DC MUN

# ICC
# International Cricket Council

## Agenda:
## Improving Proportional Representation, Financial Distribution and Inclusivity in Global Decision-making for Cricket.

# DALY COLLEGE MODEL UNITED NATIONS 2026

## International Cricket Council

**Table of Contents**


| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Letter from Executive Board |
| 2 | Introduction to the agenda<br>Proportional Representation<br>Financial Distribution<br>Inclusivity<br>Why This Debate Is Urgent |
| 3 | ICC governance overview<br>Origins, Structure and Membership<br>Governance Bodies and Decision<br>Making Financial Architecture and Competitive Inequality<br>Women's Cricket and Future Governance Challenges |
| 4 | Case studies<br>Case study 1<br>Case study 2<br>Case study 3 |
| 5 | Financial aspects<br>Overview<br>Revenue Generation and Distribution<br>Power, Influence, and Structural Challenges<br>Reform, Development, and the Future Financial Landscape |
| 6 | Distribution of representation<br>Overview<br>A Governance Structure Built on Unequal Foundations<br>The Colonial Roots of a Modern Problem<br>The "Big Three" and the Grip of Financial Power<br>What This Actually Costs The Game |
| 7 | ICC History |
| 8 | Question a resolution must answer |
| 9 | Guide to research |
| 10 | Bibliography |

**1. Letter from the Executive Board:**

Dear delegates ,
Greetings!

It is our absolute pleasure to welcome you to the International Cricket Council 2026. We are honored to serve as your Executive Board and look forward to an engaging and high-stakes committee. This background guide is designed to equip you with essential information about the agenda and help you navigate the structure and expectations of the committee.

Cricket stands at a critical turning point in its global history. While the sport has expanded across continents and reached unprecedented commercial success, power within the International
Cricket Council remains concentrated among a small group of historically dominant boards. Questions surrounding proportional representation, unequal financial distribution, and inclusivity have become central to debates about the future of international cricket.

This committee will challenge delegates to navigate the tensions between commercial interests and equitable development. From the influence of the "Big Three" to the underrepresentation of Associate Members and the continued investment gap in women's cricket, the ICC faces growing pressure to reform structures that many argue no longer reflect the global nature of the sport.

The decisions made in this committee will shape the future of cricket governance, determining who holds influence, how resources are distributed, and whether the ICC can truly evolve into a body that represents the interests of global cricket as a whole.

This committee will challenge you to think across dimensions of power, diplomacy, ethics and equality. It is not enough to protect your national interest. You must also contribute to global solutions. You will need to make bold decisions, navigate crises as they unfold, and find unity where none seems possible.

This guide is only the beginning. We encourage you to research beyond these pages, understand your portfolio's unique stance, and prepare to defend it with clarity and depth. Use every opportunity to speak, to question, and to listen. Respect opposing views but never hesitate to push your agenda with reason and conviction.

We are excited to witness the ideas, arguments, and strategies you will bring to the table. If you have any doubts or require guidance, do not hesitate to reach out at dcmunicc@gmail.com

Warm Regards,

Soham Kasturi- Chairperson
Vihana Desai- Vice-Chairperson
Suvigya Chaudhry- Vice-Chairperson
Aarav Jhaveri- Rapporteur

## 2. Introduction to the Agenda

I. Proportional Representation

The question of representation asks who gets a voice in ICC decision-making. At present, the ICC Board - its highest decision-making body - is composed almost entirely of Full Member representatives. The 96 Associate Member nations, where cricket is often growing fastest and where the sport's future audience largely lives, have no permanent voting seat at that table.

Committee structures follow the same pattern. Governance decisions that directly affect

Associate nations are routinely made in rooms where no Associate perspective is present. Proportional representation does not necessarily mean equal representation. It means representation that reflects the breadth and diversity of the membership, rather than simply its most historically powerful tier.

II. Financial Distribution

The ICC generates substantial revenue from global tournaments, broadcasting rights, and commercial partnerships - revenue that is then distributed among member nations according to a formula weighted heavily toward the largest markets. India, England, and Australia collectively receive the largest shares of ICC distributions, reflecting the commercial dominance of their broadcasting markets. Other Full Members receive smaller shares. Associate Members share a development fund that, while it has grown in recent cycles, represents a small fraction of total ICC revenue. The consequence is a funding environment in which the richest boards grow richer with each rights cycle, while many Associate boards lack the resources to maintain professional playing programmes, hire qualified coaches, or build facilities that would allow their players to compete meaningfully at international level. The current model does not develop cricket globally

- it entrenches the advantages of those who already possess them.

III. Inclusivity

Inclusivity extends beyond voting rights and funding to the broader question of whose participation cricket actively values. This encompasses the persistent underinvestment in women's cricket relative to the men's game - in prize money, broadcast coverage, professional contracts, and administrative attention. It includes the structural barriers that prevent emerging cricketing regions in Africa, the Americas, and Europe from accessing the bilateral series system and the developmental pathways available to Full Members.

IV. Why This Debate Is Urgent

The franchise T20 economy led by the Indian Premier League and the expanding ecosystem of leagues has inspired new concentrations of cricketing wealth and influence that sit largely outside the ICC's regulatory

framework. Test cricket faces genuine questions about its commercial viability outside a small cluster of nations. Women's cricket is growing rapidly but remains structurally underfunded. And the ICC's credibility as the legitimate global governing body of the sport depends, in the long run, on its ability to demonstrate that it serves cricket as a whole, not merely the interests of its most powerful members.

Cricket has an opportunity to grow in ways that were unimaginable a generation ago. Digital broadcasting, new cricketing markets, and a generation of talented players from non-traditional cricket nations all point toward a sport with enormous unrealised potential. Whether that potential is realised depends significantly on whether the ICC can reform its governance structures to match its global ambitions.

**Committee Mandate**

This committee is empowered to draft and negotiate an ICC Governance Reform Charter addressing:

1. Board representation
2. Voting structures
3. Revenue allocation formulas
4. Associate Member participation
5. Women's cricket funding mechanisms
6. Franchise league regulation
7. Future Tours Programme (FTP) reforms

Delegates may propose:

8. Constitutional amendments to ICC governance structures
9. New revenue-sharing models
10. Creation of oversight bodies and commissions
11. Mandatory development funding mechanisms
12. Reforms to scheduling and tournament qualification pathways Delegates may not:
13. Remove Full Member status from existing nations
14. Dissolve the ICC
15. Directly interfere with domestic government policy

## 3. ICC Governance Overview

| Body | Primary Function |
|---|---|
| ICC Board of Directors | Highest decision-making body responsible for governance, finance, strategy, and major policy decisions. |
| Chief Executives' Committee (CEC) | Coordinates operational matters and provides recommendations on cricket administration and scheduling. |
| Finance and Commercial Affairs Committee | Oversees budgeting, revenue distribution, sponsorship agreements, and commercial strategy. |
| Cricket Committee | Advises on playing conditions, competition structures, laws of the game, and cricket operations. |
| Women's Cricket Committee | Develops policies and strategies aimed at expanding and strengthening women's cricket globally. |
| Audit and Risk Committee | Ensures financial accountability, transparency, compliance, and institutional oversight. |
| Anti-Corruption Unit (ACU) | Investigates corruption, match-fixing, betting-related offences, and integrity breaches within cricket. |

## I. Origins, Structure and Membership

The International Cricket Council was founded in 1909 as the Imperial Cricket Conference - an organisation established by England, Australia, and South Africa to regulate Test cricket among the cricket-playing nations of the British Empire. Its founding membership was deliberately exclusive, reflecting the colonial hierarchies of the era. In 1965, the organisation was renamed the International Cricket Conference, and membership was opened beyond Commonwealth nations. In 1989, it became the International Cricket Council, adopting a more explicitly global mandate, before relocating its headquarters from Lord's Cricket Ground in London to Dubai in 2005.

These institutional milestones represent significant change, but they did not fundamentally alter the power structures embedded in the ICC's original framework. The distinction between Full Members - who play Test cricket and hold primary governance rights - and the broader membership has persisted across every phase of the organisation's evolution, and continues to define the major inequalities within ICC governance today.

Full Members are entitled to play all three formats of international cricket - Test matches, One Day Internationals, and T20 Internationals. They hold permanent seats on the ICC Board of Directors, participate in the Future Tours Programme, and receive the largest shares of ICC revenue distributions. The current Full Members are Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, England, India, Ireland, New Zealand, Pakistan, South Africa, Sri Lanka, West Indies, and Zimbabwe. However, there are major disparities even within this group. The BCCI operates on an annual budget several times larger than those of smaller Full Members, resulting in unequal levels of infrastructure, influence, and bargaining power.

Associate Members are nations or territories where cricket is established and organised, but which do not hold Full Member status. They are entitled to play T20 Internationals and, under qualifying conditions, One Day Internationals. Associate nations participate in ICC regional tournaments and qualifying competitions and receive development funding from the ICC's development pool. However, they hold no permanent voting seat on the ICC Board and their role in governance remains limited and largely consultative. The Associate membership includes nations with relatively developed cricketing systems, such as the Netherlands and Scotland, as well as countries where the sport is still in earlier stages of development across Africa, East Asia, and the Americas.

| Category | Full Members | Associate Members |
|---|---|---|
| Number of members | 12 | 98 |
| Test status | Yes | No |
| Board representation | Permanent seats | 3 shared seats |
| Voting power | Full | Limited |
| ICC funding | Majority share | Development fund |
| FTP access | Full | Limited/none |

## II. Governance Bodies and Decision Making

The ICC Board of Directors serves as the organisation's primary decision-making body. It holds authority over strategic direction, financial matters, policy decisions, and the appointment of senior leadership. Each Full Member holds one seat on the Board, represented by its chairperson or equivalent official. The ICC Chair is independently elected and presides over Board meetings, while the Chief Executive Officer attends in an executive capacity. Associate Members do not possess permanent voting representation on the Board. As a result, decisions affecting all 108 member nations - including tournament structures, eligibility rules, and revenue allocation - are made in a body where the overwhelming majority of members hold no vote.

Alongside the Board operates the Chief Executives' Committee (CEC), which consists of the chief executives of all twelve Full Member boards and is chaired by the ICC CEO. Although formally consultative, the CEC exercises substantial practical influence over operational matters. Tournament scheduling, regulatory reform, and commercial arrangements are often negotiated and shaped at the CEC level before reaching the Board itself. The committee effectively acts as a coordination space for the administrators of the most powerful cricket boards. Associate Members are excluded from representation here as well.

The ICC also operates through several standing committees dealing with areas such as cricket operations, audit and finance, anti-corruption, human resources, and women's cricket. The Cricket Committee, which advises on playing conditions and technical regulations, is largely composed of current and former players and officials nominated by Full Member boards. Associate representation across these committees is limited and often non-voting. This has broader implications because many important proposals are developed and debated at committee level before they ever reach the Board. Policies that directly affect Associate nations - including qualification structures, playing conditions, and technology usage - are therefore often shaped without meaningful Associate participation.

## III. Financial Architecture and Competitive Inequality

The ICC's principal sources of revenue are broadcasting rights for global tournaments, commercial sponsorships, and bilateral cricket revenues that flow through member boards. Events such as the ICC Men's Cricket World Cup and the T20 World Cup generate the largest share of global cricket revenue. The commercial value of these tournaments is driven heavily by a few major markets, particularly India, whose broadcasting ecosystem contributes a substantial proportion of cricket's overall global income. England and Australia also hold significant commercial influence due to the scale and profitability of their domestic and international cricket markets.

Revenue generated by the ICC is distributed among member nations according to formulas negotiated at Board level. Full Members receive the overwhelming majority of these distributions, while Associate Members share a comparatively small development fund. The precise allocations among Full Members are influenced by factors such as historical status, market value, and commercial contribution. India, England, and Australia receive significantly larger shares than other members due to their commercial importance.

This imbalance became especially visible following the 2014 governance reforms, commonly referred to as the "Big Three" model. Under this arrangement, India, England, and Australia were granted expanded financial and administrative influence within the ICC. Their revenue shares increased substantially, while the relative allocations of smaller Full Members and Associates declined. Although later reforms attempted to reduce some of these disparities, criticism regarding unequal governance and concentrated financial power continues.

The consequences of this distribution model are particularly severe for Associate nations. Many

Associate boards operate on annual budgets that are only a fraction of those available to Full Members. Limited funding restricts their ability to maintain professional player contracts, invest in coaching and infrastructure, or schedule sufficient high-level international fixtures. The funding gap therefore becomes both a cause and a consequence of the competitive gap between Full Members and Associates. Without structural financial reform, many analysts argue that meaningful competitive balance in international cricket will remain difficult to achieve.

The Future Tours Programme (FTP) further reinforces these inequalities. The FTP is the scheduling system through which bilateral international cricket is organised over multi-year cycles. It determines which Full Members play one another, how often they compete, and where series are hosted. Since bilateral cricket generates significant broadcasting and commercial revenue, participation in the FTP is financially critical.

However, the system often disadvantages smaller Full Members, who struggle to attract major teams for home tours because such series are less commercially profitable. India, in particular, tours selectively according to commercial priorities rather than rotational balance. Associate Members are entirely excluded from the FTP structure and therefore remain outside the bilateral system that generates the majority of elite-level cricket experience and financial income. This exclusion significantly widens the developmental gap between established and emerging cricket nations.

| Category | Approx. Share |
|---|---|
| India (BCCI) | ~38.5% |
| England (ECB) | ~6.9% |
| Australia (CA) | ~6.3% |
| Remaining Full Members | ~37–38% |
| Associate Members | ~11–12% |

Associates comprise nearly 90% of ICC membership but receive roughly 11–12% of ICC distributions.

## IV. Women's Cricket and Future Governance Challenges

Women's cricket officially came under the ICC's governance structure in 2005, following the merger of the International Women's Cricket Council with the ICC. This integration gave women's cricket access to the ICC's financial and organisational framework for the first time and marked an important institutional shift.

Despite this progress, women's cricket continues to occupy a secondary position relative to the men's game in many areas of governance and funding. Prize money at ICC women's tournaments remains significantly lower than that of equivalent men's competitions. Only a limited number of Full Member boards provide fully

professional contracts to women players, while many Associate nations possess minimal or underdeveloped women's cricket programmes altogether.

Although the ICC has increased investment in women's tournaments and development pathways in recent years, substantial structural inequalities remain. Expanding women's cricket requires not only greater financial investment, but also reforms in governance priorities, scheduling, infrastructure development, and long-term strategic planning.

More broadly, the ICC faces continuing challenges regarding representation, inclusivity, and the balance between commercial success and equitable development. Questions surrounding voting rights, Associate representation, revenue distribution, and the influence of financially dominant boards remain central to debates on ICC governance today. As cricket continues expanding into new regions and formats, the organisation's ability to address these structural issues will play a major role in shaping the future of international cricket.

More broadly, the ICC faces continuing challenges regarding representation, inclusivity, and the balance between commercial success and equitable development. Questions surrounding voting rights, Associate representation, revenue distribution, and the influence of financially dominant boards remain central to debates on ICC governance today. As cricket continues expanding into new regions and formats, the organisation's ability to address these structural issues will play a major role in shaping the future of international cricket.

| Indicator | Men's Cricket | Women's Cricket |
|---|---|---|
| World Cup Prize Pool (2022) | USD 10 million | USD 3.5 million |
| Professional Contracts | Widely available | Limited |
| Broadcast Coverage | Extensive | Growing but lower |
| Development Funding | Larger | Smaller |

FTP Access Challenge

1. Full Members schedule bilateral series through the FTP.
2. Associate Members are largely excluded.
3. India, England, and Australia attract the highest broadcasting revenues.
4. Smaller nations struggle to secure home tours from major teams.
5. Associates rely heavily on ICC events rather than bilateral cricket.

## 4. Case studies

I. Case Study 1: Afghanistan - Associate to Full Members Background

Afghanistan's journey from a nation with no formal cricket infrastructure to Full Membership of the ICC is one of the most remarkable stories in modern sport. Cricket took root in Afghan refugee camps in Pakistan during the 1980s and 1990s, spread rapidly through the country after 2001, and became within a generation the national sport. The Afghanistan Cricket Board was established in 1995, the country received ICC Associate Membership in 2001, and in June 2017, Afghanistan was granted Full Membership alongside Ireland, becoming the first nations to achieve that status in seventeen years.

Afghanistan's ascent demonstrates that the pathway from Associate to Full Membership, while possible, is exceptionally narrow and dependent on factors beyond cricket merit alone. Afghanistan had to qualify through successive ICC tournaments, sustain administrative development simultaneously, and satisfy governance and infrastructure benchmarks set by the ICC all while operating in a country in active conflict. The resources available to Afghanistan throughout this process were a fraction of those available to established Full Members. The Afghan team succeeded largely despite the system, not because of it.
It also illustrates the consequences of delayed recognition. Afghanistan was competing at a level that warranted Full Membership consideration well before 2017. The extended period as an Associate Member meant years of reduced funding, limited bilateral series access, and minimal governance influence, a structural penalty applied to a nation whose cricket community had done everything asked of it.

II. Case Study 2: The 2014 'Big Three' Governance Reforms

*Background*

In January 2014, the ICC adopted a new governance and financial model negotiated primarily by the Board of Control for Cricket in India (BCCI), Cricket Australia (CA), and the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB). The reforms restructured revenue distribution to significantly increase the share flowing to these three boards - India's allocation in particular was reported to be approximately 22% of total ICC distributions, compared to around 4-5% for most other Full Members. The three boards also secured enhanced influence over ICC scheduling, commercial decisions, and governance processes.
The process by which these reforms were adopted attracted immediate and sustained criticism. Several Full Member boards reported that they were presented with the new arrangements as largely non-negotiable. Associate Members were not meaningfully consulted. The timeline between the proposal and adoption was compressed. The ICC, under pressure from its three most commercially powerful members, ratified arrangements that the majority of its membership had not agreed to in any substantive sense.

The 2014 episode is the clearest recent example of the ICC's governance vulnerability: the capacity for its most powerful members to reshape the organisation's financial and structural architecture in their own interests, using the commercial leverage they hold over the ICC's revenue streams as effective leverage over its decision-making. It illustrates that the absence of proportional representation is not merely a procedural concern; it has direct and material consequences for how resources are distributed and who controls the sport's strategic direction. The reforms also illustrate the difficulty of reversing concentrated power once it has been formalised. While subsequent ICC cycles moderated some of the most extreme elements of the 2014

arrangements, the fundamental concentration of revenue and influence in the largest three markets was not dismantled. The episode remains a defining reference point in debates about ICC governance reform.

## III. Case Study 3: Women's Cricket and the Investment Gap

*Background*

The ICC Women's Cricket World Cup has been played since 1973 - two years before the men's World Cup. Women's cricket has a long and distinguished history. And yet the investment gap between the men's and women's games within the ICC framework has remained stark. As recently as 2022, the prize money for the ICC Women's Cricket World Cup was USD 3.5 million, compared to USD 10 million for the equivalent men's tournament held the same year. Broadcast coverage for women's ICC events, while growing, remains substantially less extensive than for men's events. The number of professional contracts available to women cricketers across Full Member nations varies enormously - several Full Members have no professional women's domestic structure whatsoever.

The women's cricket investment gap illustrates how inclusivity failures within ICC governance compound over time. When women's cricket receives lower investment at the ICC level, member boards have less incentive and fewer resources to invest in women's domestic structures. When domestic structures are weak, fewer professional players develop. When fewer professional players develop, the quality of the women's international game grows more slowly than it could. The under-investment is both a cause and a consequence of a governance culture that has historically treated women's cricket as secondary.

The ICC has in recent years articulated stronger commitments to closing this gap including targets for professionalising women's cricket across all Full Member boards. These commitments are meaningful but remain aspirational: the structural mechanisms to enforce them, and the funding levels required to fulfil them, are not yet fully in place. The women's cricket case demonstrates that stated commitments to inclusivity are insufficient without governance reforms that give those commitments binding force.

The Uniform Civil Code (UCC) refers to the idea of having one common, secular, codified law for all Indian citizens in matters of personal law, particularly marriage, divorce, inheritance, adoption, and maintenance. Article 44 of the Indian Constitution places this idea under the Directive Principles of State Policy and states that *"the State shall endeavour to secure for the citizens a uniform civil code throughout the territory of India."*The wording matters. It was framed as an aspiration, not an obligation. The Constitution's framers understood that while a common civil code could support national unity and equality, it also touched deeply sensitive social and cultural questions.

*The Emotional and Cultural Stakes*

**Three words. Eight syllables. One Nation, One Law.To a young woman involved in a talaq dispute in Lucknow, struggling with legal costs and facing outcomes shaped by different personal laws, these words may sound like fairness and protection.To a Khasi elder in Meghalaya, whose community has organised inheritance, identity, and ancestral land through a matrilineal tradition that predates the Indian state itself, those same words may feel like loss. A fear that local customs could be replaced by rules created far from the communities they affect.These perspectives are not impossible to reconcile. Yet India has never fully resolved the tension between individual equality and cultural autonomy. That tension sits at the centre of the UCC debate.**

*Historical Context*

The debate over the UCC cannot be separated from India's early years as an independent nation.When the government introduced the Hindu Code Bill in the late 1940s, it proposed major reforms including women's rights to divorce, restrictions on polygamy, and stronger inheritance rights for daughters. The proposals faced strong resistance, including from within the ruling Congress Party.As Law Minister, B. R. Ambedkar argued that a democracy unwilling to reform personal laws risked falling short of its own constitutional values. When the original bill was weakened and eventually divided into separate pieces of legislation passed gradually during the 1950s, Ambedkar resigned from the Cabinet.Over time, Hindu personal laws underwent substantial reform, while Muslim, Christian, and Parsi personal laws largely continued separately. That difference shaped the debate that continues today.

*Case Study: Shah Bano*

**One of the defining moments in the UCC debate came through the Supreme Court's 1985 judgment in the Shah Bano case.Shah Bano Begum was 73 years old when her husband divorced her after 43 years of marriage through triple talaq and declined to provide maintenance beyond the iddat period under Muslim personal law.The Supreme Court ruled in her favour and held that Section 125 of the Criminal Procedure Code applied to all citizens irrespective of religion.However, in 1986 Parliament passed the Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Divorce) Act, which effectively limited the impact of that judgment and returned such matters to personal law. Under public and community pressure, Shah Bano later withdrew her claim.The case remains one of India's most discussed examples of the difficult relationship between judicial protection of rights and legislative politics.**

*The Arguments*

Supporters of the UCC argue that India's communities currently function under multiple personal law systems that create unequal outcomes. They believe a common civil code, especially in areas such as divorce, inheritance, and maintenance, would strengthen equality before law and improve protection of individual rights, particularly for women.Opponents focus on constitutional pluralism. Articles 25 to 28 protect religious freedom, while Articles 29 and 30 safeguard the rights of minorities to preserve their culture. The Fifth and Sixth Schedules also provide protections for tribal customs and governance.Critics argue that uniformity alone does not guarantee justice and that a civil code introduced without broad consultation may unintentionally weaken cultural and constitutional protections.Both arguments draw legitimacy from the Constitution. The conflict between them is real and cannot be dismissed easily.

*Contemporary Developments*

The Uttarakhand Uniform Civil Code Act, 2024 provides the clearest recent example of how a UCC may operate in practice.The law prohibits polygamy and polyandry, establishes marriage regulations, and requires registration of live-in relationships with local authorities. At the same time, tribal communities are exempt from its provisions, recognising that customary laws involve constitutional and cultural complexities.The Uttarakhand model remains recent and continues to generate debate. It is neither a complete solution nor a final answer. However, it currently offers the most practical case study available for evaluating both the possibilities and limitations of implementing a Uniform Civil Code in India.

## 5. Financial Aspects of the International Cricket Council

### I. Overview

The financial structure of the ICC sits at the core of how international cricket operates today. While the organization is formally responsible for regulating the sport, organizing global tournaments, and supporting its expansion, the reality is that financial considerations influence almost every aspect of its functioning. Decisions related to scheduling, tournament formats, development pathways, and even qualification structures are rarely independent of economic factors.

Cricket does not have a uniform global footprint. Unlike sports with a more evenly distributed following, cricket's popularity is heavily concentrated in a few regions where it has strong historical, cultural, and commercial roots. This uneven distribution of interest translates directly into unequal revenue generation. A handful of countries account for a disproportionately large share of global viewership, sponsorship value, and broadcasting demand, while many others remain on the margins despite being part of the same international structure.

Because of this imbalance, the ICC's financial model has evolved in a way that reflects commercial realities rather than purely developmental goals. It prioritizes sustaining the markets that generate the most revenue, while also attempting—though often with limited success—to promote the growth of the sport in newer or smaller regions. This creates a constant balancing act between efficiency and inclusivity.At a deeper level, financial priorities shape the ICC's identity as a governing body. On one hand, it must function as a commercially viable organization capable of generating and managing significant revenue. On the other, it is expected to act as a global authority responsible for expanding the game beyond its traditional strongholds. The tension between these roles is evident in many of the financial decisions the ICC makes. In practical terms, this means that financial considerations influence where tournaments are hosted, how frequently certain teams play, and how resources are allocated across different levels of the game. It also affects how much autonomy the ICC truly has, given its reliance on the very markets that generate its income. Understanding this structure is essential to understanding both the capabilities and the limitations of the ICC in shaping international cricket.

### II. Revenue Generation and Distribution

The ICC's financial system is built primarily on broadcasting rights, which form the largest and most consistent source of revenue. Global tournaments such as the Cricket World Cup and the T20 World Cup are central to this model. These events attract audiences from across the world, but the distribution of that audience is far from even. A significant proportion of viewership comes from a few key regions, particularly South Asia, where cricket commands widespread popularity and commercial engagement.

Countries like India, England, and Australia play a major role in this ecosystem. Their domestic markets bring in large television audiences, attract major sponsors, and create strong demand for advertising. This makes them highly valuable in negotiations over media rights. As a result, broadcasting deals are often structured around maximizing engagement in these markets. This influence extends beyond financial agreements and into the structure of the game itself. Match timings are frequently adjusted to suit prime viewing hours in these regions, and tournament formats are sometimes designed to ensure the presence of high-profile teams in later stages.

In addition to broadcasting revenue, the ICC generates income through sponsorship agreements, licensing deals, and event-related activities such as ticket sales and merchandising. While these streams are important, they are relatively smaller compared to the scale of media rights deals. The dominance of broadcasting revenue means that the ICC's financial stability is closely tied to the performance of its major tournaments and the continued engagement of its most commercially valuable audiences.

Once revenue is generated, it is distributed among ICC member nations. This is one of the most debated aspects of the ICC's financial structure. Member countries are divided into Full Members and Associate Members, and the difference in financial allocation between these groups is substantial.

Full Members, including countries such as India, England, Australia, Pakistan, and South Africa, receive the majority of ICC revenue. In contrast, Associate Members—such as Nepal, the Netherlands, and the UAE—share a significantly smaller portion. In practical terms, a large majority of total ICC earnings is distributed among a small group of Full Members, while nearly a hundred Associate nations divide the remainder.

This disparity has far-reaching consequences. Associate nations often operate with limited financial resources, which restricts their ability to invest in infrastructure, coaching, grassroots development, and domestic competitions. Without sustained investment, it becomes difficult for these countries to build competitive teams or maintain consistent performance at the international level. This lack of competitiveness then affects their visibility, further limiting their commercial value and reinforcing the cycle of financial disadvantage.

Supporters of the current model argue that revenue distribution should reflect economic contribution. Since certain countries generate the majority of income through viewership and commercial activity, they believe it is reasonable for those countries to receive a larger share. Critics, however, argue that such a system undermines the ICC's role in promoting global growth. They point out that without deliberate redistribution, emerging cricketing nations will struggle to develop, limiting the sport's expansion.

This debate highlights a fundamental tension within the ICC's financial model: whether it should prioritize rewarding contribution or enabling growth. Both approaches have implications for the future of the sport, and balancing them remains an ongoing challenge.

## III. Power, Influence, and Structural Challenges

Financial strength within the ICC is closely linked to influence. Boards that are financially stronger tend to have a greater ability to shape decisions related to international cricket. This influence extends to areas such as tournament formats, scheduling, revenue allocation, and long-term strategic planning. Over time, this has led to a concentration of power among a small group of financially dominant nations.

Countries such as India, England, and Australia have historically held significant influence within the ICC. Their economic importance gives them leverage in negotiations and discussions, allowing them to shape outcomes in ways that align with their interests. This influence is not always formalized, but it is widely acknowledged within the cricketing community.

This concentration of influence raises important questions about governance and representation. While the ICC is structured as a global body with all members having a voice, the reality is that not all voices carry equal weight. Smaller Full Members and Associate nations often have limited capacity to influence decisions, even when those decisions directly affect their development and participation in the sport.

At the same time, the ICC faces internal financial constraints that shape its operations. Unlike national boards with strong domestic leagues, the ICC does not have a continuous revenue stream. Its income is heavily dependent on major tournaments held at specific intervals. This creates pressure to ensure that each event is commercially successful, sometimes leading to decisions that prioritize short-term revenue over long-term development.

There are also broader structural challenges linked to the changing nature of the sports industry. The way audiences consume cricket is evolving, with digital streaming platforms becoming increasingly important. This shift affects how media rights are negotiated and how revenue is generated. At the same time, economic fluctuations and changes in advertising markets can impact sponsorship deals and broadcasting contracts.

These factors create a level of uncertainty within the ICC's financial model. While the organization has been successful in generating significant revenue, maintaining that level of income in a changing environment requires constant adaptation. This adds another layer of complexity to an already uneven financial structure.

## IV. Reform, Development, and the Future Financial Landscape

The financial structure of the ICC continues to be a subject of ongoing debate, particularly in discussions about reform and the future direction of international cricket. One of the central questions is whether the current distribution model should be revised to provide greater support to Associate Members and emerging cricketing nations.

Those in favor of reform argue that increasing financial support for smaller nations is essential for the long-term growth of the sport. Investment in infrastructure, coaching, and domestic competitions can create a more competitive and diverse international landscape. Without such investment, the gap between established and emerging teams is likely to widen, limiting opportunities for new nations to succeed.

There are also arguments in favor of maintaining the existing structure. Some stakeholders believe that the current model ensures financial stability by rewarding countries that generate the most revenue. From this perspective, significant redistribution could reduce incentives for major markets and potentially weaken the overall financial base of the ICC.

Another important factor shaping the financial landscape is the rise of domestic T20 leagues. Competitions such as the Indian Premier League, The Hundred, and the Big Bash League generate substantial revenue independently of the ICC. These leagues strengthen the financial position of their respective boards, which in turn increases their influence within the global system.

However, the growth of domestic leagues also introduces new challenges. Scheduling conflicts between international fixtures and franchise tournaments have become more common, and player availability is increasingly influenced by financial considerations. This raises questions about the balance between international cricket and franchise-based formats, as well as the ICC's ability to coordinate a global calendar that satisfies all stakeholders.

Looking ahead, the ICC will need to navigate a rapidly changing financial environment. The expansion of digital platforms, shifts in audience behavior, and increasing commercialization of sport are all factors that will shape how revenue is generated and distributed. At the same time, there is growing pressure to make cricket more inclusive by investing in regions that are not currently major contributors to revenue.

Ultimately, the financial model of the ICC reflects a broader challenge that goes beyond numbers and budgets. It is about balancing commercial success with the need for equitable growth. Sustaining the sport at the highest level requires strong revenue streams, but the long-term future of cricket depends on expanding its reach and making it more competitive across a wider range of countries.

The way this balance is managed will have lasting implications. It will influence not only the structure of international competitions, but also the opportunities available to emerging nations and the overall direction of the sport. In many ways, the financial decisions made today will shape what international cricket looks like in the decades to come.

## 6. Distribution of Representation in The International Cricket Council

### I. Overview

Governance, at its core, concerns the distribution of power and those who hold it, who is excluded from it, and how that distribution shapes the future of an institution. Within the International Cricket Council (ICC), this question carries particular weight. As the global governing body of a sport played in over 100 countries and followed by approximately 2.5 billion people worldwide, the ICC is expected to reflect the breadth and diversity of its membership in how it makes decisions, allocates resources, and sets the direction of the game.

However, while cricket itself has expanded to every corner of the globe, its governance structures have evolved far more slowly. Today, the ICC comprises 110 member nations, yet meaningful decision-making authority remains concentrated among a relatively small group of historically dominant boards. This imbalance raises important and pressing questions about representation, equity, and the long-term development of the sport and these are questions that sit at the very heart of this committee's agenda.

### II. A Governance Structure Built on Unequal Foundations

To really get why the ICC has such a serious representation problem, you need to look at how the organisation is actually set up. And once you do, the issue becomes pretty hard to ignore. ICC splits its members into two groups. The first group is Full Members. These are the 12 nations that play Test cricket, and every single one of them gets a permanent seat on the ICC Board along with a full vote on every decision that comes up. The second group is Associate Members, which is everyone else. All 98 of them. And here is the part that really puts things into perspective: those 98 nations share three board seats between them. Not three each. Three total. 98 countries, three seats. That one fact pretty much tells you everything you need to know.

Now, for any major decision to pass at the ICC, you need 12 out of 17 board votes. The twelve Full Member directors can get to that number completely on their own. Meanwhile, the Associate Members, even if all three of their directors vote the same way and manage to get every other non-Full Member director on the board to back them up, still cannot stop a decision that the Full Members have agreed on. There is no scenario where the numbers work out in their favour. It is just not possible.

So what does this actually look like in real life? It means that those who make up almost 90 percent of the ICC's membership genuinely cannot pass or block anything important without the Full Members letting them. Sure, technically everyone has a vote. But having a vote and having a vote that actually changes things are two very different situations, and right now the gap between those two things is enormous.

Something else worth pointing out is that Associate seats are not even guaranteed. Unlike Full Members who automatically hold their board positions, Associate nations have to compete against each other in elections just to win one of those three seats. So not only do they have barely any representation to begin with, they also have to fight among themselves for what little they have.

## III. The Colonial Roots of a Modern Problem

The ICC did not end up this way randomly. This goes back over a hundred years, and honestly, once you know the history, the current situation starts to make a lot of sense even if it does not make it any more acceptable.

The organisation was originally set up in 1909 under the name the Imperial Cricket Conference. It was created by England, Australia, and South Africa, and it existed specifically to manage cricket across the British Empire. From the very beginning it was exclusive. If you wanted in, you needed the right colonial connections. The whole point was to keep cricket governance within a small circle of nations that the founders trusted, and a big open global organisation was never what they had in mind. It was a club with very strict membership rules.

As time went on and the world changed, the ICC slowly started letting more nations join. Independence movements across Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean produced new countries, those countries wanted to play cricket, and eventually the organisation could not keep the doors fully closed. By 1989 it had a brand new name, the International Cricket Council, and a membership list that looked nothing like the original three founders.

But here is the problem. Getting a new name and getting more members is not the same thing as actually changing how the organisation works. The voting system, the membership tiers, the way money gets distributed, and where real power sits were never seriously reformed to match the new, much bigger, much more diverse membership. More countries got let in, but nobody restructured the place for them. They joined an organisation whose rules were written for someone else and those rules were never rewritten to include them properly.

This is genuinely the root of everything. The hierarchy that existed in the colonial era did not disappear when the ICC rebranded. It just carried on inside a more modern-looking institution. And the boards that have the power to actually reform the rules today are, almost without exception, the exact same boards that benefit most from keeping things as they are. That is not a coincidence. That is exactly why this problem has lasted as long as it has.

## IV. The "Big Three" and the Grip of Financial Power

Even if you look only at the Full Members and ignore the Associate situation entirely, things are still nowhere near equal. India, England, and Australia, who are almost always referred to in cricket as the "Big Three", have a level of influence over the ICC that is way beyond what a single vote on a 17-person board would suggest.

India's position in world cricket is honestly in a completely different league. Cricket in India is not just a sport people enjoy on weekends. It is a massive part of the country's culture and identity, and the financial consequences of that are absolutely enormous. The BCCI generates somewhere between 70 and 85 percent of global cricket's entire broadcasting revenue on its own. Under the revenue deal currently running from 2024 to 2027, India is expected to receive around 38.5 percent of total ICC revenues, which works out to roughly 230 million dollars every single year. No other board comes close to that number. The gap between India and the next biggest recipient is not a small one at all.

England and Australia each receive somewhere around 6 to 7 percent of ICC revenues, which is much less than India but still makes both of them very significant players in how the sport is run and how it sees itself globally. Put the three of them together and close to half of all ICC revenue goes to just three boards out of 110 member nations.

But the real impact of all this money is not just about the numbers themselves. It is about what those numbers mean when decisions are being made. If your board relies on a tour from India, England, or Australia to stay financially healthy, you are not really in a position to stand up and challenge those nations when governance questions come around. Nobody wants to risk losing a valuable series just because they said the wrong thing in the wrong meeting. This kind of pressure never gets written into any official document, but anyone who follows ICC politics will tell you it absolutely shapes how boards behave and how they vote.

And then there is the financial situation for Associate Members, which is where things get really difficult to look at. The current ICC revenue model sends roughly 88 to 89 percent of all ICC money to Full Members. The remaining 11 to 12 percent gets split between all 98 Associate Members. So nearly a hundred nations are dividing up a pot of money that is smaller than what one major board receives by itself. When you break it down per country, most Associate Members are getting under a million US dollars a year from the ICC.

A million dollars does not build training facilities. It does not pay for a professional coaching setup. It does not fund a proper domestic competition or a national youth academy or give a young cricketer in an emerging cricket nation any real hope that the sport can actually be their career. And when development slows down because of that lack of funding, which it inevitably does, the fact that those nations are not developing quickly enough then gets used as the reason to keep them out of major tournaments and away from the bigger revenues that come with playing in them. The underfunding causes underdevelopment, the underdevelopment causes underperformance, and the underperformance justifies continued underfunding. It keeps going in circles and the current system does absolutely nothing to break that pattern.

## V. What This Actually Costs the Game

It might be tempting to look at all of this and think of it purely as a political or administrative issue that exists somewhere far removed from cricket as people actually watch and love it. But the effects of this system are about as real as it gets. They determine which nations get to compete at the highest level, which players ever get their chance on the world stage, and which fans go their whole lives never seeing their country play in a World Cup.

Tournament qualification is probably where this hits hardest. For an Associate nation, getting into something like the ICC Men's Cricket World Cup is genuinely life-changing for their cricket. The broadcast coverage alone can transform how a sport is seen in a country. Sponsors pay attention. Investors show interest. Young players see that cricket can actually be something worth pursuing. It creates a kind of momentum that is really hard to build in any other way. But when the number of teams in a tournament shrinks, or when the qualification system is set up in a way that Associate nations cannot realistically get through given their resources and infrastructure, all of that disappears. And once it does, the argument for funding cricket

development in those countries gets weaker, which makes the next qualification attempt even harder, which makes the funding case weaker still. It just keeps compounding in the wrong direction.

There is also a bigger issue here that the ICC is going to have to deal with at some point, whether it wants to or not. An organisation that calls itself the governing body of global cricket, while running a system that makes sure those representing the vast majority of its members can barely influence anything, is eventually going to struggle to justify that claim. The gap between what the ICC says it stands for and how it actually operates is not a small one, and it is increasingly visible.

Cricket is growing in the United States, in Canada, in Germany, in Uganda, across the Gulf states, in places that the ICC itself constantly brings up when it talks about the future of the sport. These are not minor developments. They are genuinely significant, and the ICC knows it. But if the people actually running the organisation stay the same small group of powerful boards that have always run it, shaped by the same interests and the same institutional habits that have been in place for over a century, then the ICC risks talking endlessly about a global future for cricket without ever building the kind of organisation that could actually make that future happen. That is a fairness problem. It is also just a straightforward practical problem. Cricket is changing, and the question this committee needs to grapple with is whether the institution governing it is genuinely willing to change alongside it.

## 7. ICC History

1909 – Formation of the Imperial Cricket Conference

The International Cricket Council was established in 1909 as the Imperial Cricket Conference by representatives from England, Australia, and South Africa. Initially, the organization functioned as an exclusive body limited largely to nations within the British Empire, reflecting the colonial roots of international cricket. This laid the foundation for the modern system of cricket governance.

1965 – Renamed to International Cricket Conference

In 1965, the organization was renamed the International Cricket Conference. This change marked an effort to move beyond its colonial origins and expand membership to countries outside the traditional Commonwealth structure. The reform played an important role in the gradual globalization of cricket administration.

1975 – First Cricket World Cup

The first Cricket World Cup was held in 1975 in England. The tournament became a turning point for international cricket, transforming the sport into a major commercial product through broadcasting rights, sponsorships, and global audiences. It also established the ICC's role as the organizer of major international events.

1992 – South Africa Returns After Apartheid Ban

South Africa returned to international cricket in 1992 after decades of isolation due to apartheid policies. The country's return was significant not only for cricket but also for international sports diplomacy, highlighting how political issues and global governance intersect within sport.

1996 – World Cup Hosted in South Asia

The 1996 Cricket World Cup, hosted by India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka, marked a major shift in the financial and cultural center of cricket toward Asia. The tournament demonstrated the growing commercial power of South Asian markets, particularly in terms of audience size, broadcasting value, and sponsorship potential.

2000 – ICC Anti-Corruption Unit Established

Following a series of match-fixing scandals involving international players and officials, the ICC established the Anti-Corruption Unit in 2000. The unit was created to monitor illegal activities, investigate corruption, and strengthen integrity within the sport. This became one of the ICC's most important institutional reforms.

2007 – ICC World Twenty20 Launched

The launch of the ICC World Twenty20 in 2007 marked the beginning of a major shift in cricket's commercial landscape. The shorter format attracted wider audiences, increased television engagement, and significantly expanded the sport's marketability. T20 cricket would later become central to the growth of franchise leagues and modern cricket economics.

2009 – Decision Review System (DRS) Introduced

The ICC introduced the Decision Review System in 2009, incorporating technologies such as ball-tracking and replay analysis into umpiring decisions. The reform aimed to improve accuracy and fairness in officiating while also modernizing the sport through technological integration.

2014 – "Big Three" Governance Model Introduced

In 2014, governance reforms gave India, England, and Australia increased financial and administrative influence within the ICC. Commonly referred to as the "Big Three" model, the reform allocated larger revenue shares and greater decision-making power to these boards due to their commercial importance. The move was heavily criticized for increasing inequality within international cricket governance.

2017 – ICC Governance Reforms

In response to criticism surrounding the "Big Three" model, the ICC introduced governance reforms in 2017 aimed at reducing concentrated control and creating a more balanced administrative structure. While major financial inequalities remained, the reforms were viewed as an attempt to improve representation and institutional fairness.

2018 – All ICC Members Granted T20I Status

In 2018, the ICC granted official T20 International status to all member nations. This decision was seen as a major step toward inclusivity, as it gave Associate nations greater recognition and more opportunities to participate in officially sanctioned international cricket.

2021 – First ICC World Test Championship Final

The inaugural ICC World Test Championship Final was held in 2021. The competition was introduced to increase the relevance and competitiveness of Test cricket by creating a structured global championship system for the format.

2023 – Cricket Added to the 2028 Los Angeles Olympics

In 2023, cricket was officially included in the 2028 Los Angeles Olympic Games in the T20 format. The decision was viewed as a major milestone for the sport, significantly increasing its global visibility and creating opportunities for expansion into newer markets and audiences.

**COMMITTEE REFORM**

Representation

1. Guaranteed Associate seats
2. Regional representation
3. Weighted voting
4. Bicameral governance

Finance

5. Equal base grants
6. Revenue redistribution
7. Development fund expansion
8. Independent Finance Commission

Women's Cricket

9. Ring-fenced funding
10. Equal tournament investment targets

11. Women's representation quotas

FTP

12. Mandatory Associate fixtures
13. Minimum bilateral obligations
14. Expanded qualification pathways

Franchise Leagues

15. Calendar regulation
16. Revenue-sharing requirements
17. Anti-monopoly safeguards

**8. Questions a Resolution Must Answer**

Should financial contribution decide how much power a country gets in cricket governance?

What changes should be made to the ICC voting system to ensure fairer representation of all member nations?

What role should wealthier boards play in financing global cricket development?

How can Associate Members gain more access to bilateral series, ICC events, and broadcasting opportunities?

Should ICC voting rights be proportional to membership size, financial contribution or equality?

How can Associate Members gain meaningful representation without destabilizing governance?

What percentage of ICC revenue should be reserved for development?

Should Associate Members receive guaranteed Board seats?

How should women's cricket funding be protected?

What limits should exist on franchise league influence?
How should the FTP include emerging nations?

Should voting power be equal, proportional, or weighted?

<u>Sample Funding Formula</u>

**Current Model (Illustrative)**

100% Revenue

89% → Full Members

11% → Associates

**Example Reform Model**

100% Revenue

60% → Full Members

20% → Associates

10% → Women's Development

10% → Strategic Growth Fund

## 9. Guide to Research

Delegates are to keep in mind that the International Cricket Council is not a conventional United Nations committee. It is a special committee so the research regarding it should be approached in a special manner.

Cricket being a sport is susceptible to false facts and rumors to be published in magazines or even some newspapers. Delegates are encouraged to try to research only from official sites and national newspapers, especially facts and figures.

While we do not expect you to scrutinise every piece of information that comes your way, *we highly recommend that you double check important facts and figures.*

Lastly, usage of sites like Wikipedia is disencouraged. Any and all information obtained from these sites will be disregarded unless an official source can be provided.

## 10. Bibliography


1. **ICC main Website** https://www.icc-cricket.com/

2. **ESPN on "Big 3" Influence**
https://www.espncricinfo.com/story/new-icc-finance-model-breaks-up-big-three-1094846

3. **Indian Express on Associate members fearing ICC revenue model**
https://indianexpress.com/article/sports/cricket/icc-revenue-model-threatens-growth-of-game-say-associate-members-8636258

**4) Forbes on Associate members on Olympics and revenue model**
https://www.forbes.com/sites/tristanlavalette/2025/07/30/crickets-associates-focus-on-olympic-qualifying-governance-and-funding-model

**5) TOI on "Generational privilege" and Associate members**
https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/sports/cricket/news/ilt20-unlike-icc-full-members-associatenations-havent-benefitted-from-generational-privilege/articleshow/117142051.cms

**1) ESPN on the revenue breakdown**
https://www.espncricinfo.com/story/bcci-projected-to-earn-us-230-million-per-year-in-icc-s-new-finance-model-1374623

**2) The limits of global governance in a commercialized world of cricket - Manchester University research paper**
https://research.manchester.ac.uk/en/publications/stumped-the-limits-of-global-governance-in-acommercialized-world

**3) Forbes on ICC governance issues**
https://www.forbes.com/sites/tristanlavalette/2025/03/29/calls-for-financial-overhaul-in-cricket-as-governance-issues-rear