



## FRANCESCO RICCI BITTI

IF representative • ITF – International Tennis Federation



ORIGINAL TEXT IN ENGLISH

Thank you for the opportunity to address the assembly today on behalf of the International Federations (IFs) on the Structure of the Olympic Movement.

### AUTONOMY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE

I want to briefly mention two concepts that are strongly interlinked in any discussion on the Olympic structure: autonomy and governance. Before we can go forward, we must have a common understanding of what “autonomy” means for the sake of International Olympic Committee (IOC) stakeholders. Although we pride ourselves on autonomy, its meaning is not always completely clear especially when we are dependant on sponsorship and government support. We must also develop a principle of good governance for sport in order to earn the respect the Olympic Movement deserves and to preserve our autonomous position. We have a long way to go, but, if we believe that autonomy is important for the development of sport, the IOC must define its function and assess how its main stakeholders enhance those functions for the future. For today, I want to concentrate on a different subject, the relationship between the Olympic Movement and its key stakeholders.

### RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN OLYMPIC STAKEHOLDERS

I want to be clear from the start that I have complete respect for the role played by National Olympic Committees (NOCs) and member athletes in the success of the Olympic Games to date. Most IF representatives, including myself, also wear an NOC hat and fully understand and value the important role that NOCs play in the Olympic Movement. However, I feel that the International Federation is not given enough credit, officially or unofficially, for the major part that it plays in the success of the Olympic Games.

The IOC is actually an NOC-driven organisation. This has a lot of merit but may not be the only way forward for the future, if the Olympic Movement is to maintain its status as the reference point for professional sport as it has been traditionally for amateur sport. Already there are events that can stand with the Olympic Games in stature, if not completely in reach. I think of the Super Bowl, managed by a professional league, the Fédération International de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup, organised, of course, by one of the leading International

Federations, or the four Grand Slam tournaments in tennis, organised individually and sanctioned by the International Tennis Federation (ITF).

The structure of the Olympic Movement would indicate that the NOCs' influence has greater value than that of the IF and I believe that this imbalance needs to be addressed in order to more effectively control the commercial interests of the IOC. For this reason, I think the reforming work that started in Salt Lake City must continue, with a focus on the following two areas: 1) the composition of the IOC's membership and 2) a clear plan that stresses cooperation and consistency among the main IOC stakeholders (particularly between NOCs and IFs) but not complacency, especially because the latter will signal long-term issues for the Olympic Movement.

### NATIONAL FEDERATIONS

The infrastructure for tennis, as with many sports, was established independently of the Olympic Movement in national tennis federations around the world, starting well over 100 years ago. Top-level tennis started at Wimbledon in 1877 and the United States Championships in 1881. The Davis Cup had its launch in Boston in 1900. If it would not be considered too controversial, I would even suggest that the growth of the modern Olympics in its initial stages owed much of its success to the sports that were represented in the early years. Unlike today, in Pierre de Coubertin's time, individual sports were not validated by their representation in the Games; rather those early Games were validated by the representation of the individual sports.

For our long-term success, we all have to thank National Federations.

The mandate of National Federations is to work through their local regions and authorities to identify and nurture talent and provide a proper sporting environment for their sport to grow in their countries. For many sports – tennis is a good example – there was no great support from National Olympic Committees while the sport was not a part of the Olympic Programme. Now, I am the first to say that, once tennis rejoined the Olympic Movement, the level of support for tennis from NOCs around the world grew dramatically. This has helped our sport to develop in many countries where tennis was not originally a factor, Russia being a great example. However, I insist that the foundations for sporting excellence everywhere, without exception, were laid by National Federations.

If we are to make the Olympic Movement stronger, we need to analyse the link between National Federations, NOCs and the IF, and make the operations of these two major stakeholders consistent and more related to their experience and scope.

### INTERNATIONAL FEDERATIONS AND NATIONAL FEDERATIONS

The link between the National Federation and the International Federation is strong, consistent and ongoing. The integrity of every sport, its rules, its structure and its development, are a partnership between National and International Federations. At the ITF, we have 205 member nations charged with fostering the growth and development of the sport of tennis on a worldwide basis and they accomplish this goal each and every day.

We work with our members in four key areas: governance, service, development and organisation. We also work on topics as diverse as: ball testing; anti-doping; tournament planning; men's and women's



professional circuits and calendars; junior, senior and wheelchair tennis circuits; the organisation of Davis Cup and Fed Cup ties around the world; coaching and coaches' education; the identification of talent in less developed nations with assistance to the most talented to compete with others at their level; research into new equipment; and analysis of current equipment. We take our mission seriously and our National Federations take care of our sport around the world 365 days a year. This should be respected and rewarded.

### NOCS AND NATIONAL FEDERATIONS

The relationship of the NOC and the National Federation varies by country, even though everywhere the function of the NOC is to prepare the teams for the Olympic Games and on a wider basis to encourage the development of both high performance sport as well as sport for all. This role could only be based on a partnership with the National Federations.

While I was doing research for my speech, I read a number of mission statements from National Olympic Committees around the world. In one, "podium success" was listed as a mission. I found this very disturbing. While every elite athlete has the desire to win, I do not think that this should be the mission of a National Olympic Committee. I think the concept that winning alone is a goal is counterintuitive to the fundamental principles of Olympism.

It seems to me that the role and goal of both NOCs and IFs is to create a climate where people can excel and to give people the right preparation and tools as well as the right ethic, so that a wholehearted attempt is just as valuable as a medal and perhaps more.

This brings us to the problem of the Olympic qualification system where some NOCs need to validate themselves by imposing rules that are inconsistent with those of other NOCs and inconsistent for the sports involved.

### OLYMPIC QUALIFICATION SYSTEM

What has happened to tennis, and other sports, undermines the position of the ITF with other non-Olympic stakeholders: players, professional tournaments, media, tennis fans and, to some extent, even our National Federations. The entry criteria set by the ITF and ratified by the IOC over the years are fair, transparent and consistent with how our sport works outside the Games. For a NOC to set itself up as an expert – especially when their attention to tennis is minimal in some cases (except in the run-up to the Summer Games) – is unfair to everyone, particularly the athletes themselves, the International Federation and the National Federation concerned.

Let me give you an example. The Israeli NOC decided that Dudi Sela, then ranked 57, was not qualified to participate in last year's Olympic Games, although he met the criteria set by the ITF. Mr Sela is now ranked in the high 20s, reached the Round of 16 at Wimbledon and led his country to the Davis Cup Semi-finals for the first time in history with wins over Sweden and Russia. Clearly, his record shows he has the talent and determination and that he takes enormous pride in playing for Israel. The irony is that, while Israel and other NOCs refused to enter qualified athletes, there was a list of NOCs who were eager to fill those positions with their even less-highly ranked athletes. Well done to them but, honestly, this is not good for the reputation of the Olympic Movement.

What I hope we can accomplish, working together, is to redress the balance of influence to make a stronger Olympic Movement.

### OLYMPIC REVENUE DISTRIBUTION

For the IOC to continue to maintain its position as the arbiter of sporting excellence, and for the Olympic Games to maintain their position as the most elite sporting event in the world, we need to recognise that the demands that we face today are not those of Pierre de Coubertin. The increasing and highly competitive professionalism of sport requires the IOC structure to evolve to meet that challenge in the future by giving more recognition and reward to the International Federations who have the required expertise.

An issue that we face in tennis and that other sports are facing is the level of control that International Federations and National Federations retain on the wider part of the game. In tennis, the professional tours siphon off a very lucrative part of the game but the return to the sport overall is minimal.

In the meantime, the IF is exposed and fully responsible for the integrity of the game in many areas including regulation, anti-doping, corruption and technical aspects.

In tennis, we have had to anticipate changes in equipment – balls, rackets, strings – as well as court surface that could undermine our sport. We are forced to be more and more vigilant at higher and higher costs and, while we are keeping ahead of the problem in most cases, surely every sport is in danger of commercial interest and the resultant loss in control in the area of sport rights and event ownership.

Consequently, I believe that there needs to be a review and a reallocation of Olympic funding with an adequate slice to International Federations, which have much more responsibility than just the organisation of each sport for the Olympic Games. This would allow IFs to more effectively withstand emerging threats from commercial interests and government interference and to cope with the additional costs associated with anti-doping and anti-corruption activities.

This is not a matter of the Charter; this is a matter of the future.

### IOC MEMBERSHIP

The question whether the structure of the IOC is adequate, particularly after the 2000 reform, is very common.

Denis Oswald, President of the Association of Summer Olympic International Federations (ASOIF), presented a very interesting paper where he cites the historical basis for the Structure of the Olympic Movement and then asks the question if the IOC should not consider a total reconsideration of this structure. I support that view and believe that perhaps a zero-based audit of the structure evaluating each constituency might give us some insight into the best way forward for the IOC itself.

The IFs, and through them their stakeholder NFs, must have better representation and more influence in IOC decisions.

Denis suggests, and I think it has real merit, that we consider a reinvented IOC that is, to quote him directly, "a world sport parliament" with members who represent those who run such sport. I am not certain that the split he recommends is a perfect one or an easy one to achieve,



but the IFs need to have greater representation if the IOC is to have a successful future.

This new structure would be the continuity of the 2000 IOC reform and should be implemented gradually while safeguarding the rights already in place.

I think both Denis and I believe that a stronger IF means a stronger IOC. The NOCs are very important, they live for the Games and sport in their countries; the IFs live for their sports worldwide and strong sports mean strong competition and successful Games. These are not contradictory positions, but only the leadership of the IOC can address the imbalance of power existing in some areas of the Olympic Movement.

### CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, I would like you to consider the following:

1. Analyse and define what autonomy in sport means especially in relation to the influence of sponsorship and government funding and legislation. Establish a set of basic governance principles to be made mandatory to the major IOC stakeholders in order to deserve and justify the respect and level of autonomy we want.
2. Greater recognition for the vital role of the National Federation in athletes' preparation for the major competitions including the Olympic Games. This should include enhanced and consistent accreditation for the National Federations' top representatives, with qualified competing athletes, who wish to attend the Games.
3. To find a common ground between the IFs and NOCs to solve the problem of the qualification system of the Olympic Games taking into account the specificity of different sports. Follow progress, review and clarify the Olympic Charter to deal with the contradictions between rule 45.4 (entry by the NOCs) and the bye-law of rule 41 (IF establishment of eligibility criteria).
4. Review the revenue distribution system, as soon as contractually possible to take into account the current and future needs in terms of control of the sport by the major stakeholders, NOCs and IFs.
5. Review the current practice regarding IOC membership election criteria to achieve a more balanced representation of the major groups involved (IOC, NOC, IF, athletes) with some consideration being given to the terms of office.