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</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOG</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>(Olympic Delivery Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFMB</td>
<td>(Olympic Facility Management Body)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGKM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPLC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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DEFINED TERMS

Authors (the authors of this Project as listed on the cover page)

Charter (the IOC Charter)

Host City (a city which has or will host an Olympic Games)

Games (the Olympic Games)

Proposals (the proposals put forward by the Authors as part of this Project, specifically located in Chapter Five)

Sporting Legacy (the Legacy whereby Sporting Venues are utilized for sporting purposes after the Closing Ceremony, as defined in Chapter Two)

Sporting Venues (the venues and facilities used to host sporting events during the Games)
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

1.1. INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The Olympic Games are “the biggest, most prestigious, peaceful multi-sport event in the world” and cities throughout the world compete for the privilege to host this unique sport spectacle.¹ However, it is apparent that hosting the Games continues to divide opinion.² With the growth of the modern Games leading to higher demands and costs, the Games are under continued scrutiny with regards to the Host City’s post-Games return on investment. The Games’ custodians, the International Olympic Committee (the ‘IOC’) has sought to redress this concern by prioritizing the need for an “Olympic legacy”. Yet after the implementation of various legacy initiatives in the last decade of Games, concerns remain for stakeholders.

The IOC has ensured an increased awareness of “Olympic legacy” as a function of the Games.³ One aspect, the Sporting Legacy, has also necessitated a more formal recognition in the IOC Charter (the ‘Charter’) and in Host City Contracts (the ‘HCCs’) to ensure that there is post-Games use of the Sporting Venues. Still, Sporting Legacy has proved difficult to achieve. Sporting legacy is envisioned and plotted in pre-Opening Ceremony planning, but in the years following the Games, there is no visible IOC mandate which can enforce any legacy standards and best practices.

Whilst prior research has explored, questioned and critiqued the existence and impact of legacy, minimal inquiry has been conducted on how the IOC can better enforce Sporting Legacy. It is crucial to investigate how the IOC can ensure that the spectacle of the

---

¹ Holger Preuss. The Economics of Staging the Olympics (Cheltenham: Edward Edgar, 2004), 1.
³ A web search of the term “Olympic legacy” showed 67 500 hits on search engine Google and 28 300 hits on Google Scholar on 14 May 2010.
Games survives in the Sporting Venues and a post-Games reality of under-utilized stadiums is avoided.

1.2. RESEARCH AIM

The specific aim of this research is present practical proposals (the “Proposals”) which will assist the IOC in promoting the future of the Games through the successful implementation of a Sporting Legacy. In order to achieve the research aim, the following objectives were set:

- To conduct a literature review on the concept of legacy: providing a suitable definition of Sporting Legacy and its evolution vis-a-vis the hosting of sport mega-events
- To assess the current regulation of Sporting Legacy, including implementation structures and commitments made by the Olympic Games stakeholders (a stakeholder map has been included at Appendix A)
- To determine specific reasons why the IOC should obtain greater control of Sporting Legacy

1.3. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study will focus on the primary research aim, which is to develop Proposals that will help the IOC to better regulate Sporting Legacy. An important aspect hereof is the analysis of current Sporting Legacy control measures and the need for further IOC involvement. Additionally, the research will also explore the stated research objectives, with an emphasis on how they interact with the suggested Proposals. As such, this research study is of interest to the IOC, OCOGs, International Federations (the ‘IFs’), National Olympic Committees (the ‘NOCs’), potential Host Cities and any other organizations involved in sport events and facility management.
1.4. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

For the purpose of this research, both quantitative and qualitative approaches were utilized. Quantitative data such as the Sporting Venue usage figures were collected and analysed from primary and secondary sources. An intensive search of relevant literature was undertaken on the various facets of Sporting Legacy, particularly its control within the Charter, HCCs and Technical Manuals. In an attempt to address any lack of prior research, semi-structured interviews on the research problem were conducted with representatives of the IOC, IFs and sport industry experts. These formed the basis of the qualitative data collected, complimented by FIFA Master Lecture presentations.

1.5. LIMITATIONS OF THE PROJECT

Although precautions were taken to ensure the reliability and validity of the Project, it is possible (with the benefit of hindsight) to identify some limitations to this research. The following issues were determined to be the most prevalent limitations on this Project:

- There were time constraints associated with the Project, which limited the data collection process. Not all the interested IF personnel, for example, where able to discuss the research with the Authors before the research submission deadline.
- The Project focuses on the specific aspect of Sporting Legacy as well as a specific follow-up usage of Sporting Venues. The study analyses the post-Games sporting utilization of permanent, purpose-built or significantly upgraded Sporting Venues to the exclusion of other Olympic venue types and forms of post-Games utilization. The Project also does not look to other forms of tangible or intangible legacy that are said to follow Olympic Games.
- The international sporting environment exhibits considerable political interplay. The implementation of the Proposals is dependent not only on their merits, but on the political will and likelihood of the various stakeholders to support and execute
them. This will become all the more important when considering the take-up of our various Proposals.

The above-mentioned constraints deserve consideration when interpreting the research Proposals.

1.6. STRUCTURE OF THE PROJECT

The Project will be divided into six chapters. Chapter One introduces the problem statement and the purpose of the Project. The research aim and objectives are outlined, while a brief analysis of the research design and methodology is presented. Chapter Two will explore the overall concept of legacy and review literature on the topic. The emergence of Sporting Legacy is explained with special attention placed on its historical development.

Chapter Three presents a holistic overview of the current measures used to regulate and evaluate Sporting Legacy by the IOC and its various stakeholders. The relationship between the IOC and the identified stakeholders with regards to Sporting Legacy is also analysed. Chapter Four motivates the need for greater IOC involvement in the regulation of Sporting Legacy. The Authors’ Proposals and recommendations for the implementation of greater IOC Sporting Legacy regulation are presented in Chapter Five. The Proposals offered should assist in a more planned and structured approach to Sporting Legacy and its successful post-Games transition. The final Chapter serves to wrap-up the findings and Proposals and to summarise the ultimate hopes of the Authors.
CHAPTER 2: CONCEPT OF LEGACY AND SPORTING LEGACY

The concept of a legacy left after a sport event is a wide and far-reaching one and stakeholders identify both positive and negative legacies, sometimes even at the location of the same event. Appreciating such breadth, this Chapter will identify the common breakdown of Legacies and will seek to differentiate them. Then, the following section will narrow the focus on Sporting Legacy in order to clarify which type of Legacy will be explored herein and why that type of Legacy has been selected to the exclusion of others. The Chapter will conclude with a section outlining the rise in prominence of the Sporting Legacy concept from a humanistic point of view.

2.1. LEGACY DEFINITIONS

The IOC divides legacy into two camps: tangible and intangible. The tangible benefits can flow from the designing, construction or upgrading of Olympic facilities such as the Sporting Venues or ancillary builds, improving the city or region’s transport infrastructure, urban development and beautification, and the rehabilitation and regeneration within neighboring communities. Intangible legacy may be difficult to quantify or link directly to any specific initiative or stimulus but is undoubtedly a key driver for all stakeholders under the Olympic Movement umbrella. A few examples include an increase in the national pride, enhanced workforce skills and training, the development of new methods in construction, event management and business, the rediscovery of a perhaps dormant national culture, and a catalyst for environmental awareness and consciousness. As mentioned in Chapter One, the Authors recognize that there is considerable literature currently available that explores the divisions and distinctions between different types of Legacy.
2.2. **DEFINITION OF SPORTING LEGACY**

The IOC defines sporting legacy as “the legacies of the Olympic period that facilitate the promotion and development of sport in the Host City, region and country”\(^4\). Table 2.1 shows the common features of sporting legacy as envisioned by the IOC:

*Table 2.1: Forms of sporting legacy as envisioned by the IOC\(^5\)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New permanent venues</td>
<td>Increased sport participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading existing facilities</td>
<td>Increased sport development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased/rehabilitated training grounds and playing fields</td>
<td>Developmental training programs (participants, coaches, officials, administrators, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Equipment</td>
<td>Sport “ambassadors” and role models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The danger with any investigation of the effects of legacy is the inherent difficulty in linking the opportunity of hosting the Games with the majority of legacies that may or may not ensue and academics have explored the existence and extent of any such links over the years. For the purposes of this Project, the term “Sporting Legacy” will refer to the post-Games sport use of new, purpose-built and existing but upgraded Sporting Venues. A Games always involves a reassessment of the existing sporting venues available in the city or region and this project will explore what can be done to ensure that the perils of ‘white elephants’ can be minimized or avoided. The Authors assert that the construction of new Sporting Venues or the upgrading of existing venues for Olympic use is justifiable if there is a defined post-Games sport use which is in line with the

---


\(^5\) Ibid., 61.
Charter. The capitalized “Sporting Legacy” in this Project reflects the Authors’ selected definition of the concept.

2.3. EMERGING IMPORTANCE OF SPORTING LEGACY

In 1911, the founding father of the modern Olympic Movement wrote: “It would be very unfortunate, if the often exaggerated expenses incurred for the most recent Olympiads, a sizeable part of which represented the construction of permanent buildings, which were moreover unnecessary – temporary structures would fully suffice, and the only consequence is to then encourage use of these permanent buildings by increasing the number of occasions to draw in the crowds – it would be very unfortunate if these expenses were to deter countries from putting themselves forward to host the Games in the future.” And it is these, and similar sentiments that are one of the key focus of the Olympic Family and the IOC, specifically today.

Despite the relevancy of Sporting Legacy matters at the Games since the inception of the modern Games in 1896, it was not until Jacques Rogge took over the presidency in 2001 that it came to the forefront of ‘corporate culture’ at the IOC. In 2005, Jacques Rogge wrote: “The IOC believes strongly that Olympic Games should leave a positive legacy for Host Cities. We have been paying increased attention to the point, which is why you will not see this subject included today right from the candidature phase in the Olympic bidding process… The IOC’s ability to help cities consistently learn from the good examples and avoid the bad is what we must and will continue to develop”.

Although the Games themselves span a relatively short time period, only 16 days, the facilities constructed to house the events endure for decades. The IOC continues to support infrastructure projects that are efficient and “enhance the image and popularity of

---


the Olympic movement and encouraging other similar investment.”\textsuperscript{9} After all, the Games are an “international sports festival that involves virtually all sectors of society. To host the event, therefore, brings many concrete legacies to the host city and country”.\textsuperscript{10}

\section*{2.4. SUCCESS OF OLYMPICS, INCREASE IN COST, SIZE AND DEMANDS}

It is widely accepted that the Games have developed into a global event which, every four years, “offers the host city the opportunity to become the centre of global interest”.\textsuperscript{11} But the scale of the Games has increased over time, and this is reflected across a number of measurables, including: the number of sports, events and competitors (these graphs are included at Appendix B). As such, in 2002, the IOC resolved to curb this growth and limited the number of sports in the Summer Olympic Programme to 28.\textsuperscript{12} In the same manner, the number of events was limited to 301 and the number of athletes to 10,500.\textsuperscript{13}

“In the early days, hosting the Games meant little more than assuming responsibility for providing the necessary venues for competitions and for Games-related activities”.\textsuperscript{14} However as the scale and popularity of the Games has increased, there have been greater direct and indirect demands placed on the Host City. The Games’ demands, as well as the ambitions of the Host City itself lead to a high cost for organizing the Games. Fig 2.1 below shows that the operating costs of recent editions of the Summer Games have also shown a relatively steady increase.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., 122.
\textsuperscript{11} Holger Preuss. \textit{The Economics of Staging the Olympics} (Cheltenham: Edward Edgar, 2004), 1.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14} Gold and Gold 2007, 5
\end{flushleft}
Having established that the Games are a festival increasing in cost and impact and that Legacy is a crucial element of such impact and the package of any Games, the Project will next investigate which of the Olympic stakeholders currently oversee and nurture legacy and where their duties and obligations are found in the matrix of Olympic Movement documentation, agreements, guidelines and structures.
CHAPTER 3: EXISTING FRAMEWORK THAT GOVERNS OLYMPIC SPORTING LEGACY

The IOC has researched, reported, coordinated and activated many Sporting Legacy initiatives in recent years. This Chapter analyzes the existing organizational steps undertaken by the IOC to date, from the more general and all encompassing guidelines and actions towards those which are more specific in nature.

3.1. KEY OLYMPIC DOCUMENTATION

The first section of the Chapter will look to the key documentation that currently exists. The IOC has in place a hierarchy of documentation: the Charter, the HCC and Technical Manuals, “which establish the rules and regulations to which all parties involved in Games planning and operations must adhere”.15 By picking out the relevant aspects of these central documents it becomes possible to comprehend the IOC’s general stance on Sporting Legacy issues and what the IOC and its main stakeholders are doing to ensure a successful post-Games transition.

The following three tables are an analysis of current IOC documentation in reference to Sporting Legacy. Used as a tool to summarize a wealth of IOC information, the Authors have picked out the aspects of IOC policy and guidelines most relevant to the issues of Sporting Legacy. Key reference to sporting legacy columns takes out specific articles, quotes and IOC policy from the aforementioned documentation. The “Advantages and Disadvantages/Opportunities” columns summarize arguments for each of the areas of interest as they pertain to Sporting Legacy and the Authors analysis of how they could be improved. It is hoped that the complete analysis will give readers a clearer picture of current institutional measures taken by the IOC in the domain of Sporting Legacy.

### Table 3.1 OCOG “Obligations”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Key References to Sporting Legacy</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages / Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Olympic Charter (OC)         | - Art. No.13: “to encourage and support a responsible concern for environmental issues, to promote sustainable development in sport and to require that the Olympic Games are held accordingly.”
- Art. No.14: “to promote a positive legacy from the Olympic Games to the host cities and host countries.”
- See Appendix Figure 1.1 to 1.3 which explains the hierarchy and dynamics between the most integral (OC, HCC and TM) IOC documentation and guidelines. | - Vital step forward when art.14; “...promotion of a positive legacy” placed legacy issues into the fundamental reference document for all parties of the Olympic Movement.  
- Because the Charter stipulates the conditions for the celebration of the Olympic Games, legacy concerns are therefore represented in planning and coordination of Games. | - Does not specify what exactly IOC means
- Does not state how the IOC of other stakeholders may achieve the “positive legacy” it sets out
- Art.14 is found under “Mission and Role of IOC”, but does not specify any role for the IOC in legacy. Indeed, this goes against the current organizational stance - which is to transfer legacy concerns to Host.
- No specifics in legacy related matters, unlike section 7 (Olympic Properties)  
- No Bye-Laws or legal protection to rules |
| Host City Contract (HCC)     | - The Preamble states: “WHEREAS it is the mutual desire of the IOC, the City and the NOC that the Games ... leave a positive legacy for the City and the Host Country.”
- Many technical aspects of Sporting Legacy concerns are addressed in the Host City Contract through reference to Technical Manuals, “which form an integral part of the (Host City) Contract.” | - There is a healthy number of Sporting Legacy related details enforced through the Technical Manuals which form an integral part of the HCC  
- Sec 27: “Games Knowledge Management, Archives & Records” creates detailed mandate on the transfer of knowledge which could be useful for OGKM Sporting Legacy initiatives - Appendix D for further OGKM info | - Direct references only found in the Preamble section of HCC – (Could easily have its own part in section II: “Principles of Planning, Organising and Staging” with issues like Transport, Environmental Protection, Coordination Commission, etc.)
- Wording & impact remains vague as in the Charter (“Positive legacy for the City and Host Country.”) |
| Technical Manual (TM): Venues – Design Standards for Competition Venues | - “The IOC recognizes that competition venues are a critical Olympic Games success factor and that expenditure on venue development comprises a high percentage of a total Games budget. Therefore, in developing the Design Standards for Competition Venues, the IOC’s objectives are to: | - Identifies some legacy solutions in considerable detail, such as permanent vs. temporary infrastructure recommendations  
- Objective to distinguish between Olympic and legacy venue needs | - Other than the permanent vs. temporary guidelines, no specific mention of any other venue related Sporting Legacy promotion initiatives
- IOC identify the need to “encourage” positive |

---

18 Ibid., 18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Technical Manual (TM): Sport</strong></th>
<th>**...Help distinguish between Olympic and legacy venue needs.”**²⁹</th>
<th><strong>- Technical Manuals are also annexes to the Host City Contract, and therefore contain contractual requirements</strong></th>
<th><strong>Legacy plans, but do not set up the necessary policy or guidelines in the Technical manual to help ensure that the Host delivers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- “...specific to sourcing venues for Olympic Games use, the **IOC’s philosophy is: To use existing venues, with refurbishment if needed to the required Olympic standard, build new permanent venues only if there is a legacy need, seek a temporary solution, where there is not a legacy need.”**³⁰</td>
<td>- Technical Manuals are being constantly updated by the OGKM team and IOC Staff so that new issues are passed on after each Games experience</td>
<td>- Out of the <strong>31 total Technical Manuals</strong> that were published in time for the election of the 2016 host city in October 2009, only two have any direct reference to Sporting Legacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- **Section 1.7 “Legacy Opportunities” lists the various legacy opportunities associated with Sport. **Recent experience highlights that **legacy planning should be undertaken very early in the life cycle of an OCOG, and Sport should take a leading role together with the key external clients (e.g. Government agencies, NF, NOCs, IFs).**³¹</td>
<td>- Acknowledgment of the importance of legacy planning early in lifecycle of OCOG and the integral role of sport in providing a lasting legacy</td>
<td>- Manual does not explain how relevant stakeholders (IFs, NFs, NOCs, Hosts) should work together to deliver lasting legacies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Summarizes some of the ways to deliver a positive Sporting Legacy (hosting international sporting events, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Shifts a great deal of the Sporting Legacy aspects onto external collaborators (Host, NOCs, IFs, NFs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Could take a more proactive role in coordination of stakeholders to ensure the best possible Sporting Legacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


³⁰ Ibid., 87.

### Table 3.2 IOC Legacy Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Key References to Sporting Legacy</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages / Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olympic Game Study Commission</strong></td>
<td>“...propose solutions to manage the inherent size, complexity and cost of staging the Olympic Games in the future, and to assess how the Games can be made more streamlined and efficient.” 22  - Captures five themes, of which the most significant to the topic of Sporting Legacy are “Venues and Facilities” and “Games Management.”  - Art. 2.02 – “Review and rationalize gross venue capacities. This is part of the leitmotif of cost reduction generally and the avoidance of Olympic white elephants.”  - Art. 2.06 – “Maximize temporary installations over permanent construction, especially where legacy requirements are less than Games requirements.” 22  - “As a responsible organization, the IOC wants to ensure that host cities and residents are left with the best possible legacy in terms of venues, infrastructure, environment, expertise and experience.” 24</td>
<td>- 117 practical recommendations of the OGSC were catalysts for IOC changes  - In 2003, brought legacy issue to the forefront of IOC policy and guideline making  - Changes brought from the top – practical recommendations proposed by IOC president, Jacques Rogge, were able to permeate down through corporate culture of IOC  - Recommendations led to the solutions for managing size, complexity and cost of staging Olympic Games</td>
<td>- The practicality is questionable due to the limited institutionalization of proposed recommendations from 2003 report  - Follow up on 117 recommendations outlined in <strong>Pound’s 2003 report not well documented.</strong> General frameworks and culture has been instituted but few practical measures.  - Applying the 117 recommendations requires the support and cooperation of all members of the Olympic Family, not just IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olympic Games Global Impact (OGGI)</strong></td>
<td>- N/A at date of report</td>
<td>- 11 year comprehensive study by independent local research group  - Objective to identify potential legacies and maximize benefits of hosting an Olympic Games  - After several OGGI studies, it will become possible to benchmark and compare Legacy initiatives across several games and take best practices</td>
<td>- Does it target needs of needs of Host City or the Olympic Movement and IOC?  - Hard to meaningfully identify and benchmark legacies when the OGGI study is brought to a close only 2 years after Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legacy Guide (LG)</strong></td>
<td>- IOC Legacy Guide sporting legacy definition: “Comprise the legacies of the Olympic period that facilitate the promotion and development of sport in the host city, region and country. These legacies vary in nature. They include both tangible and intangible initiatives and can be in respect of the bid to the host city’s contextual environment.” 25  - The IOC identifies the following Sporting Legacy aspects in the Legacy Guide: major stakeholders and their roles, the types of sporting legacy, the type of sporting infrastructure (temporary vs. permanent), sporting legacy related opportunities and risks and key sporting legacy lessons learned from past Games.</td>
<td>- One document focusing on all relevant Olympic legacy related issues (from the IOC’s perspective)  - Sound overview of legacy concerns and offers some ways to help ensure positive legacies  - Offers a more clear understanding of Olympic Games stakeholders and their role in legacy  - Provides specific examples of legacy solutions (drawn from past examples)</td>
<td>- Only used as a guide i.e.: no requirements or mandates  - Does not highlight past problematic cases (as a tool to learn from previous mistakes)  - Need for more organizational specifics in terms of creating positive legacies. <strong>Identifies what is a good legacy but not always how to achieve it (or examples of ways it has been achieved in the past)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


Table 3.3 Bid City Promises: Candidature Acceptance Procédure and Questionnaire (CAPQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key References to Sporting Legacy</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages / Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Theme 1: “Vision, legacy, and communication”</strong> Q 1.6 asks: “What will be the legacy for sport in your city/region? Describe the measures you intend to take to promote and develop Olympic sports that are less popular in your country in the lead-up to the Olympic Games?” Appendix E sets out the full list of ‘Legacy Questions’</td>
<td>- Most important is that it requires Applicant and Candidate Cities to consider legacy factors in early stages of Olympic Games bidding process</td>
<td>- No Sporting Legacy specific ‘guarantees’ in CAP or CAPQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Theme 9: “Sport and Venues”:</strong> “…provides an overview of an Applicant City’s facilities in terms of venues, distinguishing between existing, planned and additional venues and provides cities the opportunity to describe their concepts for the Olympic Village(s) and IBC/MPC. It also details the experience of the Applicant City in hosting international sports events.”</td>
<td>- Sport and Venues Theme calls for detailed and specific sporting venue and infrastructure information and planning while providing useful charts to guide the Candidate through the requirements</td>
<td>- Use of vague questions for CAPQ Theme 1: “Vision, legacy and communication” and CAP Chapter 1: “Motivation, concept and legacy”. Vague questioning into legacy planning elicits vague answers from Applicants/Candidates. The potential exists for Candidates to provide unsubstantiated or ill thought out hopes and aspirations that appear convincing but lack organizational backing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Venues must meet requirements and be realistic with respect to the master plan of the Host City, resource efficiencies and post-Games legacy. Venue planning should support the concept of sustainable development as it applies to the Olympic Games in general and to venues specifically (e.g. use of permanent versus temporary facilities, environmentally sensitive materials/systems/impacts).”</td>
<td>-Sport and Venues requirements specifies between “Existing venues” - permanent works and no permanent works and “Venues to be built” – permanent vs. temporary only. This makes the Candidate justify the construction of purpose built, permanent venues strictly.</td>
<td>- Emphasis on pre-games planning does not always translate to post-games solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- For venue selection: “Use existing venues with refurbishment if needed. Build a new permanent venue only if there is a legacy need, ensuring flexible use if possible. If there is no legacy need, seek a temporary solution.”</td>
<td>- Many bid process promises are forgotten or amended after games take place</td>
<td>- IOC very little power to mandate or ensure Sporting Legacy promises are fulfilled by Host</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.2. **THE STAKEHOLDERS**

The next section of this Chapter will investigate the key Olympic Family stakeholders that have an impact or interest in Sporting Legacy. The IOC Legacy Guide, as it effectively identifies the most central legacy stakeholders. From this, we will explore the main stakeholders and how they relate to Sporting Legacy in particular. As we saw in the previous section, the fundamental issue with the current stakeholder landscape is that both the documents and guidelines provided by the IOC do not include or seek any tangible mandates or specific policy commitments concerning Olympic Games Sporting Legacy issues. This is the area we believe, the IOC can improve and become more proactive to ensure positive Sporting Legacies. As the hub connecting all major Sporting Legacy stakeholders, the IOC could take measures to improve the coordination and communication of legacy policy and activities between the organizations identified in this section. The analysis will return to the IOC in the following Chapter in order to better understand the central role that it has in the working and protection of the legacy. Below, the other key stakeholders and their positions and priorities are considered in turn to better understand the Sporting Legacy environment, and where responsibilities and priorities lie.

**NATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE (NOC)**

- NOCs aim to “… promote the fundamental principles of Olympism at a national level within the framework of the sport. NOCs are committed to the development of athletes and support the pursuit of sport in all programmes and high performance sport in their countries”.  
  
- Olympic Games Host region NOCs are in a unique situation due to their close ties with the IOC. This established relationship can be a powerful tool to ensure that

---

Sporting Legacy matters are handled in a positive manor. Going through the Host NOC is a good way to implement IOC Sporting Legacy initiatives.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATIONS (IF)

- IFs “… have the responsibility and duty to manage and monitor the everyday running of the world’s various sports, including the practical organisation of events during the Games and the supervision of the development of athletes practicing these sports at every level... (Olympic) Competition venues and training sites, and their selection, need to meet the technical requirements of the requirements of the IFs”.  

- IFs are the guardians of international sport, in this capacity they acknowledge that utilization of Olympic quality sporting venues is important for the promotion of their sports. Moreover, due to Olympic Games policy, all sporting infrastructures have already been confirmed as premium and consistent with all technical requirements of each IF.

NATIONAL FEDERATIONS (NF)

- According to IOC documentation, NFs play an important role in “helping to identify the needs of their particular sport in their respective countries and often specifying the conditions for the use of sports facilities after the Olympic Games, taking the needs of both elite and amateur sport into consideration”.

- Evidently, the IOC defines the role of the NFs as having a strong role in Sporting Legacy as we have defined it. Theoretically, NF inclusion in sports infrastructure legacy planning is ideal for the further promotion of sports in and around the Host City. Realistically, NF participation in Sporting Legacy plans and actions is very dependant on effective collaboration with all other stakeholders mentioned.
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND AUTHORITIES

- The IOC acknowledges, “it also falls upon them [public authorities] to put in place the necessary safeguards to prevent the construction of permanent facilities that are disproportionately large or fail to respond to future needs, and they must also ensure that funding of the investment and the operating of the facilities is guaranteed”.  
  
- Placing such great responsibility on the Host public authorities is understandable due to the complexities and differences that each Host area presents. Though, it would be in the interest of all stakeholders involved, if the IOC and other Olympic Family stakeholders took a more active role through collaboration and the transfer of sport specific knowledge to local public authorities to ensure their investments and can earn a positive Sporting Legacy return.

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE FOR OLYMPIC GAMES AND OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

- Under the IOC Legacy Guide stakeholder descriptions, the OCOG and/or ODA are “directly responsible for the construction of Olympic venues”.  
  
- It is their task to ensure that that the requirements of the IOC and IFs are met for the Olympic Games facilities, while ensuring that “the requirements of the Post-Games owner of the permanent facilities are also met. The objective being to provide a functional, sustainable and viable resource tailored to the Host City’s long-term needs”.  
  
- As the organizational “face” of the Olympic Games, the OCOG has great demands put on it from the IOC to deliver the games in a certain manner. Often this puts their focus more on the demands of the IOC and IFs than meeting the
needs of post-Games facility management. It is in the nature of the current organizational structure of the OCOG to concentrate on the delivery of the Games rather than post-Games issues.\(^{34}\)

- The fact that OCOGs are dismantled almost entirely right after the Games gives reason for concern for Sporting Legacy issues (see chapter 5 Recommendations).

**OLYMPIC VENUE LEASEHOLDERS AND OWNERS**

- Leaseholders [clubs, sports associations, etc.] and owners [investors] are “privileged partners in the processes of constructing or upgrading sports facilities. The quantity and quality of activities and events they are able to attract to their facilities in the period following the Olympic Games will be a major determinant of whether they are a success in sporting legacy terms…”\(^{35}\)

- Much like the IFs and NFs understand best the specificities of their sport, the facility leaseholder/owner best understands the needs of their venue, and its potential in the marketplace and should therefore plan accordingly.

- Under this premise, the IOC suggests, “It is essential, therefore, that [leaseholders/owners] are consulted during the infrastructure planning phases in regards to the identification of Post-Games requirements… This consultation will assist in reducing major configuration works and related costs after the Games and maximise the sustainability and magnitude of the sporting legacy provided by the venues”.\(^{36}\)

- The main problem remains a lack of IOC clarity on who these parties should actually be consulting with, and whether any organizational foundations have been put in place to facilitate such consultations and if there is motivation for coordination amongst parties.

---

\(^{34}\) Paraphrasing of interview with Michelle Lemaitre: Project Manager, Olympic Games Department, International Olympic Committee. May 3, 2010.


\(^{36}\) Ibid.
ASSOCIATIONS

- The IOC outlines this group as “an occasion for all the associations actively upholding the Olympic ideal of promoting sport, particularly amongst your people, women and minorities and the disabled etc., to manifest their desire to participate in the events and help their members drive more long-term benefits from it”.

- Many of these types of associations are formed because cities seek to impress the IOC (2010 LegaciesNow in Vancouver) or following the Games (LA84 Foundation in Los Angeles).

3.3. OLYMPIC FACILITY MANAGEMENT BODIES

As the complexity and the scale of the Games have increased in the last twenty years, Host Cities have tried several methods to organise the facilities that have been built to host the Games. One of the most popular methods to deal with the facilities in the post-Olympic period has been the creation of, what the IOC call, an “Olympic Facility Management Body.” The creation of a foundation for managing facilities is a solution that generally guarantees their continued existence.

Looking back some of the more interesting Olympic Facility Management cases since 1996, it is evident that each Host has dealt with Sporting Legacy in different ways and used different organizational approaches in hopes of delivering positive legacies. Not all past examples fit the title of “Olympic Facility Management Body”, since different complexities and needs of Host Cities has given rise to a number of legacy management forms. The following section will present the cases of 3 types; the traditional Facility

---
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Management Body, the Event and Facility Management Collaboration, and the Social/Cultural Legacy Management Body. Each has merits and lessons to take away.

**SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK AUTHORITY - TRADITIONAL OLYMPIC FACILITY MANAGEMENT BODY**

Capitalising on the success of the Sydney 2000 Olympics, the New South Wales (NSW) Government established the Sydney Olympic Park Authority (the “SOPA”) to manage the next phase of development at the main site, Sydney Olympic Park. Under SOPA’s management Sydney Olympic Park has become one of the most active sporting precincts in the world. “The Park is Australia’s *Home of Sport* with over 50 different sports (including tennis, gymnastics, hockey and athletics) being played at the Park in 2006, by more than 1.2 million participants. A further 1.5 million spectators attended almost 100 major national and international sports events held at the Park during 2006.” Moreover, there has been a concentration on sport for all initiatives with over 1.1 million people visited Sydney Olympic Park Aquatic Centre in 2006 either to learn to swim, to participate in swimming carnivals or school sports, for leisure and recreation. 39 “Sydney Olympic Park Authority is constituted by the Sydney Olympic Park Authority Act No. 57 which established the SOPA as a statutory authority, with responsibility to manage the public assets of Sydney Olympic Park - open space, venues, parklands and development areas”. 40

All major works, programs, services, elements, and issues associated with Sydney Olympic Park are managed by a single integrated unit (the “Place Management”) which (within legal and financial constraints) focuses primarily on achieving stakeholder outcomes. 41 The continued rejuvenation and renewal of facilities does “…come at a cost.

---

Thus, the NSW government, which paid for the initial games infrastructure, has continued to invest large amounts of money in SOPA”.42 SOPA and the Australian Host public authorities pioneered an organizational model which has proven relatively successful and thus been emulated by other Host City organizers. As a leader in long-term Olympic legacy building, SOPA has also recently developed the Draft Master Plan 2030 as a blueprint for the future development of Sydney Olympic Park.43 SOPA has proven that when Host organizations take responsibility and proper care to Sporting Legacy concerns, the post-Olympic transition is improved.

Following on from the Sydney model, London 2012 has established the OPLC to harness the investment and infrastructure development legacy of the 2012 London Games, with a structure very similar to its Antipodean predecessor. According to Karen Webb, Executive Director of Marketing and Communications at OPLC, it was the first facility management body to be set up three years in advance to the Games44 and it is “responsible for delivering one of the most important Olympic legacy promises made in the original London 2012 bid. This key pledge concerns the physical legacy: the long-term planning, development, management and maintenance of the Olympic Park and its facilities after the London 2012 Games”.45 The OPLC works in coordination with The Olympic Development Agency (ODA), who is the group responsible for the technical aspects of construction of Olympic infrastructure. They are at the forefront current building phases and will continue to function after the Games to get the venues concerted for future use, at which point OPLC will take over control of the facilities for

management purposes and the OPLC is working with London Events and UK Sport to pitch for future events at Sporting Venues.46

UTAH ATHLETIC FOUNDATION / UTAH SPORTS COMMISSION - EVENT/FACILITY MANAGEMENT COMBINATION

In May 2002, the UAF, a “Utah non-profit 501(c)(3) organization”, inherited the Olympic Park and Olympic Oval following the Winter Games in Salt Lake, having been designated by the State of Utah as manager of the post-Games operations47. The mission of the UAF is “…to provide a year-round, world-class facilities to develop athletes in winter sports through competition, training and recreational programs”.48 The financial success of the Salt Lake Games provided an CS$85 million endowment to fund the Olympic Park and Olympic Oval into perpetuity. The Utah Athletic Foundation continues to manage the endowment and utilize the venues for hosting sporting and training events.

In addition to the UAF, The Utah Sports Commission was created in 1999 to support the legacy of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games and as a way to enhance Utah’s position in the sports marketplace.49 The organization partners with venues and numerous other organizations throughout the state of Utah to attract Olympic related and other major sporting events. The State of Utah and the Utah Sports Commission carry on their involvement in the Olympic movement by hosting Olympic related events and attending Olympic related conferences and other activities.50 In a 2008 marketing document, it states that the Utah Sports Commission “is working to distinguish the state of Utah as a

leader of sports marketing, event attraction, sport development and sport related tourism. As a result, sports have become a key economic platform, and an invaluable tool in enhancing the state’s image”. The commission represents both public and state leaders in sports development and is a non-profit private/public partnership foundation governed by a volunteer board of twenty-nine sports and business leaders, including former members and the chairman of the Salt Lake Olympic Committee. Post 2002 until 2008, the Utah Sports Commission was partner in hosting 50 World Cups or Championships, 76 Olympic (USOC/USA) events and are managing 14 Sporting Venues for events, elite training (home to several national winter sports governing bodies) and recreational purposes. Notably, the Utah Sports Commission also manages the Olympic Legacy Volunteer Database which includes over 10,000 Olympic-trained volunteers who have continued to lend a helping hand with subsequent sporting events that have come to Utah. Visibly, Salt Lake City capitalized on the 2002 Winter Games as a way to redefine the region as a home to winter sports. Organizers delivered a unique and effective Sporting Legacy management partnership by combining Olympic facility management by the UAF and sports event management by the Utah Sports Commission. This partnership has created a lasting Olympic Sporting Legacy in the state of Utah that continues to foster sports development at all levels in the region.

2010 LEGACIESNOW (2010 LN) - THE SOCIAL/CULTURAL LEGACY MANAGEMENT BODY

Vancouver organizers took a new direction with concern to its legacy initiatives. Instead of a facility based management body, 2010 LegaciesNow (2010 LN) was designed to nurture legacies before, during and after the Vancouver 2010 Olympics and Paralympic Winter Games. Officially launched in June 2000, the 2010 LN initiative was originally

---
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intended to ensure that the bid for the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games invested money and built capacity in the sport system: “The concept of developing a sport and recreation legacy in the years prior to an Olympic and Paralympic Games, especially during the Bid phase, is believed to be a world first”. 2010 LN was, at that stage of the bid process, created to recognize the importance of sport and physical activity programs in Canada. Regardless of the outcome of the Bid, its goal was to ensure that the Bid resulted in a strengthening of the provincial and national sport systems through targeted programming and maximizing activities by provincial and national sport organizations and athletes. Later, by the time Vancouver’s bid to host the 2010 Winter Games was won, 2010 LN used its early success and additional provincial government financial support “as an opportunity to build on the work it created, with a vision to foster healthier, active and creative communities beyond just sport”.

2010 LN has four core business areas: Sport and Recreation Now, Arts Now, Literacy Now and Volunteers Now. Under the Sport and Recreation Now division, they focused on their programme called “playground to podium.” Key goals under this initiative were to increase general participation in sport by 20% and place local athletes from British Columbia on the podium in 2010. Since inception in 2004 it has captured more than 100,000 new sport participants in over 100 communities province-wide. 2010LN’s future legacy development activities will centre on literacy, sport, First Nations and people with disabilities in British Columbia, Canada.

From the very outset, there has been a cooperative working relationship between 2010LN, the bid corporation, and subsequently VANOC. VANOC recognized that 2010LN was an essential link into the communities of the Province and that it was better equipped to create sustainable social legacies in the province. Unlike a group whose focus is the day-to-day operation of programming, the distinctive competence of 2010LN
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is elevating the impact of the wide range of programs it engages with. Creating and nurturing collaborative activities is thus a key feature of the 2010LN model.\textsuperscript{55}

3.4. UNDERSTANDING THE MATRIX

“As far as sporting infrastructures are concerned, the involvement of stakeholders connected to the games (the IOC, ODA, IFs) and, above all, the post-Olympic stakeholders (NFs, operators, leaseholders, clubs, associations, etc.) is essential”.\textsuperscript{56} This Chapter has tried to condense and clarify some of the key documentation that governs the relationship between key Olympic Family stakeholders, with the hope that this would prove a useful tool in understanding the roles and responsibilities that certain key stakeholders hold in relation to the important topic of Sporting Legacy. The exercise is a difficult one, made the more so by the feeling that this domain is populated with good ideas, positive suggestions and recommendations. However, the Authors feel that for a domain as important, sensitive and all-encompassing as Sporting Legacy, let alone legacy more generally, this status quo model needs to be improved on. Some of the concepts that the IOC has introduced are positive in their intention and vision, but the matrix of relationships and responsibilities allows for too much interpretation and potentially counterproductive autonomy. It is our conclusion based on the analysis of these Sporting Legacy stakeholders that the IOC needs to facilitate the involvement and coordination of all stakeholders in a more active manner in order to improve Sporting Legacy matters. It is hoped that the Proposals that will follow in Chapter Five will provide the IOC food for thought, but before that Chapter, it is worth investigating why the IOC particularly should take the lead with any amendments or alterations to the status quo.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 17.

CHAPTER 4: THE NEED FOR GREATER IOC INVOLVEMENT IN SPORTING LEGACY

The previous Chapter put the key Olympic Family stakeholders under the microscope to evaluate their roles in securing a positive Sporting Legacy. While not seeking to diminish or undermine their respective responsibilities, it is the Authors contention that all positive practices, initiatives and motivations flow from ‘head’ of the Olympic Family i.e. the IOC. This Chapter outlines the reasons why the IOC should become more involved in the determination and achievement of Sporting Legacy for each edition of the Games. This chapter also briefly describes how each particular concern is impacting on the operations of the IOC and the successful staging of either the Summer or Winter Games.

Recent developments, such as the formation of the OGKM Department suggest that the IOC is already aware of the strategic importance of creating a Sporting Legacy. As such, it is important to identify the reasons for greater IOC involvement in Sporting Legacy. The key reasonings for such greater involvement are broken down into different areas of concern and explored below.

4.1. LACK OF INTEGRATION OF SPORTING LEGACY INTO IOC’S KEY STRATEGIC FUNCTIONS

In recent years, the IOC has identified key activities that are required for the success of the Olympic Movement and the Games. Firstly, internally, this has resulted in administrative and governance measures such as the establishment of IOC Commissions. Currently the IOC has 25 Commissions whose roles are to assist and advise the IOC President, Executive Board and Session.57 Secondly, the IOC has also strategically claimed control of its main revenue streams and implemented the required

---

commercialisation of the Olympic brand and product.\textsuperscript{58} Thirdly, as far back as 1981, the IOC secured exclusive use of its intellectual property such as the Olympic symbol, motto and flag.\textsuperscript{59} Fourthly, in 2001, the IOC established the Olympic Broadcasting Services (OBS) to “ensure the high standards of broadcasting were maintained over successive Olympic Games”.\textsuperscript{60} As the host broadcaster, the OBS is chiefly responsible for providing the pictures and images of the Games as a service to all broadcast organizations who have purchased the television and radio rights to the Games.\textsuperscript{61} The net effect of these four developments has been an increase in the IOC’s control of the determinants of the Games’ economic success.

Despite these advancements in protecting the Games, the IOC exercises no direct control of a crucial issue which also impacts on its economic success – positive Sporting Legacy. This is because the event is managed by the OCOG and associated aims such as a Sporting Legacy can only be achieved as a result of the OCOG’s actions. Some analysts have described the relationship between the IOC and the OCOG as a franchise system whereby the IOC (the franchisor) sells its “Olympic Games” product to a franchisee OCOG.\textsuperscript{62} As in commercial franchising, this is a vertical relationship between legally independent businesses (IOC and OCOG/Host City/NOC), which is regulated by a contract (the HCC). While the IOC carefully controls the parameters of what is to be delivered through the Olympic Charter, the CAPQ, the CAP and the HCC, “the IOC does not, and never has, managed the event”.\textsuperscript{63} The IOC holds the OCOG responsible for the successful staging of the Games with guarantees underwritten by the Host City and

\textsuperscript{58} Young, Kevin and Wamsley, Kevin eds. “Global Olympics: historical and sociological studies of the Modern Games.” (Amsterdam : Elsevier, 2005), 179.
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national government. However, if Host Cities fail to deliver a Sporting Legacy, they are only accountable to their residents whose taxes provide the funding for the Games.\(^{64}\)

Programmes such as the OGKM serve to identify the potential legacies without giving the IOC actual control on the selection or control of a Sporting Legacy or the monitoring of its achievement. Host Cities can select any particular legacy which focuses on social or economic benefits – at the exclusion of a Sporting Legacy. This is true for the city of Barcelona which successfully used the 1992 Games to promote itself as a tourist destination.\(^{65}\) Even in cases where the Host City plans to have a Sporting Legacy, decisions made by the OCOG in the pre-event stage may make this unattainable. An example is the under-utilization of the purpose-built 2004 Athens Games facilities because “the location of the venues reflected political, landownership and pragmatic consideration rather planning for post-Games commercial use”.\(^{66}\)

### 4.2. NEGATIVE PUBLICITY CAUSED BY UNSUCCESSFUL SPORTING LEGACIES

The Olympics Games have always attracted significant public attention, as sport is a public good in most nations.\(^{67}\) The public scrutiny of the Games has increased as the Games have expanded and the focus shifted from merely hosting to the ambitious pursuit of political, economic and social benefits by OCOGs.\(^{68}\) The IOC has numerous concerns when one of their festivals depart from a city, but none seems more visible or potentially undermining than the site of large, thoughtfully-designed Sporting Venues being left to begin a life of underuse and neglect.

---


In the lead up to the Games, one of most contentious issues is the funding for the construction of facilities and the justification for their investment.\(^6^9\) The media and national citizens are interested in the Legacy and the benefits of their investment. Bid books promote the Olympics as a catalyst for goals such as sporting excellence, employment and economic growth.

Therefore when a Sporting Legacy for the newly constructed Sporting Venues is not adequately achieved, there is a public outcry and negative perception of the opportunity. Investigative journalism places considerable scrutiny on “the conversion and disposal of the Olympic sites, with empty stadia and unpopular housing schemes taken as poor planning and mismanagement”.\(^7^0\) The IOC is blamed by the residents of the Host City and by the general public when Sporting Venues struggle to produce sufficient usage and revenue to sustain annual operating costs after the event.\(^7^1\)

The most obvious sign of a negative sporting legacy is when large, specialised Sporting Venues are left in a state of neglect and are under-utilized. By way of example, this has been the case of some of the Athens 2004 venues, drawing mainly local criticism for the Host City but global disapproval for the IOC and the Games. The Daily Mail headline in Figure 4.1 is just one of several articles which have been written by the international press highlighting Athens’ negative sporting legacy.

---


The negative publicity is potentially increased by the nature of the relationship between the IOC and the OCOG. The conditions of the HCC mandate governmental involvement in the organization of the Games. This leads to public spending by national, state or local authorities for the Games as each candidate city has to provide financial guarantees for the Games.72

Table 4.1 shows a comparison of public and private funding in the Summer Games between 1972 and 2000. It seems logical to suggest that the greater the public investment in the funding of the Games, the greater the public criticism if no Legacy is achieved. Having been 95% publicly funded, it is no surprise that the 1976 Montreal Games are widely criticized not only for failing to achieve a Sporting Legacy but for also creating a regional debt which led to future public services, such as health and education, being underfunded.73
Table 4.1 Funding sources for Summer Olympic Games 1972 - 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olympic Host City</th>
<th>Public Funding %</th>
<th>Private Funding %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Munich 1972</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal 1976</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow 1980</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles 1984</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul 1988</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona 1992</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta 1996</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney 2000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rule 37.1 of the IOC Charter also exempts the IOC from financial responsibility liability in the organization and staging of the Games. Thus, within this franchiser/franchisee model, the IOC may be perceived as being a merely commercially-driven entity which is only interested in the financial benefits of the Games without paying attention to the Sporting Legacy of the Sporting Venues. This perception prevails despite the fact the IOC is not directly responsible for the achievement of Sporting Legacy.

The IOC should seek greater involvement in post-Games sport legacy as a positive sporting legacy minimizes the level of blame that is placed on the IOC for any shortfalls in the overall legacy benefits. As Sporting Venues are used for elite or “sport for all programmes” after the Games, the use of scarce public resources for sport infrastructure is justified. Sporting legacy should be planned and communicated to the public in all

---
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phases of the Olympics Games, even if the sporting legacy is not directly controlled by the IOC. This is currently understood by the IOC Evaluation Commission as it closely and independently monitors popular and press opinion in candidate cities. The IOC will then avoid the situation which happened before the 1976 Winter Games planned for Denver, when an action group “Citizens for Colorado’s Future” successfully forced a referendum and voted against the Olympics. With Denver not having the required federal and state funding, the IOC was forced to reassign the Games to Innsbruck, the 1964 Winter Games Host City.

4.3. ‘RIVAL’ BIDDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITIES AND LEGACY EFFORTS OF INTERNATIONAL FEDERATIONS

It should be noted that while the Games have grown in participation and popularity, there are hundreds of elite international sporting competitions annually. The increase in the quantity of global sport has led to the increased competition between cities to gain the right to host a mega-event as well as the competition between sport mega-events to secure bidders. The Olympics Games face competition from over 200 elite international sport competitions held every four years. Although these events are of varying magnitude and have diverse hosting requirements, cities can achieve their aims by hosting these “substitute events”.

An example of this trend is the city of Manchester which after failing to host the 1996 and 2000 Summer Olympic Games, achieved its urban regeneration goal through hosting the 2002 Commonwealth Games. Part of the event’s sporting legacy was achieved with

---
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the establishment of the National Cycling Centre at the Manchester Velodrome.\textsuperscript{82} The City of Manchester Stadium has been leased to English Premier League side Manchester City Football Club with the imposition of access for all income groups and “fair ticket prices”\textsuperscript{83}

Table 4.2 shows the international sport events hosted by the losing bid cities for the 1996 Olympic Summer Games. These losing bid cities have managed to, subsequently, attract international sporting competitions with some of them preferring not to re-bid for the Games. These sporting events have produced “Olympic-type legacies” such as enhancing the city’s image, stimulating the local economy and attracting further high-level sport economies.\textsuperscript{84}

Legacy is no longer an event side-effect but a priority for any host destination. International federations also now require legacy plans in the application process of any event bidding process. The “single sport” characteristic and the possible countrywide involvement of hosts make the sporting legacy for international federation events easier to achieve than the IOC’s current structure. As bound by the IOC Charter, the Games can only be held in a very limited city and region and this limits the geographical spread and scope of any Sporting Legacy.

\begin{footnotesize}
\end{footnotesize}


### Table 4.2  Examples of subsequent international sport events secured and hosted by the losing bid cities for the 1996 Summer Olympic Games*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Future Olympic Bids</th>
<th>Examples of Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Athens, Greece            | 2004 Summer Olympics      | 2011 Special Olympics Summer Games  
2008 European Rowing Championships  
2004 Summer Olympic Games  
1994 & 2007 UEFA Champions League final  
1993 & 2007 EuroLeague Basketball Championships |
| Belgrade, Yugoslavia      | None                      | 2009 World Student Summer Games  
2007 European Youth Olympic Festival  
2007 European Table Tennis Championships  
2006 European Waterpolo Championships  
2005 Men's European Volleyball Championship |
| Manchester, United Kingdom | 2000 Summer Olympics      | 2010 FIL World Lacrosse Championships  
2008 World Squash Championships  
2008 UEFA Cup final  
2002 Commonwealth Games  
1996, 2000 & 2008 UCI Track Cycling World Championships |
| Melbourne, Australia      | None                      | 2010 UCI Road World Championships  
2007 FINA World Swimming Championships  
2006 Commonwealth Games  
1996 – 2015 Australian Grand Prix (F1 motor racing)  
1989 – 2016 Australian Open Tennis Championships |
| Toronto, Canada           | None                      | 2015 Pan American Games  
2007 FIFA Under 20 World Cup Canada  
2000 International Triathlon Union (ITU) World Cup  
1997 Special Olympic Winter Games  
1994 FIBA World Men's Basketball Championships |

*The decision to award these Games to the City of Atlanta was made in 1989*

---

85 Information compiled by the authors
To cater for the magnitude of the event, some IFs have their elite events hosted on a national level and allow joint bids from member nations. This allows only justifiable investment in the event and makes the challenge of planning a Sporting Legacy more manageable, even in developing countries. Table 4.3 shows examples of national joint bids and hosting for quadrennial mega sport events. As shown in Table 4.3, the International Cricket Council 2007 Cricket World Cup was hosted by eight independent island nations with only one stadium per territory being constructed or renovated. This led to a heightened post-event profile for cricket and the stadiums being used in regional cricket tournaments at all participation levels.86

Table 4.3  Examples of joint hosting among international sport federations for quadrennial championships87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th># of Stadiums Required</th>
<th># of Countries Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Euro 2000</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2: Belgium, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>FIFA World Cup</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2: South Korea, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>IRB World Cup</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3: France (host nation), Scotland, Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>ICC World Cup</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8: Trinidad &amp; Tobago, Barbados, Grenada, Antigua &amp; Barbuda, Saint Kitts &amp; Nevis, Guyana, Saint Lucia, Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>EURO 2008</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2: Austria, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>EURO 2012</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2: Poland, Ukraine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87 Information compiled by the authors
International federations also have the advantage that they can tailor the construction of mega-event venues to future use within their single sport code. The Sporting Legacy of the Olympic Games is more difficult to implement as there are multiple sports and the purpose-built Sporting Venue might be for a sport that is not popular in the Host City. It is also difficult to establish a Sporting Legacy for Sporting Venues which have a specific use as any alternative use may also prove difficult to launch due to the specialized nature of the venue. The Athens Olympic Stadium has two local football clubs as its main anchor tenants, Panathinaikos and AEK Athens. However, the attendance for their matches is not enough to fill a permanent Sporting Venue which was ‘upgraded’ to satisfy the IOC requirement of a stadium with a capacity of at least 80,000. Moreover, stadiums essentially built or significantly renovated for athletics rarely provide ideal conditions for football matches and both clubs have plans to build their own stadiums.

This is in contrast with the sporting legacy of the Toronto National Stadium, built to host 12 of the 52 matches of the 2007 FIFA Under 20 World Cup held in Canada. This stadium is currently owned by the City of Toronto and was crucial for the admission of Toronto FC as the first Canadian team in the US Major League Soccer. Previously, the MLS had been hesitant to admit to establish a Canadian franchise due to the fact that there were no soccer-specific stadiums in Canada. The on-field success of the Toronto FC and commercial viability of the club’s stadium has led to two more Canadian team been awarded MLS franchises, thereby improving Canadian professional football.

---

89 Preuss, Holger. The Economics of Staging the Olympics. (Cheltenham: Edward Edgar, 2004), 73.
93 Ibid.
Therefore, the IOC has to take greater control of sporting legacy due to the high number of substitute international sport events that may attract away potential Host Cities. The IOC also has to match the strong legacy efforts of other international federations, especially when its hosting requirements and multisport nature place it at a disadvantage. Sporting legacy has become a key determinant of a city’s decision to bid for an international sport event and greater IOC control will ensure that the Games are associated with positive Sporting Legacy.

4.4. DECLINE IN CITIES WITH OLYMPIC GAMES HOSTING CAPABILITIES

The number of bids for the Summer Olympics significantly increased in the cycles after the economic successes of the Los Angeles Games in 1984.\textsuperscript{95} It has been stated that the greater the success and benefits of the most recent Olympics Games, the greater the number of cities that will apply for the next available edition of the Olympics Games.\textsuperscript{96} Several applicant cities still want “an opportunity to improve economic and social aspects of a city/ region through the accumulated investment triggered by staging the Games”.\textsuperscript{97}

However “the cost of attracting and staging the Games has reached truly Olympian heights”.\textsuperscript{98} Hosting costs are now a prohibitive factor in cities bidding for the Games, even with the IOC’s contribution out of the substantial revenues garnered from The Olympic Partner (TOP) sponsors and broadcasting.\textsuperscript{99} The internal application and candidature process of the IOC determines the cities which the IOC believes are capable of hosting an edition of the Games.

\textsuperscript{95} Robert Sandy, Peter Sloane and Mark Rosentraub. \textit{The Economics of Sport: an international perspective}. (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2004), 292.  
\textsuperscript{96} Preuss, Holger. \textit{The Economics of Staging the Olympics}. (Cheltenham: Edward Edgar, 2004), 283.  
\textsuperscript{97} Maximos Malfas, Eleni Theodoraki and Barrie Houlihan PhD. “Impacts of the Olympic Games as mega-events,” \textit{Municipal Engineer}, 157 (2004), 209.  
\textsuperscript{98} Leeds, Michael and Von Allmen, Peter. \textit{The economics of sport}. (Boston : Pearson, 2002), 168.  
\textsuperscript{99} Paul Close, David Akew and Xu Xin,. \textit{The Beijing Olympiad: the political economy of a sporting mega-event} (New York: Routledge, 2007), 10.
Figure 4.2 Number of Applicant & Candidate Cities for 2004–16 Summer Olympics

Figure 4.2 shows that since the introduction of the applicant and candidature procedure, there has been a decline in the number of applicant cities willing to host the Games. It is proving true that only the largest cities in the world are suitably equipped to put themselves forward as potential Candidate Cities due to the Games’ gigantic scale and cost implications. When it is considered that some cities have been candidates for multiple editions of the Games (for example, Paris for the 2008 and 2012 Games and Madrid for the 2012 and 2016 Games), the concern for the IOC is graver. The Olympic Winter Games may have to be analyzed separately given their particular climatic and topographic requirements but the IOC should still be concerned that the 2018 edition attracted only 3 applicant cities.

A positive Sporting Legacy would encourage other large cities to bid for future Games editions. As in the case of the Los Angeles 1984 Games, potential bid cities have to see

---

how the Games expenditure has benefitted other Host Cities before committing to the bid process. Thus, greater IOC Sporting Legacy control can lead to increased Games value, additional marketing opportunities and the attainment of new cities.\textsuperscript{102} With such a high demand generated by increased bids, the power of the IOC increases while the future of the Olympic Movement will be secured.\textsuperscript{103}

\textbf{4.5. \textit{CURRENT LIMITATIONS ON ABILITY TO SANCTION HOST CITIES}}

The IOC’s major source of power is found within the HCC and its economic control over the Games. As stated in Chapter 3, the HCC specifies that “all representations, statements and other commitments contained in the City's application or candidature file” are binding and any changes to the signed commitments require the IOC’s written approval.\textsuperscript{104} If, during the build-up to the Games, the Host City is not fulfilling the requirements, the IOC can refrain from publicly praising the Games preparations, hold back finances or threaten to give the Games to another Host City. This was certainly the case with the 2004 Athens Olympics when construction delays caused alarm at the IOC. The IOC President at the time, Juan Antonio Samaranch, warned the Athens OCOG in April 2000 that they might lose the Games if no action was forthcoming.\textsuperscript{105} However, it must be noted that the IOC itself suffers with every sanction and the IOC’s power to sanction lessens as the Games approach. Indeed, as Philippe Furrer himself

\textsuperscript{102} Preuss, Holger. \textit{The Economics of Staging the Olympics}. (Cheltenham: Edward Edgar, 2004), 282.
acknowledged, “[The IOC] cannot force a Host City to deliver, we can only offer principles, case studies and support”.

Currently, the IOC has virtually no power to sanction on the issue of Sporting Legacy. The primary agent of the Host City, the OCOG, dissolves soon after the Games – with its main goal of delivering the Games having been achieved. The HCC itself regulates mainly financial relations between the IOC and the Host City and no specific body within the Host is consistently accountable for the lack of a positive Sporting Legacy. This is true even if mistakes regarding Sporting Legacy (such as new oversized sport facilities and the non-use of temporary structures) are made by the OCOG due to their pre-event ambitions.

Even before the event, Host Cities themselves may acknowledge the fact that a Sporting Legacy may be difficult to achieve as planned. However the main concern is not the threat of sanctions from the IOC but the public outcry over the perceived misuse of public funds. In a 2007 House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee discussion, it was acknowledged that while: “the success of the London 2012 bid has been widely attributed to its visionary emphasis on the Games’ potential legacy of a lasting increase in participation in sport by all sectors of the community – especially children… there is no evidence that it has been achieved by any previous Host City”.

The IOC also has been forced to become a neutral observer on the proposed use of the London 2012 Olympic Stadium as a football stadium, even though the candidate file “clearly stated that athletics would be at the core of its legacy use”. Thus, the Sporting Legacy of a purpose-built Sporting Venue is currently determined by the owner of the

106 Phillipe Furrer: Head of OGKM, IOC. As stated in presentation to FIFA Master class at IOC headquarters in Lausanne on May 7, 2010
107 Preuss, Holger. The Economics of Staging the Olympics. (Cheltenham: Edward Edgar, 2004), 87.
109 Ibid.
venue (and not the CAPQ or HCC) with no applicable sanction from the IOC. In the absence of practical sanctioning authority, the IOC should have measures which ensure that the commitment to implement a Sporting Legacy is monitored and fulfilled.

**4.6. PROMOTE OLYMPISM AND FOCUS ON SPORT**

Finally, the Games involve an interaction between the promotion of sport and the economic benefits associated with hosting. Applicant cities focus on ‘place marketing’ and expect that hosting Games will lead to greater international exposure and economic benefits for the city and nation.\(^{110}\) In some tension to this approach, the IOC requires a successful event and associated Sporting Legacy to advance the Olympic Movement and encourage sport participation at various levels globally. In terms of Sporting Legacy, the IOC strongly advocates that “...the opportunities offered by hosting the Olympic Games can be optimized in order to respond not only to the requirements needed to stage the Games, but also to the needs and expectations of the Host City’s and country’s future generations”.\(^{111}\)

The lack of a Sporting Legacy at an edition of the Games contravenes the Charter. As highlighted earlier, with the growing importance of legacy, the IOC amended the Charter to include a particular reference to the creation of positive legacies from the Games and the promotion of sustainable sports development in the Host.\(^{112}\)

**4.7. CONCLUSION**

In summary, it is clear that Sporting Legacy is crucial to the sustained popularity of the Games. Sporting Legacy should be incorporated into the initial planning stages of every edition of the Games. In the same manner that new Sporting Venues have to be built,
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Olympic Legacies have to be constructed as well. This starts with the IOC’s involvement in the sustainability of any new proposed Sporting Venues, only approving those investments which will lead to Legacy benefits for the Host City’s residents. In the current situation, whereby the OCOG may win a bid based on a Legacy plan it does not intend to fulfill; the IOC needs to improve its involvement in order to develop Sporting Legacy accountability.

In order to face the competition from other international sport events and attract cities with Games hosting capabilities, the IOC needs to ensure that a genuine, lasting Sporting Legacy is created through the hosting of the Games. This will justify the use of significant public funding for investment purposes. Bid cities need to present plans on the impact of the Sporting Venues in terms of usage, elite sport or “Sport for All”. Sporting Legacies will assist OCOGs to obtain greater value from the expenditure on Sporting Venues and address sustainable sport development as mandated by the Charter. The next Chapter will propose various Proposals that will allow the IOC to evolve its structures, philosophies or proposals and so improve Sporting Legacy and consequently their impact as well as image.
CHAPTER 5: SPORTING LEGACY PROPOSALS

Up to this point, this project has shown the importance of Sporting Legacy to the impact and image of the Games, and by drilling down into the stakeholder relationships and the key documentation in this domain, an understanding of the current status has been set out. Chapter Four went on to further illustrate the urgency of this area and specifically why the IOC, as the heart of this Olympic Family needed to get a firmer grip on the motivations and actions of the remaining stakeholders. In this Chapter, the Authors, utilizing some of the background information laid out in the previous Chapters, will put forward amendments to the status quo that may capture the imagination of the IOC and which it is hoped will motivate them to follow this project up with further and deeper investigation into these Proposals. These are not comprehensive action blueprints, but are explorations and ideas that can give rise, if supported by the IOC, to meaningful change and ideally improvement.

5.1. RE-EVALUATE HOST CITY CONCEPT

In 1894, at the first Congress, Coubertin et alia started a trend that exists to this day by deciding that the first Games would be held in Athens, and that the second would follow four years later in Paris. The latest Charter continues the commitment to the single Host City concept with Article 33.2, which states, “The honour and responsibility of hosting the Olympic Games are entrusted by the IOC to a city, which is elected as the host city of the Olympic Games”.

The historical prerogative is clear when one considers the distance that attendees travelled in order to compete or watch the Games. Furthermore, Coubertin wanted not only to rekindle the sporting competition of yore with the Games, but he also sought the

creation and preservation of a sporting and competitive camaraderie that would pervade
the festival and would give the whole event a further international dimension, fostering
meeting, communication, exchange and understanding.\textsuperscript{115} Again, these concepts have
survived and today’s IOC cites the importance of a focal city venue as key to bringing
about a unique convivial atmosphere for the athletes (primarily through the medium of
the Olympic Village) and for the spectators by maintaining the idea that venues and
sports are around the corner from each other.

But it is the contention of the Authors that the ideals of the single Host City concept are
no longer in step with the contemporary realities of the Games. Indeed, the IOC
acknowledges this through the presence of Article 35 of the Charter which imbues the
IOC with the ability to ‘bend the rules’ and “authorize the organization of certain events
in other cities, sites or venues situated in the same country”.\textsuperscript{116} Moreover, the IOC grants
itself the ability, with regards to the Winter Games, to “authorize the holding of [certain
events or disciplines] in a bordering country”.\textsuperscript{117}

Having said that, IOC continues to protect the single Host City concept, citing it as a key
component in its universal success.\textsuperscript{118} Yet the two main arguments that flow from the
OGSC Report supporting a stricter interpretation of the single Host City concept are
prone to challenge. There is increasing evidence that athletes who do not need to be
present in the Olympic Village prefer to utilize any time before their competition
finalizing their training in private or at their chosen locations away from the Olympic
Park,\textsuperscript{119} while those professionals who are not required to stay till the end are likely to

\textsuperscript{115} Beatriz Garcia. "The Concept of Olympic cultural programmes: origins, evolutions and projections: university
lecture on the Olympics." Barcelona: Centre d'Estudis Olympics (UAB). International Chair in Olympism (IOC-UAB).
2001. \url{http://olympicstudies.uab.es/lectures/web/pdf/garcia.pdf}
\textsuperscript{117} under strict circumstances set out in Article 35.2 Olympic Charter (ibid)
\url{http://multimedia.olympic.org/pdf/en_report_725.pdf}
\textsuperscript{119} Seattle Times Online. “Olympics.” Seattle Times.
leave before the Closing Ceremony. This is only a reflection of the increasing professionalism and dedication of contemporary Olympians who struggle to accept any of the ‘distraction’ offered by the festival. Indeed, the Olympic Village concept unravels somewhat when it becomes clear that Vancouver had two Olympic Villages, approximately 115km apart, a situation seen as an improvement on the historically scattered nature of Winter Olympian residence during the Games.

As regards the spectators, the reality of today’s Games is that the single Host City concept is being stretched more and more. Apart from the afore-mentioned Vancouver, the situation also falters when one considers London 2012’s current plans. Seven of the Sporting Venues for the 2012 Summer Games will be at the Olympic Park, 12 will be in London and nine will be outside London completely. Indeed, a calculation of the average distance of the 28 Sporting Venues from the Olympic Park (and Village) shows a distance of 52 miles, which is the same distance as Trafalgar Square to the south coast of England. Football venues are as far away as 418 miles and the sailing events will occur 143 miles away at Weymouth and Portland. Arguments that a single Host City concept also safeguard an ability for fans to see a range of events, intentionally or accidentally, falls short when one realizes that the current London 2012 plans put the travelling distance between two disciplines of the same sport i.e.: canoe slalom and canoe sprint at over 40 miles apart. While this information may prove useful when showing a ‘national legacy’ to a Games, it appears to undermine a continued loyalty to the single Host City concept.
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123 All London 2012 venues were assigned a distance from the Olympic Park according to Google Maps. Those within the Olympic Park were given a distance of 0 miles each. The cumulative distances from the Olympic Park for the 28 venues were 1458.5 miles. This figure was divided by 28 to give the average venue distance.
124 Hampden Park is 418 miles from the Olympic Park according to Google Maps.
125 Distance from Weymouth and Portland National Sailing Academy to Lee Valley White Water Centre according to Google Maps.
ADVANTAGES OF A DIFFERENT APPROACH

So what are the benefits of the IOC abandoning or substantially amending the single Host City concept? Within the Mission and Role of the IOC, it stresses a need to “promote a positive legacy from the Olympic Games to the host cities and host countries”. The IOC thus finds itself in somewhat of a conundrum: does it strive to focus the Games in a Host City and risk alienating the remainder of a the host country, who will consequently face an increasing difficulty in identifying with those Games; or does it look to relax its own commitment and embrace a wider catchment area for its festival, thereby creating a more real buy-in from the host country at-large? Taking the example of London 2012 again, a football match at Hampden Park cannot be enough to make Scotland genuinely feel like the 2012 Games are a British phenomenon. There seems little hope in denying that the tangible Legacy from London 2012 will struggle to impact on the further areas of the UK. This feeling that the sporting infrastructure benefits thin out all too drastically the further you travel from the Olympic Park – a consequence of the single Host City concept – is all too prone to leaving national residents dissatisfied and indeed hostile as their taxes go towards paying for the Games and public spending funds are diverted. Further to the point above, a bid and host country that looked to a number of cities within said country would garner tangible Sporting Legacy benefits: a) were infrastructure needed to be built for the Games, the state and the NOC could look around the country and have the freedom to consider which city or locale would best benefit from having either a high competition or community-focused facility on its door step: this in turn would allow the country to equitably distribute a variety of Sporting Venues across the

country, avoiding the concentration of, for example, a majority of top Sporting Venues around one location; and b) were countries and NOCs permitted to consider a number of cities in their bids and hosting obligations, they could utilize existing or easily upgradable existing Sporting Venue further afield (for example, a British 2012 bid could meaningfully investigate and evaluate the utilization of venues left over from the World Student Games in Sheffield 1991 or the Manchester Commonwealth Games 2002).

Further to the points made in Chapter Four, to counter any spectator-centric fears, it is also perhaps worth mentioning that the biggest mega-event that adopts a national rather than single city approach, the FIFA World Cup, has managed to create a profitable and entertaining way for spectators to benefit from the experiential facilities of the event while not having to travel around. The Fan Fest concept allows those spectators who cannot or who do want to travel extensively to enjoy an experience which appeases their desire to see the event, partake in the experience and enjoy a dense and exuberant spectator-primed venue (in some ways relocating the Olympic Park look and feel to a range of IF controlled locations). Any Olympic variation on such a concept would not replace an Olympic Park atmosphere, but it would go a long way to preserving some of that atmosphere while allowing the IOC to stretch the hosting obligations specifically beyond the single Host City.

Zooming out from the UK, the Authors have previously highlighted the decreasing number of applicant cities for the Summer and Winter Games, and it is contended that an accepted policy that would allow countries to distribute their hosting obligations across a range of new Sporting Venues in disparate locations or across a range of disparate locations with existing or easily upgradable Sporting Venues would immediately open up countries and markets (especially more developing ones) which currently simply cannot practically put forward or justify a Host City. These new countries and markets would in turn allow the IOC to more meaningfully support its own fundamental principles of

national Legacy and broader Olympism: principles of covering the five continents, of placing sport at the service of the harmonious development of man, and of conquering discrimination. There is a growing sense that the spiraling costs and requirements of the Games are a form of discrimination, and that is why a model that is not based on a single Host City concept may offer philosophical and commercial benefits to the IOC.

Any alternative model would require a not insubstantial rethinking of the IOC’s current modus operandi. It would appear that the use of joint bids between cities that are not too far apart and in the same country (as was practically reflected in numerous Winter Games and is already an increasing reality in the Summer Games) would seem the least painful next step. But other options would be to utilise certain cities not too far apart that are not in the same country (which could be used to foster a partnership ethic and in some cases continuation of reconciliations); or to utilise regions within countries, or where appropriate (depending on size) whole countries. Any amendments to the Charter and supporting IOC documentation are beyond the remit of this thesis, but it is the Authors’ hope that a line of inquiry may have opened up.

5.2. **ADOPT ‘MANUFACTURED LEGACY’ CONCEPT**

Achieving a Legacy, let alone a Sporting Legacy that is attractive and appeasing to all stakeholders is nigh on impossible, but the Authors concentrated on investigating whether use of Sporting Venues for future national or international competitions and events could be stimulated, increased and maintained. Admittedly, this specie of Sporting Legacy is not all-inclusive, but it was felt that the markers for it would be much more evident, tangible and measurable and would be the most efficient way to show a positive intention and its successful achievement by the three key interested parties: the IOC, the IFs and the Host. The main concern was to undertake a study to understand any existing
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reluctance for the return of competitions to Sporting Venues (see Fig. 5.2 below) and how this could be meaningfully addressed.

Table 5.2: Table illustrating Sporting Venue utilization post Olympic Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federation</th>
<th>Facilities Used During Olympic Games</th>
<th>Utilization Post Olympic Games</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAAF</td>
<td>Main Athletics Stadium</td>
<td>Approx. 800 IAAF events held in the last 24 months Total of 15 held in last 6 Olympic Games Host Cities Of the 15 events, 9 were road races (do not use main stadium itself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISA</td>
<td>Rowing Venue</td>
<td>481 events in the last 5 years (June 2005-June 2010) Total of 9 held in last six Olympic Games venues Of the 9 events, 5 were held at Bayoles (Barcelona ‘92 Rowing Venue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>Velodrome</td>
<td>Has used Sydney and Beijing Velodrome venues for Track Cycling events consistently in the last 5 years Sydney used for 6 events (March 2006-October 2009) Beijing used for 2 events (2009 &amp; 2010) Athens 2004 Olympic Velodrome not used at all by UCI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further to the prevailing analysis, the IOC was the first party considered. The previous Chapters has shown that the IOC has couched most of its Sporting Legacy intentions and manifesto in terms of advice, guidance, facilitation of information and experience exchange, but has not moved beyond that, into policies of guarantees, obligations and mandatory provisions. When confronted with this observation, key figures at the IOC stated that this was symptomatic of the fact that the power of the IOC (in terms of negotiation, pressure and even veto) lay in the time before the Games began. 132 Legacies, on the other hand, primarily come to life (and so become visible and evaluable) after the Games had left. As laid out in Chapter Four, there is no denying that under the terms of
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132 Interview with Pierre Ducrey: Head of IOC Sports Department. 2 June 2010
the various agreements signed in advance of the Games, it is difficult for the IOC to ‘come after’ the Host if it has failed to live up to or deliver a satisfactory Legacy, even if such commitments are enshrined in the agreements’ texts. The bad publicity that the IOC would garner alone would be a significant deterrent, and it would be difficult to find an appropriate counter-party to sue.

With the true bargaining power of the IOC (vis-à-vis the Host and potential Hosts) lying in the ten or so years preceding the Games themselves, the obvious question seemed to be, notwithstanding the initiatives currently in place and discussed above, why the IOC did not do more in those preceding years to conceptualize, craft and guarantee a Legacy for when the IOC and its Games did leave the City? Key figures at the IOC continued to argue that the idea was in theory good, but neglected to appreciate the practical fact that any failings in the Legacy would still not be apparent until after the Games and the same issues of IOC enforceability would remain. The Authors at this stage respectfully counter that although the IOC cannot guarantee a successful Legacy after the date of the Games, creating an environment where various ingredients, policies, structures and commitments are reached, created and finalized before the Opening Ceremony will increase the chances of a successful legacy after the Closing Ceremony. Consequently, the Authors went about investigating what more the IOC can do to add a layer of commitment to their positive recommendations.

5.2.1. IF-focused Manufactured Legacy model

In order to galvanize opinions and perspectives, the Authors decided to create a concept that could potentially increase the amount and quality of Sporting Venue utilization: the Manufactured Legacy. The concept rested on the idea that the IOC would negotiate or put pressure upon the IF community in order to get the IFs to agree to host an international competition from their portfolio at the Host’s relevant Sporting Venue in the years
immediately following the Host’s Closing Ceremony. While the concept was being finessed, the Authors circulated the concept and discussed it with key stakeholder figures in order to gain some clarity on the political and intentional push and pulls in the Olympic Family.

The initial hypothesis proposed that it was the IFs who were reluctant to return so quickly to the site of their Olympic competitions. It was felt that IFs, especially the more profitable or more successful IFs, may have an interest in (and the luxury of) distributing their portfolio of events across various key markets and that in many cases, returning to the Host, whether the Games was a success or not for those IFs, would result in the IFs effectively targeting the same market twice in short succession. Although it became clear that the highest profile IFs, such as FIFA had tremendous flexibility and therefore control over their competition portfolios, for the vast majority of IFs, the evidence did not support the hypothesis of IF reluctance. The Authors spoke to key figures at IFs and at ASOIF, and the general consensus lies close to Andrew Ryan’s quote: “It is the IFs who push hard for Olympic cities to organize world championships in the city… the push back comes from the city and OCOGs… the general view is that most [IFs] would want to go back”. This was the feedback received by ASOIF or the Authors from, among others, the IAAF, FISA, UCI, FIBT, FIL and the BWF.

The Authors’ focus moving on to the Host echoed a comment made by a key figure in an IF, who had said that when his IF approached the Host about using the Sporting Venue for future marquee IF events, the reaction that he received was that the Host was fully focused on the Games and was not particularly interested in bringing sport events back afterwards.
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133 The Authors recognized that IF reluctance would be higher, the more ‘marquee’ the competition, so the concept stated that the IF would decide which of their competitions they would choose to send back to the ex-Olympic venue
134 Interview with Andrew Ryan: ASOIF Director. 1 June 2010.
135 Email responses from various individuals at the respective IFs between 1 June 2010 and 20 June 2010
136 Interview with Denis Oswald, FISA President, April 26, 2010.
5.2.2. **Host-focused Manufactured Legacy Model**

The Authors modified the Manufactured Legacy concept to try to better target the more reluctant stakeholders. The concept still required the securing of post-Closing Ceremony IF events (or where appropriate NF events) at Sporting Venues, but the obligations would be targeted not at the IFs, but at the Host. Before ascertaining which of the relevant Host organizations would be tasked with making and fulfilling those obligations, the problem of chronology needed to be reconsidered. As previously recognised, seeking obligations or the fulfillment of obligations from the Host after the Closing Ceremony would prove practically unworkable. Seeking commitments while the potential Host was in the Candidate City phase would also not work. Firstly, that would require a Host to make a commitment to host post-Closing Ceremony events in its Sporting Venues before it even knew if it was a Host or not. Secondly, IFs would have to complete agreements to send their events to a Host’s Sporting Venue more than seven years in advance of that event – a situation that seems practically untenable since IFs cannot make those kinds of commitments so far in advance. Thirdly, such a commitment by a Candidate City is not in keeping with the spirit of the matrix of activities and questionnaires that Candidate Cities undertake in the years before discovering if they are to Host or not.

The most significant milestone when a Host makes commitments and promises to the IOC is when it signs the HCC. The Authors argue that there is no reason why the IOC could not (in the years between the signing of the HCC and the Opening Ceremony) oblige the Host to secure the guaranteed utilization of its Sporting Venues (especially those purpose built or significantly upgraded) in a defined amount of years after the Closing Ceremony. By way of an example, London in 2005 would sign a HCC which obliges it to secure, in 2010, that an IF U-18 World Championship will take place at the appropriate London Sporting Venue in 2014. The IOC would then use its existing Evaluation Commission\textsuperscript{137} to monitor, applaud or where appropriate, demand

\textsuperscript{137} Or any alternative Commission set up for the purposes of Legacy (see p. [x] of this Project)
improvement in the Sporting Legacy-securing work. While the problem of enforceability of any IOC contract would always surface after the Closing Ceremony, by front-loading a clearer matrix of obligations in this regard, while the IOC still maintains coercive powers, will allow the IOC to better ensure a Sporting Legacy, while the obligation itself can be drafted in such a way that the Host has sufficient flexibility in which aspects or characteristics of Sporting Legacy it feels are best suited to its unique requirements and market. That amount of flexibility which the IOC will grant is the key, as if it grants too much flexibility to the Host, the IOC may find that the Host may ‘satisfy’ the requirements, while leaving the ex-Olympic city without the Sporting Legacy that the IOC actually feels is adequate or appropriate; on the other hand, if the IOC minimizes room for interpretation, it will be seen as dictatorial and trying to impose a one-size-fits-all model. But the Authors contend that a happy medium can be reached where a strict model with in-built elements of flexibility can be imposed on the Host, which can give the IOC, the IFs and the Host peace of mind and better utilization of the key Sporting Venues.

The details and nature of the model that the IOC introduces to keep an improved rein on the Sporting Legacy is probably beyond the remit of this project, but the Authors see a few broad approaches that may work and these are set out in Appendix F.

5.3. **CREATE A LEGACY COMMISSION**

As mentioned in Chapter Four, the IOC has shown a keen interest in various parts of its business and has reflected such keen interest by creating Commissions\(^\text{138}\) to oversee and advise the IOC President, Executive Committee and Congress.\(^\text{139}\) In this section, the idea that a Legacy Commission be created is presented and scrutinized.


The mandate of the proposed Legacy Commission would of course ultimately lie with the IOC, who would need to consider the make-up, size and relationships that the Commission nurture and utilize. The Authors however suggest that the Legacy Commission would be a permanent Commission, created in a similar vein to the existing Commissions. Its role would be as the main recipient of all knowledge and practices relating to Legacy and in this regard it would work very closely with the existing OGKM department. As a specialized Commission, the accumulated information that it would become privy to over time would allow it to be the best judge of successful initiatives and best practices.

Over time, the Commission would acquire enough data to allow it to create a template that would highlight those strategies and concepts that should be maintained across the various Olympic cycles (bringing a sense of continuity across the various Games) while in parallel also becoming increasingly cognisant of the idiosyncrasies and specificities that may require room for interpretation or even freedom for the Hosts. The Commission would use this acquired experience-base to scrutinize the performance of Host Cities from the time that a Host City wins the bid to a date approximately four years after the Closing Ceremony. The Commission would not only create Manuals and Reports internally – for the IOC President and Executive Board, but would also remain in close communication with OCOGs and/or any other relevant Legacy-related stakeholders advising, but also monitoring, the creation and securing of key Legacy components. Indeed, the Legacy Commission could have some of its members become part of the Coordination Commissions, focusing purely on the progress and viability of the Legacy-related ideas and promises of the Host. The Authors have already seen that advisory bodies and tools already exist in the Olympic Family and the IOC more specifically, but

140 Ibid.
it is hoped that as more ingredients or frameworks are turned into mandates, the Legacy Commission’s role would increase as a counsellor and watchdog in regard to this key Olympic domain.

The remainder of this section will look in more detail at the interaction between any Legacy Commission and Sporting Legacy. What this section advocates is that the Legacy Commission be involved in the Sporting Venue construction phase, where a lot of plans are revised or shelved. As has been observed many times, from the Candidature Phase to the actual hosting of the Games, governments change and sometimes that means a change in policies or budget cuts.\textsuperscript{143} This has a huge impact on the plans that have been devised years in advance. This potential lack of consistency and indeed execution can be incredibly sensitive for the IOC and hence it is felt that a Legacy Commission has a critical stabilizing role to play by monitoring the progress and pulling rank when necessary. It would be the function of this Commission to convince and ensure that when a city is spending millions of dollars, it is in its best interest to have a plan in place for the future. The mindset needs to be modified and this is where the IOC, through a Legacy Commission, can take the initiative and guide the other stakeholders.

**CHALLENGES TO A LEGACY COMMISSION**

The principal obstacle in the creation of a Legacy Commission would come from the very entity that it intends to support, the OCOG. The IOC came under continued criticism from numerous OCOGs at the SportAccord Convention and their contention is that the IOC’s desire to apply a standard rule across various cities and locations, when each city has its own demands flies in the face of reality and serves to illustrate a lack of trust and faith by the IOC in the local organisers. It is to be feared that the creation of a Legacy Commission could be viewed as further interference and a serious step in the IOC’s perceived bid to wrestle and maintain control after the Closing Ceremony of a Games.

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid.
Another challenge to the concept of the Legacy Commission would be the oft-repeated one of sway and enforceability after the Closing Ceremony. There is no denying that positive Legacy plans and ideas can prove decisive when the IOC Congress decides on potential Host Cities. The issue remains that the current situation does not support the ability for the IOC to ensure that these promises are fulfilled, unless significant steps or even completion of key Legacy initiatives and structure are put in place before the Closing Ceremony. As mentioned above, the Legacy Commission could prove a key watchdog and assistant in this drive, by working closely with the Coordination Commission.

Another bastion of resistance that the IOC faces with respect to the creation of a Legacy Commission is from within. Already there is a sense of weariness because currently there are over 20 Commissions running. When this Proposal was presented, the IOC countered the idea, since Legacy according to them was and should ultimately remain the imperative of the Hosts (as they are best placed to investigate, understand and respect their local needs and appetites); there was no merit in bringing Legacy deeper in-house as this would only open up the IOC to greater criticism for an area they continue to feel is not their expertise. This is the core reasoning why they see themselves as information gatherers and disseminators, rather than mandatory policies.

**FINAL THOUGHTS ON LEGACY COMMISSION**

The creation of a Legacy Commission, administratively speaking, is one of the most painless of the Proposals suggested in this Project. Legally, there is nothing to stop the creation of a Legacy Commission and with some very powerful members on board it could be an influential body. Furthermore, this Proposal wouldn’t require any changes

---

144 IOC commissions may be created for the purpose of advising the Session, the IOC Executive Board or the President as the case may be. The President establishes permanent or other standing or ad hoc commissions and working groups whenever it appears necessary. Source: IOC Olympic Charter. [http://multimedia.olympic.org/pdf/en_report_122.pdf](http://multimedia.olympic.org/pdf/en_report_122.pdf)
in the Charter, as it will only be an addition to the already existing Commissions of the IOC.

The Authors have shown in this Project why Legacy, and Sporting Legacy particularly, is so important to the stakeholders and potential stakeholders. This recognition and respect for the import of Legacy needs to be meaningfully and tangibly reflected within the IOC’s internal workings. Ultimately, the Legacy Commission can serve as an effective reminder to potential bidders about the serious intentions of the IOC. Moreover, a Legacy Commission can also serve as an efficient public relations tool to amend the public and media perception and ensure that the IOC’s intentions and focus contain genuine concern and altruism.

5.4. CREATE A LEGACY FUND

It is safe to say that one of the main ingredients in any successful Sporting Legacy initiative is sufficient and appropriate allocation of financial resources. As the Authors have illustrated in Chapter One, hosting a Games typically requires a healthy investment from the local public and private sectors. Therefore, continued funding to maintain and rejuvenate a Host City’s Sporting Legacy often gets cut short or forgotten.

Under the current arrangements, the revenue that the OCOG receives comes from a variety of sources: portions of the IOC’s own TOP Programme and Olympic broadcast revenues; the domestic sponsorship programme; ticketing and Games-specific licensing revenues; and finally, under the HCC: “Any surplus resulting from the celebration of the Games shall be divided as follows: a) 20% to the NOC; b) 60% to be used for the general benefit of sport in the Host Country as may be determined by the

---

OCOG in consultation with the NOC; and c) 20% to the IOC”. 147 Despite the many different revenue-generating activities for the OCOG, not one is directed specifically on supporting Sporting Legacy projects after the Games, although the Authors understand that the IOC tends to donate their 20% to the OCOG in the expectation that that amount will be used for Legacy purposes. 148

The Authors believe that there could be some measures put in place to help ensure financial support specifically for Sporting Legacy, such as a ‘Legacy Fund’, which would allocate limited funds to the responsible authority with the purpose of helping support Sporting Legacy programmes. The idea is not entirely new since the Calgary 1988 Games organizers created such a scheme, and using the case of the Calgary 1988 Winter Olympics, the Authors will illustrate the concept of an Olympic Games ‘Legacy Fund’.

5.4.1. Calgary 1988: Legacy Fund Case Study

The organization of the Olympic Winter Games 1988 in Calgary was a financial success and as it became apparent that a operational surplus would be generated, the organizing committee (OCO’88), the Canadian Olympic Association (COA – now the COC), Calgary Olympic Development Association (the CODA) and the three levels of government involved in the funding of the Games agreed to establish a ‘Legacy Fund’. 149 This agreement was approved by the IOC. Under this Legacy Fund’s provisions, a portion of the operational surplus would be made available to CODA to subsidize the operation of the Sporting Venues so that athletes could use them at a reasonable cost. The balance of the Legacy Fund would be paid over to COA in order to finance its programmes and in acknowledgment of the fact that the COA had transferred its marketing rights for the Games to the organizing committee. These funds went on to

148 Email from Denis Oswald, dated 7 July 2010
provide the financial resources necessary for both the COA and CODA to be able to achieve their objectives.\textsuperscript{150}

From the Calgary 1988 Games’ C$90 million profit, C$70.5 million went to CODA as an endowment fund for the management of legacy facilities; by 2006, that fund had grown to a market value of C$185 million. CODA uses only five percent of the fund every year to finance its operations. Out of that five percent, almost C$4 million per year goes toward sustaining and building its Legacy facilities, equipment, office and administrative support to national sport organizations, and World Cup event assistance in Southern Alberta. The money also goes toward supporting the operations of CODA’s “Becky Scott High Performance Training Centre on Haig Glacier”.\textsuperscript{151} CODA also develops new facilities to meet the demands of current winter sports trends such as an official Olympic 22 foot long snowboard half-pipe. CODA is able to bring about all this with an annual operating budget of some C$12,000,000, of which approximately 50\% is represented by income generated from the Calgary Legacy Fund and the balance from operating revenues earned at Canada Olympic Park. Perhaps most significantly, CODA has been able to work with the Canadian national sports organizations to bring many national and international events to the Calgary area. As a result of this Legacy, between 1987 and 2004, well over 200 national and international sport competitions were held in the Calgary area, most of them using facilities built for the 1988 Olympic Winter Games.\textsuperscript{152}

According to Dr. Roger Jackson (member of the executive board of the organizing committee, president of the Canadian Olympic Committee and dean of the University of Calgary’s Faculty of Kinesiology), 20 years later, all the facilities built for the Games are still being used for the purpose for which they were intended, since they were built with an intent of long-term legacy use, and according to him, the second factor that allowed

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid., 27.
\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., 22.
the facilities to remain functional was the millions of dollars of legacy funding that were left in Calgary after the Games for the maintenance and operation of those facilities. In addition to the typical sporting facilities of a Winter Games, the University of Calgary’s Faculty of Kinesiology (in 1988, the Faculty of Physical Education) flourished as a result of Games investments. The Faculty’s Human Performance Laboratory and Sport Medicine Centre has been the site of a wide variety of research, from analyses of animals’ skeletal muscle to biochemistry, physiology, biomechanics, growth and development, sport psychology and nutrition.

5.4.2. Legacy Fund - Practical Recommendations

As illustrated in the case of Calgary 1988, if properly managed, a Sporting Legacy Fund can be extremely beneficial to a Host City and region. Although CODA was fortunate to have a substantial surplus and demand for Sporting Legacy initiatives, one could argue that the most important factor for the successful post Games Sporting Legacy transition was in fact the proactive desire, planning and coordination of Legacy platforms long before the Games came to town. The Authors believe that through proactive centralized coordination by the IOC, collaborating with the OCOGs and Host NOCs, future Hosts can benefit from the Games in similar ways to Calgary.

The first step is institutionalizing the idea of a Legacy Fund across all Games. This must come from the IOC, as it is the only real constant amongst all recurring Games. As the “supreme authority of the Olympic Movement”, the IOC needs to be the one taking the lead to institutionalize such a Fund. This institutionalization can come via a variety of different methods, depending on the internal IOC organization. The Authors would suggest one key part of the funding could be to redirect a set percentage of the 80% surplus that goes to the NOC and for the benefit of sport in the Host Country and to

153 Ibid.
154 Ibid., 22-23.
designate such set percentage (for example 10%) to the Sport Legacy Fund (the Surplus Funding). In terms of drafting, it could look like this in the HCC:

**VIII. Financial and Commercial Obligations**

43. **Division of Surplus**

Any surplus resulting from the celebration of the Games shall be divided as follows:

a) fifteen percent (15%) to the NOC; [Changed from 20%]

b) fifty-five percent (55%) to be used for the general benefit of sport in the Host Country as may be determined by the OCOG in consultation with the NOC; [Changed from 60%]

c) ten percent (10%) to be placed in the NOC's Olympic Sporting Legacy Fund for the maintenance of Olympic facilities and development of Sport Legacy initiatives; and

d) twenty percent (20%) to the IOC.

A second key source could be the allocation of a set percentage of the total amount earned by the OCOG (the OCOG Revenue Funding). This OCOG Revenue Funding amount should come from either one of, or a combination of, the amounts earned by the OCOG through IOC broadcast revenues, TOP sponsors and/or Olympic Games licensing, ticketing and/or local sponsorships.

It is beyond the remit of this Project to determine exactly how much the percentage or amount of either the Surplus Funding or the OCOG Revenue Funding should be in order to ensure that a Sporting Legacy is possible. The Surplus Funding (in our example above – 10%) will fluctuate based on the additional earning from each Games. Therefore, there should always be an OCOG Revenue Funding amount available that remains guaranteed and not conditional on the presence of any Games’ surplus. The Authors suggest a complete analysis of several examples of Sporting Venues and Sporting Legacy activity costs in order to determine an appropriate figure to set as the base amount for each Legacy Fund.
Once the source and amount of the funding is clarified and set by the IOC, the next step would be to decide who will administer the funds. In terms of who will manage the Legacy Fund, the task is made more complex by the fact that each country has a unique sport administration system. In light of this, cooperation and planning between the IOC, NOC and OCOG will be extremely important. By taking a proactive stance and opening communication on Legacy matters early in the OCOG and Games planning stages, stakeholders can work together to determine the organization that is best suited for managing the Legacy Fund.

Finally, there needs to be a set timetable for delivery and utilization of the Legacy Fund. In this case there are two different paths to be considered. First, to ensure a long-term focus, Legacy Funds should not be made entirely available to the Legacy Fund administrative body immediately after the Closing Ceremony. This is not to say that the management cannot be trusted to budget this money correctly, only that a staggered release of funds from the Legacy Fund would mandate a much more long-term stance and would provide positive PR for the related stakeholders. One argument that could be made against this waterfall type of Legacy Fund is that, although system could be feasible, it could facilitate the complete release of funds with the final payment date. This in turn could hinder the Funds’ earning capacity through investments and interest. CODA turned the C$70 million capital from the Legacy Fund in 1988 into a market value of C$185 million in 2006. The waterfall transfer of Legacy Fund capital could discourage any such long termism with regards to the earning capacity of the endowment.

5.5. **EXTEND HOST RESPONSIBILITY – PROLONG OCOG LIFE**

In the event that a HCC is concluded with Manufactured Legacy provisions enshrined within, all stakeholders will need to know which organization will be tasked with selecting the appropriate sports and events, undertaking the bidding processes and securing those bids and, if appropriate, preparing and hosting those events. The same will be true in the event that the Sporting Legacy envisioned by the Host will be the utilization
of the Sporting Venues in other sporting ways, such as being converted into national or regional high performance training facilities.

The key organizations that are on the Host side of the equation involve the OCOG, the NOC, the City administration (such as the Mayor’s office), any other public organization that may be relevant (such as UK Sport in the UK), and any other organisation that may be created to oversee legacy (such as OFMBs). The current HCC envisions the City administration signing, along with the NOC (the OCOG and the OFMBs do not exist at this stage in the process).

The reality that some organizations are not in existence or are not currently signatories of the HCC at the point the City is awarded the Games is not as big an obstacle as it may at first appear. The investigation needs to be turned around in order to ascertain in theory which are the organizations best placed to oversee and deliver promises regarding a Sporting Legacy. The organizations best placed are those that traditionally look to bring high performance events to their respective countries i.e. usually the NOCs but in countries such as the UK, UK Sport, plus those organizations tasked with overseeing legacy issues in general i.e. the current trend points to OFMBs that are deemed best practice. A relationship between the NOC and the OFMB (and an organisation such as UK Sport where appropriate) would appear to be the best way to achieve certainty and cooperation in the delivery of a Sporting Legacy. The practicalities and the division of duties and responsibilities could either be set out in the HCC (perhaps in an Appendix) or could be set out in a stand-alone memorandum of understanding between those parties. The nature of the relationship could be one where the NOC outsources parts of the delivery to UK Sport or the OFMB (while not being allowed to admonish its contractual responsibilities). The key question would be how the IOC would be able to oversee this working relationship. The options would be the have a party which signs the HCC have direct or vicarious liability for the performance or non-performance of the Manufactured Legacy, or, more directly, the IOC could be made a party to the proposed memorandum
of understanding, solely to be given specific and direct monitoring and sanctioning powers as against the other parties.

An alternative means of ensuring delivery of any Sporting Legacy (whether Manufactured or not) would be to overhaul the role and responsibilities of the OCOG. The current purpose and mission of the OCOGs, as envisioned by the IOC, is to oversee the lead-up to the Games and to ensure a successful delivery of the Games itself.\(^\text{156}\) After the Closing Ceremony, the OCOG survives for a short amount of time, primarily to write the Final Report.\(^\text{157}\) But the Authors contend that it would be worth considering changing this, so that the OCOG could survive for four years after the Closing Ceremony in order to secure, supervise and deliver the proposed Sporting/Manufactured Legacy in a process that begins a few years before the Opening Ceremony and continues for the four years after the Games have finished.

When this suggestion was put before key figures at the IOC, the response presented was that the individuals working within the OCOG do not have the right skill-set in order to perform that kind of role after the Games.\(^\text{158}\) This response appears questionable for two reasons: a) the current LOCOG is responsible for supervising a series of test events in the year before the Games and of course the events of the Games themselves.\(^\text{159}\) Notwithstanding that the logistics of the events are handled by the respective IFs, there is no reason why the OCOG manpower and skill-sets used to perform the afore-mentioned vital supervisory tasks cannot be translated toward similar events in the years following the Closing Ceremony (in collaboration with the respective IFs); and b) the response is founded on the status quo. The Authors respectfully stress that the OCOG can be

---

\(^{156}\) Olympic.org. “Organising Committees for the Olympic Games, Mission.” IOC. [www.olympic.org/en/content/The-IOC/Governance/OCOGs/?Tab=0](http://www.olympic.org/en/content/The-IOC/Governance/OCOGs/?Tab=0) (accessed on June 8, 2010).

\(^{157}\) Olympic.org. “Organising Committees for the Olympic Games, Main Tasks.” IOC. [www.olympic.org/en/content/The-IOC/Governance/OCOGs/?Tab=1](http://www.olympic.org/en/content/The-IOC/Governance/OCOGs/?Tab=1) (accessed on June 8, 2010).

\(^{158}\) Interview with Michelle Lemaitre: Project Manager, Olympic Games Department, International Olympic Committee. May 3, 2010.

changed: and these changes can include the amendment of the workforce in order to suit any change in the requirements of the OCOG after the Closing Ceremony. The Authors would respectfully suggest that a Sporting Legacy department be created at some stage not long after the city in question wins the bid. This department would then put its resources into creating and securing the bids for the Manufactured Legacy and then, after the Closing Ceremony, to implement and deliver those events, in collaboration with whichever other stakeholders are relevant. Whether the Sporting Legacy would include staff members who gain experience in supervising the test events, or whether they would be a stand-alone department that undertakes regular communication and know-how exchange with the department(s) that supervise the test events could be left to the OCOG itself to decide or could be mandated by a template OCOG model presented by the IOC.

The survival of this department along with and beyond the life of the current OCOG model would then become an inevitable result of the new mandate and the amended working conditions that would reflect this new mandate. Another potential pitfall for any extension of an OCOG’s life would be ensuring it has the finances to survive so long. OCOGs do not tend to have a great deal of surplus after the Closing Ceremony to plough into Sporting Legacy, but money could be drawn from (among other sources): a) the IOC’s proportion of operational surplus that it tends to handover to the OCOGs; or indeed b) the Legacy Fund suggested and explored at 5.4 above.

It seems that resistance to the modification of the mandate of the OCOG and the re-evaluation and amendment of the staffing of the OCOG model is borne of a loyalty to past practices. The IOC does not have unlimited flexibility in imposing conditions and commitments upon potential Host Cities, but it does have the prerogative, because of the attractiveness of the hosting opportunity to push through a new template, and this upgrading of the OCOG template, characterized by an active Sporting Legacy pursuit can only reflect positively on the IOC as it shows an awareness, responsiveness and respect that will improve its PR.
5.6  FOSTER CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

As stated earlier in this Project, one of the main burdens that Sporting Venues impart upon the city and country where they are located is financial. The cost of maintaining premium sporting facilities in the days that follow their successful utilization during the Games can be incredibly high, even during periods of time when the Sporting Venues remain relatively dormant and empty.\(^{160}\)\(^{161}\) The fact that Sporting Venues may remain under-utilised has compounded the problem when costs for such up-keep are paid for by the state and are levied from taxpayers. In recognizing this potentially destructive Legacy of the sporting infrastructure, one possible solution that can be explored, primarily by OCOGs, OFMBs or any other private owners and managers, is the use of sponsorship and naming rights in order to provide vital support and funding towards the running and maintenance costs of the Sporting Venues.\(^{162}\)\(^{163}\)

While this Proposal is not one that the IOC would directly control or mandate, the Authors assert that the opportunity that corporate sponsorship can potentially bring to Sporting Venues and those organisations that own or manage them are attractive enough, that the IOC should investigate and familiarize itself to a higher degree with the practice in order to offer the Olympic Family stakeholders a comprehensive understanding and supportive platform in this domain.

In general, the concept of naming rights has been prevalent for years; institutions like schools, libraries, places of worship and hospitals have a long tradition of granting benefactors the right to name buildings in exchange for generous contributions.\(^{164}\)


Likewise, the naming of sports stadia is not a new concept either.\textsuperscript{165} What is new, however, is the seeming proliferation of stadium naming rights deals in recent years, and their increasing value. It is a trend that is fast catching on a global scale, particularly over the past two decades with the increasing commercial exploitation of sport.\textsuperscript{166} Most of today’s larger and higher profile new sport stadia around the world now have (or are seeking) corporate sponsorships. ‘Named’ stadiums can be found in countries including Australia, Japan, China, Finland, Canada, and Israel.

5.6.1. Applying the Principle to Olympic Facilities – Lessons from the Past

Constructing new Sporting Venues on the one hand, and regenerating or upgrading existing facilities on the other hand, both require a substantial investment of funds. Moreover, both will require further funding in order to offset maintenance and upkeep costs. The sale of post-Games naming rights in advance of any construction or upgrade expenditure can provide an invaluable revenue stream. Both models have been applied in by Olympic cities in the past and have been successful.

Stadium Australia was the first Olympic stadia to utilize this commercial route.\textsuperscript{167} In 2002, the telecoms company Telstra paid for the right to change the name to the Telstra Stadium. In 2003, pursuant to Telstra’s naming rights acquisition, reconfiguration work was completed to shorten the north and south wings, and install movable seating. These changes reduced the capacity from 110,000 to 83,500 for a rectangular field and 81,500 for an oval field. In 2007, it was renamed the ANZ Stadium in Australia’s biggest ever naming rights sponsorship deal, reported to be worth A$31 million over seven years. The National Rugby League is the most regular tenant of the ground, while Rugby Union

\textsuperscript{165}Business Week. “Quirkiest Stadium Rights naming deals.” Bloomberg Businessweek.\newline\url{http://images.businessweek.com/ss/09/10/1027_quirkiest_stadium_naming_rights_deals/index.htm} (accessed, June 1\textsuperscript{st} 2010.)

\textsuperscript{166}Nowak, Alojzy and Steagall, eds., \textit{Globalization, International Business and European Integration}. UK: 2006. 205

internations, football internations and Australian Football are all played at the
ground.  

For the Centennial Olympic Stadium in Atlanta, a pre-emptive deal was struck, whereby
Ted Turner, the then owner of Atlanta Braves, paid approximately $170 million of the
$209 million total cost. As part of the deal, it was designed and built in a way that it
could be converted to a new baseball stadium, with the Atlanta Committee for the
Olympic Games (ACOG) paying for the reconstruction.

5.6.2. Applying the Principle to Olympic Facilities – Challenges

The revenues generated by naming rights deals can help finance the redevelopment of
older facilities within an existing ground, but the circumstances of new stadia are
generally much more favourable for a naming rights sponsor as the risk of fans and
broadcasters continuing to use the historic name of an existing stadium is minimized.

State-of-the-art Sporting Venues with high visibility both domestically and
internationally, built especially for the Games could in fact be just what big corporate
giants are looking for. As one of the benefits that companies generally are looking for
when purchasing naming rights is general brand awareness. Every ticket, programme,
banner and sign for all events held in a stadium – non-sporting events included – will
generally have the sponsor’s name on it. The biggest advantage, however, lies with the
media coverage that the sponsor receives through its association: carried by television
and radio broadcasts, as well as national newspaper articles. Ultimately, the sponsor has
its name promoted every time its partner stadium is mentioned.

168 ANZ Stadium has hosted National Rugby League; Association Football; Australian Football League; International

(accessed on July 1, 2010)

170 George R. Milne and Mark A. McDonald, Sport marketing: managing the exchange process. (Canada: Jones and
Bartlett. 1999), 209.
Most would argue that it is much easier to get sponsorship for the marquee Sporting Venues built especially for the Games, but that the story may be different when attention falls on niche facilities like the velodrome. The scope of selling the naming rights is clearly more limited. One school of thought is that naming rights can be explored through the NF or IF’s own set of existing sponsors. An alternative Sporting Legacy of these Sporting Venues would be to convert them into a training facility or centre for excellence, as was the case with the velodrome constructed for the Manchester-hosted Commonwealth Games. When doubt sets in about the attractiveness and viability of naming sponsors being found for such training centres, it is American sports that provide an answer to this. The New York Giants training facility located adjacent to the new stadium obtained a new name – the Timex Performance Center, as the centerpiece of a 15 year $35-40 million deal.¹⁷¹

There are a number of further issues regarding a more widespread propagation of Sporting Venue naming rights.¹⁷² Firstly, time frame is an issue as the time when the owner or manager of any Sporting Venue will be looking to find potential naming rights will be a number of years before the Opening Ceremony and there may be reluctance on the part of any naming sponsor to make a commitment so far in advance of any of the tangible benefits it will be able to enjoy some time after the Closing Ceremony. Linked to this, is the fact that the naming sponsor will need to be kept in the loop with any potential uses of the Sporting Venue and changes in ownership/management or such use. The sponsor will only make the investment and formalize the relationship if it sees a synergy or affinity between the use of the Sporting Venue and its own branding goals.¹⁷³ If there is no clarity on the ownership and usage of the Sporting Venues, or indeed any guarantees on the long-term use and ownership, the potential naming sponsors will not have the clarity and comfort they need to complete any investment. Thirdly, conflict of

¹⁷² Anja Wyludda. The Impact of a Mega Sports Event for a Nation: Analysis of the FIFA World Cup. (UK: 2008), 137.
interest around the names is a real concern. The ‘Olympic’ brand is one of the most valuable brands in the world today and corporates often look for the opportunity to link their own identity and mission with that of the Olympic Movement.\textsuperscript{174} Fully cognisant of this, the IOC has paid great heed to protecting its own key corporate partners and so one of the IOC conditions regarding Sporting Venues which use the word ‘Olympics’ in their name, is that they cannot seeking naming rights from corporates that are in direct competition to the IOC’s own sponsors. The way around this was provided by the example of Sydney, who did not at any time name their main stadium as ‘Olympic’ and hence were free to choose their partners.

5.6.3. Applying the Principle to Olympic Facilities – Advantages

Notwithstanding the above challenges, the Authors contend that with sport being one of the most highly visible platforms for corporates to showcase their brands or products, there are many who would be see procuring the naming rights of Sporting Venues as a beneficial proposition:\textsuperscript{175}

- Naming rights deals can offer an especially beneficial form of marketing to some of the newer and smaller companies who have not had as much publicity as some of their competitors.
- Often a naming rights sponsor has a geographical connection to, or presence in, the city or region where the stadium is located, so having a local company on board that sees the Sporting Venue as an extension of the larger community would be advantageous.
- For large international companies, which often have a presence in many countries around the world, the opportunity to acquire naming rights for a Sporting Venue
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where it has its headquarters provides a good opportunity to develop roots and ties with the local community.
- Likewise, companies not based locally also use naming rights as a means of entering a market and gaining name recognition.
- Foreign companies may be willing to pay higher fees in exchange for the instant name recognition delivered by the naming rights to a high profile stadium.
- Some corporations place such high value on this form of advertising that they have sponsored more than one stadium or arena.

CLOSING THOUGHTS

Chinese officials reported their intention to put the naming rights of the 91,000-seater Olympic stadium in Beijing up for sale. Zhang Hengli, deputy manager of the National Stadium Company, tasked with operating the venue until 2038, told the Beijing News newspaper: “We have already started talks with a number of companies. We have spent over $129.4m on the venue and we need to see some sort of return on that. Domestic or foreign companies are both entitled to bid to have their name on the stadium. Although [in the case of any foreign sponsor] we will carefully consider if the company will be accepted by the Chinese people.”

As mentioned at the start of this section, selling the naming rights of Sporting Venues constructed or upgraded solely for the Olympics can be a cornerstone in ensuring that the Sporting Legacy continues. Naming rights deals can relieve some of the financial burden on the Host Cities and related stakeholders of building expensive new stadia or redeveloping existing facilities, and can offer corporates a special association with heightened brand awareness and profile in what is otherwise becoming an increasingly crowded marketplace.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

Since the beginning of the Olympic Movement, organizers have had to weigh the benefits of bringing a Games to their shores, as against the burden and costs that such an organizational feat requires. As the Games have increased across all measurables, the importance of this balancing act has only become more profound and delicate. The Authors have illustrated the trend that sees cities overextend themselves and promise impacts and improvements that are ambitious, if not unattainable. Yet at the same time, observers of the Games remain unforgiving of such practices and are given examples and ammunition with which to criticize various decision-makers and organizers, with the IOC being located at the heart.

The initial Chapters set out the groundwork for this Project. The general importance of Legacy to the intentions and image of the Olympic Movement were highlighted and a clarification offered on how the various actors collaborate and divide responsibility. The focus on Sporting Legacy was clarified. While it was accepted that a Sporting Legacy is by no means a holistic solution, it was underlined that this specie of Legacy was a key one that could be easily measured, reported and publicized. In Chapter Four, the analysis showed that the status quo was not shielding the IOC from culpability and tarnish, and the Authors put forward the proposition that in order to improve, and to be seen to improve, Sporting Legacy, the IOC would need to take a more active role in structuring and controlling those imperatives.

From that point onwards, the Authors set about presenting, scrutinising and evaluating some creative Proposals that could lead to a more coherent and proactive approach by the IOC, while not alienating or undermining the other key stakeholders. It is important at this stage in this Chapter to underline the positive work that the IOC has undertaken to date. Chapter Three stressed the initiatives and structures brought into effect in the last decade, primarily under the aegis of Jacque Rogge, which have shown a real empathy and determination in this domain. The promotion of temporary structures, the capping of
athletes and sports plus the variety of in-house departments and studies have undoubtedly made impacts and necessitated greater attention from all Olympic Family members further down the chain. However, along with the Proposals set out, the Authors feel that the IOC would do well to either carefully select some of its own recommendations and accumulated best practices and make them mandatory, or enter a dialogue with key Host stakeholders during the Candidate City phase and agree which of the IOC recommendations and accumulated best practices the Host promises to integrate and undertake before the Opening Ceremony. Further to such latter option, the IOC would need to set out a clear timetable enabling it to monitor such integration and undertaking.

A word of caution regarding our Proposals: as set out in the First Chapter, the politically sensitive interplay and reality that pervades the collaborations between the various Olympic-related stakeholders makes the creation of the Proposals, let alone the suggestion of practical and administrative tools and templates that can support and facilitate them, incredibly difficult. The Authors have tried to comprehend and respect these realities and have tried to either limit the extent of their Proposals or have conceded further suggestion if the use of assumptions would be too prevalent and would ultimately discredit the Proposals themselves.

Having said that, the Project has sought to respect the status quo where appropriate, but has ignored it where it feels feasible. It may well be trite to say so, but these Proposals would involve change and that change would necessitate amendments to the existing philosophies, documents and interplays. While the IOC have been truly proactive in presenting individuals and documentations that could offer us advice and insight, the Authors have found that there is a reluctance to move away from the existing dogmas. The abandonment of the single Host City concept would involve a re-think of bidding imperatives, not to mention the Charter, while the Legacy Fund Proposal would undoubtedly require discussions between the IOC, NOCs, IFs, sponsors at the IOC and domestic level and reworking of a number of current documents and agreements.
It is the Authors’ contention that the IOC has created and learnt a range of best practices and proposals to date. But the IOC has seen any increase in involvement or pressure as a precursor to rebellion, opposition, outcry and accusations of ‘control-freakery’. While the Authors have respect for this fear, there must be a grey area between the status quo and such accusations of overbearingness – and the Authors believe that these Proposals fall into this grey area. The abandonment of the Host City concept will allow countries to share the benefits of the Games across a much wider catchment area, thereby creating broader buy-in. The Manufactured Legacy concept will facilitate an environment where greater costs of construction and development are complimented with a longer and visible ‘tail’ of Sporting Venue utilization and greater exposure to top-level competitions and athletes. The Legacy Fund will create a more robust structure that requires a staggered and focused spending on Sporting Legacy, while a Legacy Commission will allow a dedicated part of the IOC to accumulate and disseminate information, while offering focused counseling and evaluation of individual Sporting Legacy plans. A longer OCOG life will create a counterpart in the respective Hosts that can show and execute a real dedication to creating and maintaining a Sporting Legacy, and the promotion of naming sponsorship structures will ease the burden on the state and its taxpayers. These are the hopes of the Authors and it is clear from the above that these ideas may work in isolation, but may well work in collaboration with existing IOC initiatives, or other Proposals set forth in this Project.

As a final word of warning, one key issue that the Authors have recognized is that any IOC recommendations, whether maintained as just such or ‘upgraded’ into obligations, or any of the Authors’ Proposals, if adopted, need to be clearly set out, monitored and have the majority of their steps completed as far in advance of the Opening Ceremony as possible: this is where the IOC’s real powers lie and the IOC will struggle to exert influence and pressure the closer the process gets to the Opening Ceremony. Delaying or leaving significant steps and milestones for after the Closing Ceremony leaves them liable to be passed over or not satisfied adequately.
The Authors approached this Project hoping to move forward from some of the accusations and criticisms that have been found in academic journals and media output, and offer the IOC some proactive and positive suggestions and structures that could build on its good work to date and allow it to show a real intent, understanding and impetus to improve the futures of Hosts after the amazing festival that is the Games moves on to its new home. We hope that a spark of interest or a curiosity for further investigation follows.
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APPENDIX A

Olympic Stakeholder Map
APPENDIX B

Growth of Olympic Games vis-à-vis number of sports, events and competitors

APPENDIX C

Interrelationships between IOC Documentation

OLYMPIC CHARTER

The Olympic Charter represents the permanent fundamental reference document for all parts of the Olympic Movement and it governs the organisation, action and operation of the Olympic Movement and stipulates the conditions for the organisation of the Olympic Games.

HOST CITY CONTRACT

The Host City Contract sets out the legal, commercial and financial rights and obligations of the IOC, the Host City and the NOC of the host country in relation to their specific Olympic Games (it is therefore different from Games to Games). In case of conflict between provisions of the Host City Contract and the Charter, the Host City Contract shall take precedence.

MASTER SCHEDULE

All planning requirements (deliverables and milestones) are marked in a Generic Master Schedule: an executive road map used by the IOC to outline the key Games deliverables and to monitor the Games preparations. The Generic Master Schedule is then adopted per Organising committee into a specific Master Schedule, reflecting organisational planning evolution. This information is the necessary planning component to the Technical Manuals, and available through the IOC Games Dept.

TECHNICAL MANUALS

IOC Technical Manuals are documents that contain key educational information on a specific subject (stakeholder function or theme), related to the organisation of the Olympic Games, and the Paralympic Games: functional requirements, consistent, process, planning information, current practices. Technical Manuals are also annexes to the Host City Contract, and therefore contain contractual requirements, which are identified as such. Technical Manuals can be found in deviation only on the OOGM extranet (http://extranet.olympic.org).

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Guiding Principles are documents that contain key educational information on a specific subject related to the organization of the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Unlike the Technical Manual, these documents do not contain any contractual requirements. They are positioned as best practices in their respective fields recommended to be integrated in the planning and staging of the Olympic and Paralympic Games. The Guiding Principles can be found in deviation only on the OOGM extranet (http://extranet.olympic.org).

OCOG Obligations

OLYMPIC CHARTER

HOST CITY CONTRACT

TECHNICAL MANUALS

Olympic Games Knowledge Reports

---

178 Technical Manual on Sport, November 2005, IOC. P.8
APPENDIX D

Further information on the OGKM Programme

Initially coordinated in the preparations for the Sydney Games in 2000, OGKM is “an integrated platform of services and documentation which assists Games organisers in their preparations; lets them evaluate their progress and success; and helps to define the future of the Games. OGKM aims to help bid cities and Organising Committees develop their own vision and understand how a host city and its citizens can benefit from the long-lasting impact of the Games, while managing the opportunities and risks that such an event produces.”

Under the OGKM sphere of influence includes a number of different tools and services that current and potential organisers can draw upon these include; Technical Manuals, the Games Observer Programme, expert Workshops, the Games Evaluation process, Building Knowledge Capabilities, IOC Debrief, Cross-Cultural Awareness, the Secondee Programme and the OGKM extranet providing relevant reports and case studies.

In essence the purpose of the OGKM programme is “avoiding the re-invention of the wheel and reducing the overall risk of staging the Games.” The IOC debrief programme “gives future Games hosts access to a vast array of Olympic knowledge built up from previous organisers’ experience, and provides them with the opportunity to participate in observation.”

The aim of the debrief programme is not to supply a standard template for each future host to follow. Instead, it is intended to encourage future hosts to build on the successes of the previous organizers, while incorporating their own cultures and identities. It does not seek to impose solutions on

---

180 IOC Website. [http://www.olympic.org/en/content/Olympic-Games/?articleNewsGroup=1&currentArticlesPageIPP=50&currentArticlesPage=5&articleId=91235](http://www.olympic.org/en/content/Olympic-Games/?articleNewsGroup=1&currentArticlesPageIPP=50&currentArticlesPage=5&articleId=91235), Posted June 7th, 2010.


182 2016 Candidature Procedure and Questionnaire, June 2008, P.9

other Games, but rather to show options and possibilities that up-coming organisers can analyse to see if they fit into their own unique context.\textsuperscript{184}

Games legacy concerns are a major theme which touches a large proportion of OGKM activities. Through OGKM documentation and seminars, OCOG’s can learn about successful and unsuccessful Sporting Legacies of previous games and can choose to apply aspects of these examples to their current planning.

\textsuperscript{184} IOC Press Release, June 10, 2010. \url{http://www.olympic.org/en/content/Press-Release/PRESS-RELEASE-Vancouver-passes-know-how-to-Sochi/}
APPENDIX E

Full List of Questions regarding Legacy as found in the CAPQ\textsuperscript{185}

B - LEGACY

Q 1.4 What will be the benefits of bidding for the Olympic Games for your city/region, irrespective of the outcome of the bid?

Q 1.5 Provide details of your key Olympic legacy initiatives and how these are linked with your city's/region's long-term planning and objectives.

Provide details of how the above key initiatives will be supported, financed, monitored and measured by all relevant stakeholders prior to, during and post-Games.

Q 1.6 What will be the legacy for sport in your city/region?

Describe the measures you intend to take to promote and develop Olympic sports that are less popular in your country in the lead-up to the Olympic Games.

Q 1.7 How can hosting the Olympic Games in your city contribute to the Olympic Movement?

\textsuperscript{185} 2016 CAPQ. P.66
APPENDIX F

Suggested Models for the Manufactured Legacy

1. **Venue Specific:** the IOC mandate that any sporting infrastructure that involves the investment of over US$\times$ (whether in new build or upgrade costs; figure to be determined by the IOC) must host at least two international level events in the three years following the Closing Ceremony. Once the investment crosses the threshold, the IOC is notified and the IOC and the Evaluation Commission then begin to monitor the progress and success of bids that look to bring the events to those venues. Of course the requisite amount and quality of the bids must be successfully secured in advance of the Opening Ceremony.

2. **Sport Specific:** the IOC and ASOIF or AIWF (as appropriate) agree a tiered list of sports with, for example, seven Tier A sports, seven Tier B sports, seven Tier C sports and seven Tier D sports. On what basis sports are tiered are at the stakeholders’ discretion but relevant values may be viewer figures, audience attendance etc. The IOC mandate that within the three years following the Closing Ceremony, two Tier A, three Tier B, two Tier C and one Tier D sport must be brought back to the Host City. The IOC and the Evaluation Commission monitor the progress and success of the bids that look to bring the events to those venues. Of course the requisite amount and quality of the bids must be successfully secured in advance of the Opening Ceremony. At first glance, the problem with this structure is that new or expensive venues are not guaranteed to be utilized after the Closing Ceremony (subject to the tiering).

3. **Host Specific:** the IOC mandates that within 18 months of a city becoming the Host, it will agree with the IOC and ASOIF a matrix of events that it will look to bring to the city in the three years following the Closing Ceremony (subject to any predetermined minimum requirements). All parties will have to act reasonably but

---

186 The basis of the tiering needs to be agreed, but could be based on Olympics-time TV viewers, public attendance, income etc.
the IOC and ASOIF must be happy with the commitments of the Host. Once this matrix is complete, the IOC and the Evaluation Commission then begin to monitor the progress and success of bids that look to bring the events to those venues. Of course the requisite amount and quality of the bids must be successful in advance of the Opening Ceremony. This structure has more elements and opens up areas for disagreement, but the advantage is that the Host is given the maximum opportunity to tailor its Sporting Legacy to its venues, market and public, while still existing within a controlled structure.

The purpose of the above exercise was to give some broad-brush structures for setting out hosting obligations of the Host, but of course all elements of the above are only suggestions, and ingredients such as the time frames and the amount of sports are all open to amendment.