



THE FORMAL SPORTS POLITICAL POWER INDEX 2013-2015

Poul Broberg, pbr@dif.dk, Director of Public Affairs
Lasse Bak Lyck, lly@dif.dk, Project Consultant
Jonas Hjortdal, jhj@dif.dk, Communications Consultant
Peter Gottlieb, pgo@dif.dk, Project Leader

January 2016

**BEVÆGER
DANMARK**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| BACKGROUND | 3 |
| PURPOSE | 4 |
| METHODOLOGY | 4 |
| INCLUDED SPORTS FEDERATIONS | 4 |
| EXECUTIVE BOARDS | 6 |
| WEIGHTING OF INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCE FOR INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATIONS | 7 |
| METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS TO THE RESULTS | 8 |
| RESULTS | 9 |
| DENMARK | 10 |
| DENMARK IN COMPARISON TO THE SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES | 11 |
| THE EUROPEAN POWER INDEX | 11 |
| THE INTERNATIONAL POWER INDEX | 13 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 15 |

BACKGROUND

In 2013, The NOC and Sports Confederation of Denmark (DIF) made an investigation into formal sports political power between all nations. This was made possible by registering members of executive committees in 118 international and European sports federations and applying a weighting of the different roles. This is a method of presenting a picture of the formal power that each nation possess through their elected sports leaders.

The stepping-stone for this investigation was DIF's new international strategy in which it was an ambition to have more Danish sports leaders elected for influential positions in their respective European and international federations. It was vital to determine a baseline both to help the Danish sports leaders navigate in the international sports domain and to be able to assess the success of DIF's efforts.

At the completion of the index in 2013, it was decided to repeat the investigation two years later. With the baseline from 2013, it is now possible to analyze changes between the nations' formal sports political power and look for possible tendencies bearing in mind the relative short period since baseline was established.

After the baseline was published in October 2013, a digital and interactive version was made. The new digital version was made in the statistical tool Tableau, which involved creating a digital method for counting the positions and calculating the points by applying the weighting automatically. This resulted in minor discrepancies between the results in the original report and the new digital version. In comparison between the baseline from 2013 and the new report, numbers from the digital version will be used.

PURPOSE

The continued task of collecting data for an international sports political power index has four main purposes for DIF:

1. To provide an overview of whether Denmark is currently represented at level, under level or above level in international sports politics, when comparing the number of elected sports leaders from Denmark to the number of elected sports leaders from comparable countries.
2. To identify which nations have the greatest formal sports political power on the international arena, in order to strengthen DIF's knowledge of the countries advantageous to cooperate or to make alliances with.
3. To strengthen DIF's position when engaging in the debate on how to seek influence in international sports.
4. To look for changes in political power between all nations.

METHODOLOGY

The applied methodology for the data collection and addition of a weighting is completely the same as for the investigation from 2013. This allows for the aforementioned comparison of the results, making the investigation from 2013 the baseline.

Underneath here is described how and why the included international sports federations were selected. It is described how executive committees are defined and the criteria for counting members. Lastly, the applied weighting and its background is explained.

INCLUDED SPORTS FEDERATIONS

The first task was to select the most powerful European and international federations/organizations relevant to DIF's sports policy work. The following criteria led to the selection of 118 associations and organizations:

- International and European federations that DIF's 61 federations are members of
- International and European federations representing an Olympic sport by the IOC Congress in September 2013

- Members of ARISF (Association of IOC Recognized International Sports Federations)
- IOC (International Olympic Committee), EOC (European Olympic Committee) and ANOC (Association of National Olympic Committees) in which Danish sport too has the opportunity to exercise international influence

The basis of the study is DIF's interest in the representation of its own 61 national sports federations in the international federations. All the Olympic sports are represented within the international federations included. Therefore, no additional Olympic federations have had to be included. In order not to centre the investigation on DIF's own national sports federation, all members of ARISF (Association of IOC Recognized International Sports Federations) have been included. The associations represents 34 sports, which achieve sustained dialogue with the IOC through membership. Its members are also a meaningful representation of the major international sports.

In addition to the included international federations, the IOC, the IOC Executive board, the EOC and ANOC are all included in the study. The Olympic Games is the biggest sporting event and the organizations define much of the framework for international sports activities regarding finances, media exposure and political impact in relation to the surrounding community. The Olympic organizations are not federal, but possess considerable power; thus they are included in the study.

Some included international federations are neither on the Olympic program nor a member of ARISF: International Powerlifting Federation (IPF), the World Minigolf Sport Federation (WMF), World Darts Federation (WDF), World Rugby (WR) (though part of the Olympic programme 2016), and World Association of Kickboxing Organizations (WAKO). The inclusion of the above mentioned federations cause a methodical reservation to other nations' use of the study. Despite that, the international sports federations have been included due to the Danish national federations' opportunity of being elected into executive boards, which was the primary criteria.

EXECUTIVE BOARDS

As it is understood that the executive boards in the international and European federations have the basic power of relevance to Danish sports, the study reveals the boards' composition by recording the individual board members' nationality. The criteria for the selection of the positions has been following:

- Member of the federations' executive board or highest governing body
- Member is entitled to vote

Because it is assumed that IOC members have a certain international influence, the nationality of all members are recorded. The nationality of all the federations' executive board members' have been registered. The names of the 119 presidents have also been registered.

The selected boards are for most of the federations' concerned dubbed *executive board* or *executive committee*. In the event that it is not obvious in official documents on the website if for example *honorary members* or the Secretary General is entitled to vote, some of the federations have been contacted. Because of several federations' opaque rules, small deviations may occur.

These criteria for selection lead to 1,673 positions included in the analysis. Registration of members' nationality has taken place in mid-August to mid-October 2015, while data for the baseline was collected in May to July 2013. This results in a timeframe of approximately 2 years and 3 months between the collections of data.

Board members are subsequently divided by nationality, and 19 factors for weighting the positions' power.

WEIGHTING OF INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCE FOR INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

In terms of political power, it is of greater value to Danish sport to have a member of the IOC rather than a member of the executive board in a small European sports federation. To create a relevant tool for portraying the influence, the international sports political power index operates with a weighting. The weighting of the positions' power will always be a judgment. A more accurate assessment of this involves qualitative studies of all international federations and an analysis of the supposed influence provided by the international representation.

In connection with the preparation of this analysis, the following weighting was decided to qualify the data.

Table 1: Weighting of positions in international sports

| Position | Weighting (1-10) |
|---|------------------|
| President of the IOC | Factor 10 |
| Member of the IOC Executive Board | Factor +2 |
| President of an international Olympic federation | Factor 8 |
| President of the EOC | Factor 7 |
| Member of the IOC | Factor 6 |
| Member of an international Olympic federation | Factor 6 |
| Member of the EOC | Factor 5 |
| President of a European Olympic federation | Factor 5 |
| President of a non-Olympic international federation | Factor 4 |
| Member of a European Olympic federation | Factor 3 |
| Member of an international non-Olympic federation | Factor 2 |
| President of a non-Olympic European federation | Factor 2 |
| Member of a European non-Olympic federation | Factor 1 |
| President of the ANOC | Factor 7 |
| Member of the ANOC | Factor 6 |
| President of the FIFA | Factor 9 |
| Member of the FIFA | Factor 7 |
| President of the UEFA | Factor 6 |
| Member of the UEFA | Factor 4 |

As a basis for the weighting above, the following criteria were applied:

1. Due to the assumption that federations with Olympic status have more power than non-Olympic federations regarding economy and media exposure, these are weighted higher

2. Due to the assumption that the greater the economic turnovers are, the more influence it provides, international federations are weighted higher than European federations
3. Due to the assumption that media-related interest is greater in international federations than European, and that more media interest indicates greater power, international federations have more influence in the international sports world
4. As international federations represent more active members than European federations, the international federations have greater influence
5. Due to the assumption that international federations have a greater political impact than European federations, international federations have more influence on international or national decision-makers

The reader of this analysis is encouraged to actively debate the weighting, as there may be different estimation parameters over this. The used weighting should not be seen as an absolute methodology for calculating the nations' power, but rather as a possible tool whereby nations' power can be estimated and thereby provide a quantitative basis to initiate a discussion of the sports political power.

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS TO THE RESULTS

Repetition of the data collection is not done without complications. The rules set for the data collection in 2013 can be difficult to follow in 2015 due to several circumstances:

- A few federations have for instance changed the number of members in their executive committee. For instance, the World Karate Federation has included four more members in their executive board.
- The International Golf Federation (IGF) and World Rugby are now Olympic federations.
- Some positions have not been up for election in the 2-year period.

Conclusions on changes between 2013 and now should not be drawn based on a few points won or lost, hence the considerations mentioned above.

RESULTS

The study is divided into two main tracks:

- A comparison of European nations represented in all the 118 European and international federations (including IOC, EOC and ANOC).
- A comparison of all nations' representation in international federations (including IOC and ANOC) - not the European federations.

In other words, as only European nations are represented in European federations, points from European federations can only be used to compare European nations. When compared with non-European nations, only points from international positions are used.

Below are the results divided into thematic sections. If more data is needed please contact the authors.

NB: The use of "[+/-]" in the result section refers to the changes in rank and points compared to the baseline from 2013. "-1" means that the nation has climbed down one place in the ranking.

DENMARK

Denmark has a total of 28 European and international positions and 96 points. The positions are divided into:

- 1 president of an Olympic international federation
- 2 members of the IOC
- 3 members of Olympic international federations
- 1 president of an Olympic European federation
- 10 members of Olympic European federations
- 5 members of non-Olympic international federations
- 4 members of non-Olympic European federations
- 1 member of UEFA
- 1 member of the EOC

Table 2: The European and international representation of Denmark

| | European rank (+/-) | Total points (+/-) | Total positions | International rank (+/-) | International points (+/-) |
|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Denmark | 12 (+1) | 96 (+13) | 28 | 28 (+8) | 48 (+8) |

DENMARK IN COMPARISON TO THE SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES

Both when judging on points and the number of positions, Sweden surpass Denmark, but the difference is smaller than in 2013. Norway comes out close to Denmark, but they a few hold more international positions more. On the other hand, Denmark has more positions in federations with Olympic status.

To an unknown extent, the nation's size of population can be a factor for the nation's number of points. In the index, Sweden is the most influential country in Scandinavia, but with the populations taken in to account Norway and Denmark outperform Sweden.

Table 3: Comparison of the Scandinavian nations' representation in international and European federations

| | | Total points (+/-) | Total positions (+/-) | European rank (+/-) | Points per capita in mill. (+/-) |
|---|---------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Sweden | 131 (-2) | 35 | 10 (-1) | 13,3 (-0,5) |
| 2 | Denmark | 96 (+13) | 28 | 12 (+1) | 16,9 (+2,2) |
| 3 | Norway | 85 (+3) | 28 | 14 (+3) | 16,4 (+1,1) |
| 4 | Finland | 73 (-7) | 24 | 17 (0) | 13,3 (-1,6) |

THE EUROPEAN POWER INDEX

In the European index UK, France, Germany, and Italy are the four most powerful nations divided by only ten points. There is however a difference in how the points are achieved. Germany's points are split between 82 positions; UK holds 78 positions while the points of France and Italy are divided among only 73 positions. This signifies that France and Italy hold more international and powerful positions. Germany and France have achieved significantly higher scores since 2013, both with the addition of 23 points more, while UK Italy have lost respectively 7 and 19 points. The biggest winner is Turkey gaining 38 points since 2013, while Austria has lost 25 points in the same time.

The biggest drop since the 2013 study is Switzerland. Despite losing 30 points in the span of two years, they are still among the highest ranked nations despite a significantly smaller population than the other high scoring nations.

Denmark ranks 12 on the European Index. Denmark is distinguished by having the second smallest population in the top 20, surpassed only by Norway. Unfortunately, Denmark also has one of the weakest international representations, as exactly half of the 96 points are obtained through European positions.

Table 4: Comparison of the European nations' representation in the international and European federations

| | Country | Points (+/-) | European Rank +/- | Points per capita in mill. |
|----|----------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Italy | 289 (-19) | 0 | 4,8 |
| 2 | United Kingdom | 288 (-7) | 0 | 4,4 |
| 3 | France | 285 (+23) | 0 | 4,2 |
| 4 | Germany | 279 (+23) | 0 | 3,4 |
| 5 | Russia | 243 (-4) | 0 | 1,7 |
| 6 | Spain | 223 (-7) | 0 | 4,7 |
| 7 | Switzerland | 169 (-30) | 0 | 20,4 |
| 8 | Turkey | 146 (+38) | +1 | 1,9 |
| 9 | Netherlands | 145 (+10) | 0 | 8,6 |
| 10 | Sweden | 132 (-2) | -1 | 13,4 |
| 11 | Belgium | 118 (+12) | 0 | 10,5 |
| 12 | Denmark | 96 (+13) | +1 | 16,9 |
| 13 | Greece | 89 (+12) | +6 | 8,2 |
| 14 | Norway | 85 (+3) | 0 | 16,4 |
| 15 | Hungary | 76 (-8) | -3 | 7,7 |
| 15 | Poland | 76 (-8) | -1 | 2 |
| 16 | Finland | 73 (-7) | -2 | 13,3 |
| 18 | Czech Republic | 69 (-11) | -2 | 6,5 |
| 19 | Bulgaria | 60 (+13) | +7 | 8,3 |
| 20 | Austria | 56 (-25) | -4 | 6,5 |
| 20 | ireland | 56 (+8) | +5 | 12,1 |

THE INTERNATIONAL POWER INDEX

In the international index, the number of total positions for each nation is almost similar to the ranking with the application of the weighting. This signals that a very similar index could have been made based on only on the total number of positions for each nation.

USA is still on top of the index and increased its influence by six points since 2013. France has a few more positions in the international federations than UK, Germany and Italy, which explains the growing gap between the four countries compared to the European index. That results in a 2nd place for France in the International index.

The biggest winners in the international index are Germany (+28 points), Japan (+33 points) and Canada with an impressive 52 international points more than in 2013.

10 out of 20 countries on the list are European signalling that Europe has considerable power in the international federations. The biggest losers are Australia (-26) and Switzerland (-32).

Denmark has moved up 9 places to a 28th place after gaining 8 points.

Table 5: Comparison of all nations' representation in international federations

| | Country | Points (+/-) | Rank +/- |
|------------|----------------|--------------|----------|
| 1 | United States | 309 (+6) | 0 |
| 2 | France | 211 (+14) | +2 |
| 3 | United Kingdom | 200 (-8) | 0 |
| 4 | Italy | 196 (-14) | -2 |
| 5 | Germany | 185 (+28) | +4 |
| 5 | Canada | 184 (+52) | +6 |
| 7 | Russia | 183 (0) | -2 |
| 8 | Spain | 183 (-6) | -2 |
| 9 | China | 166 (+19) | +1 |
| 10 | Australia | 150 (-26) | -2 |
| 11 | Switzerland | 145 (-32) | -4 |
| 12 | Japan | 133 (+33) | +2 |
| 13 | South Korea | 116 (-6) | -1 |
| 14 | New Zealand | 98 (+4) | +1 |
| 15 | Egypt | 97 (-4) | -2 |
| 16 | Turkey | 89 (+22) | +6 |
| 17 | Netherlands | 88 (+16) | +3 |
| 17 | Sweden | 88 (-6) | -2 |
| 19 | Belgium | 87 (+16) | +2 |
| 20 | Mexico | 84 (-8) | -1 |
| 21 | Brazil | 83 (+2) | -4 |
| 22 | Qatar | 54 (+2) | +5 |
| 23 | Greece | 52 (+10) | +11 |
| 23 | Hungary | 52 (-14) | 0 |
| 25 | Argentina | 50 (-29) | -8 |
| 25 | Finland | 50 (-16) | -3 |
| 25 | Norway | 50 (-2) | +2 |
| 28 | Denmark | 48 (+8) | +8 |
| 28 | India | 48 (+14) | +13 |
| 28 | Kuwait | 48 (+1) | +2 |
| 28 | Morocco | 48 (+14) | +13 |
| 28 (32) | Poland | 48 (-6) | -2 |

CONCLUSIONS

- Denmark has a strong sports political position in relation to both absolute terms and in relation to population size in Europe. The upward move of eight places in the list of the most powerful countries internationally is partly due to the NOC of Denmark's intense work for more influence. Conversely, on the international stage there is still room for improvement with only 50 % points coming from international federations. Considering that it requires global solutions to tackle some of the sport's most serious challenges such as match-fixing, doping, sustainability of events, the world's inactive population and the global sports economy, it is not enough to focus on the European organizations.
- With six out of the first ten nations in the international index being European, Europe continue to assert significant global influence.
- With the significant gains of Germany and Canada the NOC of Denmark should consider to open dialogues with these nations to learn from their experiences. Meanwhile the nations with greatest influence as for an example USA, France, United Kingdom and Italy.
- Concerning international influence in relation to population size, it seems that the NOC of Denmark still have something to learn from the following nations comparable to the Danish sports structure and culture: Belgium, Holland and New Zealand.
- Finally, it can be difficult to conclude that there is an overhanging problem with democracy in international sport, when power primarily is focused on candidates who come from countries with a democratic culture. Thus, it is worth discussing whether the bad examples of corruption and enlightened despotism in sport, merely are examples concentrated to individual federations rather than being a general challenge. Recent events involving the major international sports federations have shown that good governance is not merely based on the democratic background of its board members.