

The Sports Political Power Index 2023-2025

Poul Broberg, pbr@dif.dk, Director of Public Affairs

Nina Skyhøj Babore, nsko@dif.dk, Head of International Affairs

Peter Gottlieb, pgo@dif.dk, Project Manager

Lars Hestbech, lhe@dif.dk, Communications Consultant

Marlene Dalsgaard Wiberg-Jørgensen, mawi@dif.dk, International Trainee

Report Title

The Sports Political Power Index 2023-2025

Primary author

Marlene Dalsgaard Wiberg-Jørgensen, mawi@dif.dk, International Trainee

Publisher

DIF – National Olympic Committee and Sports Confederation of Denmark

House of Sport, Brøndby Stadion 20, DK – 2605 Brøndby

T: +45 46262626

E: dif@dif.dk

W: www.dif.dk

Reproduction of this report is permitted only with clear references to the source.

Table of contents

Background	4
Purpose	4
Methodology	5
Definition of terms	5
Which international federations are included?	6
Executive boards	7
Weighting of international influence on representation	7
Methodological considerations	9
The Global Power Index	9
No significant changes within the top 10	11
International profiling - top 4 countries	12
Continents	13
Positions gained and lost - athletes play a role	15
The European Power index	18
Denmark	19
Denmark - global ranking and positions	19
Denmark - in Europe, the North, and Scandinavia.	20
Denmark compared with other Nordic countries	20
Denmark compared to Scandinavia	21
Danish profiles	22
Do Olympic medals influence high rankings in the Power Indexes?	23
Danish Olympic medals	24
Conclusions	26
Important notes	27
Appendix	28

Background

The 2025 edition marks the seventh publication of the Sports Political Power Index by the National Olympic Committee and Sports Confederation of Denmark (NOC Denmark). The Index has been published biennially since 2013, with previous editions released in 2015, 2017, 2019, 2021 and 2023.

Over the past twelve years, both the publications and the underlying data have undergone significant digital development. Compared with the baseline report from 2013, the data collection and analysis process has become increasingly digitised. All calculations are now carried out using Tableau data analysis software, enabling an automated and transparent approach to ranking countries based on individually weighted positions.

The Sports Political Power Index measures the international influence of countries within the field of sport. The database underlying this report includes data from 130 international and European sports federations and organisations.

Since the first publication in 2013, the Sports Political Power Index has been used to compare countries and regions across the world. This comparative perspective was also the original purpose of developing the Sports Political Power Index. NOC Denmark has consistently taken its own ranking in the Index into account when shaping its international advocacy efforts and developing its international strategy over time.

Compared with previous editions, this seventh publication places an even stronger emphasis on profiling current representatives in leading positions. In addition, it explores how different strategic approaches related to gender, age and professional background may influence countries' rankings and highlights considerations that countries may take into account when assessing their own positions.

A digital version of the report is available on the NOC Denmark website, where countries can access and review their respective rankings.

Purpose

The purpose of the Sports Political Power Index is twofold.

First, the Index provides an overview of Denmark's position within international sports politics and enables comparisons of strengths and weaknesses with countries of different sizes and operating under different conditions.

Second, the Index helps identify which countries hold the greatest political influence within the international sports arena and it supports NOC Denmark in assessing and refining its international political strategy.

By strengthening its international position, NOC Denmark seeks to engage with a broad range of countries and alliances to identify emerging challenges and shifts in the balance of power within international sport. The Sports Political Power Index serves as a tool for detecting such patterns and developments.

Furthermore, the Index makes it possible to analyse key variables and themes relevant to the contemporary sports political environment and to compare these with findings from previous editions, thereby identifying potential changes over time.

Methodology

Ensuring comparability across editions is a central objective of the Sports Political Power Index. To maintain consistency over time, the methodology applied in previous reports has been replicated for the 2025 edition. This applies both to the overall methodological approach and to the weighting system used to allocate points to each country.

The report includes a visual overview of the international sports federations represented in the Index. This is followed by a description of the executive bodies included and the criteria determining which positions are counted towards a country's overall score.

In addition, the weighting system applied to different positions is described and illustrated in detail in order to provide transparency and clarity regarding the allocation of points.

Definition of terms

Profiling plays a central role in this report, making it important to clarify the terms and criteria applied.

In this report, **gender** has been recorded using the categories "men" and "women". It is acknowledged that gender identities exist beyond these two categories.

Athletic background refers exclusively to representatives who have competed at elite level in national, international or Olympic competitions. This definition ensures

that athletic experience, including medal achievements, can be compared consistently across the dataset. Recreational or amateur-level participation is therefore not included. For the purposes of this report, elite level is defined as participation in national championships as a minimum.

Age averages presented in the tables are based on information obtained from publicly available online sources.

Which international federations are included?

The Sports Political Power Index measures the international influence of countries based on their positions in 130 federations and organisations using the following criteria.

- International and European federations that the 62 federations in NOC Denmark are members of. It should be noted that after the data was collected, another federation (padel) joined NOC Denmark bringing the number to 63 federations. The padel federation is therefore not yet included as a part of the Power Index data.
- International and European federations representing an Olympic sport at the International Olympic Committee (IOC).
- Members of the Association of IOC Recognized International Sport Federations (ARISF).
- IOC, the European Olympic Committee (EOC), the International Paralympic Committee (IPC), and the Association of National Olympic Committees (ANOC).

Although the index originated within NOC Denmark and its 62 national sports federations, every effort has been made to avoid a Denmark-centric approach.

Every Olympic sport is represented, as are all members of ARISF, which represents 42 sports, and has achieved a sustained dialogue with the IOC through membership. Their members also constitute a meaningful representation of the major international sports.

In addition to international sports federations, the index also includes IOC members and the executive boards of the IOC, EOC, IPC and ANOC. The Olympic Games are by far the largest sporting event, and IOC plays a defining role in shaping the framework for international sports activities, including funding, media exposure and political impact. Consequently, the IOC is included in this index despite its lack of federal structure.

Executive boards

Executive boards hold the primary decision-making authority within international and European sports federations and therefore constitute a key factor when assessing a country's political influence in sport. This report records the nationality of executive board members and weights their influence, as outlined below.

Two criteria were applied when selecting individuals for inclusion in the Index. Representatives must:

- (1) be a member of the executive board or the highest governing body of the federation
- (2) be entitled to vote within that body.

IOC members are assumed to have the capacity to influence international sports policy, and their nationalities are therefore included in the ranking. Similarly, the nationalities of executive board members and presidents of federations are recorded.

In most cases, the governing bodies selected are formally designated as executive boards or executive committees. Where official documentation on a federation's website did not clearly specify voting rights—for example, whether honorary members or the secretary generals were entitled to vote—federations were contacted directly for clarification. Minor deviations may nevertheless occur due to ambiguities in the statutes of certain federations.

The data for this edition were collected during September and October 2025 and are compared with data collected in September and October 2023, December 2021, September and October 2019, September and October 2017, August to October 2015, and May to July 2013. It is therefore possible that some federations have held general assemblies and elected new executive boards after the data collection period.

Weighting of international influence on representation

To provide a realistic picture of the relative political power of countries within international sport, the Sports Political Power Index recognises that different positions carry different levels of influence. For example, holding a position as an IOC member is considered to carry greater weight than serving on the executive board of a smaller European sports federation.

To generate a meaningful ranking of countries' international influence, the Index applies a weighting scale to the various international positions included. It should be noted, however, that any weighting system is inherently subject to judgement. A fully

comprehensive assessment would require qualitative analyses of each federation and an evaluation of their respective influence.

For the purposes of this report, NOC Denmark has applied the following weighting system when analysing the collected data.

Position	Weight (1-10)
President of the IOC	Factor 10
Member of the IOC	Factor 6
<i>Member of the IOC Executive Board</i>	<i>Extra factor 2</i>
President of the EOC	Factor 7
Member of the EOC	Factor 5
President of ANOC	Factor 7
Member of ANOC	Factor 6
President of FIFA	Factor 9
Member of FIFA	Factor 7
President of UEFA	Factor 6
Member of UEFA	Factor 4
President of an International Olympic Federation	Factor 8
Member of an International Olympic Federation	Factor 6
President of a European Olympic Federation	Factor 5
Member of a European Olympic Federation	Factor 3
President of an International non-Olympic Federation	Factor 4
Member of an International non-Olympic Federation	Factor 2
President of a European non-Olympic Federation	Factor 2
Member of a European non-Olympic Federation	Factor 1

Table 1: Weighting system used to analyse the collected data

The following criteria were applied in the weighting process:

1. Based on the assumption that federations with Olympic status exert greater influence than non-Olympic federations in terms of funding and media exposure, Olympic federations are weighted higher.
2. Based on the assumption that greater economic turnover corresponds to greater influence, federations with larger economies are weighted higher.
3. Based on the assumption that higher levels of media interest indicate greater influence, federations with more extensive media coverage are weighted higher.

4. Federations with a larger number of members receive a higher weighting.
5. Greater political impact results in a higher weighting.
6. As football is widely regarded as the most popular sport in the world, FIFA and UEFA are weighted higher than comparable international and European federations of similar size.
7. Readers are encouraged to actively engage in discussions regarding the weighting system. The system should not be regarded as infallible, but rather as an analytical tool that enables an estimation of a country's political power in sport. As such, the weighting system provides a quantitative basis for qualifying discussions of political influence within international sport.

Methodological considerations

A precise replication of the data collection process applied in 2013 has been challenging, primarily due to two factors.

First, the number of members serving on the executive boards of certain federations has changed over time.

Second, the structure of the Olympic sports programme evolves continuously, leading to changes in both the number of Olympic sports and the organisational structure of the relevant international federations.

As a result, direct comparisons of point totals for individual countries between the earliest editions of the Index and later editions should be interpreted with caution. Comparisons are more reliable when focusing on changes in countries' relative positions over time rather than on absolute point differences.

The Global Power Index

There are two indexes within the Sports Political Power Index. The Global Power Index is calculated based on each country's representation in international/global federations. It is important to note that representation in European federations is not included in the calculation of points for the Global Power Index. A separate European Power Index is presented later in the report.

Global Ranking	Country				
1	United States 409 (1) -	57	Kuwait 28 (64) + 7	112	Bosnia & Herzegovina 9 (New)
2	Australia 242 (2) -	-	Tunisia 28 (69) + 12	-	Iceland 9 (119) + 7
3	France 235 (3) -	59	Uzbekistan 26 (83) + 24	114	Botswana 8 (154) + 40
4	Great Britain 221 (5) + 1	-	Bulgaria 26 (49) - 8	-	Gambia 8 (119) + 5
5	Italy 219 (4) - 1	-	Latvia 26 (52) - 5	-	Georgia 8 (108) - 4
6	Japan 193 (6) -	-	Singapore 26 (49) - 8	-	Guam 8 (119) + 5
7	China 170 (8) + 1	-	Taiwan 26 (58) - 1	-	Iraq 8 (108) - 6
8	Canada 169 (7) - 1	64	Fiji 22 (58) - 4	-	Monaco 8 (83) - 31
9	Germany 163 (9) -	65	Kenya 20 (70) + 5	-	Namibia 8 (154) + 40
10	New Zealand 149 (12) + 2	-	Venezuela 20 (79) + 14	-	Syria 8 (108) - 6
11	Switzerland 130 (17) + 6	-	Lithuania 20 (71) + 6	-	Trinidad and Tobago 8 (83) - 31
12	Spain 128 (10) - 2	-	Mali 20 (68) + 3	123	Bahrain 7 (104) - 19
13	Sweden 127 (13) -	-	Nigeria 20 (43) - 20	-	Barbados 7 (119) - 4
14	South Korea 114 (11) - 3	-	Ukraine 20 (46) - 17	-	Laos 7 (115) - 8
15	Brazil 108 (14) - 1	-	Lebanon 20 (100) + 35	-	Mauritania 7 (New)
16	Egypt 107 (18) + 2	72	Djibouti 19 (119) + 47	-	Montenegro 7 (81) - 42
17	Argentina 95 (19) + 2	73	Afghanistan 18 (75) + 2	-	Turks and Caicos Islands 7 (New)
18	South Africa 95 (14) - 4	-	Cuba 18 (55) - 18	-	
19	Hungary 89 (21) + 3	-	Madagascar 18 (119) + 46	-	Vanuatu 7 (115) - 8
20	Czech Republic 80 (22) + 2	-	Sudan 18 (119) + 46	130	Bangladesh 6 (119) - 11
21	Turkey 79 (29) + 8	77	Ghana 16 (81) + 5	-	Bhutan 6 (119) - 11
22	Austria 78 (23) + 1	-	Hong Kong 16 (93) + 17	-	Bolivia 6 (119) - 11
23	Greece 73 (31) + 8	-	Luxembourg 16 (100) + 24	-	Burkina Faso 6 (119) - 11
24	Finland 70 (20) - 4	-	Mongolia 16 (83) + 7	-	Burundi 6 (119) - 11
-	Thailand 70 (34) + 10	-	Puerto Rico 16 (58) - 18	-	Cabo Verde 6 (119) - 11
26	India 68 (37) + 9	-	Senegal 16 (66) - 10	-	Cook Islands 6 (93) - 37
-	Poland 68 (29) + 3	-		-	Ethiopia 6 (119) - 11
-	Norway 68 (26) -	-	Uganda 16 (69) - 7	-	El Salvador 6 (New)
29	Belgium 65 (32) + 3	84	Cyprus 15 (80) - 4	-	Grenada 6 (119) - 11
30	Mexico 64 (28) - 2	-	Azerbaijan 14 (83) - 1	-	Honduras 6 (119) - 11
31	Romania 63 (33) + 2	-	Cameroon 14 (69) - 15	-	Malawi 6 (119) - 11
-	Russia 62 (16) - 16	-	Iran 14 (151) + 67	-	Micronesia 6 (119) - 11
33	Qatar 61 (25) - 8	-	Israel 14 (63) - 21	-	Nauru 6 (119) - 11
34	Netherlands 60 (23) - 11	-	Jordan 14 (83) - 1	-	Nicaragua 6 (New)
35	Denmark 59 (36) + 1	-	Kazakhstan 14 (58) - 26	-	San Marino 6 (104) - 26

36	United Arab Emirates 56 (26) - 10	-	Niger 14 (108) + 24	-	South Sudan 6 (119) - 11
37	Malaysia 51 (41) + 4	-	Panama 14 (108) + 24	-	Seychelles 6 (119) - 11
-	Morocco 51 (35) - 2	-	Sri Lanka 14 (154) + 70	-	Tanzania 6 (New)
39	Ireland 49 (37) - 2	94	Aruba 12 (83) - 11	-	Zambia 6 (119) - 11
40	Colombia 47 (39) - 1	-	Côte d'Ivoire 12 (83) - 11	150	Virgin Islands 4 (154) + 4
41	Dominican Republic 42 (52) + 11	-	Indonesia 12 (75) - 19	151	Benin 2 (104) - 47
42	Serbia 41 (42) -	-	Jamaica 12 (93) - 1	-	Moldova 2 (100) - 51
43	Slovenia 37 (51) + 8	-	Kyrgyzstan 12 (119) + 25	-	Togo 2 (New)
-	Philippines 37 (55) + 12	-	Lesotho 12 (93) - 1		
-	Saudi Arabia 37 (43) -	-	Malta 12 (108) + 14		
46	Algeria 36 (40) - 6	-	Pakistan 12 (83) - 11		
-	Zimbabwe 36 (96) + 50	-	Papua New Guinea 12 (93) - 1		
48	Portugal 34 (47) - 1	-	Rwanda 12 (119) + 25		
49	Paraguay 33 (47) - 2	-	Sao Tome and Principe 12 (93) - 1		
50	Chile 32 (58) + 8	-	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines 12 (119) + 25		
51	Costa Rica 31 (43) - 8	-	Liechtenstein 12 (119) + 25		
-	Uruguay 31 (55) + 4	107	Ecuador 11 (104) - 3		
53	Croatia 30 (52) - 1	108	Macao 10 (New)		
-	Guatemala 30 (75) + 22	-	Mauritius 10 (100) - 8		
-	Palau 30 (75) + 22	-	Belarus 10 (64) - 44		
-	Peru 30 (66) + 9	-	Slovakia 10 (83) - 25		

Table 2: The Global Sports Political Power Index.

The number following each country name indicates the total number of points in the 2025 Global Index. The number in brackets shows the country's position in the 2023 Global Index. Countries highlighted in bold are those that have experienced the greatest movement in the ranking. The symbol following the 2023 position (+ or -) indicates the number of positions gained or lost compared with the previous report from 2023.

No significant changes within the top 10

The United States remains ranked as the number one country in the Global Power Index. The United States is more than 100 points ahead of the second-ranked country, Australia. Compared with the previous edition from 2023, the United States has increased its total score by 85 points, rising from 324 points in 2023 while retaining its leading position.

2023		2025	
1	United States	1	United States
2	Australia	2	Australia
3	France	3	France
4	Italy	4	Great Britain
5	Great Britain	5	Italy
6	Japan	6	Japan
7	Canada	7	China
8	China	8	Canada
9	Germany	9	Germany
10	Spain	10	New Zealand

Table 3: Top 10 countries in the 2023 and 2025 Global Sports Political Power Index.

When examining Table 3, it is evident that the top three countries remain unchanged. It is also noteworthy that three different continents are represented within the top three. Europe is represented by four countries, North America and Asia by two countries each, and Oceania by one. In addition, New Zealand has entered the top 10, replacing Spain.

In line with the report's focus on profiling as both a potential explanation for the rankings and a tool for future international strategies, it is therefore relevant to examine the profiles of the top four countries in more detail.

International profiling - top 4 countries

Profiles 2025	1. United States	2. Australia	3. France	4. Great Britain
Representatives	80	56	81	74
Women	28	15	12	30
Men	52	41	69	44
= Female representation	35%	27%	15%	40%
Former Athletes	58	30	54	48
Administrative background	22	26	27	26
= Athlete representation	72%	53%	67,5%	65%
Age average	59 years	56 years	58 years	63 years

Table 4: Comparison of the profiles representing the top four countries in 2025

Interestingly, Table 4 illustrates how France stands out in several respects. First, France has the lowest level of female representation among the top four countries. It is also

important to note that France has the highest number of representatives overall, which should be taken into account when comparing France with the other countries shown in Table 4.

In contrast, France and the United States have the highest number of representatives with an athletic background, while Australia has the lowest. This is partly related to Australia having the smallest overall number of representatives; nevertheless, Australia remains the second most powerful country internationally.

Average age varies only marginally across the four countries, with Great Britain having the oldest group of representatives, though only slightly older than that of the United States. In addition, Great Britain displays the most balanced gender distribution, with more than twice as many women represented compared with France.

Continents

In addition to the Global Index presented in Table 2, it is also relevant to examine developments across continents.

Continent	Points 2023	Points 2025	Difference in points
Europe	3549	2529	- 1020
Asia	865	1205	+ 340
North America	805	885	+ 80
Africa	559	691	+ 132
Oceania	444	482	+ 38
South America	361	413	+ 52

Table 5: Development across continents from 2023 to 2025. The numbers in bold indicate the highest point total compared with the other year. In addition, the difference in points between 2023 and 2025 is shown in a separate column (+/- points).

As shown in Table 5, Europe is the only continent to have lost points since 2023. In contrast, Asia is the continent that has gained the most points since the previous report. Furthermore, there is a clear gap between Asia and Africa, with Africa ranking second in terms of points gained. In addition, African countries have regained most of the positions lost between 2021 and 2023 and are now positioned close to their 2021 levels.

Although no African country appears in the top 10 of the Global Index, countries from the continent have recorded some of the most significant upward movements in the rankings. Zimbabwe, Tunisia, Djibouti, Madagascar, Sudan, Niger, Rwanda, Botswana and

Namibia are among the countries that have gained 10 or more positions. By contrast, Nigeria, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire and Benin have lost 10 or more positions.

In line with the report's focus on profiling, this section examines whether changes have occurred in the proportion of male and female representatives within the African countries concerned. These developments are presented in the following table, which highlights the countries that have gained the most positions.

	2023	2025
Zimbabwe	Female: 1 Male: 1	Female: 2 Male: 3
Tunisia	Female: 1 Male: 3	Female: 1 Male: 5
Djibouti	Female: 1 Male: 0	Female: 2 Male: 1
Madagascar	Female: 0 Male: 1	Female: 1 Male: 2
Sudan	Female: 0 Male: 1	Female: 0 Male: 1
Niger	Female: 0 Male: 2	Female: 0 Male: 3
Rwanda	Female: 1 Male: 0	Female: 1 Male: 1
Botswana	Female: 1 Male: 0	Female: 1 Male: 1
Namibia	Female: 1 Male: 0	Female: 1 Male: 1

Table 6: Gender representation among African countries in the Global Sports Political Power Index. The table shows the number of female and male representatives in African countries that have risen by 10 or more positions from the 2023 to the 2025 edition of the Sports Political Power Index.

Table 6 highlights that with each additional woman appointed to executive boards, the proportion of male representatives either remains unchanged or increases. The number of African countries with no female representation has decreased since 2023 and now stands at two countries in 2025.

Positions gained and lost - athletes play a role

In addition to Table 2, the following Table 7 highlights the countries that have gained or lost the most positions in the Global Index since the previous edition in 2023. In line with the report's focus on profiling, the table also illustrates changes in gender composition, professional background and average age for each country.

Country	Female	Male	Former athletes	Age Average
Sri Lanka + 70	1 (1)	2 (0)	2 (1)	58 (55)
Iran + 67	0 (0)	5 (2)	4 (2)	53 (52)
Zimbabwe + 50	1 (1)	3 (1)	1 (1)	51 (50)
Djibouti + 47	1 (1)	1 (0)	2 (1)	53 (58)
Madagascar + 46	1 (0)	2 (1)	3 (1)	48 (53)
Sudan + 46	0 (0)	3 (1)	3 (1)	48 (30)
Namibia + 40	1 (0)	1 (1)	2 (1)	60 (60)
Botswana + 40	1 (1)	1 (0)	2 (1)	51 (45)
Lebanon + 35	1 (0)	4 (3)	1 (2)	56 (62)
Kyrgyzstan + 25	1 (0)	1 (1)	2 (1)	36 (29)
Rwanda + 25	1 (1)	1 (0)	2 (0)	54 (67)
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines + 25	0 (1)	2 (1)	2 (1)	57 (41)
Uzbekistan + 24	2 (0)	3 (3)	2 (1)	53 (60)
Luxembourg + 24	1 (0)	9 (7)	7 (0)	57 (59)
Niger + 24	0 (0)	3 (2)	2 (0)	58 (65)
Panama + 24	2 (1)	1 (1)	3 (1)	51 (47)
Guatemala + 22	2 (1)	5 (4)	3 (2)	69 (62)
Palau + 22	4 (2)	0 (0)	3 (2)	52 (57)
Hong Kong + 17	1 (0)	5 (4)	2 (2)	60 (52)
Venezuela + 14	1 (1)	5 (4)	1 (2)	55 (51)
Malta + 14	2 (1)	3 (3)	2 (2)	54 (61)
Netherlands - 12	8 (6)	30 (30)	5 (4)	54 (58)
Cameroon - 15	1 (1)	2 (2)	1 (2)	55 (61)
Ukraine - 17	3 (4)	7 (9)	3 (3)	53 (53)
Russia - 16	7 (8)	12 (23)	3 (11)	54 (57)
Cuba - 18	2 (2)	1 (3)	3 (4)	53 (69)
Puerto Rico - 18	2 (1)	2 (3)	1 (1)	56 (64)
Bahrain - 19	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)	59 (57)
Indonesia - 19	1 (2)	1 (1)	1 (1)	47 (56)
Nigeria - 20	1 (2)	3 (4)	2 (0)	59 (59)
Slovakia - 25	6 (5)	3 (3)	2 (3)	52 (51)
Kazakhstan - 26	0 (0)	3 (5)	0 (0)	60 (61)
San Marino - 26	0 (0)	2 (2)	0 (0)	65 (65)
Monaco - 31	0 (0)	2 (3)	1 (2)	61 (63)
Trinidad and Tobago - 31	2 (2)	0 (1)	1 (1)	58 (62)
Cook Islands - 37	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (1)	62 (58)
Montenegro - 42	0 (0)	4 (3)	2 (1)	56 (57)
Belarus - 44	2 (4)	1 (3)	1 (2)	56 (61)
Benin - 47	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)	46 (66)
Moldova - 51	1 (1)	0 (1)	1 (1)	27 (53)

Table 7: Countries with the greatest gains and losses in ranking positions since the 2023 edition. The number of positions gained or lost is shown next to each country's name. The table is colour-coded, with green indicating the top 10 countries that have gained

positions, yellow indicating countries with moderate gains or losses, and red indicating the top 10 countries that have lost positions. The number in brackets shows each country's position in 2023.

When examining the top ten countries that have gained the most positions, an athletic background among representatives appears to have a positive effect. The opposite tendency can be observed among the countries that have lost the most positions. Overall, average age varies only marginally, generally remaining within the 50s across countries. However, it may be argued that younger representatives are more prevalent among the top-performing countries than among lower-ranked countries.

Regarding gender composition, the addition of female representatives appears to have a positive effect among the top ten countries in Table 7, whereas the opposite trend is observed among countries that have lost positions. Nevertheless, male representatives continue to constitute the majority. Overall, Table 7 indicates several factors that may contribute to positive or negative changes in ranking positions.

The European Power index

In the European Power Index, **both** international/global and European federations are included.

European ranking	Country (2025 European ranking)		
1	France 336 (1)	25	Serbia 69 (24)
2	Great Britain 319 (4)	26	Bulgaria 45 (26)
3	Italy 293 (2)	27	Latvia 44 (28)
4	Germany 242 (3)	28	Luxembourg 39 (36)
5	Spain 187 (5)	29	Lithuania 34 (30)
6	Sweden 179 (6)	30	Ukraine 31 (27)
7	Switzerland 160 (9)	31	Iceland 29 (29)
8	Hungary 132 (10)	32	Cyprus 28 (30)
9	Austria 125 (12)	33	Georgia 24 (35)
-	Netherlands 125 (8)	-	Slovakia 24 (32)
11	Turkey 123 (14)	35	Malta 22 (37)
12	Norway 115 (11)	36	Estonia 21 (39)
13	Greece 113 (13)	37	Liechtenstein 12 (43)
14	Belgium 110 (17)	38	Albania 10 (46)
15	Finland 104 (14)	-	Belarus 10 (32)
16	Czech Republic 103 (14)	40	Andorra 9 (41)
-	Portugal 103 (18)	-	Bosnia & Herzegovina 9 (New)
18	Poland 98 (20)	42	San Marino 9 (43)
19	Denmark 96 (21)	43	Monaco 8 (40)
20	Romania 91 (19)	-	Gibraltar 6 (43)
21	Croatia 84 (22)	45	Faroe Islands 3 (48)
22	Russia 80 (7)	46	Moldova 2 (42)
23	Ireland 77 (22)	47	North Macedonia 1 (46)
24	Slovenia 75 (25)	-	Armenia 1 (49)

Table 8: The European Sports Political Power Index. The number following each country name indicates the final point total. The number in brackets shows each country's ranking in the European Index in 2023.

As shown in Table 8, France is ranked first after adding 19 points since the previous European Power Index and therefore remains the leading European nation. In addition, the same top five countries have dominated recent editions of the European Index, with the exception of Russia, which ranked fifth in the 2021 report.

It is also notable that both France's and the United Kingdom's rankings in the European Index differ from their respective positions in the Global Index. As illustrated in Table 4, Great Britain has a female representation rate of 40 per cent among its representatives, whereas France has a corresponding rate of 15 per cent. When considering other

profiling factors, such as athletic background and average age, the two countries appear largely similar.

Furthermore, Luxembourg and Albania are among the European countries that have gained the most positions since the 2023 report. By contrast, Russia has experienced by far the largest decline in rankings since 2023, reflecting a negative development following the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

Denmark

Denmark - global ranking and positions

Even though Denmark has experienced a substantial decline in positions compared with the 2019 report, it did gain one position in 2025. In 2023, Denmark was ranked 36th, but in the 2025 report it ranks 35th.

After 2017, Denmark saw a decrease in the number of representatives, from 29 in 2019 to 22 in 2021 and 21 in 2023. The different representatives are visualized in Table 9.

Federation	2023	2025
European Olympic federation members:	8	9
European non-Olympic federation members:	1	2
European Olympic federation presidents:	0	2
European non-Olympic federation presidents:	1	0
International Olympic federation members:	5	7
International non-Olympic federation members:	3	2
International Olympic federation presidents:	1	0
International non-Olympic federation presidents:	1	1
UEFA Executive Committee members:	1	1
Total	21	24

Table 9: Development in Danish-held positions from the 2023 report to 2025.

As shown in Table 9, Danish representation within European Olympic Federations and International Olympic Federations stands out compared with the other categories. The fact that these federations have Olympic status has a significant impact on the total number of points compared with non-Olympic federations.

Overall, there has been a slight increase in Danish representation, with 24 positions recorded in the 2025 report. As the number of representatives directly affects

Denmark’s final ranking in the Global Power Index, the development in the Danish ranking since the first Sports Political Power Index in 2013 is as follows:

2013: 33

2015: 25

2017: 23

2019: 21

2021: 34

2023: 36

2025: 35

It should also be taken into account that Denmark recently lost one of its most significant positions, following Poul-Erik Høyer’s resignation as President of the Badminton World Federation in late April 2025. As a result, Denmark currently holds no positions as president of an International Olympic Federation, as reflected in Table 9. Nevertheless, Denmark has still recorded an overall increase in the number of positions.

Denmark - in Europe, the North, and Scandinavia.

As shown in Table 9, Denmark has gained one position since 2023. With the additional position, Denmark moves closer to its highest European ranking, achieved in 2021, when it was ranked 14th with 90 points. It should be noted, however, that twice as many European countries are represented in the 2025 edition compared with 2021.

Denmark compared with other Nordic countries

Northern countries represented in the data	European Index ranking 2025 + (Points)	Global Index ranking 2025 + (Points)
Sweden	6 (179)	13 (127)
Norway	12 (115)	26 (68)
Finland	15 (104)	24 (70)
Denmark	19 (96)	35 (59)
Iceland	31 (29)	113 (9)
Faroe Islands	45 (3)	Only present in the European Index
Total Nordic points	526	333
Per country	87,6	66,6

Table 10: Overview of Scandinavian rankings in both the Global and European Indexes. The number in brackets indicates each country's point total in the respective index for 2025.

As shown in Table 10, Sweden is by far the highest-ranking Nordic country. Furthermore, Table 11 below suggests a correlation between Scandinavian profiles and their respective Nordic rankings presented in Table 10.

Denmark compared to Scandinavia

When developing an international strategy, countries often compare themselves with peers of similar size and structure. This is also the case for Denmark, which frequently benchmarks its performance against the other Scandinavian countries. When comparing Sweden, Norway and Denmark, it is important to consider the differences in the size of their respective National Olympic Committees (NOCs). It is also relevant for Denmark to compare both profiles and rankings with these countries, as Sweden and Norway currently outperform Denmark in both the Global and European Indexes.

2025	Sweden	Norway	Denmark
Members	42	30	24
Women	22	11	9
Men	20	19	16
= Female representation	52%	37%	37%
Former athletes	20	22	8
Administrative background	22	8	16
= Athlete representation	49%	76%	33%
Age average	62	59	56

Table 11: Profiles in Sweden, Norway and Denmark in 2025.

When comparing the Scandinavian countries presented in Table 11 with their respective Nordic rankings in Table 10, Sweden stands out in several respects. Most notably, Sweden demonstrates a strong gender balance, with women accounting for 52 per cent of its representatives.

Furthermore, both Sweden and Norway have a higher proportion of representatives with an athletic background than Denmark, which may partly explain why they rank

higher in both the Global and European Indexes. It is also noteworthy that Norway's position differs between the European and Global Indexes, suggesting that the presence of former athletes among its representatives may be a contributing factor.

Danish profiles

When comparing Denmark with other countries, it is also relevant to examine whether there have been changes in Danish profiles compared with previous reports.

Year	Women	Men	Age average	Athletic background	Global ranking
2017	7	27	51	18 of 34	23
2019	6	23	52	15 of 29	21
2021	7	15	51	9 of 22	34
2023	5	16	54	7 of 21	36
2025	8	16	56	8 of 24	35

Table 12: Development in Danish profiles and global rankings from the 2017 report to the 2025 edition.

As shown in Table 12, Denmark has moved from having almost 50 per cent of its representatives as former athletes to approximately one third in 2025. In both 2017 and 2019, a higher proportion of representatives with an athletic background coincided with higher rankings. Notably, in 2019, former athletes constituted a larger percentage than in any other year presented in Table 12, and 2019 also marked Denmark's highest global ranking.

The average age has increased slightly over the years in parallel with changes in ranking positions, although it has consistently remained within the 50s. As the total number of representatives has declined, it is natural that the number of both male and female representatives has decreased accordingly. Furthermore, the three additional positions gained since 2023 are held by female representatives. Looking at the overall development across the years, a consistent imbalance between male and female representation remains evident.

Do Olympic medals influence high rankings in the Power Indexes?

As noted earlier in the report, the top 10 countries in the Global Power Index have remained relatively stable over the years. In line with the report's focus on profiling, it is also relevant to examine whether a country's Olympic performance influences its global power ranking.

Table 13 presents the 10 countries with the highest total number of Olympic medals and compares their rankings in the Global Power Index in 2019 and 2025. By comparing data from 2019 and 2025, both the Summer and Winter Olympic Games held during this period are taken into account. This approach also makes it possible to identify any broader trends over time.

Nation	Gold medals	Silver medals	Bronze medals	Total all Olympics	Power ranking 2019	Power ranking 2025
United States	1229	1000	876	3105	1	1
Soviet Union	473	376	355	1204	Not Present	Not present
Germany	384	419	408	1211	5	9
China	384	281	235	900	10	7
Great Britain	325	351	359	1035	3	4
France	312	336	392	1040	2	3
Italy	299	278	308	885	4	5
Russian Federation	290	243	246	779	7	31
Sweden	233	245	262	740	12	13
Japan	229	220	241	690	8	6

Table 13: Top 10 countries by total Olympic medals compared with their rankings in the 2019 and 2025 Sports Political Power Indexes.

Australia, Canada and New Zealand were among the highest-ranked countries in the 2025 Global Power Index but are not included in the list presented in Table 13. Conversely, Sweden is the only country that ranks outside the top 10 most powerful countries in both 2019 and 2025 while still being among the nations with the highest total number of Olympic medals overall.

Overall, most countries have declined by one position in the Power Index between 2019 and 2025. The comparison between the 2019 and 2025 editions allows for an

assessment of potential effects following the most recent Olympic Games in Paris 2024, which took place between these two reporting years. It is therefore relevant to compare the top 10 performing countries in the Paris 2024 Summer Olympics with their respective rankings in 2019 and 2025. With these rankings in mind, the following section presents the countries that won the highest number of medals in Paris 2024.

Country	Total medals Olympics 2024
United States	126
China	91
Japan	45 (More gold medals than the countries ranked below)
Australia	53 (More gold medals than the countries ranked below)
France	64 (More gold medals than the countries ranked below)
Netherlands	34 (More gold medals than the countries ranked below)
Great Britain	65
South Korea	32 (More gold medals than the countries ranked below)
Italy	40
Germany	33
New Zealand	20

Table 14: Ten countries that won the most medals at the 2024 Summer Olympic Games

In line with the Global Power Index, Table 14 shows that the United States continues to lead. The only two countries that do not appear in both Table 2 and Table 14 are the Netherlands and South Korea. A similar pattern is observed when comparing the 2019 Power Index rankings, with New Zealand being the only additional country not represented among the top 10 countries that year.

Danish Olympic medals

As noted earlier in the report, Denmark achieved its highest global ranking in 2019. It is therefore relevant to compare the number of Olympic medals won by Denmark at the 2016 Summer Olympic Games in Rio de Janeiro with the medals won at the 2024 Summer Olympic Games in Paris. In addition, the number of medals won at both Olympic Games can be compared with Denmark’s Global Power Index rankings since 2019.

Medals won in Summer Olympics	Global Power Rankings
2016: 16	2019: 21
2020: 11	2021: 34, 2023: 36
2024: 9	2025: 35

Table 15: Olympic medals won by Danish athletes at the 2016, 2020 and 2024 Olympic Games compared with Denmark's Power Index ranking in the subsequent year.

It is important to note that a longer period elapsed between the 2016 Summer Olympic Games and the subsequent Sports Political Power Index in 2019 than between the 2024 Summer Olympic Games and the 2025 edition of the Index. This allows for more developments during the earlier period that may have influenced Denmark's ranking in 2019.

In 1998, Denmark won its only Winter Olympic medal, when the Danish women's curling team secured a silver medal. As the first Sports Political Power Index was published in 2013, the 1998 Winter Olympic Games are not included in Table 15, although they remain noteworthy in a historical context.

Overall, Table 15 suggests a parallel development between a decline in Olympic medals won and lower subsequent rankings in the Sports Political Power Index.

Conclusions

- The United States remains the most powerful country for the seventh consecutive edition
- The top three positions remain unchanged
 - The top five consist of the same countries, with Great Britain and Italy having exchanged positions.
 - New Zealand has secured a place in the top 10, replacing Spain.
 - Otherwise, the top 10 includes the same countries as in the previous edition.
- Europe is represented by four countries in the top 10, while North America and Asia are each represented by two, and Oceania by one.
 - France remains the highest-ranked European country in the European Index.
- African countries have collectively gained a significant number of ranking positions since 2023.
- An athletic background among representatives appears to have a positive impact on a country's ranking.
- Gender composition does not appear to have the same level of impact as athletic background; however, among the countries that have achieved the largest increases in ranking positions since 2023, the addition of female representatives appears to have had a slight positive effect.
 - Conversely, several of the countries that have lost the most positions have also experienced a decline in female representation.
- Denmark gains positions in both the Global and European Indexes.
 - Denmark moved from 36th place in 2023 to 35th place in the Global Index.
 - Although Denmark lost one of its most significant positions following Poul-Erik Høyer's resignation, it gained three additional representatives compared with 2023, resulting in an overall improvement in ranking.
 - Denmark gained three positions in the European Index since 2023.
 - Sweden retains the strongest position among the Nordic countries and demonstrates the highest level of gender balance.
 - Norway and Denmark both have a female representation rate of 37 per cent.
 - Both Norway and Sweden have a higher proportion of representatives with an athletic background than Denmark.

- A higher number of Olympic medals is often associated with stronger positions in the Power Indexes.
 - There is a general tendency for the most powerful countries to also achieve higher Olympic medal counts.
 - When Denmark wins fewer medals than in the previous Summer Olympic Games, it tends either to maintain or to lose positions in the Global Sports Political Power Index.
- When considering average age alongside the apparent positive impact of athletic background on election outcomes, it may be argued that National Olympic Committees (NOCs) would benefit from identifying and supporting potential candidates at an early stage and developing their candidacies over time.

Important notes

- The data for this year's edition were last updated and collected on 20 October 2025. It is therefore possible that some federations may have held their general assemblies after the data collection was completed.
- Some sports are represented only through either their international or European federation, while others are represented in both Indexes. This also depends on whether the federation is recognised by the IOC.
- The international data from the previous edition were collected from www.dif.dk/idraetten-i-tal/magtbarometer as this source is more up to date than earlier reports.
- The European data from the previous edition were collected from earlier Sports Political Power Index reports, as the European data available on the website exclude points from international federations.
- The weighting system assigns points to the individual elected to a federation rather than to the federation as a whole. Consequently, a European federation with 10 executive board members will generate a higher total number of points than a federation with five executive board members.

Appendix

A total of 130 federations are included in the dataset for 2025. These comprise both international and European federations. As noted earlier, some federations are represented at either the international or European level, while others are represented at both levels.

The federations included are as follows:

American Football (INT), ANOC, Archery (INT & EU), Athletics (INT & EU), Automobile (INT), Badminton (INT & EU), Bandy (INT), Baseball/Softball (INT & EU), Basketball (INT & EU), Basque Pelota (INT), Billiard (INT & EU), Boxing (EU), Mountaineering (INT), Table Tennis (INT & EU), Bowling (INT & EU), Bridge (INT), Cheerleading (INT), Cricket (INT), Curling (INT), Cycling (INT & EU), Dance Sport (INT & EU), Dart (INT & EU), EOC, Floorball (INT), Fencing (INT & EU), Golf (INT & EU), Gymnastics (INT & EU), Paralympic (INT & EU), Hockey (INT & EU), Handball (INT & EU), Ice Hockey (INT), Icestocksport (INT), IOC, Judo (INT & EU), Ju-jitsu (INT & EU), Canoe/Kayak (INT & EU), Karate (INT & EU), Ninepin (INT), Kickboxing (INT & EU), Luge (INT), Lacrosse (INT & EU), Lifesaving (INT), Many Sports - Workers and Amateurs (INT), Many Sports - ISF (INT & EU), Many Sports - Military (INT), Minigolf (INT & EU), Modern Pentathlon (INT), Motorsport - Motorcycling (INT & EU), Netball (INT), Orienteering (INT), Parachuting (INT & EU), Pétanque (INT & EU), Polo (INT), Racquetball (INT & EU), Rafting (INT), Equestrian (INT & EU), Rowing (INT), Rugby (INT & EU), Roller Skating (INT & EU), Sambo (INT), Sailing (INT & EU), Ski Mountaineering (INT), Skiing (INT), Biathlon (INT), Shooting (INT & EU), Skating (INT), Powerboating (INT), Diving (INT), Sports Climbing (INT), Squash (INT & EU), Powerlifting (INT & EU), Sumo (INT), Surfing/SUP (INT & EU), Swimming (INT & EU), Taekwondo (INT & EU), Chess (INT), Tennis (INT & EU), Muay Thai (INT), Tug of War (INT), Triathlon (INT & EU), UEFA, University Sports (INT), Waterski/Wakeboard (INT), Volleyball (INT & EU), Weightlifting (INT & EU), Wrestling (INT), Wushu (INT).

The abbreviations in brackets indicate whether the federations are represented at the Global level, the European level, or both within the dataset.