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ABSTRACT
The Olympic Charter is the binding document that rules the Olympic Movement which, among other things, has the role of managing the organization of the biggest and most complex sporting event in the world - the Olympic games. The multi-disciplinary nature of this event implies the involvement of diverse stakeholders, including hosts and respective communities that, besides having different interests, rely on each other to fulfil them. As the owner of the event, the International Olympic Committee has the role of managing these interests through the update and modification of the Olympic Charter. This paper explores the evolution of this document, taking special consideration of the influence that occurrences related with stakeholder’s governance and urban strategies of hosts had on its rules. A cross-referenced review between the historical events within these two fields of study is compared to a systematic review of the Charter’s evolution. The results include a timeline with eight periods identifying the progress of those relationships, showing that the Olympic Charter has had a more reactive than pro-active character: it was highly influenced by hosts and other internal and external governance issues that, together, were responsible for the addition of new rules.
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Since the foundation of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) by Pierre de Coubertin in 1894, and the beginning of the modern Olympic games, in 1896, the leading organization in world sport has been increasingly expanding its dimensions from a very small visionary club to a very influential non-governmental organization, representing sport and promoting its values worldwide. Throughout the twentieth century, the growing scale of the Olympic games and their ability to command substantial income, have had a strong impact on more and more people and organizations around the world, being reflected in the increasing different interests of...
many Olympic stakeholders. As the leader of the Olympic Movement, one of the main roles of the IOC is to manage these different stakeholder’s interests in the best possible manner, ensuring that the celebration of the Olympic games happens accordingly. Over decades, cities demonstrated interest in hosting the Olympic games to use them as urban development tools to implement and accelerate large-scale urban plans and create lasting legacies for their populations. This interest is related with short to long-term socio-economic, socio-cultural, political, and physical impacts which may be tangible or intangible. The most visible and understandable are the impacts of urban interventions affecting the host city’s urban development. Since the first modern Olympic games, these urban impacts have evolved from very few interventions to a time when cities use the event for radical urban transformations. Nowadays, interventions go beyond the provision of competition facilities, including also investment in supporting infrastructures such as accommodation, transport, water systems, and urban landscaping. In theory, by constructing or improving facilities, these impacts affect directly the social, cultural, economic and political legacies as they potentially increase the touristic, commercial and sports activities of the city and, therefore, create permanent jobs. In turn, these jobs can elevate the potential for investment, acting in a ‘snowball effect’ on the city’s economy.

Besides the growth in urban interventions, there has also been an increasing expansion in the number of Olympic stakeholders, each one showing different objectives and needs. Although the Olympic games belong to the IOC, which owns all the related rights and properties, the interests of many other stakeholders are essential for their celebration. In fact, the IOC is not the most relevant entity in the actual delivery of the event: the host provides the infrastructure and local services, mostly depending on public investment; the International Federations (IFs) direct the sports events; the National Olympic Committees (NOCs) manage athletes’ delegations; the Organizing Committees of the Olympic Games (OCOGs) organize the event; the private sector considerably finances the Olympic Movement by means of sponsorships, broadcasting rights and other contractual agreements and; volunteers assure the running of the activities. Many other stakeholders must be added to this list, especially when considering legal and regulatory entities or non-governmental organisations. These stakeholders interact with each other in order to satisfy their individual and collective interests and take the most benefits out of the event. Their actions are aimed at the construction of their own Olympic legacy, which differs from actor to actor. Gerginov states that ‘it is this tension between what is being done in the name of legacy, for whom, at what cost and to what effect that turns Olympic legacy into a governance issue’. Therefore, it is the need to distribute equally and fairly the benefits from hosting the Olympics, considering varying perspectives of different actors, that constitutes the major challenge of Olympic governance.

At its uppermost, the role of the IOC is performed by the adoption, amendment and maintenance of the Olympic Charter, a ‘basic instrument of a constitutional nature’ which ‘governs the organisation, action and operation of the Olympic Movement and sets forth the conditions for the celebration of the Olympic Games’. This document, existing since 1908, has been subject to many modifications,
following and governing the growth of the Olympic Movement and of the Olympic games according to its recurring changing needs. During its evolution, the IOC has also resorted to additional guiding documents in order to drive other important changes such as the Olympic Agenda 2020. This Agenda is aimed at pointing the practices of the Olympic Movement towards modern societal concerns, meaning that the Olympic games are undergoing one of its major, and radical, changes. 12

Figure 1 shows the number of papers published on topics of sports governance and Olympic governance and the percentage of those related to urban studies. Although research on sports governance is vast, studies on Olympic governance are notably lower. Further, although research on Olympic urban studies has been increasing in recent years, not much attention has been given to its connection with Olympic governance, as studies are mostly focused in one of these specific fields. But is this relation important to make reasoned decisions for the future? If Olympic urban interventions are meant to satisfy the needs of the stakeholders, if Olympic urban legacies are aimed at the host cities and populations and if the correlation between both are the Olympic requirements, it is only natural that this game of interests has a joint evolution, important to understand the dynamics of the games. Throughout history, influences between parties existed in every decision and negotiation, with a goal of different converging visions. Thus, an important missing piece in Olympic knowledge is the study of this reciprocity.

Therefore, this paper seeks a comprehensive and consistent review of the Olympic Charter to understand how it has been subject to the mutual influence between Olympic stakeholders’ interests and urban development strategies adopted by hosts. Its main objective is to investigate the extent to which the relevance of this relationship has shaped the Olympic Charter. Additionally, it aims at recognising which stakeholders have had the biggest influence in changes of urban requirements for host cities and how the IOC has changed the Olympic Charter to manage this mutual influence. The following section of the paper describes the methodology used for the review. Then, the combined evolution of Olympic governance, Olympic urban strategies, and Olympic Charter requirements is presented, divided into eight identified historical periods. A discussion of results is carried afterwards and, finally, conclusions are drawn in the final section.

**Host Urban Strategies and Stakeholder’s Governance**

Through a documental analysis, this paper follows and cross-references four timelines of Olympic history. Three of them, namely the timeline of Olympic governance and stakeholders and the timelines of Olympic urban development strategies for both
summer and winter editions, cover subjects that are already explored in detail in Olympic literature and, therefore, are here based on factual evidence reported in a set of selected scientific publications of the respective fields of study. For reasons of simplification, and because most of these publications report similar evidence, each of the three timelines is primarily based on one paper of reference that better suits the purpose of this work. Those three publications are briefly presented below. To avoid recurrent and repeating citation, most references to these primary sources are hereinafter omitted, unless considered necessary. Additional evidence presented by other sources, if not presented in these primary ones, is used to complement the review – and fully cited.

The timeline for Olympic governance and stakeholders mostly resorts to the evolution models described by Chappelet. 13 Such evolution models are significantly based on the authors’ previous extensive and recognised work, together with Kübler-Mabbott, which identifies and characterizes the Olympic stakeholders, yet updated and summarized to suit the purpose of the present review. 14 The author identifies three historical periods of the Olympic System, plus an initial period of establishment of the Olympic Movement, grounding this division on stakeholder assertiveness:

1. **Foundation of the Olympic Movement: 1894–1910**
2. **Classic Olympic System: 1910–1985**
3. **Regulated Olympic System: 1985–2010**
4. **Total Olympic System: 2010–present (2016)**

Olympic urban development strategies are extensively reported in literature. The classic papers of Essex and Chalkley are widely acclaimed as a reference, and the authors might very fairly be considered the ‘fathers’ of Olympic studies in urban planning. 15 Many other appreciated authors, such as Gold and Gold, recognise that ‘when considering the urban character of the early Summer Olympic Games, it is instructive to consider Essex and Chalkley’, as also proved by the extensive systematic literature review of Scheu and Preuss. 16 However, their papers on the summer editions date from the late 1990s and do not include most recent editions. For that reason, the timeline for urban strategies is here based on another paper, that of Liao and Pitts, that largely relies on Essex and Chalkley’s work, but updated to 2006 and adding interesting new insights. 17 The authors named the four historical phases of Olympic urban development for the summer event, previously identified by Chalkley and Essex, as follows:

1. **the Origins of Olympic Urbanism: 1896–1904**
2. **the Dominance of the Olympic Stadium: 1908–1928**
3. **the Rise of the Olympic Quarter: 1932–1956**
4. **the Age of Urban Transformation: 1960–2012**

Because the Olympic Winter Games are considerably less studied, the most appropriate historical review that could be found for this methodology is that of Essex and Chalkley, from 2004, which also identifies four distinctive periods:
i. Minimal Infrastructural Transformations: 1924–1932
ii. Emerging Infrastructural Demands: 1936–1960
iii. Tool of Regional Development: 1964–1980
iv. Large Scale Transformations: 1984–2002

The three previously presented papers very well serve the purpose of this study in historically contextualizing and understanding the identified modifications throughout the evolution of the Olympic Charter. The fourth timeline, which constitutes one of the main contributions of this paper, is carried by a systematic review of all its editions over history, with a focus on rules related to Olympic stakeholders and/or urban requirements. The cross-reference between all four timelines was then carried out in order to define the combined historical periods of Olympic governance and related urban development strategies.

Olympic Charter Evolution Shaped by Urban Strategies and Stakeholders’ Governance

The chosen methodology resulted in the identification of the eight historical periods described in the next sub-sections. Note that the periods are not necessarily subsequent and may overlap. For that reason, no dates were specifically assigned.

The Foundation of the Olympic Games

At the beginning of the twentieth century, following the birth of the IOC, the organisation was still a ‘modest white male dominated club’ with no employees, ran by Pierre de Coubertin, whose main task was to choose the host city for the games every four years. The concept of the modern Olympic games was still being established and, as shown in Table 1, in the first three editions less than a thousand athletes participated. The first anticipation of what the urban impacts of the Olympic games would come to be was hinted at by the construction of the first Olympic stadium in London’s edition of 1908, when the number of athletes more than doubled the previous editions. Also in 1908, the first Olympic Charter (Annuaire du Comité International Olympique) was published, consisting of regulations not more than two pages long, and several lists of members, reunions, and congresses.

The Development of the Olympic Movement

Chappelet identified 1910 as the beginning of the Classic Olympic System, which are part of today’s official constituents of the Olympic Movement: the IOC, the NOCs, the IFs, the OCOGs, and the National Sports Federations (NFs). Even though their official inclusion in the Olympic Charter occurred throughout the beginning of the twentieth century, along with the development of their own concept of the Olympic Movement, these entities were, since the beginning of the modern Olympic games, always involved. The concept of OCOG existed under diverse designations since the first edition in Athens 1896. NOCs started being founded at the
same time to form national teams to participate at the games, Germany as the first in 1895. Thus, the concept of national representation appears in the first Olympic Charter of 1908, which stated that IOC members ‘should consider themselves the delegates of the IOC to the sports and exercise federations and societies of their respective countries’. This was also the first time NFs were referred to. Later, in the 1911 edition, IOC members started being listed by country.

The year 1914 represented a turning point for Olympic administration since, for the first time, representatives of NOCs were invited to take part in the Olympic Congress in Paris. Later, in 1920, they would be recognized by the Olympic Charter as part of the Olympic Movement, as long as they were constituted by IOC members. At the same time, representing the international sporting community, the existing IFs, whose number was significantly increased by the creation of the IOC, were trying to be heard in relation to binding rules and clarification of responsibilities in the Olympic programme. The supremacy of the IOC and OCOGs started being questioned, with arguments that misunderstandings and home advantages corrupted the process of admission of amateur athletes for the games. With no specific measures taken at the congress, IFs united to form the Permanent Bureau of International Federations, with the objective of constituting an alternative to the IOC.

Table 1. Olympic Games’ statistics: number of participating NOCs, sports events, and participating athletes.23

| Year   | NOCs | Events | Athletes | Year   | NOCs | Events | Athletes |
|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|------|--------|----------|
| 1896   | 14   | 43     | 241      | 1924   | 16   | 16     | 258      |
| 1900   | 24   | 95     | 997      | 1928   | 25   | 14     | 464      |
| 1904   | 12   | 95     | 651      | 1932   | 17   | 14     | 252      |
| 1908   | 22   | 110    | 2008     | 1936   | 28   | 17     | 646      |
| 1912   | 28   | 102    | 2407     | 1940   | Cancelled due to WWI | 49   | 129    | 3963     |
| 1912   | Cancelled due to WWI | 29   | 156    | 2626    | 1940   | Cancelled due to WWII | 49   | 129    | 3963     |
| 1916   | Cancelled due to WWI | 1924   | 16   | 16     | 258      |
| 1920   | 44   | 126    | 3089     | 1928   | 25   | 14     | 464      |
| 1924   | 46   | 109    | 2883     | 1932   | 17   | 14     | 252      |
| 1928   | 37   | 117    | 1332     | 1936   | 28   | 17     | 646      |
| 1932   | 49   | 129    | 3963     | 1940   | Cancelled due to WWI | 59   | 136    | 4104     |
| 1936   | Cancelled due to WWII | 1944   | 28   | 22     | 669      |
| 1940   | Cancelled due to WWII | 1924   | 16   | 16     | 258      |
| 1944   | 59   | 136    | 4104     | 1952   | 30   | 22     | 694      |
| 1948   | 69   | 149    | 4955     | 1956   | 32   | 24     | 821      |
| 1952   | 67   | 145    | 3155     | 1960   | 30   | 27     | 665      |
| 1956   | 83   | 150    | 5338     | 1964   | 36   | 34     | 1091     |
| 1960   | 93   | 163    | 5151     | 1968   | 37   | 35     | 1158     |
| 1964   | 112  | 172    | 5516     | 1972   | 35   | 35     | 1006     |
| 1968   | 121  | 195    | 7134     | 1976   | 37   | 37     | 1123     |
| 1972   | 92   | 198    | 6084     | 1980   | 37   | 38     | 1072     |
| 1976   | 80   | 203    | 5179     | 1984   | 49   | 39     | 1272     |
| 1980   | 140  | 221    | 6829     | 1988   | 57   | 46     | 1423     |
| 1984   | 159  | 237    | 8391     | 1992   | 64   | 57     | 1801     |
| 1988   | 169  | 257    | 9356     | 1996   | 67   | 61     | 1737     |
| 1992   | 197  | 271    | 10,318   | 1994   | 72   | 68     | 2176     |
| 1996   | 199  | 300    | 10,651   | 1998   | 72   | 68     | 2176     |
| 2000   | 201  | 301    | 10,625   | 2002   | 77   | 78     | 2399     |
| 2004   | 204  | 302    | 10,942   | 2006   | 80   | 84     | 2508     |
| 2008   | 204  | 302    | 10,568   | 2010   | 82   | 86     | 2566     |
| 2012   | 204  | 306    | 11,238   | 2014   | 88   | 98     | 2780     |
| 2016   | 205  | 306    | 11,238   | 2018   | 91   | 102    | 2833     |
This power struggle did not last, since in 1921, at the VII Olympic Congress in Lausanne, the IOC addressed the IFs concerns, demonstrating good faith regarding a future agreement, but making clear the imposition of ‘loyalty towards the IOC’.\textsuperscript{24} In the same year, a renewed Olympic Charter was published, including a section of regulations and protocol for the Olympic games’ celebration. The role of the OCOGs was also demarcated and IFs were mentioned for the first time. However, it was not until 1924 that IFs were recognized in the Olympic Charter as part of the Olympic Movement and started being invited for Olympic Congresses. A section for General Technical Rules was added to the document to meet IFs claims, occupying nearly half of its size. Also in this Charter, the organization of the Olympic games became entrusted to the NOC of the country of the host city, which was made responsible to form an OCOG to correspond directly with the IOC. Finally, the first five fundamental principles of Olympism were listed, although completely different from today’s.

The inclusion of NOCs and IFs represented a huge step towards today’s organisation of the Olympic Movement and facilitated relations between all parties. At the IX Olympic Congress in Berlin in 1930, IFs were represented by 41 delegates, more than twice as many as had attended an Olympic Congress to that point.\textsuperscript{25} Roles of the IOC, OCOGs, NOCs, and IFs became clearly defined in the 1930 edition of the Olympic Charter, which is also the first to be written in English – demonstrating the internationalization and growth of the event. NFs were for the first time referred to as such, and gained the right to sit at congresses as part of the respective NOCs and IFs delegations. Three years later, the IOC published a further document entitled ‘The International Olympic Committee and the Modern Olympic Games’, clarifying the organization of the Olympic administration. Later in 1950, a new version of the document was published, showing an administration diagram similar to ‘The Classic Olympic System’ identified by Chappelet.

**The Growth of the Olympic City**

The concept of the Olympic city was an ideal of Pierre de Coubertin dating back to 1906 and inspired by ancient Olympia. However, it was only referred in the Olympic Charter in 1921: ‘The events must all take place in the town chosen either at the Stadium or in its neighbourhood. The only exception which can be made is in the case of nautical sports when geographical conditions shall make it necessary ….’\textsuperscript{26} The clear definition of the Olympic Movement, together with the clarification of the admissible athletes to take part in the Olympics, following the consensus on the definition of amateur athlete, led to a significant increase in the number of participating nations, from 29 in Antwerp 1920 to 46 in Amsterdam in 1928 (around 3000 athletes). Given this growth, financial issues regarding travelling and accommodation costs emerged. For that reason, in the Olympic Charter of 1930, OCOGs became responsible for the accommodation of athletes. Following that responsibility, the first genuine Olympic village was built for the Los Angeles Olympic games, in 1932, ironically the edition registering the biggest drop in the number of participants due to the Great Depression. For an inclusive price, athletes were granted
accommodation and food for the period of the games, in a village completely conceived for their needs. Consequently, the host population became more involved, constituting the workforce either for construction works or services provision.

In 1936, for the Olympic games in Berlin, the ideal of the Olympic village was upgraded to an Olympic quarter by the development of several Olympic facilities in a 130 hectare-site. The dimension of these interventions was a clear propaganda strategy by Hitler to showcase National Socialism, an initiative that resulted in an obvious preference of the IOC for an Olympic city model of this type. Therefore, later in 1949, the Committee changed the Olympic city section of the Olympic Charter to: 'The events must all take place in or as near as possible to the city chosen and preferably at or near the Stadium'. The concept of the Olympic village was also added as a mandatory requirement. In the same Charter, a new fundamental principle clearly stated that 'the honour of holding the Olympic Games is entrusted to a city and not to a country and that applications to hold the Games are made by the Mayor or other chief authority of the city concerned'. By the inclusion of this principle, the involvement of municipalities was objectively introduced and, together with the involvement of the host population, urban impacts of the event gained relevance. Such relevance was confirmed by Helsinki’s edition, in 1952, when the first Olympic park was constructed and, for the first time, the Olympic village was developed in concordance with the municipal housing plan. In the same year, in Oslo, the first winter Olympic village was built, also with post-Olympic intentions of using it for student residences, a hospital, and an elderly nursing home. However, the Olympic village did not become a tendency for subsequent winter games since populations of host cities were very small and, in some cases, local opposition from hoteliers and environmental groups prevailed. To prevent and smooth this opposition, later at the 1960 Squaw Valley games a temporary Olympic village was built for the first time.

From here on, the growth in popularity of the event led to an increasing interest of cities to bid to host the games and, therefore, the IOC began publishing an official document with 'Information for Cities which desire to stage the Olympic Games', including what would be the first Candidature Questionnaire. In this document, most probably because of the high number of United States’ cities bidding for the 1948, 1952, and 1956 summer and winter Olympics – a total of 19 bids corresponding to the period at the beginning of the Cold War – the candidatures became limited to one city by country that should have 'the approval of the Government of the country in which the city is located in order to assure its cooperation in staging the Games successfully'. Therefore, the involvement of state authorities grew from local to national, with national governments having to be officially associated with the bid. In the Olympic Charter of 1955, the IOC added that two Olympic villages should be provided, one for men and another for women, and required that they should 'be conveniently located to the stadium, other facilities and practice fields'. Three years later, new groups of stakeholders were added to the Charter: team officials, technical delegates, and officials and jury. The Olympic villages were then extended to the team officials, and accommodation and transportation arrangements became a requirement to be provided to the remaining stakeholders.
This increase of stakeholders, reflected in an increase of urban requirements, resulted in what Liao and Pitts classify as the ‘Age of Urban Transformation’, starting in 1960 and extending to the most recent editions, with host cities using the games to deliver rapid implementation of large-scale urban development plans. Consequently, local, regional, and national host authorities and communities became strictly involved in staging the games, since they collaborate in the construction of facilities, ensuring security, providing services, and organizing transport for all the remaining stakeholders. A similar period was also identified by Essex and Chalkley for the winter Olympics, but starting only in 1984, after a period when the event was hit by a series of protests regarding environmental concerns.

The Fireback of Olympic Politics

After the boost given by the editions of Rome 1960 and Tokyo 1964, the Olympics grew to a point that became so large and expensive that cities could hardly meet the stakeholder expectations. Since 1952, transportation matters were already considered essential for the winter Olympics given that competition venues were often in remote and isolated locations, with difficult access and, many times, constrained by adverse weather. However, for the summer Olympics, such problems became especially evident in the edition of 1968, in Mexico City when, because of the high investments required and the poor economic conditions of the country, the city could not afford to build the required facilities and, therefore, the organizers decided to refurbish existing venues. Such strategy led to a decentralized Olympic city model, requiring the development of different transport solutions and an extraordinary effort to provide transportation for all stakeholders.

This edition marked the beginning of a problematic period for the Olympic games, as it faced strong public opposition and triggered violent conflicts. A protest organised by students ten days prior to the opening ceremony ended up with the violent intervention of the authoritarian Mexican government, killing close to 250 people in what became known as the Tlatelolco massacre – the beginning of Mexico’s transition to democracy. The following edition at Munich in 1972 was hit by a terrorist attack, when a group of armed Palestinians invaded the Olympic village and made hostage 11 Israeli athletes, coaches, and team officials. During the rescue operation all hostages were killed, as well as a German police officer, and five of the eight terrorists. Even after these incidents, the Olympic Charter did not feature any relevant modifications in regard to security.

The Munich massacre also contributed to the cost overrun of the subsequent edition at Montreal in 1976 as, for security reasons, the IOC rejected the initial plan of building the accommodation in five different residential areas, aligned with the city’s housing plan. Thus, the location of the Olympic villages was changed to a large area of urban green reservation, resulting in local protests, delays, and a large debt. Not only because of that but also because of the expensive construction of the Olympic stadium, this edition had the largest ever cost overrun in Olympic financial history (720%). Perhaps recognising the consequences of the decision, in 1979 the IOC changed the Olympic Charter allowing, for the first time, a host city to ‘share its privilege with other cities or sites in the same country upon agreement.
of the IOC’ but, if so, additional accommodation should be provided for the participants at those cities – ‘satellite’ Olympic villages. Consequently, more local communities, authorities and entities needed to be involved in order to provide the required services.

This period was also marked by a series of political boycotts: first, in Montreal in 1976 when 22 African nations boycotted because of the ‘apartheid tour’ of New Zealand’s All Blacks rugby team to South Africa; second, in Moscow in 1980 when 65 western nations boycotted over the Soviet Union’s invasion of Afghanistan; third, in Los Angeles in 1984 when 19 Communist nations boycotted as a retaliation for Moscow. Together, these events led to a colossal decrease in the number of candidate cities for both the summer and winter Olympics between the bid periods of 1970 and 1981 corresponding to the games between 1976 and 1988. For the summer edition of 1984, Los Angeles ended up being the only candidate.

**The Rise of the Olympic Committee**

The early growth of the Olympic games pushed an increase in participation of radio and television media. From the first radio broadcasting of the Olympics in 1924 to the first television broadcasting in public spaces in 1936, the Olympics were broadcast on local television in 1948. In 1958, the Olympic Charter referred to publicity for the first time, mentioning members of the press, radio, television, and cinema, for which free access and accommodation should also be arranged. In the Olympic Charter of 1972 ‘accommodation’ was changed to ‘facilities’, sustaining the growing relevance of this new group of stakeholders. In 1974 a new chapter was added to the Charter to meet the media requirements, the ‘Radio-Television Facilities Questionnaire’ and, in 1980, the Media Press Centre (MPC) became a mandatory requirement. Media accredited members for the summer Olympics grew from around 9000 in 1984 to around 16,000 in 2000 and around 25,000 in 2008 (Figure 2). In the 1980s, the revenue derived from the media also increased significantly for the Olympic Winter Games. Attracting more audience, the games got the attention of commercial sponsors, which began to provide substantial amounts of finance to national and international sports organizations.

The edition of Los Angeles in 1984, recognizing the potential of this intense growth, took advantage of being the only candidate city to demand of the IOC that the organization of the games would follow a ‘zero public funding’ policy. As a combined result of private management, the neo-liberalist presidency of Ronald Reagan, and the exploitation of the growing revenues of Olympic commercial rights, the Los Angeles Olympics were fully financed by sponsors, broadcasters, and other private entities, including the construction of the (few) new sports venues required. This innovative ‘LA Model’ prompted the creation of the ‘TOP Programme’, in 1985, which was the strategy of the IOC to collect and control the commercial revenues derived from the games by granting exclusivity to a small set of sponsors. The success of the ‘private games’ had an immediate response in terms of cities willing to bid: from one and two candidates, respectively, for the 1984 and 1988 summer editions, in 1986 there were
six candidates for the 1992 games; for the winter Olympics, from two or three candidates between 1974 and 1981, there were seven candidates in 1986 for the 1992 edition.

In the late 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, new associations were created to represent groups of stakeholders. During the period of decolonization throughout the 1960s and 1970s the number of NOCs in the summer Olympics increased significantly from 83 in Rome in 1960 to 140 in Los Angeles in 1984. In 1979, prompted by this increase, the NOCs created the Association of National Olympic Committees (ANOC) to represent themselves and their common interests. In 1981 the IOC established the Athlete's Commission with the purpose of creating athletes' representation within the IOC organization. In 1983, three other associations were created to coordinate with the IFs: the Association of Summer Olympic International Federations (ASOIF), the Association of International Olympic Winter Sports Federations (AIOWF) and the Association of IOC Recognized International Sports Federations (ARISF). Seeing the growth of stakeholders, with different interests and representations, in 1984 the IOC found the need to create the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) to internally settle sporting disputes. CAS was first mentioned in the Olympic Charter of 1991, marking the beginning of ‘The Regulated Olympic System’ identified by Chappelet. With the increasing involvement of host communities, the growth of commercial attractiveness, and the larger number of sports stakeholders,
in 1985 the IOC added a document later known as the ‘Host City Contract’ to the Olympic Charter, in order to ensure its capability to cooperate with all the new stakeholders, and keep the games under a set of controlled core requirements.

The Olympic Charter of 1991 introduced the eligibility of professional athletes to the games. Together with the increasing role of media and sponsors, the number of athletes significantly increased, from around 6800 in 1984 to 10,300 in 1996. There was a similar trend for the winter Olympics. This obviously impacted in terms of urban requirements such as accommodation, but especially in indirect costs, that is, non-sports related costs. The difference in quantity between direct and indirect expenditure rose in the edition of Seoul 1988 and reached an isolated peak in the edition of Barcelona in 1992, which rendered the latter the title of ‘role model’ of mega event urban planning.

Following this exponential growth, in 1991 the IOC radically modified the Olympic Charter. Among changes, was the creation of the ‘Olympic Village Guide’ and the constitution of the Enquiry Commission to evaluate host city candidatures. But the most notable change lay within the Fundamental Principles of Olympism which, until then, were focused on aspects, rules, requirements, and concepts of the Olympic games. However, with the growing influence and responsibility of the Olympic games and the IOC over society, sport, and communities in general, the Principles of the 1991 Olympic Charter became focused on societal values and ethical principles such as world peace, human rights, inclusion, education, sports, and culture. The five new principles became very close to today’s seven Fundamental Principles of Olympism, even though in slightly different arrangements: Olympism and its goals were clearly defined (today’s first and second principles); the Olympic Movement was differentiated from Olympism as being the mechanism responsible to conduct it (today’s third principle), with the goal of securing human rights and upholding a more peaceful world (today’s sixth principle) and the Olympic Charter was identified as the guideline of the organization (today’s seventh principle). Today’s fourth principle, which identifies sport as a human right, was later added to the Olympic Charter in 1996.

As of this period, and utilizing the wide influence and media attention of the Olympic games, the IOC gained a new role within society, raising its voice for the values of Olympism as a way of promoting a peaceful world and helping to solve worldwide issues in general. This shift of perspective put the IOC in a wider managing role, more concerned with sports and society values and less capable of portraying an operational role in staging the games. In that sense, the 1993 Olympic Charter called for the creation of a Coordination Commission for each edition of the games, with the objective of facilitating cooperation between all stakeholders and monitoring the progress of organization of the games. Later in 1994, the Commission started including athletes and other theme-specific specialists, such as transportation advisors, and including members of previous OCOGs.

The Birth of Olympic Governance

The IOC celebrated its centenary in the XII Olympic Congress in 1994 in Paris, with attention turned to environment. At this congress, media was invited to speak for the first time, demonstrating its essential and absolute involvement with the
By the end of the 1990s, the IOC had already established strong commercial partners, attracting wide media attention and having huge influence over society and, as a result, many cities were willing to bid to host the games. But in 1998, the corruption scandal after the election of Salt Lake City to host the 2002 winter Olympics raised serious concerns about the ethics of the candidature process. At the time, it was found that members of the IOC were bribed during the bidding process, a situation that led to an investigation of similar occurrences during previous candidatures. Although occurrences of this type were reported for other editions, sanctions were applied only to some of those involved in the Salt Lake City scandal. However, the IOC recognised the flaws of the Olympic Charter regarding the ethics of the candidature process and made relevant structural changes in its administration. Thus, the Ethics Commission was created to develop and further supervise the fulfilment of the Code of Ethics, the Nominations Commission was created to check candidacies for IOC membership, and the IOC Executive Board, until then constituted only by IOC members, started including members of the Athlete’s Commission and other associations like the ANOC, ASOIF and IOWF. Also, as a consequence of the high number of cities willing to bid, the candidature became a two-phase process, with the IOC Executive Board first selecting the candidates that would be considered finalists for the final vote by the IOC Session.

At the same time as the Salt Lake City corruption scandal, concerns of European governments regarding doping use were confirmed by another scandal, the ‘doping tour’. Actions by French customs and police during the Tour de France showed that ‘drug use in cycling … was widespread, systematic, and organized … institutionalized within the structure of professional cycling’. As a response, in a collaborative effort with governments, the IOC set up the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), immediately mentioned in 1999’s Charter.

In 2004, after the wrap-up of these developments, the IOC added to its fourth Fundamental Principle the concept of good governance. Later in 2008, it published the ‘Basic Universal Principles of Good Governance of the Olympic and Sports Movement’ and, in the 2011 edition of the Olympic Charter, the concept of governance gained its own Fundamental Principle, constituting today’s fifth principle and the last modification:

> Recognising that sport occurs within the framework of society, sports organisations within the Olympic Movement shall have the rights and obligations of autonomy, which include freely establishing and controlling the rules of sport, determining the structure and governance of their organisations, enjoying the right of elections free from any outside influence and the responsibility for ensuring that principles of good governance be applied.

Although this marked the official inclusion of Olympic governance in the Olympic Charter, the concept had been expanding along with the evolution of the Olympic Movement. It evolved from the primordial foundation of a restricted club into what is now a global social movement appealing to governments of all ideological persuasions and with an important commercial capability, especially through the sales of the Olympic game’s rights and its sponsorship programmes. This concept of Olympic governance gained even more importance from 2010, in what Chappelet
describes as ‘The Total Olympic System’. ASOIF, AIOWF, and ANOC, and its continental associations controlling regional games, gained relevance as the IOC patronized more and more competitions. The United Nations, and especially the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), developed closer links with the IOC as their concerns on society and sports started aligning, particularly regarding human rights, sustainability, corruption, or anti-doping policies. This collaboration was proved by the 2005 UNESCO convention against doping, where governments signed an agreement to finance WADA. By the adoption of such international standards other external interrelationships were created with other governmental bodies like the European Union and its constituent organizations.

The Supremacy of Public Opinion

Even with great efforts to improve its governance system and appeal to all the involved stakeholders, the late 2000s and early 2010s represented, once again, a turning point for the IOC. In 1992 the UN’s Agenda 21 was published, focusing on worldwide sustainability concerns of an economic, social, and environmental nature. Earlier, the IOC had already faced sustainability criticisms regarding, for example, the planning of the 1994 Lillehammer winter games. At the time, the committee responded with the modification of plans in regard to the location and efficiency of venues, and with environmental commitments in contracts with suppliers and contractors. Throughout the process, the IOC added to the Olympic Charter of 1991 an environmental commitment for host cities and, in 1994, environment was made the third pillar of Olympism (joining sport and culture). This inspired the organisers of Sydney 2000 to commit to deliver ‘green’ games, making Greenpeace an official partner for the edition. To some extent, this was also a strategy to avoid criticisms, denoting the role of non-governmental bodies in the Olympic governance system. Later in 1999, the IOC approved its own (Olympic Movement) Agenda 21, focused in the three spheres of sustainability.

While both agendas seemed to have had an impact on environmental concerns – as shown later in Beijing 2008, which made a great effort to enhance energy efficiency – the economic and social spheres remained problematic. The term ‘legacy’ was only introduced in the Olympic Charter of 2003, after the first report of the Olympic Games Study Commission and the International Symposium of 2002. The still existing disregard for the games post-event impacts was proven by the edition of 2004 in Athens, where a series of changes in venue location, immersed in controversy, rendered many of the sports facilities the title of ‘white elephants’. Outcomes of this type compromised the theory of using the high public investment involved in hosting the games to achieve sustainable long-term legacies as, at the same time, many editions presented enormous budgets and very high cost-overruns – such as Torino 2006 or London 2012, but with Sochi 2014 as the extreme example. In a more positive perspective, the London 2012 games addressed sustainability by making maximum use of existing venues and facilities and breaking the record for the number of temporary venues. It was also the first edition to have an Olympic legacy plan in execution before the games, a concept that, afterwards, became a candidature requirement. The legacy plan was committed to producing
benefits for local populations through the regeneration of the Stratford area and the delivery of affordable housing. But the project is currently struggling to fulfil its promises. This type of social concern gained special relevance at the time of Seoul in 1988, where thousands of low-income residents were displaced from several parts of the city to make way for the event. Displacement and gentrification are recurring themes in Olympic urban projects over the last decades, being prominent in Beijing in 2008, Sochi in 2014, and Rio de Janeiro in 2016, but also present in Barcelona in 1992, Sydney in 2000, and Athens in 2004.

Although these aspects were recently aggravated by new twenty-first century societal values and concerns, they were rightly predicted by the Olympic Games Study Commission. In 2002/2003, the Commission had advised the IOC that:

The Games have reached a critical size which may put their future success at risk if the size continues to increase. Steps must be undertaken and serious consideration given to effectively manage future growth, while at the same time preserving the attractiveness of the Games. If unchecked, the current growth of the Games could discourage many cities from bidding to host the Games.

Indeed, in the last decades, the hosting of the Olympic games has been increasingly seen as controversial. The general public has raised concerns regarding the event’s unsustainability and the always present notion of elitism associated with the Olympic Movement. These concerns gained force when the hosting of the games became seen as pursuing of status led by governments, bringing the question as to whether the elites making the decisions have correctly defined what is of public interest. As a response, communities, which have until now been a silent impacted stakeholder, gained voice and became active in defence of their own interests, constituting a core resistance to the pro-games growth coalitions in bidding cities. Consequently, public petitions and referendums were crucial for the bid processes of the most recent host city elections, especially for the 2022 Winter Olympics, which saw four of the six bidding cities withdraw after public consultation. The same situation happened for the election of the host cities for the 2024 summer Olympic games.

**The Standing of the Olympic Agenda**

Globalization and innovation have become pivotal within a changing modern, diverse, and digital society, with elevated concerns about sustainability and low tolerance to totalitarianism. Given that, and in the context of the most recent Olympic developments, the IOC published, in 2014, the Olympic Agenda 2020, a guiding document aimed at driving important changes within the Olympic games and Movement and strengthen the values of Olympism in accordance with the expectations of modern society. The ideas for the recommendations were discussed by all Olympic Movement stakeholders, external experts, and the public who, by request of the IOC, submitted suggestions for issues needing further attention. The share of participation by the different stakeholders is shown in Figure 3, where a high public participation (identified as individuals) can be noted. Also interesting to note is the contribution of the academic community.
In 2015, immediately after the announcement of the Olympic Agenda, the Olympic Charter underwent important modifications. In line with the objective of promoting transparency, credibility and ethical values, a Members Election Commission was created. Also, IFs were delegated with total competence to administer their respective sports within the Olympic games. Regarding IFs, it is interesting to note that in the Olympic Charter of 2017 words like 'administration' were changed to 'governance'. Further, internationally recognized standards of governance were adopted in all of the IOC activities and a strong partnership with the United Nations was developed.

With a focus on sustainability and to promote the use of shared venues, the duration of the Olympic Games – fixed in sixteen days since 1925 – became flexible under the approval of the IOC and IFs. It also became possible to locate venues outside the host country for sustainability reasons. Later, in the Olympic Charter of 2019 a big change was made regarding the host. Until then defined as a 'host city', the host became simply a 'host', which 'in principle ... [is] a city ... [but] where deemed appropriate ... [may be] several cities, or other entities, such as regions, states or countries'. The concept of Olympic city, dating from the Olympic Charter of 1921, disappeared, as well as restrictions of venues outside the host city or country. These rules gave way to a new one, giving ‘priority ... to the use of existing or temporary venues and infrastructures’ and demanding that ‘new permanent venues or infrastructures ... shall only be considered on the basis of sustainable legacy plans’.

Some observations regarding the effects of the Olympic Agenda on urban development strategies can be made. Note that, as of May 2021, the only future summer hosts elected after its announcement were Paris, for 2024, and Los Angeles, for 2028. These two future editions are, allegedly, completely in line with the Agenda. They both managed to reduce costs by using a record number of existing and temporary facilities, with very few new permanent sports venues to be built. Also,
for Tokyo 2020, the cancellation of some planned new constructions has significantly reduced costs.66 Regarding the Olympic Winter Games, besides low numbers of new venues to be built, the Agenda has also induced the first macro-regional host in the history of the Olympic games: Milano-Cortina for 2026 in Italy.67

**The Role of Olympic Governance**

The historical periods identified in this review are evidently either driven by hosts or by other stakeholders, clearly demonstrating the relevance of the synergy between them. The first and second periods correspond to stakeholder growth that induced urban requirement changes in the Olympic Charter (1894 to 1930). In the beginning of the third period, these requirements forced an adaptation of hosts, also induced by external events (1932 to 1936). The innovative urban strategies increased the interest in the Games, which allowed the IOC to increase the Olympic Charter requirements (1936 to 1955). Consequently, media interest grew, further triggering more new requirements (1955 to 1976). In the fourth period, external events provoked by the growth of the games dictated the decrease of interest in bidding (1968 to 1984). This led to the 1984 ‘Private Games’, whose strategies recovered the interest in bidding and, consequently, changed the financing model of the Olympic Movement (1984 to 1986). In the fifth and sixth periods, the events on the stakeholders’ side induced radical changes in the Olympic Charter, which also affected hosts (1986 to 2012). The seventh and eighth periods result from a dispute between the concerns raised by public opinion and the IOC’s responses to it (2012 to 2020). As such, the events mostly occur in a ‘snowball effect’ manner, with variations in stakeholders resulting either directly in changes in the Olympic Charter or in innovations in urban strategies which, in turn, result in changes to the Olympic Charter.

Overall, these findings support Girginov’s statement regarding the fact that the Olympic games are undoubtedly a matter of governance:

1. the Games have always pursued political ideals; 2. the Games represent a development project promoting a universal normative vision of ideal with the Olympic Charter prescribing the role and conduct of the entities involved and; 3. the Games are a collective undertaking, from the bid to the legacy stage, involving multiple stakeholders.68

In the multidisciplinary world of the Olympic games, the term Olympic regards governance as an assembly of disciplines. Olympic governance emerges as a way of guiding the different stakeholders’ perspectives, into a consensual direction, through the management of other governance systems when involved in the domain of Olympism (e.g. sports, urban, corporate – Figure 4), all included in the wider system of global governance. Through the years, the coordination among Olympic stakeholders has proven to be difficult since many times their interests have not been compatible. As the leader of this governance system, the IOC has balanced the stakeholder’s trade-offs and has adapted to the stakeholders’ different needs by the amendment of the Olympic Charter and other binding documents.
Inter-Relationships between Stakeholders and Hosts: Influencers of Olympic History

This historical review resulted in the identification of eight, not necessarily subsequent, historical periods. The first was a period of foundation of the IOC and the Olympic games when no urban requirements and impacts were derived from the games – The Foundation of the Olympic Games. Then, while the Olympic Movement was being defined, the concept of Olympic Stadium emerged and a few urban requirements were added to the Olympic Charter – The Development of the Olympic Movement. Afterwards, the concept of the Olympic city gained form as governments and communities started being involved and aimed at using the event for urban development. During this period, urban strategies of the hosts strongly influenced the creation of new requirements added to the Olympic Charter – The Growth of the Olympic City. Eventually, the growth of the Olympics and its associated costs, together with national and international political manifestations and massacres, put a pause on the hosting attractiveness of the event – The Fireback of Olympic Politics. Taking advantage of this disinterest, the edition of Los Angeles 1984 leveraged from commercial rights and recovered the cities’ willingness to bid. Meanwhile, that growth in interest together with the increasing involvement of media and the commercialisation of the event, raised the role of the Olympic games and elevated the status of the IOC into a powerful world-influencing organization – The Rise of the Olympic Committee. When popularity of the IOC was at its peak, the Salt Lake City and ‘doping tour’ scandals provoked a huge decrease in trust in the Olympic Movement which, in response, made changes regarding its governance concept – The Birth of Olympic Governance. However, when the worldwide society started giving increased importance to sustainability, the IOC, while tackling the event’s

Figure 4. Stakeholder’s network in the Olympic governance system.
environmental problems, underestimated other social and economic concerns and, as a consequence, the high public investment used to pay for the event and its poorly-planned legacies started becoming relevant within society. This led local communities to claim control over the decisions of hosting the games in their cities, resulting in low willingness to bid and a consequent significant number of bid withdraws – The Supremacy of Public Opinion. Recognizing the problem and understanding the need for change, the IOC adopted the Olympic Agenda 2020 aiming at the reorganization of its governance system to increase its transparency and improve the event’s sustainability. Since its implementation, important changes in the conceptualization of the Olympic games have been adopted – The Standing of the Olympic Agenda. The future edition’s delivery plans seem to be aligning with the new rules, engaging in innovative urban strategies that refocus the games to the concept of Olympism. Only time will tell the positive and negative consequences of these changes – a ninth historical period to come: The New Olympic Games?

These findings show that Olympic stakeholders are directly linked with the urban strategies adopted to host the Olympic games and that Olympic governance has had the role of managing those impacts through the update of the Olympic Charter. According to the developed cross-referenced review, the stakeholders involved in Olympic governance impacting urban development the most are sports organisations, enterprises (media and sponsors), and hosts, each one of them having contributed to the increase of requirements. Moreover, opposite to what could be expected from an organisation connoted with an ‘elitist’ image, the actions of the IOC seem altruistic and impartial. They seemed to follow a comprehensive approach, induced by the growth of stakeholders and observing the urban strategies from hosts and selecting the innovative ones to include in the rules of the Olympic Charter.

This means that the Olympic Charter evolved ‘naturally’ and was not forced by selfish interests. For example, while the Olympic village is nowadays an extremely valued requirement, it was induced by a strategy of Los Angeles 1932; similarly, the IOC’s ‘contested’ preference for concentrated Olympic city models was induced by Hitler’s nationalist propaganda in Berlin 1936; the commercialisation of the games and the current financing model of the IOC emerged from the Los Angeles 1984 leveraging position. However, while this research gives insights on the chain of events that led to the Olympic Charter evolution and the reasons for modifications, it does not explain how the IOC dealt with the different stakeholders’ interests and negotiated such changes. Further research, targeted at the way the IOC has organized and negotiated the priorities, might certainly contribute new insights regarding the inter-relationships between stakeholders and hosts.

Nonetheless, the need to adopt the Olympic Agenda 2020 to radically correct conceptualisations and standards, in part overturns the theory of a ‘natural’ evolution. The fact is that many of the Olympic standards were adopted a long time ago, when its implementation made sense, and have been kept ever since. Until recently, the tendency of the IOC was always to continuously increase the scale of the event, mostly to increase the attractiveness of the games and match the stakeholders’ interests (media and sponsors), and seeing urban requirements as a necessity to achieve it. Consequently, the growth of the event has attracted a considerable amount of criticism from groups who see negative economic, environmental, and social
impacts derived from it. With the changes introduced by the Olympic Agenda, and after recognizing a threat to the survival of the event, the IOC acknowledged that an excess of urban requirements puts too much burden on the host, not matching the needs and interests of the host community. Therefore, the Olympic Agenda appears as a way of re-establishing the equilibrium between the purposes of the host and the needs of the other stakeholders, being triggered by a changing modern society raising their voices for their individual and collective interests.

The main challenges of the Olympic games are related not only with the structures of the organisations involved but also with the global context of the event, including its globalisation, commercialisation, and dimension. Additionally, issues of sustainability have become pivotal within the modern society bringing a new dimension to the delivery of mega events, forcing the Olympic Movement stakeholders to work together towards a new conceptualization of the games. Consequently, the challenge for Olympic governance is to coordinate all systems of governance involved in the Olympic games, guiding and coordinating all actions towards a consensual outcome. The stakeholders of each system have different interests but, ultimately they all depend on each other and on the survival of the event. Given the complex, multijurisdictional and multi-sectoral composition of the network of actors involved in Olympic governance, the IOC is responsible to act as an intermediary. This paper has shown that historically, the synergies between interested parties are very relevant and, as so, the committee shall lead through the negotiation of the overall meaning of legacy and of the policies to achieve each specific vision of it. Although in practice it may not be easy to achieve, all stakeholders shall work together in order to focus their actions on the fulfilment of the principles and values of Olympism and deliver a sustainable legacy to the worldwide society.
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