INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

Formal Background Guide and Position Sheet

Formal Session, 2027

Topic: Revocation and Reassignment of the 2028 and 2034 Olympic Games

Committee Type	International Olympic Committee Executive Session
Format	Advanced / Standard Model UN committee
Freeze Date	12 January 2027, 09:00 CET (fictional scenario)
Voting Members	15 selected IOC and Olympic Movement stakeholders
Intended Use	Delegate background guide, dais reference, and stakeholder position sheet

Note to Delegates

This guide presents a fictional 2027 Olympic governance scenario created for educational Model UN use. Real-world Olympic institutions, bidding practices, and host-city planning constraints are used as reference points, but all scenario developments in this guide are fictional and designed for simulation.

1. Committee Mandate and Agenda

The International Olympic Committee bears primary responsibility for preserving the continuity, credibility, and operational viability of the Olympic Games. In this committee, delegates must address an unprecedented governance scenario in which the IOC has revoked the host status

of both Los Angeles for the 2028 Summer Olympic Games and Utah for the 2034 Winter Olympic Games.

The central task of the committee is not to debate the Olympic movement in the abstract, but to decide what criteria and process the IOC should use to reallocate the Games. Delegates should be prepared to debate host selection criteria, venue readiness, athlete logistics, political neutrality, climate suitability, commercial guarantees, regional balance, and the reputational limits created by a dual-host collapse.

Primary agenda item: Reallocation of the 2028 Summer Olympic Games and the 2034 Winter Olympic Games.

2. The IOC Committee in 2027: Membership and Procedure

For the purposes of this committee, the IOC convenes an ad hoc emergency session composed of representatives of IOC member countries. All countries that will be represented could potentially host either the 2028 Summer or 2034 Winter Olympics.

Candidate cities, affected governments, Olympic host committees, and relevant international federations may be invited to participate without a vote.

Basic procedural reminders

- Any final host selection decision requires a simple majority of voting members unless the dais imposes a higher threshold for legitimacy.
- Consensus outcomes are politically preferable because sponsors, federations, and host governments will interpret narrow victories as a sign of institutional weakness.
- Delegates should distinguish between binding operational decisions, advisory recommendations, and political statements intended to stabilize the Olympic movement.
- The IOC may also request technical reports, venue inspections, commercial guarantee letters, and joint presentations from candidate cities.

3. Historical Background to Olympic Hosting

3.1 The Olympic host model and why timelines matter

Modern Olympic host selection has traditionally relied on long lead times. Cities usually secure the Games years in advance so they can finalize venues, transportation systems, accommodation plans, security architecture, and sponsorship coordination. The Summer Games in particular demand an unusually high level of metropolitan readiness because they involve more athletes, more venues, and a larger operational footprint than nearly any other recurring sporting event in the world.

Winter Games planning is similarly demanding, though in different ways. Winter hosts must balance sport-specific infrastructure with mountain transport, snow reliability, environmental protections, and climate resilience. A city that appears financially sound may still prove unsuitable if its winter conditions are unstable or if its venue geography makes competition schedules unworkable.

3.2 Why reassignment is so difficult

- Olympic planning requires years of contracting, staffing, test events, and broadcasting coordination.
- Host-city legitimacy depends not just on money, but on venue readiness, public support, and government guarantees.
- Reassigning a Summer Games on compressed timelines strongly favors cities with existing venues or recent Olympic legacy infrastructure.
- Reassigning a Winter Games requires special attention to snow reliability, altitude, transport corridors, and long-term climate viability.

3.3 Why this issue matters internationally

A dual Olympic host collapse would immediately affect athlete qualification planning, sponsor confidence, tourism markets, broadcasting contracts, and the credibility of the IOC itself. It would also intensify debates over whether future Olympic hosts should be selected for geographic symbolism, financial power, technical readiness, or sustainability. For this committee, the issue therefore combines governance, logistics, economics, reputation, and global diplomacy.

4. The 2027 Committee Scenario

This committee uses a fictional 2027 scenario: on 12 January 2027, the IOC announces that Los Angeles is no longer able to stage the 2028 Summer Games and that Utah is no longer able to stage the 2034 Winter Games. The IOC cites irreparable governance breakdowns, collapsed implementation confidence, and a material risk that both Olympic editions would fail to meet minimum operational standards.

4.1 Why Los Angeles 2028 was revoked

- An escalating conflict between the organizing committee, municipal authorities, and state regulators has frozen critical procurement decisions.
- Public-security planning assumptions have broken down after repeated disputes over policing, protest management, and federal cost-sharing.
- Several venue conversion timelines have slipped beyond acceptable contingency margins.
- Key sponsors and service contractors have privately warned the IOC that the delivery model is no longer reliable.

4.2 Why Utah 2034 was revoked

- Projected snowpack instability and water-stress concerns have undermined confidence in long-term winter competition planning.
- Environmental litigation has delayed mountain venue approvals and fragmented transport planning.
- State and local authorities have failed to provide a unified guarantees package on timeline, land access, and liability.
- The IOC has concluded that reputational risk would be severe if the Winter Games appeared environmentally unviable before the torch was ever lit.

4.3 Timeline to freeze date

Date / Time	Event
September-October 2026	Internal IOC review teams flag widening concerns over both Los Angeles 2028 implementation risk and Utah 2034 climate-risk assumptions.
November 2026	Contingency consultations begin with broadcasters, international federations, and major sponsors regarding possible pathways.
December 2026	Candidate backup cities are quietly asked to indicate whether existing infrastructure could support accelerated hosting.
8 January 2027	Confidential technical memoranda conclude that both existing host plans are no longer secure enough to protect Olympic delivery standards.
11 January 2027	IOC leadership notifies affected parties that a dual-revocation decision is imminent absent extraordinary guarantees.
12 January 2027, 09:00 CET	Freeze date: the IOC committee convenes to identify replacement hosts for the 2028 Summer and 2034 Winter Games.

5. Freeze-Date Situation Report

At the start of committee, the following conditions are assumed to exist:

Operational

- No replacement hosts have yet been selected for either Games.
- Broadcast and sponsorship partners are demanding an immediate path to certainty.
- The 2028 Summer Games timeline is critically compressed and strongly favors cities with proven venue stock.

Political

- Governments are lobbying heavily for regional representation and economic prestige.

- Some IOC members want the Summer Games to remain in the Americas; others argue that readiness should outweigh geography.
- Winter candidate cities are divided between traditional alpine hosts and modern legacy hosts with recent Olympic infrastructure.

Financial

- Commercial rights holders have not withdrawn, but they are signaling that prolonged uncertainty could trigger renegotiation pressure.
- Potential hosts are testing whether accelerated hosting would expose them to unsustainable public subsidy demands.
- Insurance, accommodation, and transport projections differ sharply among candidate cities.

Reputational

- The IOC is under intense scrutiny for having allowed both host plans to deteriorate so far before intervening.
- Athletes and national committees are calling for transparency and practical certainty rather than symbolic process language.
- The Olympic movement faces a credibility challenge if the committee appears politically divided or technically unserious.

6. Core Issues Before the Committee

Issue	Questions for Delegates
Selection criteria	Should the committee prioritize readiness, regional balance, political neutrality, financial guarantees, or some combination of the four?
Summer 2028 timeline	Can any new host realistically prepare for the Summer Games on compressed timelines without major venue risk?
Winter 2034 sustainability	How heavily should climate resilience and environmental credibility weigh against legacy infrastructure?
Use of legacy venues	Should recent or former Olympic hosts receive preference because they can reactivate tested facilities quickly?
Commercial confidence	What formal guarantees should be demanded from candidate cities before a final vote?
IOC legitimacy	How can the committee demonstrate that the reassignment process is rigorous rather than improvised?

Global politics	Should the Games remain in North America, or should the committee treat revocation as a chance to rebalance global prestige?
Athlete impact	How should travel, athlete village readiness, qualification schedules, and federation logistics shape the final decision?

7. Research Questions for Delegates

- What minimum technical requirements should the committee demand from any replacement Summer 2028 host?
- How should your stakeholder balance delivery certainty against geographic symbolism and political fairness?
- Would your delegation favor a recent Olympic host, a past host with legacy infrastructure, or a wealthy new host with strong guarantees?
- What financial commitments and sovereign guarantees would your stakeholder consider non-negotiable?
- How should the committee assess climate risk and environmental legitimacy in choosing a 2034 Winter host?
- What public communication strategy should accompany any final decision to restore confidence in the Olympic movement?

8. Suggested Resolution Architecture

A. Immediate process language

Establish a selection framework; define technical criteria; authorize rapid inspections; require guarantee letters from shortlisted hosts.

B. Summer 2028 pathway

Prioritize cities with existing venue networks, proven transport capacity, and minimal construction exposure; set a rapid reporting deadline for final readiness review.

C. Winter 2034 pathway

Require explicit climate and sustainability findings, mountain-venue viability assessments, and a unified government guarantees package before final award.

D. Commercial and athlete protections

Mandate continuity planning for broadcasters, national Olympic committees, and athletes; require transparent updates once hosts are selected.

E. Institutional credibility measures

Reserve the possibility of future governance reform recommendations after immediate host reassignment is completed.

9. Glossary and Source Note

Term	Meaning
Future Host Commission	IOC body tasked with evaluating potential host opportunities and advising on long-term host selection strategy.
Legacy infrastructure	Existing venues, transport systems, athlete housing, and operational systems that can be reused for future Olympic editions.
Host-city contract	The legal and operational agreement between the IOC and the selected host authorities.
Host reassignment	A fictional committee procedure in this guide under which the IOC revokes and reassigns previously awarded Games.
Venue readiness	The practical condition of competition, training, media, transport, and village facilities needed to stage the Games successfully.

Source note: Olympic governance structures, host-selection terminology, and committee design were adapted into the same educational Model UN guide structure as the previously shared background guide. All scenario developments in this guide concerning the revocation of Los Angeles 2028 and Utah 2034 are fictional and created for educational simulation.