

2016 Olympic Sailing Competition

Voting Procedure – Events and Equipment

A submission from the Chairman of the Events Committee

Purpose or Objective

This submission defines the voting process proposed for use by the Events Committee. The process is also recommended for used by Council.

Proposal

Preparatory Stage

To be considered, a submission shall propose a slate of 10 Events each with its Equipment option (retain current; evolve current; or evaluation) in compliance with the Regulations.

Where two or more submissions are the same, the ISAF office will combine them so that they are considered and voted on as if a single submission. Where the wording of submissions is different, but their effect is the same (i.e. they will result in the same slate in regulation 23.1.4 but for instance include different terminology or supporting reasons) the chairman shall combine them so that they are considered and voted on as if a single submission.

Meeting Stage

A two-stage voting process is proposed. The purpose of Stage 1 is to consider every slate separately, and reject those with no support. The purpose of Stage 2 is to select the slate with the greatest all-round support.

Stage 1

Every submission proposing a slate of 10 Events with Equipment options, including the provisional slate, is individually required to be proposed and seconded by two members of the committee (or Council).

If the submission attracts a proposer and a seconder from within the committee, it is considered in Stage 2. If it fails to achieve this, it is rejected.

Each such vote is separate, so committee members in stage 1 can propose or second more than one slate.

Stage 2

Stage 2 decides the single slate to be specified in Regulation 23.1.4 from those that have been proposed and seconded in Stage 1.

The voting process recommended is an Alternate Vote (AV) system, as used by the IOC when choosing a host Olympic city. It is also used in many political elections worldwide and is similar to the system ISAF uses for electing its President.

The process is as follows:

1. Each voter casts one vote for his or her preferred slate.
2. If a slate receives >50% of votes cast, it is selected and the voting process is concluded.
3. If no slate has >50% of votes cast, any slate that has received zero votes is rejected.
4. Of the remaining slates, the one with the fewest votes is rejected.
5. The above process is repeated with the remaining slates.
6. The process continues until a slate receives >50%, whereupon it is selected.

Tie-breaking

Ties in step 4 are broken as follows:

1. The tie is broken in favour of the slate that received more votes in the previous round.
2. If this fails to break the tie, or if it is the first round of Stage 2, a run-off ballot is held.
3. If at any stage a tie between more than 2 slates is partially broken, the tie-break process continues with only the slates that are still tied.
4. If the run-off ballot fails to break a tie, the chairman shall have a casting vote.

It is proposed that Events Committee uses the above process. It is proposed that Council is first given the opportunity to accept the Events Committee's recommendation. If Council votes not to accept the Events Committee's recommendation, then it is recommended that Council should follow the above process.

Additional Notes on the Recommended Process

1. The calculation of voting percentages counts votes cast excluding abstentions. To illustrate with an example, there are 28 members of the Events Committee. In the event that one member abstains and everyone else votes there will be 27 votes cast. 14 votes will be necessary to secure >50% of votes cast.
 2. After each vote, the rejected option(s), but not the numbers of votes, is announced. The totals of all votes is announced at the conclusion of the process.
 3. There is the question of "what does 'or' mean in 'windsurfer or kite board'"? In every such case the Equipment option will be "evaluation" (as kite-board is a new Event), and these submissions are proposing that both windsurfers and kite boarders are eligible to take part in the evaluation. Council will therefore have the opportunity at a later meeting (November 2012) to choose the Equipment, and will be able at that time to choose either just windsurfer, or just kite board, or a format including both. It is recommended that Council should not at this time constrain the evaluation, so recommends that for the purpose of this vote, slates with 'or', 'and' and 'and/or' that are otherwise equivalent are combined and voted on as if a single submission.
 4. When the regulations do not define a voting process, it is for each committee to decide its voting process. This can be time-consuming at the meeting, produce inconsistencies between committees, and may introduce unexpected consequences. A follow-on submission will therefore be made in November 2011 to define the voting process for subsequent Olympics in regulation. It is intended that this process will be consistent with the process recommended for May 2011, with changes to reflect:
 - (a) any improvements following usage in May 2011;
-

- (b) the existence of a “current” slate (as opposed to the “provisional” slate in May 2011), and the desire to improve the continuity and evolution of our Olympic Events and Equipment.

Current Position

The voting process is not defined

Reasons

1. Stage 1 ensures that every submission is considered on its merits and treated equally, and eliminates those without a minimal level of support in the committee.
2. Stage 2 is a recognised voting system that is used by IOC (see extract below) and many political systems for selecting one from many.
3. The slate finally selected will have received more than 50% of votes cast on the final vote. The process also avoids the possibility of a slate being rejected despite receiving more than 50% of votes cast.
4. As voters are simply voting in favour of the slate they support, there is very little opportunity for tactical voting to distort the result. This is also why ties are initially broken in favour of the slate which was more popular in the previous round, with a run-off ballot only used if this fails to break the tie.
5. The process will enable delegates representing multiple MNAs to act in accordance with a mandate they have received to vote in favour of particular slates.

Extract from IOC Procedures (for 2016 City Selection)

Voting procedure

Voting will take place in successive rounds until one candidate receives a majority vote. IOC members in a country which has a candidate in the election must abstain from taking part in the vote whilst their city is still in the running.

Non-votes, spoiled votes and abstentions do not count towards the calculation of the majority. For example, if 100 members are present but four (4) abstain, the number of votes needed for a majority is 49.

If there is no majority in the first round, the city with the fewest votes drops out of the running, and the members vote again for the remaining candidates. If two or more cities are tied for the lowest number of votes, a run-off election is held between them, with the city gaining the most votes going on to the next round.

Electronic vote

The members vote using an electronic voting system, which immediately and securely tallies the votes. ... How each member votes is not recorded to shield the member from external pressures to vote in a certain way. If multiple rounds are needed, the city with the least number of votes is eliminated and announced and there is a new round of voting. The tally of votes per round is reported after the conclusion of the election.
