

Olympic Events Selection - Specification of the Voting Process

New Regulation 23.1.9

A submission from the Chairman of the Events Committee

Purpose or Objective

To specify in regulation the voting process for selecting a new set of Olympic Events so that this is consistently applied and is known in advance to submitters and members of Council and Committees.

Proposal

Add new regulation 23.1.9 to define the voting process

23.1.9 The process below for voting on Olympic Events shall be used by Reporting Committees. Council may choose to accept or reject a recommendation of a Reporting Committee. If Council chooses not to accept a recommendation of a Reporting Committee it shall also use the process(es) below to make its decision(s).

(a) Voting Process

In the event of one or more submissions to change Olympic Events, a two stage process shall be used to choose whether to retain the existing set of Events or to change to an alternative set proposed in submission.

Stage 1

Every submission to change Olympic Events is requested to be proposed and seconded by a member of the committee (or Council). Committee members may propose or second more than one submission.

If a submission receives such a proposer and seconder, it goes forward to Stage 2. If it fails to receive this, it is rejected.

Stage 2

Stage 2 uses the Alternate Vote (AV) system to choose one set from the current set of Olympic Events and alternative sets of Olympic Events proposed in submissions and proposed and seconded in Stage 1.

(b) The Stage 2 process is as follows:

- (i) Each voter casts one vote for his or her preferred set of Olympic Events.**
 - (ii) If a set receives more than 50% of votes cast, it is selected and the voting process is concluded.**
-

- (iii) **If no set receives more than 50% of votes cast, any set that has received zero votes is rejected, and, of the remaining sets, the one with the fewest votes is rejected.**
- (iv) **The above process is repeated with the remaining sets.**
- (v) **The process continues until a set receives more than 50% of votes cast, whereupon it is selected.**
- (vi) **After each round, the rejected set(s), but not the number of votes, is declared. The totals of all votes in all rounds is declared at the end of the process.**

(c) Ties in step (b)(iii) above are broken as follows:

- (i) **The tie is broken in favour of the set that received more votes in the previous round.**
- (ii) **If this fails to break the tie, or it is the first round of Stage 2, a run-off ballot is held.**
- (iii) **If at any time a tie between more than two sets is partially broken, the tie-break process continues with only the sets that are still tied.**
- (iv) **If a run-off ballot fails to break a tie, the chairman shall have a casting vote.**

Current Position

The voting system is not specified.

Reasons

1. Defining the voting process in regulation is appropriate given the significance of this decision to ISAF and its members, and the impact of any voting system on preparatory consultation undertaken by delegates.
 2. The recommended process is based on the process used in May 2011 and reflects the process used by IOC when choosing a single Olympic city from multiple candidates.
 3. The recommended process preserves Council's options to vote on a recommendation from a reporting committee or to consider all submissions itself.
 4. Stage 1 ensures that every submission is considered on its merits and considered equally, and eliminates those without a minimal level of support in the committee.
 5. Stage 2 ensures that the current set of Events is considered alongside any new sets, and ensures that the set selected receives more than 50% of votes cast in the final vote.
 6. **The opportunity for tactical voting is minimal as voters are simply voting for their preferred option, and for this reason this previous voting is also used initially to break any ties.**
-

2011 NOVEMBER CONFERENCE

COUNCIL DECISION – NOVEMBER 2011

Council received Submission 101-11 from the Chairman of the Events Committee

Decision

On a proposal from Chris Atkins, seconded by Kurt Lonnqvist, Council deferred submission 101-11 to May 2012 (0 reject, 2 abstain, 37 approve).

Recommendation From The Reporting Committee

Events Committee

Recommendation to Council: Approve

Executive Committee

Recommendation to Council: Reject

Drafting errors e.g. this should be regarding voting on Events and Equipment.

Opinion From The Other Committees

Constitution Committee

Opinion: No Recommendation

Subject to policy being determined by Council. Constitution Committee to finalise the wording

Match Racing Committee

Opinion: Reject

Same reason as 099-11
