



INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE (IOC)

BACKGROUND

The International Olympic Committee (IOC) was founded in 1894. It is an international non-governmental organisation which acts as the umbrella organisation for the Olympic movement. The IOC is the supreme authority of the Olympic Movement which includes National Olympic Committees, International Sports Federations, and the Organising Committees for the Olympic Games. The IOC selects the host cities and the programme for the Olympic Games.

ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE

The IOC is composed of a maximum of 115 co-opted individual members who meet in Session at least once annually. The Session elects an Executive Board which includes the IOC President, four Vice-Presidents and ten other members. The administration of the IOC is the responsibility of the Director General, who is appointed by the President.

Headquarters: Lausanne, Switzerland

Countries of operation: 205

Budget: US\$ 4.2 billion (2004)

Employees: no information available

Website: www.olympic.org

Accountability Initiatives signed up to:

- Olympic Movement Medical Code
- World Anti-Doping Code

ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

TRANSPARENCY

Based on publicly available information, the IOC has no transparency policy, but has expressed support for the draft *Basic Universal Principles for Good Governance of the Olympic and Sports Movement* which includes some transparency commitments related to sports governance. The IOC also has an *Archives Access Rules* document that guides public access to archived material and primarily covers the disclosure of information that has been restricted for at least 20 years. It does not guide what, when and how information is disseminated on a daily basis within IOC.

No senior manager is identified as having responsibility for oversight of IOC transparency practices or compliance with IOC commitments on transparency, nor is any training or guidance on the issue specified in any of its publicly available documents. The draft *Basic Universal Principles* document is available in English and French, but has not been widely disseminated to stakeholders.

2008 GLOBAL ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT RATINGS			
Dimension	Score	INGO Rank	2008 Rank
Transparency	15%	9=	29=
Participation: External Stakeholder Engagement	49%	9	18=
Participation: Member Control	75%	10	25
Evaluation	24%	10	30
Complaints & Response: Internal	41%	8	23
Complaints & Response: External	17%	9	17
Overall	32%	10	30

= denotes tied ranking

The IOC did not engage in the research process

PARTICIPATION – EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The International Olympic Committee has a complex governance structure into which members of several external stakeholder groups have been incorporated both in the governing body itself (the IOC Session) and in advisory roles. Approximately 25% of the IOC Session are also members of international sporting federations, members of National Olympic Committees or recent Olympic athletes. Engagement between the IOC and the general public on a day to day basis is not guided by any specific policy or procedure although the general public are able to participate in IOC activities through periodic consultative forums called Olympic Congresses which provide a venue for the engagement of all IOC stakeholders. The next Congress will be held in 2009.

No senior manager is publicly identified as having responsibility for oversight of IOC external stakeholder engagement practices. Nor is any mechanism to ensure compliance with IOC commitments to external stakeholder engagement within IOC governance described in any of its publicly available documents.

PARTICIPATION – MEMBER CONTROL

The IOC Session, the annual meeting of all 115 IOC members, elects a President for a term of eight years, with the possibility of a single extension of four years, and Executive Board members for terms of four years. The Executive Board consists of the IOC President, four Vice-Presidents and ten other members. All members are given representation at the governing body level although it is not clear whether individual members are able to add items to the Session agenda or if only the Executive Board or President may do so. The IOC Charter does not indicate how Executive Board candidates are nominated and placed on the ballot for election by the IOC Session. Based on publicly available information, no process was identified that would allow members to initiate a process of dismissal for members of the Executive Board.

EVALUATION

Although the IOC has no specific evaluation policy, the 2005-6 IOC *Interim Report Catalyst for Collaboration* highlights the IOC's commitment to extensive knowledge transfer programmes and systematic reviews of sports on the Olympic Programme. The IOC Olympic Programme Commission also regularly reviews which disciplines will be included in the Olympic Games and has a standard evaluation matrix for considering inclusion of sports in the Games, the *Evaluation Criteria for Sports and Disciplines*. In addition, the IOC has recently developed a framework for evaluation to produce *Olympic Games Impact Reports*, but neither the framework nor any evaluations have yet been made publicly available.

Although no senior managerial oversight or staff training on evaluation is indicated in any publicly available documents, the existence of the *Olympic Games Knowledge Management Programme* implies that learning is shared both within the IOC and with potential host cities.

COMPLAINTS AND RESPONSE—INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL

The IOC has no publicly available policy or procedure for handling internal complaints from employees. However, the IOC does have the *Ethics* (2007) book which includes the *IOC Code of Ethics* and an investigative procedure for the IOC Ethics Commission to handle complaints regarding *Code of Ethics* violations. There is no clear indication of whether staff may raise a complaint, but the IOC Ethics Commission process appears intended to apply to all members of the Olympic Movement and all Olympic Games participants with an emphasis on IOC members. Nonetheless, *Ethics* and its contents do not adhere to accepted best practice principles for complaints handling such as commitments to complainant confidentiality, non-retaliation, and independence of the investigative process. There are no publicly available documents outlining the IOC's policy and procedures for complaints from external complainants regarding IOC policies or compliance with policies in its activities.

The IOC Ethics Commission is responsible for overseeing and investigating internal complaints regarding violations of the *IOC Code of Ethics*, but there is no indication of any training given to Commission members. The *Ethics* book is available in English and French on the IOC website and in hard copy upon request.

ONGOING ACCOUNTABILITY REFORM

The IOC has begun to address its accountability gaps, as demonstrated through establishment of the Ethics Commission. Similarly it appears that the IOC is making progress with the introduction of an evaluation framework examining the impact of the Olympic Games, although it remains to be seen whether this framework will meet key good practice principles in evaluation including engaging relevant stakeholders in the evaluation process and making public the results of evaluations.

PERFORMANCE SNAPSHOT

The IOC scores poorly in comparison to all sector averages in every dimension of accountability capabilities except participation. This relatively higher score in participation is largely due to the IOC's incorporation of key external stakeholder groups in its governance. However, these strong capabilities are offset by its inequitable member control that provides several key powers to the IOC President and Executive Board that are unchecked by the IOC Session. The IOC's transparency and evaluation capabilities are the least developed both within the INGO sector and when measured against all other assessed organisations; with regard to evaluation, references to the *Olympic Games Impact Reports* in the IOC's most recent Annual Report indicate that it is possible that there are relevant internal documents that are not publicly available and therefore were not considered in the assessment. In addition, despite the establishment of the IOC Ethics Commission, the IOC performs poorly in complaints handling capabilities due to the lack of protections provided to complainants. As a result of these accountability gaps the IOC ranks at the very bottom of both the INGO sector and all assessed organisations for 2008.

