

IPACS Benchmark Guidelines

Updated 2 September 2022, version 2

IPACS Benchmark E9 – Awarding of main events follows an open and transparent process

Definitions

- Awarding of main events – decisions made by the designated authority in the organisation (e.g. general assembly, governing body or a committee with delegated authority) to allocate hosting rights for the events for which the organisation is the rightsholder

Introduction to this benchmark and its significance

- Sports organisations should treat their members and stakeholders fairly; if event bidding/hosting opportunities are open to all members, it is important that members perceive that bids/proposals they submit which meet the criteria will have a fair chance of being successful
- Demonstrating that event bids/proposals are assessed and awarded in an appropriate way, while managing conflicts of interest, helps build trust in the organisation among stakeholders and directly addresses ethical concerns

Commentary on the action to be taken

- Please also refer to the work done by [IPACS Task Force 2](#) on conflicts of interest and the reallocation toolkit for sport events
- The organisation should publish key hosting criteria (including on human rights and sustainability) and details of the bidding/hosting application process, including a realistic timetable
- The organisation should have a defined process and designated responsibility for awarding main events for which they are the rightsholder with proportionate processes for events of different size (e.g. delegated authority for smaller events, a two-stage process for the largest, highly competitive events)
- The organisation should have clear rules covering conduct for the bidding campaign
- It is recognised that some aspects of the event awarding process may have a confidential nature; however, the rules and procedures should all be published
- The organisation should provide a written assessment report of candidates to the decision-making body
- The organisation should manage associated conflicts of interest; individuals or members with potential or perceived conflicts of interest should not be permitted to participate in discussions or voting, in order to avoid an actual conflict of interest arising; alternatively, a policy decision may be adopted that each individual or member linked to a bid/hosting organisation has an equal opportunity to contribute to discussions and vote
- The organisation's hosting criteria may include a principle of rotation among venues/regions etc.
- The organisation may choose as a policy to make public votes by individuals or members that take part in the selection of hosts; voters should be notified about such a decision clearly in advance
- An independent person/committee should actively monitor the event allocation process, including implementation of conflict of interest rules, with the power to recommend sanctions
- The organisation should publish the outcome of hosting decisions, including voting numbers
- The organisation should have a defined, streamlined process for re-allocation of events at short notice, when this is required
- It is recognised that many sports organisations will need to solicit candidatures/hosting proposals rather than being in the position of choosing from competing bids/proposals; in this situation, incentives and the balance of power work in a different direction, with potential risks of improper attempts being made to encourage members/cities/event organisers etc. to agree to host
- See also Recommendations B1 (Code of Ethics), B10 (anti-corruption Code), C8 (conflicts of interest), E5 (competition law compliance), E6 (open tendering) and E8 (event bid evaluation)

Investment requirement – there are limited costs associated with putting in place an appropriate process for awarding main events; some investment may be needed for monitoring observance of rules

Guidance according to stage of organisation

Early stage

- The organisation has a defined process and designated responsibility for awarding main events for which it is the rightsholder (e.g. a vote by the governing body)
- The organisation publishes key hosting criteria for its major events (e.g. in an application pack) and details of the bidding/application process, including a realistic timetable
- The organisation has clear rules covering conduct for the bidding campaign
- The organisation manages conflicts of interest; individuals or members with potential or perceived conflicts of interest should not be permitted to participate in discussions or voting, in order to avoid an actual conflict of interest arising; alternatively, a policy decision may be adopted that each individual or member linked to a bid/hosting organisation has an equal opportunity to contribute to discussions and vote
- The organisation provides a written assessment report of candidates to the decision-making body
- The organisation publishes the outcome of hosting decisions, including voting numbers

Developing

- The organisation's hosting criteria may include a principle of rotation among venues/regions etc.
- The organisation has proportionate processes and rules for allocating events of different sizes (e.g. a designated committee may have authority for selecting hosts for an annual calendar series of smaller events)
- The organisation may put in place a two-stage process for major event bidding/hosting, reducing the number of candidates to a shortlist in order to limit the work and investment needed by bid teams that do not meet the criteria or are unlikely to be successful
- An independent person/committee actively monitors the event allocation process, including implementation of conflict of interest rules, with the power to recommend sanctions
- The organisation may choose to make public the votes by individuals or members that take part in the selection of hosts

Advanced

- The organisation considers the risks to integrity that arise when it is in the position of soliciting bids/hosting applications rather than choosing from among several competing bids/proposals
- The organisation has a defined, streamlined process for re-allocation of events at short notice, when this is required

Good practice examples

International Sports Organisations (from 2020)

- UCI: All information is published on the website, including [Bid Guides](#) that provide information on criteria and timetable
 - Championships are awarded by the Management Committee and announcements are published – [Constitution, Article 47.n](#)
- FIBA: Rules for bidding published in [Book 2 - Competitions](#). Rules include detailed responsibilities for hosts/FIBA regarding major events
 - Brief [evaluation criteria](#) are provided and there are news stories announcing the allocation of events
- World Athletics: Rules for the allocation of events, including a rotational policy, are explained in the bidding rules (see [Article 4 of book C6.1](#))
 - The timetable for bid processes is outlined in the [calendar](#)
 - There are news stories about [hosting decisions](#)
- International Dragon Boat Federation: Process outlined in [Bye-Law 13](#) and [Annex to Bye-Law 13](#), which includes timetable for bid process.
- UEFA: Vote by Executive Committee to allocate hosting of EURO 2024 to Germany with [voting numbers published](#)
- IOC: All documents related to the hosting process are [published](#), including the Rules of Conduct for Continuous and Targeted Dialogue, the Future Host Commissions Terms of Reference, the Voting Regulations, the Host Questionnaire for the Olympic Games and the Olympic Winter Games, the Contractual Framework for Hosting the Olympic Games, the Host Contract, the Operational Requirements, and the final reports of the Future Host Commissions. Information about how to apply to host the Games is available on the IOC website. Elections including presentations by Preferred Hosts are broadcast online

Overall standard among International Federations:

- 18 out of 31 members of ASOIF had a process for awarding events with criteria and a published timetable
- This topic was one of 20 covered in the 2018-19 GAISF assessment for non-Olympic sports (compared to 50 topics for Olympic sports) as it was judged to be important and feasible for small organisations to achieve

Selected references

- [ASOIF GTF Questionnaire 2019-20](#), Indicator 6.9
- IPACS Task Force 2, Recommendations for mitigating risks in the candidature process for major sport events (link to be shared as soon as available)
- IPACS Task Force 2, [Reallocation toolkit for sport events](#)
- Geeraert, A. (2018). [Sports Governance Observer 2018](#). An assessment of good governance in five international sports federations. Aarhus: Play the Game / Danish Institute for Sports Studies, p.11-15:
 - Principle 34: Decisions on the allocation of major events are made through a democratic, open, transparent, and objectively reproducible process.

ASOIF indicator 6.9 – scoring definitions used in the 2019-20 assessment

- 0 – No
- 1 - Some information published about process for awarding main events
- 2 - Process for awarding main events with rules including criteria, fair timetables, outcomes published
- 3 - Process for awarding events, rules include criteria, fair timetables, shortlisting or rotation

- 4 - Process for awarding events, rules include criteria, fair timetables, shortlisting or rotation, with element of external bidding assessment