

# POW questions candidates ahead of pivotal FIS presidential election

**As part of the upcoming FIS presidential election process, a short survey has been sent out to support the creation of transparent and structured candidate scorecards. The following answers are intended to inform discussion, encourage transparency, and support a constructive and informed election process.**

The questions were sent to all candidates but answered only by Johan Eliasch and Alexander Ospelt. Unfortunately Victoria Gosling did not get back to us even after several attempts of contacting her. Therefore we can't provide Yes/No answers for her but can present her positions as a short qualitative summary, assessed from her published program.

## 1. Will you maintain the FIS Impact Programme, the 50% emissions reduction target by 2030, and the net-zero target by 2040, in line with the UNFCCC Race to Zero framework FIS has signed?

Johan Eliasch	YES
Victoria Gosling	-
Alexander Ospelt	YES

### Additional context question 1:

#### Johan Eliasch:

Climate change is an existential challenge for snow sports. FIS must continue to lead with ambition, credibility and practical action. The commitments already adopted by FIS – including the FIS Impact Programme, our 50% emissions reduction target by 2030, our net-zero target by 2040, and our participation in the UNFCCC Race to Zero framework – will remain in place during a second term.

We have made meaningful progress in recent years, but this is not a reason to slow down. It is a reason to accelerate. Sustainability must be embedded into how FIS governs, plans events, works with hosts and engages with athletes and fans.

At the same time, our approach must remain practical, science-based and globally workable. Snow sports can demonstrate that elite sport, commercial success and environmental responsibility are compatible – and mutually reinforcing.

Protecting winter is not only an environmental responsibility for FIS – it is fundamental to the future of our sport.

#### Victoria Gosling\*:

Maintaining existing commitments: strong general climate stance, but names none of the existing instruments (Impact Programme, 2030/2040 targets, Race to Zero). She frames climate as a present reality rather than a future risk and says FIS should lead the global sporting community on it, so abandoning the targets would contradict her own program, but she never affirms them either. Unclear.

**Alexander Ospelt:**

I support the continuation of the FIS Impact Programme and the sustainability targets already adopted by FIS, including the emissions reduction and net-zero goals. However, it is important that these objectives remain aligned with the realities of our sport.

**2. Within your single four-year term, will you commit to publishing an annual milestone plan with sectoral pathways within the first 100 days of your presidency, in line with Race to Zero minimum criteria?**

Johan Eliasch	YES
Victoria Gosling	-
Alexander Ospelt	NO

**Additional context question 2:**

**Johan Eliasch:**

Targets without implementation frameworks are insufficient. In a second term, I will ensure that FIS publishes a structured delivery roadmap with annual milestones and clearer sector-specific pathways.

This work should include detailed assessment of the major sources of emissions across our ecosystem, including travel, logistics, accommodation, energy usage, snow production and venue operations. It should also establish clearer reporting structures and measurable indicators for progress.

Importantly, this must be done in partnership with organisers, athletes, broadcasters, teams, suppliers and experts. The objective is not simply to publish targets, but to create practical tools and transparent accountability mechanisms that help stakeholders achieve them.

I also believe strongly in improving the quality, consistency and comparability of environmental data across all FIS events. Better data leads to better decisions.

Credibility comes not from announcing targets, but from demonstrating measurable progress year after year.

**Victoria Gosling\*:**

Annual milestone plan, 100 days: commits to measurable, publicly reported carbon benchmarks, but no milestone plan, sector pathways or timeline. The intent to report transparently is there; the specific delivery architecture our question asked for is not. Unclear.

**Alexander Ospelt:**

Transparency and accountability are key elements of my programme. For this reason, I support a review of the existing sustainability targets and the establishment of clear priorities and responsibilities.

**3. Will the use of the FIS CO<sub>2</sub> Calculator become contractually binding for all World Cup hosts under your presidency?**

Johan Eliasch	YES
Victoria Gosling	-
Alexander Ospelt	NO

**Additional context question 3:**

**Johan Eliasch:**

The systematic use of the FIS CO<sub>2</sub> Calculator should become part of the standard operational framework for World Cup organisers.

Implementation must be phased responsibly and in consultation with organisers to ensure consistency and quality of reporting across disciplines and regions. My objective would be for mandatory implementation to be introduced progressively across all FIS World Cup events within the next competition cycle.

The purpose is not administrative burden. The purpose is to create a consistent, internationally recognised methodology for understanding emissions, identifying reduction opportunities and sharing best practice between organisers.

One of the major challenges in global sport today is fragmentation and duplication. Hosts should not have to reinvent sustainability systems from scratch each season. FIS should help provide common tools, guidance and institutional support.

Consistency and transparency of data are essential if we want sustainability efforts to produce meaningful results.

**Victoria Gosling\*:**

CO<sub>2</sub> Calculator binding for all hosts: closest to a yes. All hosts “must meet” consistent environmental benchmarks including carbon reporting, but she doesn’t name the Calculator or say “contractually binding.” The mandatory, universal language is genuinely strong, which is why this is the one question where a program-based yes would be defensible. Unclear, strong yes-lean.

**Alexander Ospelt:**

I support the transparent measurement of emissions and therefore encourage the use of the FIS CO<sub>2</sub> Calculator. However, I would not commit at this stage to making its use contractually mandatory for all World Cup organisers. Before introducing binding requirements, the practical implications and costs should always be carefully assessed.

**4. Will your governance reform include embedding climate oversight at Council level, with mandatory climate reporting in annual budgets and board oversight?**

Johan Eliasch	NO
Victoria Gosling	-
Alexander Ospelt	YES

**Additional context question 4:****Johan Eliasch:**

The responsibilities and competences of the FIS Council are clearly defined in the FIS Statutes, and it is important to respect that governance structure.

That does not mean sustainability lacks accountability within FIS – quite the opposite.

Through the FIS Impact Programme, FIS has already established one of the most structured sustainability frameworks in international sport, with defined targets, implementation pillars and measurable milestones. In addition, the annual Impact Report provides transparency, monitoring and accountability regarding progress and performance.

The decision to place the Sustainability Unit within the President's Office was deliberate. It was done to elevate sustainability to the highest strategic level of the organisation, to demonstrate its importance across all areas of FIS activity, and to ensure that all stakeholders – athletes, organisers, National Ski Associations, commercial partners and hosts – are brought with us on this journey.

In addition to the existing structure, I am considering appointing a dedicated Council member with specific responsibility for sustainability, working in close coordination with the FIS Sustainability Director. This would strengthen the link between strategic oversight at Council level and operational delivery within the administration, without duplicating or diluting existing governance structures.

I believe this combination of executive-level anchoring, structured programme delivery, and targeted Council engagement represents a more effective model than creating parallel governance structures outside the Council's statutory remit. The priority remains clear: embedding sustainability across the organisation and ensuring measurable implementation supported by transparent reporting and data-driven execution.

Sustainability must be institutional, measurable and enduring – not dependent on symbolic structural changes, but embedded into the way FIS operates every day.

What matters most is not where sustainability sits on an organisational chart, but whether it drives real decisions, measurable outcomes and long-term accountability across the federation.

**Victoria Gosling\*:**

Climate oversight at Council level: not addressed. Governance section is about consultation and transparency, never where climate sits structurally. She commits to an independent governance review in her first year, but it is not tied to climate oversight in any way. Unclear.

**Alexander Ospelt:**

FIS already has sustainability structures and ongoing reporting mechanisms in place.

These provide a solid foundation that can certainly be further developed and strengthened.

## 5. Will you publicly commit to a mid- or late-November season start?

Johan Eliasch	YES
Victoria Gosling	-
Alexander Ospelt	NO

### Additional context question 5:

#### Johan Eliasch:

I believe climate intelligence must play a much larger role in the way we design and manage the FIS race calendar. That is why the plan is to make sustainability and carbon impact a central consideration in every future calendar decision.

To support this, I am planning to propose the development of a comprehensive FIS Sustainability Report, including a Carbon Budget for the entire FIS competition ecosystem. This report would be presented to the FIS Congress – the highest authority of our Federation – starting next year. The Carbon Budget would provide a transparent framework for measuring, monitoring and reducing the environmental impact of our activities.

The ultimate objective is clear: to bring awareness and to minimise the carbon footprint of our race calendar and adapt the calendar accordingly. This includes evaluating travel patterns, improving regional clustering of events, reducing unnecessary long-haul travel, assessing snow reliability, strengthening operational resilience, and enhancing athlete welfare.

FIS governs multiple disciplines with different sporting, climatic, commercial and geographic realities. Therefore, a sustainable calendar reform must be based on robust data, measurable targets and sound governance rather than a one-size-fits-all approach.

Through the Sustainability Report and Carbon Budget process, we can establish a clear pathway that enables our Congress and the wider FIS community to make informed decisions and progressively align our calendar with our environmental commitments.

#### Victoria Gosling:

November season start: commits to a climate-intelligent calendar and embedding climate assessment in every decision, but no date. This is the same substantive gap that made Eliasch's answer our weakest YES, so scoring the two differently on identical substance is the consistency trap to avoid. Unclear.

#### Alexander Ospelt:

The calendar must be considered as a whole — from sporting, commercial and organisational perspectives, as well as from a sustainability standpoint. What I clearly support is a review of the calendar, including identifying where unnecessary travel can be reduced or avoided.

**6. Will FIS sponsorship policy under your presidency explicitly and publicly exclude fossil fuel companies, state oil companies, and the petrochemical sector by name, and extend this principle across national federations and FIS-related events over time?**

<b>Johan Eliasch</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>Victoria Gosling</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Alexander Ospelt</b>	<b>NO</b>

**Additional context question 6:**

**Johan Eliasch:**

The reason my answer is no is not because I believe we should do less, but because we will go further.

FIS is in a strong and credible position today because snow sports understands better than most the realities of climate change. Our sponsorship and partnership frameworks must reflect our values, our responsibilities and the long-term future of winter sport. I am planning to strengthen our sponsorship framework by looking not at the industry in which a company operates, but at the values it demonstrates, the actions it is taking, its sustainability commitments, and whether its long-term direction is aligned with the future we want for our sport. The key question should not simply be what sector a company belongs to, but whether its conduct, strategy and values are compatible with the values of FIS.

This is a more comprehensive and meaningful approach than relying solely on a pre-defined list of excluded industries. It allows us to assess potential partners against clear principles and standards while recognising that businesses, technologies and industries are evolving.

At the same time, I am not a believer in making public declarations simply for the sake of headlines. What matters is the substance of our policies, the integrity of our decision-making and the consistency of our actions. Any framework must be supported by proper governance, objective criteria, legal consistency and practical implementation across our commercial structures.

More broadly, sport has an important role to play in encouraging innovation, transition and responsible business practices. FIS will continue working with partners whose values, commitments and actions support the long-term sustainability, credibility and future of winter sport.

**Victoria Gosling:**

Exclude fossil-fuel sponsors by name: full sponsorship section, no exclusion commitment. She notes that sustainability credentials increasingly drive partner decisions, but frames sponsorship around growth and values rather than any named exclusion. Not committed, but absence is not rejection.

**Alexander Ospelt:**

I am generally not in favour of blanket prohibitions. Sponsorship decisions should be assessed carefully against clear criteria. The key question is whether a partnership is compatible with the values, credibility and long-term interests of FIS.

**7. Structural emissions reductions in mobility, energy and infrastructure depend on policy frameworks. Will FIS use its institutional voice to advocate for ambitious climate policy in the regulatory environments our sport depends on and publicly position itself in favor of ambitious climate policy?**

<b>Johan Eliasch</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Victoria Gosling</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Alexander Ospelt</b>	<b>YES</b>

**Additional context question 7:**

**Johan Eliasch:**

Snow sports depends directly on a stable climate and healthy mountain ecosystems. FIS therefore has both a responsibility and a legitimate voice in discussions affecting the long-term future of our sport.

FIS should continue advocating for credible, science-based climate action and policies that support sustainability, resilience and environmental protection.

At the same time, international federations must remain constructive, evidence-based and globally inclusive institutions. Our role is not partisan politics. Our role is to champion the long-term interests of athletes, winter sport communities, mountain regions and future generations.

We can use the platform of sport positively – to educate, convene, inspire innovation and demonstrate practical solutions.

Snow sports cannot remain neutral about the conditions required for its own survival.

**Victoria Gosling:**

Institutional voice for climate policy: leads the sporting world’s climate response by example and operations, not advocacy in regulatory arenas. Our question asked specifically about FIS using its voice in the policy environments the sport depends on, which her program does not address. Leaning not-clearly-yes.

**Alexander Ospelt:**

Snow sports depend on a healthy mountain and winter environment. FIS should therefore contribute constructively to relevant discussions, while at the same time respecting its role as an international sports federation.

**8. Will you treat climate change as an athlete safety priority, integrated into the FIS Athletes’ Health Unit’s mandate, with reporting on climate-related safety risks alongside the existing injury and concussion frameworks?**

<b>Johan Eliasch</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Victoria Gosling</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Alexander Ospelt</b>	<b>YES</b>

**Additional context question 8:****Johan Eliasch:**

Climate change is no longer only an environmental issue for snow sports. It is increasingly an athlete health and safety issue.

Athletes are already experiencing the effects of changing snow conditions, temperature volatility, glacier retreat and greater weather unpredictability. These realities have implications for injury prevention, concussion risk, heat management, training environments and long-term event planning.

The Athletes' Health Unit should therefore incorporate climate-related risk assessment into its broader work on athlete safety and welfare.

This should include closer monitoring of climate-related safety trends, integration of environmental risk factors into competition planning, and collaboration with scientific and medical experts to ensure evidence-based decision-making.

Athlete welfare must remain at the centre of every decision we make. Protecting the future of winter sport ultimately means protecting the athletes who define it.

As President, I believe athlete safety and climate resilience must increasingly be considered together, not separately.

**Victoria Gosling:**

Climate risk in Athletes' Health Unit: strong on athlete health and strong on climate, but never links the two. Her health section covers concussion, course safety and mental health while climate sits in a separate silo, so the integration our question asked for is absent. Not addressed.

**Alexander Ospelt:**

The safety of athletes is my highest priority. If changing climatic conditions affect snow quality, weather conditions or health-related risks, FIS must take these developments seriously. Such risks should therefore be continuously monitored and taken into account.

Don't hesitate to reach out if you have questions:

POW Europe  
Jonas Schneider  
[jonas@protectourwinters.eu](mailto:jonas@protectourwinters.eu)

POW Austria  
Moritz Nachtschatt  
[moritz@protectourwinters.at](mailto:moritz@protectourwinters.at)