to explain the post-Olympic use of new accommodation. The 2016 Candidature Procedure and Questionnaire⁵⁴ request information on the requirements for land acquisition and displacements, and their conformity with international standards. Similarly, the basic principles and guidelines on development-based evictions and displacement are made available to future host cities⁵⁵. The commitments made at the candidature stage are binding for the candidate city if selected as host city.⁵⁶

49. Overall, the International Olympic Committee has developed a fairly structured and institutionalized mechanism for the bidding process and selection of host cities. In addition, the transparency of these procedures facilitates social accountability. Thus, the bidding and selection process offers many opportunities for addressing the right to adequate housing at an early stage; indeed, the 2016 questionnaire incorporates a few housing concerns. No information suggests, however, similar practices in other procedures, such as in letters of guarantee or host city contracts. Likewise, the Rules of Conduct applicable to all Cities wishing to organize the Olympic Games do not encompass requirements in this regard. To guarantee compliance with the principles of Olympism and with the commitments adopted in Agenda 21, it is important that housing concerns be adequately tackled in all stages of the Committee's bidding process.

50. Between 2006 and 2007, the previous Special Rapporteur, maintained a fruitful engagement with the Committee, through exchange of correspondence and meetings with representatives of the organization. At meetings in 2007, they addressed the impact of the Olympic Games on the realization of the right to adequate housing and measures to prevent violations. The Committee also collaborated in the preparation of the present report, providing comments and useful information.

2. FIFA

51. Information concerning the selection process of countries to host the FIFA World Cup is not readily available to the general public. The Special Rapporteur unsuccessfully approached FIFA authorities to request information concerning the procedures and regulations involving the organization of the World Cup. From 2006, the previous Special Rapporteur, has sought out FIFA to engage in a dialogue in this respect. Since her appointment in May 2008, the current Special Rapporteur has renewed that invitation on several opportunities; however, no response from the organization, or comments to the present report, have been forthcoming. Given the lack of transparency and accountability of any relevant procedures, it is difficult to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the existing methods and mechanisms, and to identify the good and bad practices of the institution with regard to selection procedures.

⁵⁴ Available at the International Olympic Committee website at www.olympic.org.

⁵⁵ Information provided by the International Olympic Committee.

⁵⁶ Candidature acceptance procedure. Games of the XXX Olympiad 2012, IOC, Switzerland, 2003; 2012 Candidature Procedure and Questionnaire, IOC, 2004; and Rules of Conduct applicable to all Cities wishing to organize the Olympic Games, *op. cit.*

52. Despite the lack of official information in this regard, the public announcement for the bidding process for the 2018 and 2022 FIFA World Cups and the bid registration and rules of conduct applicable to those events offer some insights into the process. According to the announcement, future host countries will be expected to ensure that efforts are made to achieve positive change in keeping with the FIFA philosophy: “for the game, for the world”.⁵⁷ The announcement also describes procedures leading to the selection of the host countries for 2018 and 2022. At different stages of the candidature, applicant member associations must complete and submit to FIFA an expression of interest form, a bid registration form, a bidding agreement, a bid book, a hosting agreement and other documents. In view of the bid proposals received by FIFA, its Executive Committee will appoint the host member associations of the 2018 and 2022 FIFA World Cups.⁵⁸

53. According to the bid registration form and the rules of conduct, integrity is essential to the bidding process; and applicant member associations must comply with the FIFA code of ethics. In addition, FIFA can request the Ethics Committee to conduct an evaluation of the bidding process in relation to the rules of conduct. Although this provides a normative framework and accountability tool for the 2018 and 2022 bid, the Rules of Conduct remain an ad hoc directive applicable to this particular bid, while the framework for future bids remains unclear. Moreover, no housing regulations or requisites are incorporated in the code of ethics, the bid registration form, or the rules of conduct. Nonetheless, the code of ethics requests all FIFA officials to refrain from any conduct that could be harmful to its principles and aims.

54. The process for the 2018 and 2022 football World Cups offers a number of opportunities to incorporate housing concerns into the early stages of the preparation for the Cup. Indeed, the bid book requested from applicant member associations provides an opportunity to request detailed information concerning the expected impact of the event on the housing sector.

55. The Technical Recommendations and Requirements for Football Stadiums (2007) address certain housing concerns. Organizers are asked to bear in mind that proximity to existing residential areas is the most sensitive issue in the development of a new stadium and, if possible, should be avoided. In addition, they are asked to establish early contact and consultation with local community representatives concerning the location and design of the stadiums, to ensure that the stadiums are integrated into the community and enhance the life of local residents. Although these recommendations are of great importance for the protection of the right to adequate housing of the local population, it is important that they be included in the bidding requirements for candidate countries as well as in bidding and hosting agreements, so as to guarantee their effective implementation.

56. Overall, FIFA procedures lack information accessible to the general public. Transparency and accountability are crucial to guarantee that the event will not undermine, but enhance, the human rights of local populations. In addition, although FIFA regularly issues rules of conduct applicable to each bidding process, there is no normative framework applicable to all bids. Guidelines for all bidding procedures must be adopted by FIFA. As no housing concerns have been introduced to the FIFA bidding process, there seem to be no means to assess and ensure candidates’ compliance with the right to adequate housing.

57. The Special Rapporteur hopes that a constructive dialogue with FIFA regarding these issues can be established in the near future.

⁵⁷ Bidding process for the 2018 FIFA World Cup and the 2022 FIFA World Cup, Zurich, 2009.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 1–2.

D. Role of candidate cities and countries in the bidding process: positive and negative practices

58. During the bidding process, authorities of candidate cities and countries expose their strategy for the organization of the event and make commitments to the International Olympic Committee or FIFA, the local population and the international community as a whole. Housing concerns and commitments, however, are often neglected in the planning and bidding process, which can lead to violations of human rights.

59. States have the duty to respect, protect and fulfil the right to adequate housing. States neglect their duties when in planning and bidding to host events they fail to respect existing access to housing, to regulate and monitor actions by State agents and third parties, to grant adequate legal and institutional protections, to investigate and prosecute abusers or to provide redress to victims.

60. In recent years, the International Olympic Committee and FIFA bidding processes have resulted in some good and bad practices from candidate cities with regard to housing. Focusing on the events to be held in coming years, it is important to trace back the housing commitments of the bid proposals and evaluate compliance.

61. London's bid book for the 2012 Olympic Games encompassed an environmental impact assessment with socio-economic aspects, but no attention was paid to, or independent impact assessment conducted on, the housing impact of the event, nor was an explicit commitment to respect human rights included in the proposal. Nonetheless, the London bid entails a commitment to limit the construction of new venues to a minimum to avoid disrupting the existing housing stock, limiting the number of possible forced evictions. The London bid also included a commitment to devote 50 per cent of new dwellings to social housing.⁵⁹ Official plans also indicate that 10,000 new homes, 35 per cent of which will be affordable housing, and several community facilities will be constructed in the Olympic Park to combat the historic deprivation in the area. Regardless of these commitments, a number of social housing units are being destroyed in connection with the Games, and local residents are being displaced from Olympic sites (see para. 23 above). In some cases, however, the authorities have sought to resettle displaced communities; for example, the London Development Agency is building new sites to relocate 35 traveller families from Hackney and Newham.⁶⁰

62. Some of the practices of the bidding process for the Vancouver Winter Olympic Games in 2010 have been considered an example of best practice. When adopting the Vancouver Olympic bid book, alongside the Inner-City Inclusive Agreement and the Multi-Party Agreement, the organizers undertook to ensure that the Games would be socially and environmentally sustainable. These commitments included the guarantee that all people would benefit from the Olympics and that the most disadvantaged sectors of society would not be negatively affected.⁶¹ The Inner-City Inclusive Agreement encompassed the commitments to avoid evictions, contain house prices, ensure no one was made homeless as a consequence of the Olympics and that 30 per cent of new dwellings would be allocated to social housing. The Olympic Village in Whistler will be transformed into a residential neighbourhood, where most units will be price-restricted and reserved for local residents; 250 units from the Olympic Village in Vancouver will be assigned to non-market housing; 10 SRA hotels were acquired to stabilize low-income housing stock; \$250,000 were allocated to the expansion of Covenant House emergency shelter and \$250,000 to

⁵⁹ "Fair play for housing rights", *op. cit.*

⁶⁰ Information provided by the International Olympic Committee.

⁶¹ Olympic Oversight Interim Report Card, Impact on Communities Coalition, 19 April, 2009, p. 1.

temporary shelter during the Games; and negotiations were sought to ensure that no social housing would be included in accommodation for actors.⁶² However, reports indicate that 19 of the 37 pledges will not be implemented. Indeed, reports indicate a notable increase in the number of homeless, a pledge of authorities to increase “infraction tickets” for the homeless, a lack of access of the homeless to essential services in restricted Olympic areas, the dismantling of one-room hotels providing social housing, proposals to cut funding for affordable housing, a lack of redress for illegal evictions, a lack of consultation with residents, and violations of freedom of expression and association of housing activists.⁶³

63. The Bid Book for the 2016 Río Olympics anticipates the improvement and relocation of some settlements and the commitment to comply with national and international standards.⁶⁴ Media reports refer, however, to threatened evictions in some settlements, with no information concerning resettlement or compensation (see also para. 25 above).

64. In South Africa, a development agenda was put together for the bid proposal to host the 2010 World Cup. With a view to use the Cup as a catalyst for poverty alleviation and the struggle against segregation, South Africa committed to not only build or renew sport venues and the necessary infrastructure for the Cup, but also to initiate sport programmes in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, improve medical services and develop community art centres, among other initiatives to improve the life of the less advantaged sectors of society. The focus on development in the South African bid and the commitment to foster a more inclusive and prosper society, however, do not appear to match reality. Reports show that the resources allocated to the preparation of the Cup for the housing budget remain low, while those for sport and recreation have dramatically increased.⁶⁵

E. Role of sponsors, partners and other corporations in mega-events

65. Private corporations involved in the preparation and hosting of mega-events should behave in compliance with the principles and values of the Olympic Movement and the FIFA mission. Furthermore, human rights standards offer additional guidance, as do instruments focusing on corporate social responsibility.

66. States have the primary responsibility to protect, respect and fulfil human rights; but corporations must observe international human rights norms as well as the laws of the countries in which they operate.⁶⁶ The role of the private sector should be addressed from a human rights perspective, including victims' access to justice and their right to compensation.⁶⁷

67. Local and national authorities and the organizers of the mega-event, such as the International Olympic Committee and FIFA, also have responsibilities concerning the role

⁶² Vancouver 2010 sustainability Report 2007–2008, VANOC, p. 56.

⁶³ Olympic Oversight Interim Report card, op. cit., p. 6; and “Fair play for housing rights, op. cit, pp. 190–191.

⁶⁴ See the Rio 2016 Candidate City website at www.rio2016.org.br.

⁶⁵ Caroline, Newton, op. cit.

⁶⁶ See the report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (A/HRC/11/13), according to which corporate responsibility to respect human rights requires due diligence (become aware of, prevent and mitigate adverse human rights impact of activities and relationships of companies), and the provision of grievance mechanisms.

⁶⁷ See also “Making the law work for everyone”, Commission on Legal Empowerment of the Poor and UNDP, New York, 2008.

of sponsors. As part of their responsibility to protect, it is the obligation of public authorities to establish appropriate legal and procedural framework to guarantee that private entities, including sponsors, as well as those operating locally in the preparation of the event, do not infringe upon the right to adequate housing of the local population.

VI. Conclusions and recommendations

68. **In view of the impact of mega-events, it is essential that all relevant stakeholders adopt a responsible attitude concerning the impact of the Olympic Games, the World Football Cup and similar events on the right to adequate housing. Their consequences for the enjoyment of human rights must be duly considered at all stages of the event and by all actors involved.**

A. Recommendations for States

69. **National and local authorities should take all measures necessary to respect, protect and fulfil the right to adequate housing in the context of mega-events.**

70. **As candidate cities and countries prepare their bid proposals, housing concerns must always be present. Host cities should include commitments to comply with the right to adequate housing in their candidatures, bid proposals and hosting contracts. To ensure that the impact of hosting the event will not lead to violations of fundamental rights, the bidding and planning processes need to be in compliance with all relevant international and national standards.**

71. **In addition, the proposals should provide for:**

- (a) Legal security of tenure for owners, tenants and occupants;**
- (b) Protection against forced evictions, discrimination and harassment of local population in connection to the event, and remedy for victims;**
- (c) Programmes for the resettlement of and compensation for the affected population.**

72. **Before submitting a bid proposal, State and local authorities should conduct an assessment of the impact that the preparations for the event will have on the right to adequate housing of local residents. The housing impact should also be monitored throughout the organization of the event. In addition, post-event audits should be undertaken to assess the legacy of the event in the housing sector.**

73. **To strengthen transparency and accountability, local authorities must involve in their planning process, from the tendering stage, all those who will be affected by the preparation of the event and give genuine consideration to their views. Participation should also be open to civil society organizations, including those working in the promotion of the right to adequate housing.**

74. **State and local authorities should refrain from forced evictions in the preparation for mega-events. Where evictions are justified, they should be undertaken in full compliance with the relevant provisions of international human rights law and according to the procedures underlined in general comment No. 7 and in the basic principles and guidelines on development-based evictions and displacement.**

75. **It is important to ensure that the housing stock created as a result of the mega-event responds to the housing needs of the host city. Priority should be given to**

projects and investments plans that create and improve low-income housing, including informal settlement upgrading and regularization.

76. The authorities should ensure that their actions, and those of third parties involved in the organization of the event, contribute to the creation of a stable housing market. Steps can be taken to prevent speculation in housing prices and to deliver more affordable housing.

77. Urgent attention must be given to those living in distressed housing conditions and homeless people to ensure that their situation does not deteriorate as a result of mega-events.

78. Legislation must be enacted to guarantee that homeless people will not be subjected to harassment and receive appropriate support, services and accommodation. Guarantees may also be given to ensure that homeless people and other groups, such as sex workers and street vendors, will not be criminalized in connection to the organization of the event.

79. Special attention should be paid to groups particularly vulnerable to discrimination to ensure that the impact of hosting a mega-event does not adversely affect them. States must ensure respect for the principles of non-discrimination and gender equality.

80. States should adopt a regulatory framework to ensure that the actions of sponsors and other private entities involved in the mega-event comply with the right to adequate housing. A comprehensive and formal set of criteria should be adopted for the selection of sponsors and partners.

81. Provisions pertaining to the right to adequate housing should be adopted in all contractual agreements with third parties involved in the organization of the event. States should investigate and sanction any violation of the obligations set out in the agreements and in international human rights standards.

B. Recommendations for the International Olympic Committee and FIFA

82. To ensure that the Olympic Games and the World Cup do not result in violations of the right to adequate housing, the International Olympic Committee and FIFA should evaluate the bid candidatures against compliance with international standards on the right to adequate housing and guarantee that only those in conformity with the standards are selected.

83. In addition, the International Olympic Committee and FIFA should require detailed information in the candidature questionnaire pertaining to housing issues, and demand an assessment of the housing impact of the candidature project. The Committee and FIFA should ask candidate associations and cities to inform about:

- (a) Strategies for monitoring the housing impact throughout the organization and after the event;
- (b) Procedures to investigate and sanction violations of the right to adequate housing and to offer redress to victims;
- (c) Regulations and procedures to enforce security of tenure;
- (d) Regulations and procedures to protect against forced evictions, discrimination and harassment against local populations in connection with the event;
- (e) Mechanisms to provide compensation and resettlement for affected persons.

84. In selecting the host city or association and closing an agreement with them, the International Olympic Committee and FIFA should incorporate housing provisions in the hosting agreements.

85. The International Olympic Committee and FIFA should ensure that their bidding and selection procedures are open to scrutiny by civil society. They should require candidates to undertake open and transparent planning and bidding processes involving civil society, including organizations representing the housing sector and affected persons.

86. The International Olympic Committee and FIFA should evaluate whether the actions of third parties envisaged in the projects of candidate cities are adequately regulated and do not allow deviations from housing standards.

87. Likewise, the International Olympic Committee and FIFA should select the sponsors for their events according to detailed criteria taking into account the records of the companies concerning corporate social responsibility and respect for international human rights standards. Priority should be given to corporations that have appropriate codes of conduct or social corporate responsibility initiatives.

88. In contractual agreements with sponsors, partners and private companies for the preparation of events, the International Olympic Committee and FIFA should incorporate contractual clauses that regulate the actions of these corporations in conformity with human rights standards, including the right to adequate housing. Explicit provisions should be incorporated to prevent corporations from executing forced evictions, harassing or intimidating local populations and discriminating against vulnerable groups. Finally, corporations should be held accountable and redress should be provided to the victims of any abuse.

89. The International Olympic Committee and FIFA should include reference to housing standards in their main normative instruments such as their charter, statutes, codes of ethics, or rules of conduct. They should also consider mechanisms to monitor and evaluate compliance with these standards by all relevant stakeholders involved in mega-events, investigate and sanction abuses and establish complaint procedures.

90. The International Olympic Committee and FIFA should ensure that the institutional and legal frameworks for the bidding and selection processes address the right to adequate housing.

91. The adoption of more structured and institutionalized mechanisms for FIFA selection processes is highly desirable to monitor candidates' compliance with their obligations pertaining to housing.

92. FIFA must ensure that all of its procedures and regulations concerning the preparation of mega-events, including the bidding and selection processes, are made public and easily accessible.
