

Factors Influencing Sponsorship vs Partnership Agreements for the International Olympic Committee

The aim of this paper is to propose research-based insights on factors behind an international sports governing body, the International Olympic Committee (IOC), forming a sponsorship agreement or partnership agreement with a prospective company. The problem to be solved is addressed as: what factors influence the IOC when concluding a sponsorship agreement versus a partnership agreement?

The theoretical part of this paper defines the concepts of governing bodies, commercial agreements and the objectives of the relevant stakeholders in the process of conducting commercial agreements. It also reviews the theories and elements of the specific types of commercial agreements: sponsorship agreements and partnership agreements. The field analysis part of the paper reviews the relevant research that has previously been conducted in this area for the IOC. The conclusion of the paper highlights the key elements of a sponsorship and partnership agreement from the perspective of an international sports governing body, and lists which are the driving factors for each agreement.

Keywords: cross-sectoral collaboration, partnership, resource sharing, sponsorship, sport's governing body.

Šio straipsnio tikslas – pasiūlyti mokslinius tyrimais pagrįstų įžvalgų apie veiksnius, darančius įtaką tarptautiniam sporto valdymo organui – Tarptautiniam olimpiniam komitetui (TOK), jam sudarant rėmimo ir partnerystės sutartį su būsima remiančia įmone. Spręstina problema – išsiaiškinti, kokie veiksniai daro įtaką TOK, jam sudarant rėmimo ir partnerystės sutartį.

Teorinėje šio darbo dalyje apibrėžiamos valdymo organų sąvokos, komerciniai susitarimai bei atitinkamų suinteresuotų šalių tikslai komercinių sutarčių sudarymo procese. Be to, apžvelgiamos konkrečios komercinių sutarčių rūšys – rėmimo ir partnerystės sutarčių – teorijos ir praktiniai elementai. Šių dokumentų lauko analizės dalyje apžvelgiami atitinkami anksčiau atlikti TOK šios srities tyrimai. Išvadose išryškunami pagrindiniai rėmimo ir partnerystės sutarties elementai tarptautinės sporto valdymo institucijos požiūriu ir išvardijami kiekvienos sutarties esminiai veiksniai.

Raktiniai žodžiai: sektorių bendradarbiavimas, partnerystė, dalijimasis ištekliais, sporto rėmimas, sporto valdymo institucija.

Introduction

Sports organizations work within business models, whilst collaborating with

stakeholders and potential investors to generate profits and further their goals (on and off the field/court of play). Therefore, sports governing bodies will

Olajide OJUAWO – Legal Counsel, Fédération Internationale de Football Association, and Master Graduate from Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania. Address: K. Donelaičio g. 52, LT-44248 Kaunas, Lithuania. Phone: +1 786 564 5208. E-mail: jidejuawo@gmail.com

Audrius ŠIMKUS – PhD, associate professor at Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Management, Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania. Address: K. Donelaičio g. 52, LT-44248 Kaunas, Lithuania. Phone: +370 37 327856. E-mail: audrius.simkus@vdu.lt

conclude commercial agreements with companies who are interested in sponsorship/partnership opportunities where the respective company provides funds and/or resources in exchange for authorisation to exploit the product/event and sporting brand with their own. However, the level of commitment and intent of the respective parties can influence the type of agreement and its stipulations. This is of current relevance due to the long-lasting impact that sports and major sporting events can have on society, therefore the impact that a sports governing body can have on a society with the assistance of prospective companies.

The research problem addressed in this paper is what factors influence a sports governing body, such as the International Olympic Committee (IOC), to decide on a corporate partner, in comparison to a sponsorship agreement, with a prospective company. **The object of this paper** is the prioritized factors in sponsorship vs. partnership agreements in the decision-making criteria for sports entities, specifically international sports governing bodies. **The aim of the paper** is to analyse the different elements in both type of agreements within the scope of the sports industry, and determine what factors were prioritized by IOC when concluding the respective agreements. The following **objectives** were set:

1. To present an overview of the concepts regarding the role of sports governing bodies, and the types of commercial agreements that they conclude with companies.
2. To discuss and analyse the theories and frameworks underlying the factors that constitute sponsorship and partnership agreements.

3. To present the factors that are prioritized by the IOC, with a practical example.

The research methods conducted for this paper focus on theoretical research. The information sources are from literature review to analyse previous methods, frameworks and past research conducted on this topic.

Key concepts within the specificities of sport

Sports governing bodies

Due to the variety of respective sporting governing body types, a definition suitable for the sake of this paper is that a "Sports Governing Body" is *"first and foremost responsible for the management of their sport and its activities within its governing area but also act as an entity that is responsible for passing judgement on disputes and enforcing those judgements"* (O'Boyle, 2012). Within this definition includes the concepts of membership, operations, legal/policy and commercial overview. A sporting governing body may be responsible for the local, regional, national or international jurisdiction, which can also be reflected in the legal entity of the sporting governing body. The size of the governing body and its respective members should impact the operations, but they all have relatively the same responsibilities, to safeguard their respective sport within their jurisdiction. These governing bodies also need to establish strategic goals and monitor them to ensure that they are satisfied, completed, and are in the best interest of

all the relevant stakeholders (i.e., players, teams, fans, investing parties, etc.). However, like corporations, sports governing bodies have evolved and so have their objectives, which can range from societal to political, due to the influence and impact that their operations can have on individuals and groups. Financially and practically, sports governing bodies typically cannot accomplish their goals and objectives alone.

The primary “products” and “services” produced by sports governing bodies

For the sake of this paper, the focus shall be on sports governing bodies with an international dimension of jurisdiction. The primary product and/or service in which international sports governing bodies provide to customers/fans are their sporting events, usually titled as the “World Championship” or “World Cup”. Over the years, these events have continued to develop and are structured as sports festivals. These events are classified as mega sporting events due to the large number of spectators, mediated reach, high costs and impact on the environment and population (Müller, 2015). The respective product may be outputted yearly, biannually or quadrennially. The product will attract fans and customers for a multitude of reasons and the value they put on their purchase, which therefore leads to the commercial opportunities for the respective governing body and other stakeholders. Companies would be interested in investing and aligning their brand/image with the sports product/service. What is noteworthy about international sports governing

bodies is that they are not structured as corporations, however some, like the International Olympic Committee, are able to generate large amounts of profit from their quadrennial products. Due to the large scale of these events, there is the potential to leave an impactful “legacy” in the host country or city. Sports governing bodies want to capitalize on that.

Role of the companies as a sports stakeholder

A continued development of sport governing bodies that are legally structured as non-profit or associations is the relevance of their primary product and using the profits to further the entire sporting ecosystem. Therefore, these entities have had to increasingly focus on the commercial aspects of the organization. The focus on commercial operations enters the prominence of sports governing bodies engaging in commercial agreements, such as sponsorship and partnership agreements, where a large portion of their funds can be generated. The objective from potential companies is for the sports governing body to agree to allow for a sponsor, endorsement or brand initiative on the sporting entities’ elements, such as: the sporting match, the sporting arena, sporting participants, and/or provide resources to be implemented into the sporting product (a world championship sports event for example) to enhance the experience. The role of the companies plays an important part within the relative sports ecosystem, along with the other main stakeholders (the media entities and the fans). In collaboration with the media entities, the

sports governing body and the prospective companies can devise media objectives and strategies in order to show, promote and attract fans to engage with the respective products and brands.

Commercial agreements

A sponsorship agreement, for the sake of this paper, may be defined as *“a business relationship in which cash or in-kind fees are paid to a property such as a sport organization or event in return for access to the exploitable commercial possibilities associated with that property”* (Takamatsu, 2022). It has been proven to be a successful way to provide financing for an organization while promoting the sporting business in other fields/industries. Sports governing bodies and the collaborating company will execute strategies to promote the brand of the company at sporting events and/or brand activations on linear television/digital outlets, for example.

In this paper, an appropriate definition for partnership agreements is *“...agreements in which two or more partners divide the commitment to reach a common objective, joining all their capacities and resources and coordinating their activities strategically and operationally”*. Therefore, a partnership is not always commercial (Franco & Hasse, 2017). The idea of sharing commitments allows for the parties in the partnership to fill “resources gaps” and the respective parties can engage and evolve.

Based on the above-mentioned definitions of sponsorship and partnership agreements, a hypothesis that can be deduced for this paper is that: From

a commercial relationship standpoint, partnership agreements can be sponsorship agreements but not all sponsorship agreements are partnership agreements.

As the operations of a sports governing body grow and expand, their operational objectives will relatively grow as well. It could be argued that the success of future initiatives by a sports governing body will not be entirely defined by the numerical value (profit), but ultimately defined by collaborations and impact.

Underlying theories of sponsorship and partnership agreements

Research approach

In this paper, the primary research that had to be completed was qualitative, with theoretical analysis. As sponsorship and corporate partnerships are conducted in a wide array of industries, there is a substantial amount of information and data that has already been analysed on this topic, which provides for copious amount of literature analysis to find the information that best applies to this paper.

The main theoretical structure is breaking down the elements and parts that encompass the commercial agreements between sports entities and a company to ultimately determine what are the common factors, themes, objectives, correlations and aims of said agreements. The research design of this paper was focused on exploratory design, where analysing qualitative methods and models help to comprehend the vision and strategy of sport governing bodies when engaging in commercial agreements with companies.

Along with literature analysis, the empirical research was conducted based on case assessments. Previous research in relation to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) was analyzed.

Theoretical research of sponsorship agreements

The relationship between sponsors and sport entity

When conducting a sponsorship agreement, the parties are forming a contractual relationship where the intentions are stipulated. In the context of this paper, the relationship is established between a sport organization and a company where they can share benefits through sports events and teams (Takamatsu, 2022). Therefore, from the company's perspective, they are seeking brand awareness, image transfer and platforms, while the sport organization is looking to gain financial, media and in-kind benefits.

The research from the author Takamatsu found that past research of sport sponsorships can be classified into five streams:

1. *Nature of sponsorship* – identifying definition and characteristics.
2. *Managerial aspects of sponsorship* – analysing corporate motivations and sponsorship objectives.
3. *Measurement of sponsorship effects* – examination of communication and sponsorship effects.
4. *Strategic use of sponsorship* – investigating strategies and counter strategies.
5. *Legal and ethical considerations in sponsorship* – legal restrictions and tax implications.

A major takeaway from the five streams is that the success of a sponsorship agreement in sports may ultimately be quantifiable because the objective of the sports organization is financial gain, and the goal of the sponsoring company is related to positive aspects relating to their brand and its connectedness to the audience through a sports outlet. In these five streams, the aspect of “length” does not appear to be a driving factor.

Specific research has been conducted and focused on the adaptability of sponsorship agreements to have goals for both parties. This is because of the view that for a sports organization, sponsorships can be channels of supplementary funds to allow the organization to develop its activities and objectives (Dumitru, 2014).

This has led to a modern theory within sports sponsorship named the “triangle of publicity” which focuses on the objectives of three groups:

1. The sponsor – beneficiary of image capital through sports, thus becoming its supporter.
2. The event – the channel of transmitting the promotional information and reception of feedback.
3. The direct or indirect public – the target of the effort of promotion.

It seems that the theory of the “triangle of publicity” in the context of sports sponsorship is that of the relationship between the sports organisation and the sponsoring company: the exchange of money for the communication tools (such as a sports event) that allow the company to communicate directly with the public. The sport organization's image can be further enhanced due to the collaboration with the specific companies. What is important in the “triangle

of publicity” is that the Sports governing body has an event (or service) that is used as the medium to transmit the message and brand of the sponsoring company. Having a sports event is a prerequisite for the sponsorship agreement to be fruitful.

An imperative aspect of the sponsorship agreement relationship is that the sport governing body needs to have a product and/or service that may be marketed and communicated, which is of interest to companies who can see the benefits of associating their brand with it. Both parties have a tangible object that is being provided to the counterparty.

Theoretical research of partnership agreements

The five main dimensions of partnership

Similar to sponsorship agreements, empirical research led to a conclusion that partnership agreements contain specific aspects which provide for additional value for the respective parties. The author Ronald McQuaid theorized that partnership agreements contain five main dimensions, which are (McQuaid, 2000):

1. What the partnership is seeking to do, i.e. what is the purpose and is it strategic or project driven?
2. Who is involved, i.e., the key actors and the structure of the relationships in the partnership.
3. When? i.e. the timing or stage of development of the partnership process and the changing relationships and activities over time.
4. Where? i.e., the spatial dimension.

5. How are the activities carried out? The implementation processes?

The element of resource-sharing

Within the empirical research phase for this term paper, research had been conducted regarding partnership agreement and it was determined that there is not always a monetary trade off. In some instances, the partnership could be organizational and the sharing of resources and information. Research by Mario Franco and Heiko Hasse theorized that “*A partnership concerns agreements in which two or more partners divide the commitment to reach a common objective, joining all their capacities and resources and coordinating their activities strategically and operationally*” (Franco & Hasse, 2017). My takeaway from this theory is that the “common objective” may not necessarily lead to direct funds being passed from one party to another in exchange for positive brand engagement at an event. This is connected to the notion of “resources sharing” which was defined as “*filling resource gaps, access to complementary resources are the most prominent reasons for engaging in inter-organisational partnerships*”. Value can be generated by both parties, not just from a financial aspect but also human and organizational. Practically, new products and services can be formed, as well as dual oversight over these new products and services.

It appears that there are perspectives on the differences between a sponsorship agreement and partnership agreement, as well as the overlapping aspects of the agreements. From the analysis of theories and research by authors in this field, there is a difference on the commitment,

which can be presumed begins from the financial input. This is a logical conclusion because it could be rationally assumed that the higher the financial commitment that a company provides a sporting organization, the higher degree the intent on the relationship, and the higher degree that relationship will be prioritized.

Theoretical research on the semantics of sponsorship vs partnership

Due to the overlap of obligations that may stem from the different form of commercial agreements between a sports entity and prospective company, it can lead to the query as to whether there is a difference between the factors, implications and effects of these type of agreements for a sporting entity. Terry Lefton analysed this aspect, as over the last couple decades “sponsorship” and “partnership” may be utilised as synonyms (along with the words “collaboration” and “relationship”), which has led to sporting entities renaming their sponsorship departments to something along the lines of “partnership development department” (Lefton, 2022). Moreover, due to the marketing aspect of said agreements, perhaps “marketing partnership” is an ideal term to encompass all forms of commercial agreements within the scope of sporting entities leasing their intellectual property or licensing products/services to companies, and the prioritized factors of all the agreements is the same? As Lefton recalls from an interview with Bill Sutton, former vice president of the NBA marketing and business operations, “*It became easier* [for a prospective

company] *to sell internally when they were asking their company to fund a partnership rather than a sponsorship – and it implied a higher level of benefits*”.

The takeaway from the discussion of the appropriate vernacular to use for a respective agreement is that the aspect of funds should impact the importance and positioning of the respective agreement in comparison to agreements that a sports governing body would sign with other companies. Furthermore, if an agreement between two parties obligates further responsibilities outside of managing funds and proprietary products and services, should the agreement holder greater value if it is named as a partnership rather than a sponsorship agreement?

A common theme in these forms of commercial agreements is the notion of cross-sectoral collaboration, which encompasses a party’s expansion into a new sector (Martorell et al., 2020). The contractual parties are creating a network and are attempting to seek success in other fields that may potentially be full of competitors. It can be argued that whether it is a sponsorship agreement or partnership agreement, there is a cross-sectoral aspect regardless of the exchange of money or products. This may lead to the assumption that, in practice, both agreements have the same application.

Christina Herrick states that “*Partnerships are relationship-driven, where each entity shares in promotion*” (Herrick, 2015). However, it may be argued that sponsorships can ultimately be relationship driven and is imperative to their success, on both sides.

To conclude this section of the paper, it was important to analyse whether the above-mentioned theoretical perspectives can be adopted for solving the problem. The answer is that they can, as the theories may be applied to the specificities of sports and international sports governing bodies. The main specificity being that these forms of agreements are prevalent in sports and attached to the respective sporting event that a sports entity is in charge of. The theories identify the objective and goals for each party of the agreement, which illuminate what factors are mandatory and considered important for the success of said agreement.

Sponsorship and partnership agreements by the IOC

This section will apply the findings to research and case studies relevant to determining the factors that sports governing bodies, such as the IOC, hold as important and/or vital when conducting sponsorship and partnership agreements with prospective companies, or if there is a difference.

A difficulty when reviewing previous research is the lack of research conducted in this area from the perspective of sports governing bodies, specifically international entities. The sporting entities that tend to be analysed in previous research are sports teams/clubs, not the ultimate governing body in which the respective team or club operates under. Moreover, previous research has attempted to determine what are the impacts and expectations for a company whose aim is for brand engagement and

awareness at sporting events, as well as the co-creation and initiatives that can be formed with said sporting entity.

Therefore, it was not only important to review research conducted on this topic relative to the sports industry, but as well as the research conducted from the perspective and viewpoint of not-for-profit sports governing bodies with global governance.

Empirical research: International Olympics Committee (IOC)

The International Olympics Committee (IOC) is the international governing body of Olympic events, headquartered in Lausanne, Switzerland. The primary product/service/event produced by the IOC are their mega sports events, the Summer and Winter Olympic games, each event taking place in a different city every four years. Over the decades, authors have researched the IOC and their corporate sponsors and partnerships, with some analysed in this section for a practical approach to the above-section theories. A relevant aspect of the previous research conducted on this topic is the dissection of the IOC's The Olympic Partner (TOP) Sponsor Program.

The Olympic Partner Sponsors Program – the TOP Program

The IOC concludes agreements with companies located in the jurisdiction of the respective Olympic Event, and also with worldwide partners that tend to be multinational corporations. But do

all these sponsorship and partnership agreements have the same factors, elements and objectives? This would appear to not be the case, and the differentiations can be seen in the formation of the IOC Top Program.

The TOP program was established in 1985 by the IOC with the objective to “...add another dimension to the organization’s existing organizational support model” by attempting to further the societal impact of the Olympics (Fairfield-Sonn, 2022). They select specific sponsorship allies, who would then be considered partners, that are deemed committed to the idea of producing long-term shared value. This implies that a deeper level of commitment would be required from these companies towards the IOC. The goal of the IOC is that the companies who would make up the members of the TOP program were committed to assisting in furthering the IOC’s sustainability-focused strategy, which was the impact that they had on society (DeRychke & DeBosscher, 2019). This would include objectives and initiatives focused on enhanced societal impacts on: fighting against doping, gender equality, legacy, refugees, and sustainability (International Olympic Committee, 2022). As author Fairfield-Sonn phrased it, these companies would assist the IOC in their double-bottom line goals: money and social mission.

Along with the sponsorship and intellectual property exclusivities that the IOC would provide to the TOP program members, it would appear that factors the IOC put focus on were the length of commitment by the prospective company, and the access to their resources, products, technology and operational

support (Kang & Stolar, 2011). Each TOP member would be provided exclusivity in a certain aspect of the Olympic event (i.e., Food, E-Commerce, Audio/Video, Vehicles, etc.) and received additional benefits such as: access to Olympic archives, Olympic merchandise and premiums, and first right of negotiation.

Data collection by Fairfield-Sonn found that the initial members to the Top Program, also known as the companies for Cycle 1 from 1985-1988 for the Summer Olympics in Seoul and Winter Olympics in Calgary, were: Coca-Cola, Brother, Federal Express, Kodak, Matsushita, Philips, Time/Sports Illustrated, Visa and 3M. All multinational corporations. By 2010 the members grew to 14, with some of the original members staying, but new members including Alibaba Group, Toyota and Intel. To date, the financial contributions by a TOP member to IOC is over \$100 million each, and they have obligations to assist the IOC’s societal impact initiatives. Some examples of these initiatives are the following: Toyota introducing new innovative mobility solutions to vehicles for helping with the transport of athletes and officials at the 2020 Olympics, General Electric’s innovative healthcare treatment for athletes, and Proctor & Gamble’s program to recognize athletes for good acts (Fairfield-Sonn, 2022).

From analysing the previous research and data compiled on the IOC’s TOP program, it can be deduced that there are direct and indirect factors that go into IOC’s selections that differentiate the TOP partnership agreements in comparison to the many sponsorship agreements that the IOC would conclude with other companies. Three

main direct factors appear to be: 1. The financial commitment; 2. The ability to co-create with the IOC and 3. The length of the commitment (at least 4 years). An interesting, yet significant, indirect factor that would appear to be important for IOC's partners is the size, equity and goodwill of the corporate partner. In order for a company to be able to provide the financial commitment, along with all the additional resources that would be required for cross-sectoral collaboration, the partners would seem to have to be large multinational entities that have the capacity to fulfil their commitments to the IOC.

Research has also been conducted from the opposite approach and looking into the factors that influence the decision of a company to participate in the TOP program. This research can be important for the paper as it will help identify the factors that the prospective company takes into consideration when deciding whether to become a TOP member. It may be logically concluded that part of the decision-making process by the company would be taking into account the obligations and commitments requested from them by the IOC. Besides the financial commitment, the IOC communicated that corporations had the opportunity to *"...leave a long-lasting company legacy in the communities where they do business through the Olympic Games"* (Kang & Stolar, 2011). Another factor for the IOC is the ability for the company to protect the Olympic image. Even though the Olympic games and participation takes place in one region, it is viewed by fans and customers worldwide, meaning that the Olympic image, which the IOC

wishes to promote, is perceived and experienced globally.

With the initiatives of the IOC being output at the global level, a partner would need to have a similar type of reach. As mentioned at the beginning of this paper, international sports governing bodies tend to be non-profit organizations, but factors for a corporate partnership extend to the profitability of the respective partner, as well as the intangible success that can be created through co-creation, and allowance of said company to have a certain degree of decision making regarding their participation and exclusivity category.

Sponsorship and partnership with McDonalds

In order to provide a thorough analysis on the factors behind the choice of sponsorship vs partnership for an international sports governing body such as IOC, it would be important to analyse the expectations that the IOC would have for a sponsoring company who is not part of the TOP program. An example of this dynamic is that of the IOC's relationship with the corporation McDonald's.

McDonald's is a successful multinational corporation that has become synonymous with the food category "fast food". However, for decades the corporation has been involved in sponsorship initiatives in other sectors, such as sports.

McDonald's had been a sponsor of the IOC since 1976 (Dewey, 2018), contributed a vast amount of money, and eventually became a member of the TOP Program with exclusivity of the global

retail food operations sponsorship category. In 2017, it was announced that the IOC and McDonald's had mutually agreed to terminate the latter's membership from the TOP Program (International Olympic Committee, 2017). The practical impact can be viewed in the difference between McDonald's brand visibility in the Olympic events before and after the announcement. For example, among Olympic themed television commercials and signage in the sporting arenas, the 2016 Summer Olympics in Rio de Janeiro had two new restaurants in the Olympic Village and park where free Big Mac burgers and McNuggets were served to the Olympic athletes (Partlow, 2016). However, for the 2018 Winter Olympics, the brand awareness for McDonalds considerably dropped as the partnership had been scaled back dramatically and McDonalds only ran advertisements, using the Olympic intellectual property in Seoul (Dewey, 2018).

As we understand the goals and factors that the IOC prioritizes for their partnership agreements, it can be argued that no longer was McDonald's considered a partner, and the collaboration was downgraded to a sponsorship relationship, where the goals for both parties was now the corporation providing funds to the IOC in exchange for exploiting their brand with the Winter Games, strictly within the country in which the Olympic event was hosted. One could also argue that this may have been necessary for the legitimacy of the IOC's societal missions as McDonalds is perceived as a company that may not have similar values to the Olympics and the idea of living a healthy lifestyle.

The case study of McDonalds' relationship with the IOC may provide

credibility to the notion that "sponsorship" and "partnership" are semantics, and the name of the agreement is not as relevant as the practical impact of the relationship. However, in the Olympics Marketing Fact File of 2022, differentiation is made between their Partners (TOP members) and companies taking part of the Olympic Games Domestic Sponsorship programme, which allows companies to participate in sponsorship and marketing initiatives within the host country or territory only (International Olympic Committee, 2022), which can have as many as six-times more the amount of companies involved compared to the exclusive TOP program. The geographical impact of an IOC partner vs sponsor is apparent. It would also appear that the objectives that IOC places on partners is much greater than that of a sponsor.

As a subtopic, the United Kingdom's McDonald's website state their commitment to *"...providing free opportunities, for children of all abilities aged 5-11, to participate and receive qualified football coaching in their local area. As a result, we are unable to undertake additional sponsorship initiatives as our football coaching programmes account for all of our sports sponsorship activation"* (McDonalds, 2018). Within that statement contains the phrase "sponsorship activation", however there are elements which favour that of partnership, specifically coaching programmes pertaining to sports relationships at a national level. This is an example of the reach expectation that a sporting governing body would factor in for their partner or sponsor. McDonalds is now a sponsor to the IOC but a partner to the governing bodies of football within the United

Kingdom. The expectations of their co-creation and input to the IOC post-2018 versus towards the football governing bodies in the United Kingdom are different, and this could probably be explicitly seen by the updated contractual relationships with the respective sporting entities.

Conclusions

An overarching takeaway from the research conducted is that international sports governing bodies make a distinction between a corporate sponsor and a corporate partner, with the latter having a greater investment and commitment to the sports governing body. These additional factors would be specified and required in their partnership agreements.

It can be concluded that there are four driving factors that sports governing bodies take into account when negotiating a sponsorship agreement where there is a potential benefit to them:

1. Attracting funds.
2. Having a product(s)/service(s) of commercial interest to the prospective sponsoring company.
3. Top-down monitoring of the implementation of the sponsorship agreement (strategic relationship).
4. Measurements to quantify the additional value and benefits received by both parties.

In relation to partnership agreements, the four factors mentioned above are indeed important for both the sports governing bodies and the companies, because ultimately the partnership agreement will

contain and stipulate similar obligations, but the following factors are additional:

1. The size, reach and positioning of the prospective company.
2. The higher level of funds raised.
3. Value creation with the partner that goes beyond funds, typically social impact initiatives.
4. Sharing resources internally (for operations) and/or externally (for initiatives and projects).
5. Governance, which may be less top-down and more dynamic (communicative relationship).

The following companies are official partners of the IOC as of 30 December 2022: Airbnb, Alibaba, Allianz, Atos, Bridgestone, Coca-Cola, Deloitte, Omega, Panasonic, Proctor & Gamble, Samsung, Toyota, Visa and Intel.

The list of governing body partners above reflects the conclusions of the research, as each company listed has the financial means and resources to meet all the factors that the governing body would consider important in a partnership agreement. They are all companies with a strong position in their respective industries and the ability to provide significant sponsorship funds and resources that could be used internally or externally by the sport governing body to promote CSR initiatives and co-creation at a global level. The resource-sharing element should be emphasised, as products and services of commercial interest will be defined within the parameters of the sponsorship, but the partnership strategy may also include initiatives that may come to fruition through co-creation at a later stage. The governance of these projects may be top-down or bottom-up, through the staff responsible

for the implementation of such co-creation or through the respective partner with category exclusivity. “Partnership involves cooperation, i.e., “working or acting together” (McQuaid, 2000).

Although trust and commitment are necessary for both forms of agreements, there is a higher degree in the partnership agreement due to the higher degree of interaction and mixing of both entities (Franco & Hasse, 2017).

References

1. Cambridge Dictionary (2022). Governing Body. Internet access: <<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/governing-body>> [accessed April 23, 2024].
2. De Rycke, J., De Bosscher, V. (2019). Mapping the Potential Societal Impacts Triggered by Elite Sport: A Conceptual Framework // *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*. Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 485–502. doi: 10.1080/19406940.2019.1581649
3. Dewey, C. (2018, February 9). Olympic Athletes Love McDonald's. But Its Role in PyeongChang Will Be the Smallest in Decades. *Washington Post*. Internet access: <<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/work/wp/2018/02/09/olympic-athletes-love-mcdonalds-but-its-role-in-pyeongchang-will-be-the-smallest-in-decades/>> [accessed April 23, 2024].
4. Dumitru, L., Nichifor, F. (2014). Contemporary Dimensions of Sports Sponsorship // *Timișoara Physical Education & Rehabilitation Journal*. Vol. 7, No. 13, p. 133. doi: 10.1515/tperj-2015-0023
5. Fairfield-Sonn, J. W. (2022). Enhancing the Societal Impact of the Olympics: An Interorganizational Partnership Approach // *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*. Vol. 23, No. 1. doi: 10.33423/jmpp.v23i1.4978
6. Franco, M., Haase, H. (2017). Success Factors in University Sport Partnerships: A Case Study // *EuroMed Journal of Business*. Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 87–102. doi: 10.1108/EMJB-04-2016-0011
7. International Olympic Committee (2017, June 16). IOC and McDonald's Mutually Agree to End Worldwide TOP Partnership. Internet access: <<https://olympics.com/ioc/news/ioc-and-mcdonalds-mutually-agree-to-end-worldwide-top-partnership>> [accessed April 29, 2024].
8. International Olympic Committee (2022). Olympic Marketing Fact File. 2022 Edition. Internet access: <<https://stillmed.olympics.com/media/Documents/International-Olympic-Committee/IOC-Marketing-And-Broadcasting/IOC-Marketing-Fact-File.pdf>> [accessed April 23, 2024].
9. Kang, K. J., Stolar, D. (2011). An Investigation of Factors Influencing Decision Making for Participation in the Olympic Partners Sponsorship: A Case Study of Samsung // *International Journal of Applied Sports Sciences*. Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 225–250. doi: 10.24985/ijass.2011.23.1.225
10. McDonalds (2018, May 21). What Sports Do McDonald's Sponsor? McDonalds, United Kingdom. Internet access: <<https://www.mcdonalds.com/gb/en-gb/help/faq/what-sports-do-mcdonald-s-sponsor.html>> [accessed April 29, 2024].
11. McQuaid, R. W. (2000). The Theory of Partnership: Why Have Partnerships? / In *Managing Public-Private Partnerships for Public Services: An International Perspective*, ed. S. P. Osborne. – London: Routledge, pp. 9–35. Internet access: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291300642_The_theory_of_partnership_Why_have_partnerships> [accessed April 29, 2024].
12. Müller, M. (2015). The Mega Event Syndrome: Why So Much Goes Wrong in Mega-Events Planning and What to Do About It // *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 81, No. 1, pp. 6–17. doi: 10.1080/01944363.2015.1038292
13. O'Boyle, I. (2012). Corporate Governance Applicability and Theories Within Not-for-Profit Sport Management // *Corporate Ownership & Control*. Vol. 9, Iss. 2, pp. 335–342. Internet access: <<http://www.virtusinterpress>.

- org/IMG/pdf/10-22495_cocv9i2c3art3.pdf> [accessed April 29, 2024].
14. Partlow, J. (2016, August 12). Olympic Athletes Are Gorging Themselves on Free McDonald's. Washington Post. Internet access: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/the_americas/olympic-athletes-are-gorging-themselves-on-free-mcdonalds/2016/08/12/25f0eb35-5a26-4bdb-8643-123855fb0430_story.html> [accessed April 23, 2024].
 15. Rim, H., Yang, S.-U., Lee, J. (2016). Strategic Partnerships with Nonprofits in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): The Mediating Role of Perceived Altruism and Organizational Identification // Journal of Business Research. Vol. 69, No. 9, pp. 3213–3219. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.02.035
 16. Takamatsu, S. (2022). The Relationship Between Sponsorship Objectives and Sport Team Reputation Among Sponsor Companies: An Exploratory Study Focusing on Sponsors of a Japanese Professional Women's Volleyball Club // Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science. Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 252–268. doi: 10.1080/21639159.2021.1914128

The paper submitted: June 10, 2024

Prepared for publication: August 30, 2024

Olajide OJUAWO, Audrius ŠIMKUS

VEIKSNIAI, DARANTYS ĮTAKĄ TARPTAUTINIO OLIMPINIO KOMITETO RĖMIMO IR PARTNERYSTĖS SUTARČIŲ SUDARYMUI

S a n t r a u k a

Dinamiškame tarptautiniame sporto valdymo pasaulyje derybos dėl rėmimo ir partnerystės sutarčių yra pagrindiniai mechanizmai, kuriais siekiama užtikrinti finansinius išteklius ir skatinti strateginius aljansus. Šiame straipsnyje nuodugniai išnagrinėti skirtingi rėmimo ir partnerystės susitarimų būdai, paaiškinta jų reikšmė sporto valdymo srityje. Išanalizuota literatūra, apimanti tiek sporto vadybą, tiek platesnes verslo disciplinas. Daug dėmesio skirta šių susitarimų skirtumų niuansams ir tam, kaip šie skirtumai atitinkamai veikia finansinį tvarumą ir suinteresuotų šalių dalyvavimą sporto valdymo srityje.

Tyrimas atskleidžia skirtingus rėmimo ir partnerystės susitarimams būdingus tikslus, struktūras ir galimus rezultatus. Nors rėmimo sutartys pirmiausia apima finansinę paramą mainais už prekės ženklo pristatymą ir rinkodaros galimybes, partnerystės susitarimai apima platų bendradarbiavimo, išteklių dalijimosi ir strateginio derinimo slenksį. Pagrindinis šio diskurso tikslas yra pripažinti pagrindinį vaidmenį ir atsakomybę, kurią prisiima partnerių įmonė, palyginti su remiančia įmone.

Sporto organizacijos dirba pagal verslo modelius, bendradarbiaudamos su suinteresuotomis šalimis ir potencialiais investuotojais, siekdamos uždirbti pelno ir siekti savo tikslų (žaidimo aikštėje ir už jos ribų). Todėl sporto valdymo organai su įmonėmis, kurios domisi rėmimo arba partnerystės galimybėmis, sudaro komercines sutartis, kai

atitinkama įmonė skiria lėšų ir (ar) išteklių mainais už leidimą panaudoti produktą arba renginį ir savo sporto prekės ženklą. Tačiau atitinkamų šalių įsipareigojimo ir ketinimų lygis gali turėti įtakos susitarimo tipui ir jo sąlygoms. Šiuo metu tai aktualu dėl ilgalaikio poveikio, kurį sportas ir dideli sporto renginiai gali turėti visuomenei, taigi, ir dėl poveikio, kurį visuomenei gali turėti sporto valdymo organas, padedamas būsimų remiančių įmonių. Šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjama tyrimo problema – išsiaiškinti, kokie veiksniai daro įtaką sporto valdymo organui, pavyzdžiui, Tarptautiniam olimpiniam komitetui (IOC), sprendžiant dėl korporatyvinio partnerio, palyginti su rėmimo sutartimi su būsima remiančia įmone. Šio darbo objektas – prioritetiniai rėmimo ir partnerystės susitarimų veiksniai pagal sporto subjektų, ypač tarptautinių sporto valdymo organų, sprendimų priėmimo kriterijus. Darbo tikslas – išanalizuoti skirtingus abiejų tipų sutarčių elementus sporto industrijos srityje ir nustatyti, kuriems veiksniams TOK suteikė pirmenybę, sudarydamas atitinkamas sutartis. Užsibrėžti šie uždaviniai:

1. Apžvelgti sporto valdymo organų vaidmens sąvokas ir komercinių sutarčių, kurias jie sudaro su įmonėmis, tipus.

2. Aptarti ir išanalizuoti veiksmų, darančių įtaką rėmimo ir partnerystės sutarčių sudarymui, teorijas ir pagrindus.

3. Praktiniu pavyzdžiu pristatyti veiksnius, kuriems TOK teikia pirmenybę.

Šiam darbui atlikti tyrimo metodai buvo nukreipti į teorinį tyrimą. Informacijos šaltinis – literatūros apžvalga, skirta ankstesniems metodams, sistemoms ir ankstesniems šia tema atliktiems tyrimams išanalizuoti.

Šio straipsnio tikslas – suteikti vertingos informacijos apie motyvus, suvokimą ir tikslus, kurie apima tarptautinių sporto valdymo organų sprendimų priėmimo procesą ir jų komercinius sutartinius santykius su būsimomis remiančiomis įmonėmis, pasiūlyti moksliniais tyrimais pagrįstų įžvalgų apie veiksnius, darančius įtaką tarptautiniam sporto valdymo organui – Tarptautiniam olimpiniam komitetui (IOC), jam sudarant

rėmimo ir partnerystės sutartį su būsima remiančia įmone. Spręstina problema yra išsiaiškinti, kokie veiksniai daro įtaką TOK, jam sudarant rėmimo ir partnerystės sutartį.

Teorinėje šio darbo dalyje apibrėžiamos valdymo organų sąvokos, komerciniai susitarimai bei atitinkamų suinteresuotų šalių tikslai komercinių sutarčių sudarymo procese. Be to, apžvelgiamos konkrečios komercinių sutarčių rūšies – rėmimo ir partnerystės sutarčių – teorijos ir elementai. Šio straipsnio analizės dalyje apžvelgiami atitinkami anksčiau atlikti TOK šios srities tyrimai.

Darbo išvadoje išryškinami pagrindiniai rėmimo ir partnerystės sutarties elementai tarptautinės sporto valdymo institucijos požiūriu ir išvardijami kiekvienos sutarties esminiai veiksniai.

