Appendix 1

Bid milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Review of the 2004 bidding process and Candidate City submissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– First synopsis of London’s potential presented to the BOA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– First meeting of London Olympic Games Environment Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– BOA report to DCMS on the issues of staging a London Olympic Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key milestones of the London 2012 bid: 2001-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ARUP report commissioned</td>
<td>– First Government commissioned poll returns 82% support for a London bid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Launch of London 2012 website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Olympic and Paralympic plans released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Advertising campaign commences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Applicant City Questionnaire response submitted to IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Evaluation Commission visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Green light for Velopark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– JVA for LOCOG signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Commissioning of cost-benefit analysis (ARUP report) of staging a London Olympic Games</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Leap Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Nations and Regions Group meets for the first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– First Premier Partner signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Speech by bid Chairman to the Environment Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Green light for Hockey Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– BOA’s first formal presentation to the Mayor and GLA</td>
<td>– Government commits to London 2012</td>
<td>– Candidate City announcement</td>
<td>– Olympics Bill announced in Queen’s speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Revised logo unveiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Feedback from the IOC on Applicant City Questionnaire phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Release of questions for Candidature File by IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Lord Coe appointed bid Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Barbara Cassani announced as bid Chairman</td>
<td>– Relay of Olympic Torch around London</td>
<td>– Confirmation of the Dome as an Olympic venue</td>
<td>– 40 Artists, 40 Days project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Report of the IOC’s Evaluation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– London awarded 2012 Games at Host City election in Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Olympics Bill submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Olympic Lottery launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– First IOC Coordination Commission meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Athens Paralympic Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Last Premier Partner signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– BOA, Mayor, GLA and LDA publicly pledge support to a London bid</td>
<td>– Management team fully in place</td>
<td>– Candidature File sent for production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– First briefing by the IOC</td>
<td>– Bid flag revealed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Logo judges revealed</td>
<td>– Planning application granted for the Olympic Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– LOCOG formally established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 35 NGBs endorse London’s bid</td>
<td>– Logo and preferred Olympic sites unveiled</td>
<td>– Candidature File delivered to IOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Promotional films released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Photographic exhibition of ‘next generation athletes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– 10 Lords are Leaping event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– London 2012 Day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 2 provides information relating to the bid company itself. This Appendix is divided into four sub-sections:

Appendix 2.1: Human Resources
Appendix 2.2: Internal Finance
Appendix 2.3: Commercial and Legal
Appendix 2.4: IT support

Appendix 2.1: Human Resources

2.1.1 Bid company set-up and initial recruitment

On set-up, there was no formal HR function or HR director on the management team. Two consultants were employed as recruitment support, initially to assist Barbara Cassani, the bid Chairman, in appointing her team of Directors. The consultants then went on to fulfil a joint HR role on a job share basis.

Barbara Cassani was elected as bid Chairman in June 2003 and she began the process of filling some of the key positions, given the submission of the Applicant Questionnaire was due in January 2004.

A large number of recruitment referrals did come from the stakeholders (DCMS, LDA, BOA) prior to the company being set up but these were evaluated in the same manner as any other application. A lot of time was spent processing these as soon as London 2012 had formed.

An advert for all Executive Director positions was placed in the Sunday Times and all recruitment (other than the CEO) was handled by London 2012, which resulted in a significant financial saving on recruitment fees.

2.1.2 Ongoing recruitment

A policy was implemented to respond to every speculative recruitment application, in order to support London 2012’s PR approach and to encourage people to support the bid. The introduction of standard responses, statements on London 2012’s website and on partners’ websites were effective measures in managing the number of enquiries coming into London 2012.

In terms of background, Games experience was not necessarily a prerequisite. However, some of the senior management did come with international sports experience and subject matter experts were drafted in to help improve specific technical and specialist areas that were needed on the bid.

The company’s growth was organic in that employees and consultants were recruited as the bid company’s needs changed. However, quality people were recruited, which produced a high quality bid.

The company grew very quickly to a total of approximately 120 staff – about half of whom were employees, and the other half a mixture of secondees and consultants. The full contingent of staff was needed up to
the final submission of the Candidature File in November 2004 and the Evaluation Commission visit in February 2005. The numbers of employees for each phase were approximately as follows:

- Applicant Questionnaire submission: 50-60 employees
- Candidature File Submission: 120 employees
- Evaluation Commission visit: 120 employees
- Host City election: 90 employees
- Transition period: 67 employees (44 originally in transition plan)

London 2012 wanted to involve the local community in order to support the bid’s public relations activity. As such, positions were advertised in the local press and at local colleges although the response was limited.

2.1.3 Appointment of consultants
When consultancy services were required, individual departmental heads made the appointments. The cost of the consultants was taken out of each department’s budget. The Legal department devised a consultancy contract request form and these forms were completed and signed by departmental heads and then forwarded to the Legal department for actioning. The contract request forms contained all the information required for the Legal department to draft a contract. Procurement minutes were required from the respective department if the cost of a consultant company exceeded £10,000. If the cost of a consultant company exceeded £150,000 then it was a requirement to follow EU procurement directives, otherwise known as OJEC procedures (see Appendix 2.3).

2.1.4 HR function
The initial remit of the two HR consultants was executive recruitment. However, this remit evolved to a broader recruitment and HR function which fulfilled a number of standard HR roles and served to provide guidance and advice on individual and team issues. The HR function was supported by the Finance and Legal departments which assisted in payroll requirements and the drafting of contracts.

Given the short time-frames and deadlines, there was little opportunity for employee training. Therefore, employees had to have the relevant skill requirements at the outset and be good self-starters. In the Finance department, employees were able to combine their role with gaining accountancy qualifications in order to enable them to carry out their functional role.

2.1.5 Organisational structure
The structure of the organisation changed three or four times to reflect the changing nature of the work and various phases through the life cycle of the bid. Technical expertise was brought in through the employment of external consultants on either a full-time or part-time basis. See Appendix 4 for full details of the bid team structure. As the company was only in existence for two years, there had to be flexibility in people’s willingness to carry out various roles.
2.1.6 HR systems and policies
Most records were maintained on manually set-up PC systems. An HR employee handbook was developed in conjunction with the Legal team.

2.1.7 Transition arrangements
Soon after the bid company was formed, the bid Chairman recognised that employees may understandably seek work elsewhere before the final decision in July 2005. The Chairman determined that a redundancy scheme should be adopted so that employees could work to the end of July 2005 without having to worry during the final stages of the bid.

The redundancy policy was designed to apply to employees who were made redundant either as a result of an unsuccessful bid or because they were not required as part of the team which would transfer work from the bid company to the OCOG.

To ensure that any redundancy payments under the redundancy policy were not taxable, it was necessary to get a ruling to that effect from Inland Revenue. Inland Revenue subsequently confirmed that the redundancy payments would be construed as one-off ex-gratia payments and that any payments under the policy would be non-taxable.

Employment law required a full employee consultation process to precede the nomination of transition team members. All employees were retained on their contracts until the end of July 2005, during which time they could take any unused 2005 holiday entitlement or be paid in lieu. Following that, any employee who was not on the transition team was given a further one month’s enhanced redundancy payment. This provided staff with a cushion of time and money to look for other employment after the election vote, especially as they were required to focus all their time and attention on their work in the final stages of the bid. Consultants’ involvement ended as per the terms of their contracts, and secondees returned to their employers.

In a ‘lose’ scenario, 14 staff would have been required to wind-up the bid company. In a ‘win’ scenario, 44 staff were identified as being required during the transition phase. However, in reality, this grew to 67.

APPENDIX 2.2: Internal Finance
2.2.1 Objectives
The principal objectives of the Finance team were to implement a system of financial management sufficient to monitor and control both costs and income, and provide timely, relevant financial information to the bid’s senior management and primary stakeholder groups. It was also recognised from the outset that the bid was a fixed life project (as opposed to a business) which needed to be highly flexible in its approach while maintaining strong controls to ensure that costs did not overrun. Essentially we wanted to fund as many campaign activities that our budget allowed. The Finance team aimed to provide the support that would allow the rest of the company to concentrate on winning the bid while ensuring that the company stayed within its budget. The accounting company policies and procedures were developed with this in mind.
2.2.2 Stakeholders and other key parties
The key company stakeholders were:

- Greater London Authority (GLA)
- Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)
- British Olympic Association (BOA)

Other key parties:

- British Paralympic Association (BPA)
- International Olympic Committee (IOC)
- London Development Authority (LDA)
- General public

2.2.3 Funding and income
There were three main categories of funding for the company: grant income made up the majority, sponsorship income was the second largest category, followed by donations.

Grant income: the grant income was provided equally between the DCMS and the GLA. There are two main agreements concerning the grant: the stakeholder agreement and the funding agreement. The funding agreement exclusively concerned the use and provision of the grant income, the provision of information to the stakeholders and the split between basic grant and contingency. The two agreements were negotiated in July 2003 and laid out clear boundaries for information and involvement from the stakeholders. The company was required to provide the stakeholders with monthly management accounts, quarterly cash flow statements (for grant draw-downs) and budget updates.

Sponsorship income: the second largest category of income was from corporate supporters/sponsors. This came in two main forms: cash sponsorship and value-in-kind income (VIK). VIK goods and services were valued at fair market value - that is, the cash price of the goods or services on the open market. It was decided that only budget-relieving VIK should be included in the company budget. Budget-relieving VIK was deemed to be those goods and services that were essential to the bid and, should no VIK deal have arisen, London 2012 would have been required to spend the equivalent amount in cash in order to acquire them.

Donations: the final category of major income was donations. In particular, London 2012 received a £1 million donation from the Royal Mail and the use of office space in 1 Canada Square, Canary Wharf, as a donation.

Bank interest: as London 2012 received grant income in instalments, it was possible to manage cash in such a way as to maximise bank interest receivable.
2.2.4 Budgets and cash flow

As part of the funding agreement we were required to produce an interim budget for the bid. This was produced and agreed in July/August 2003. A second (final) budget was produced in Oct 2003. The company undertook two additional major budgeting exercises during the two years, the first of which took place in March 2004.

The first two budgets included VAT as a cost as the company was not given a VAT recovery status by HM Customs and Excise. Various negotiations took place and we were able to gain a full recovery status. This was fundamental to the company’s spending ability as VAT amounted to a significant portion of the total budget. If London 2012 had not won the election it would have had to treat VAT as a cost.

The final major budgeting exercise was undertaken in October 2004. Each budgeting exercise took into account all the variables known at that particular date. So as we secured more sponsorship income or were given a VAT recovery status we were able to amend our spending plans accordingly.

Initially, the budgeting process needed to contend with the uncertainty surrounding the level of supporter income we would be able to raise. Due to the possibility that we would not hit our sponsorship target or exceed the expected amount, management drew up several contingency plans which were incorporated into the budget. The main difficulty with the budgeting process was the uncertainty surrounding the level of income we would be able to raise.

2.2.5 Accounting systems

In line with the size and nature of the company, the accounting systems used during the bid were chosen with an emphasis on simplicity. Advice was taken from KPMG, our auditors, before selecting the accounting software. Listed below are the systems used during the bid:

– Accounting software: standard accounting software was used
– Excel was used for budgeting and reporting
– Payroll was outsourced
– A paper-based purchase order system was operated

2.2.6 Summary of operations

A summary of the functions of the internal finance department has been given below. Due to the nature of the work involved, these activities remained reasonably unaffected by the various stages of the bid’s life-cycle:

**Book-keeping:** a substantial part of day-to-day operations was centred on recording and processing financial paperwork (invoices, purchase order forms, etc) and making supplier payments. The controls and procedures involved would be considered standard for any commercial organisation.

**Financial reporting:** this included the production of monthly management accounts for distribution to stakeholder groups; detailed financial analyses in compliance with IOC ‘Candidate City’ reporting requirements; and the preparation of statutory financial statements.
Maintenance of bid budget: actual income and expenditure levels were periodically reviewed, analysed and compared against budget. Departmental reporting packs were also provided to all internal budget holders on a monthly basis.

Resolution of tax issues: lengthy negotiations were held with HM Customs and Revenue before the bid company’s status as fully VAT recoverable was confirmed.

Payroll: the payroll processing function was outsourced. However, the Finance department was responsible for preparing the monthly payroll details, and reconciling the reports received back to internal records.

Treasury: a consistently high bank balance required the management of working capital to maximise interest receivable as an additional source of income. Ongoing forecasts of the bid’s cash requirements were also produced, as were formal applications to draw-down on grant funding.

Accounts receivable: contracted corporate supporter fees and cost recharges were invoiced, and debtor accounts were monitored and managed.

Other: other significant functions of the department included value-in-kind accounting, maintenance of the fixed asset register and policing of the procurement policy.

2.2.7 Staffing
The department consisted of four permanent positions with the following roles and responsibilities:

Finance Director: ultimately responsible for the financial operations of the company and providing overall strategic direction to the company as a member of the Executive Management Committee.

Financial Controller: responsible for the day-to-day running of the department, including the activities of the Financial Accountant and Finance Assistant.

Financial Accountant: responsible for the production of required financial reports, including monthly management accounts, and the review of accounting controls and procedures.

Finance Assistant: responsible for processing financial paperwork and ensuring the payment of suppliers and staff.

Temporary staff were brought in during various stages of the bid to assist the Finance Assistant.

2.2.8 Summary
The company tailored its accounting systems and policies to fit the nature of the bid, ensuring that the systems were flexible. The Finance team’s approach was one of support. Flexibility was the key to the success of the accounting systems. Maintaining the balance between control and flexibility...
was a key issue for the team. Various contingency plans were drawn up to cover all income possibilities (for example, if London 2012 failed to raise the projected amount of income).

**Appendix 2.3: Commercial and Legal**

**2.3.1 Stakeholders’ agreement**

This is the document which constituted London 2012 Ltd as a joint venture vehicle whose members were DCMS, BOA and GLA. The key issue was to ensure that, within agreed parameters, London 2012 could operate at arms’ length from its stakeholders. This was achieved by limiting the number of matters requiring stakeholder sign-off to the sensible minimum (that is, annual budget and business plan and material variations thereto, etc). Also, and importantly, the board was not dominated by ‘representatives’ of the stakeholders. Ensuring that the requirements to provide information and reports to stakeholders were consistent with the requirements of the funding agreement was important.

**2.3.2 London 2012 funding agreement**

This agreement between London 2012 Ltd, the DCMS and the LDa provided £10m from the DCMS and £10m from the LDa. The key issue was to ensure that regular amounts of money were delivered to London 2012 so that it could plan its affairs with confidence. This was vital to the ability of the management of the bid to operate at arms’ length from the stakeholders.

In the interim period between 18 June and 19 August the LDa agreed to stand behind the agreed expenses of the bid. This enabled the bid to become operational before the legal documents were signed.

**2.3.3 Corporate governance**

Each director was required to sign and return their appointment letter and in doing so they agreed to the matters in the letter.

In addition to the appointment letter, each director was also sent a copy of the company’s directors’ code of conduct. The code of conduct incorporated a number of company policies including an expenses policy, ethics and conflict of interest policy and a communications policy. The code existed to ensure stringent standards of ethical behaviour in compliance with the Olympic Charter, the IOC Code of Ethics, other rules of the IOC and all UK company law requirements relating to directors’ duties of skill and care and their fiduciary duties of good faith and honesty.

Accompanying the directors’ code of conduct was a four-page summary of information for directors. The summary included information about directors’ fiduciary duties, duties of skill and care, and statutory duties. The directors were advised to approach the company secretary or the ethics commissioner with any questions about directors’ duties.

The code of conduct established an Ethics Advisory Group, which existed as an independent body and was chaired by an ethics commissioner. The Ethics Advisory Group advised the company on how to properly meet its obligations under the Olympic Charter, the IOC Code of Ethics and the other rules of the IOC and it also gave direction regarding how to carry out duties pursuant in order to comply with UK company law and the directors’ code of conduct.
Each director and officer of the company was sent a directors’ and officers’ questionnaire which collected information about the directors’ and officers’ other business interests and any past offences/convictions. This information was required to complete each director’s Form 288A and also to make an application for directors’ and officers’ insurance. In addition to the questionnaire, each director was sent a registration form which collected personal information. This information was required for Form 288A and for the company should it need to contact any director or director’s family urgently.

The board of directors was required to meet four times each calendar year (more frequently if necessary). The board meetings were chaired by the company’s chairman and there were three vice-chairmen of the board. The board structure was determined pursuant to Part F of the stakeholder agreement and the procedures of the board were set out in the company’s articles of association.

The articles of association required that directors were given at least five business days’ notice of any board meeting. The formal notice of meeting and all board papers (including draft minutes of the previous meeting) were generally sent to the directors at least 14 days before the board meetings. The board papers included a written report from each departmental head which summarised the activities of their department.

2.3.4 Third-party suppliers of products and services
A tendering process was adopted for the procurement of outsourced functions. The principal third-party suppliers were in the following areas:

- IT support
- Production company for the Candidature File
- Public Relations
- Events and conferencing

2.3.5 Procurement
The funding agreement specified that a competitive tender process should be used for all contracts equal to or exceeding £10,000, except where there were compelling and lawful reasons not to do so. It was not allowable to divide a contract into a number of contracts to reduce the value of each divided contract below £10,000.

To ensure compliance with the funding agreement, a procurement policy was drafted and adopted. The procurement policy set out the guidelines which personnel had to adopt when they were engaging with a third party for the purchase of goods or services.

Attached to the procurement policy was a procurement minute which was completed and signed by the head of department when any work with a value of over £10,000 was being procured. The minute contained information about the contracting parties, the date of the procurement, details of services or goods, details of tender process followed and an explanation if the contract was not awarded to the cheapest tender offer.
For contracts valued at £150,000 or over it was necessary to comply with EU Public Procurement Directives which are aimed at ensuring full, fair and transparent competition throughout the EU. When entering into a contract with a value of over £150,000 it was necessary to follow OJEC procedures.

OJEC procedures required the procuring body to advertise the contract in the official journal of the European Community. It was not necessary to follow OJEC procedures when the services or supplies were offered for free.

OJEC procedures can be a time-consuming process and by using a ‘central purchasing body’ it was possible to fast track them. Both the Central Office of Information (COI) and the Office of Government Agency are central purchasing bodies. Provided that a procuring body (London 2012) procured through a central purchasing body then it was deemed to have complied with the procurement directives.

When procuring goods or services valued at over £150,000 the COI was used, making it possible to allocate a contract in a very short time frame. Going through OJEC procedures without using a central purchasing body would have taken up to three months and many hours of administration.

2.3.6 Insurance
There was an immediate need for directors’ and officers’ insurance, office contents insurance, public liability insurance, employer’s liability insurance, and business travel insurance. A number of insurance brokers were consulted to provide quotes. As the business grew it was necessary to continually upgrade the limits of our policies.

2.3.7 Employment contracts and employee handbook
Standard draft employment contracts were provided. Specifically there were three types of employment contract adopted:

- Basic employment contract in the form of a letter which the incoming employee was required to sign.
- Executive service agreement in the form of a deed for executive employees.
- Executive director service agreement for executive employees who were also statutory company directors.

These contracts (or variations of them) were used by the Legal team for each London 2012 employee.

An employee handbook was created and the initial draft had to be revised significantly to suit the organisation. The employee handbook incorporated the company policies, including an equal opportunities policy, an expense policy, a communications policy, a bullying and harassment policy and a health and safety policy.

A number of employees required work permits in order to work in the UK. Applications for non-EC employees were submitted by a law firm on behalf of the company.
2.3.8 Confidentiality agreements
Standard forms of confidentiality agreements were provided by a law firm and the agreements were then adapted. Each consultant and employee of the company had confidentiality provisions contained in their agreements. The confidentiality agreements were used primarily for volunteers or in discussions about procurement of goods or services. In cases where particularly sensitive information was being shared, the relevant individuals were required to enter into confidentiality agreements in their own names.

2.3.9 Registration of trade mark
The London 2012 logo was registered as a trade mark and faced no third-party opposition to it during the opposition period.

The IOC required all bidding cities from an early stage (August 2003) to register the word mark of their city, plus the year – i.e. ‘London 2012’. The IOC made it very clear that this was an essential part of the bid. There has previously been resistance from the Trade Mark Registrar to the registration of any such word marks in the UK (for example, Sydney 2000 application was rejected), as they were not seen to be ‘distinctive’ for trade mark purposes. This has not been the approach taken in other jurisdictions. Nevertheless, London 2012 was able to persuade the Registry that the mark was registrable on the basis of its clear association with the event in 2012 in London.

2.3.10 Registration of domain names
Contact was made with Demys (which provides domain name services) to arrange for the registration of various ‘London 2012’ domain names. It became apparent that the domain name ‘london2012.com’ was unavailable, having already been registered by a legitimate user. We immediately took action (with the assistance of Demys) to secure the domain name from that user. All other domain names (including blocking domain names) were registered to ensure protection of the brand online.

2.3.11 Data protection
The Data Protection Act 1998 sets out various principles about how personal information must be used and stored. London 2012 was advised that it fell within the definition of ‘data user’ under the Act and that an application to the Data Protection Registrar needed to be made. The registration procedure was fairly simple and mechanical, and involved providing full details of the data user (London 2012). The registered particulars had to be kept up to date and could not be deliberately or recklessly misleading. Holding and using personal data was then only permitted within the terms of the registration. Even though registered, it was an offence to knowingly or recklessly hold/use personal data save as described on the register; use personal data for a purpose not on the register; obtain information from sources not on the register; or transfer personal data to countries or territories other than those which it had stated on the register it intended to transfer such data.

2.3.12 Corporate Supporter Agreements
With assistance from a law firm, a standard form Corporate Supporter Agreement was drafted. This was then modified to create a standard agreement for four of the five tiers of corporate supporters – Premier, Major,
Champion and Supporter. A simple letter of agreement was used for the lowest tier of corporate supporter – the Contributor tier.

The Corporate Supporter Agreements granted each corporate supporter the right to use the logo applicable to their tier within Great Britain and Northern Ireland and granted the right to certain other benefits (see section 7 for more detail) in return for their support. Such support could be in the form of cash or value-in-kind. It is important to note that according to IOC rules, the Candidate City is prohibited from commercialising the Olympic symbol in any form and, therefore, the corporate supporter logos must not include the Olympic rings. The Corporate Supporter Agreements also included a clause requiring the corporate supporters not to use any representation of the Olympic symbol, the Olympic motto (‘Citius, altius, fortius’) or any translation of the Olympic motto or any of the words ‘Olympiad’, ‘Olympiads’, ‘Olympian’, ‘Olympians’, ‘Olympic’ and ‘Olympics’. The right to use the logo ceased upon the date of the announcement of the 2012 Host City and the Candidate City was prohibited from granting the supporter any automatic or residual rights following the date of the decision.

2.3.13 Trade mark licence
This was a straightforward licence between the BOA and London 2012, allowing London 2012 to use the mark and sub-license it to its corporate supporters on the basis of the IOC’s rules for bidding cities (that is, supporters not allowed to use any Olympic terminology or marks, all rights end on date of Host City election and confined to use within the territory).

2.3.14 Ongoing corporate governance
Initially London 2012 had an audit and finance sub-committee. After several months this became the board supervisory committee. These committees met each month in between the months when there were board meetings.

The audit committee was chaired by Mary Reilly (chair of the GLA and partner at Deloitte). The remit of this committee was to supervise the finances of the company and to ensure that proper financial control procedures were in place. The committee was also responsible for supervising the company’s procurement practices. To that end the committee ensured that the company set up a formal procurement policy.

The board supervisory committee was chaired by Sir Howard Bernstein (chief executive, City of Manchester) and met monthly. The remit of this committee was set out in the committee’s terms of reference which provided that, among other things, its role was to oversee and give direction to the executive management of the company in relation to the company’s four remaining major projects, namely: the Evaluation Commission visit, building UK public support, the Singapore presentation, and international relations. The board supervisory committee was charged with overseeing the general management of the bid, including the management accounts and budgets, and took over the responsibilities of the audit committee.
2.3.15 Guarantees – general approach
The IOC requires bidding cities to provide a very large number of guarantees (in London 2012’s case, approximately 400 from more than 200 different organisations). This was a big task and the department’s largest piece of work.

This process has become more detailed, as the IOC have tried to move a lot of technical detail from the OCOG stage to the bidding stage. Their experience is that bidding cities have more leverage with third parties than OCOGs, as people are more willing to assist a bid than an OCOG. The difficulty can be getting third parties to engage or legally commit to anything so far in advance.

Given the leverage issue, the approach we took was to try and secure as many legally binding agreements as possible. Vancouver 2010 had taken the same approach and it had impressed the IOC and put Vancouver in a strong position after winning their bid to host the 2010 Winter Games.

Some of the guarantees were in a form prescribed by the IOC (for example, in relation to providing a clean venue). Others (the majority) were simply requests for guarantees and it was up to a bidding city to interpret them. The advice London 2012 received was to ensure that all guarantees should be in the form requested by the IOC.

In relation to the venues in the Olympic Park which did not yet exist, London 2012 agreed that the stakeholders (BOA, DCMS and GLA) should give the guarantees on the basis that they would be the organisations which would control the bodies that would deliver the venues. This seemed acceptable to the IOC. Please see Appendix 3 for the different types of guarantees for each theme.

2.3.16 Host City Contract
The contract covers all aspects of staging the Games. It is non-negotiable, except for the tax provisions which the IOC had said could be amended to ensure they worked to the IOC’s and the OCOG’s best advantage under the Host City’s legislation. A 2012 draft of the contract was issued on 18 May 2004 – the date of the Candidate City announcement.

2.3.17 Brand protection
A standard form of letter was sent to third parties when they infringed London 2012’s intellectual property (IP). The BOA had a strict brand protection policy which they forwarded to London 2012 as a base model to use. Depending on the gravity of the brand infringement either a formal or informal letter would be sent by the Legal department.

The formal legal letter was used when it was thought that a third party had knowingly and seriously infringed London 2012 IP. This letter demanded immediate removal of the offending matter and pointed out that the offending party was in breach of statute and trademark law. The letter pointed out that if the prohibited matter was not immediately discontinued then damages would be sought from the infringing party.
The informal legal letter was used when it was thought that a third party had mistakenly used London 2012 IP. This regularly occurred, as there were many parties that did not understand the distinction between supporting the bid and breaching London 2012’s IP. Quite often small businesses were not aware that they needed a licence to use the IP.

One of the most frequent brand protection issues London 2012 faced was with property development companies using the London 2012 mark in newspaper advertisements. The property development companies were generally based in east London and it was assumed that they were using the London 2012 IP in order to demonstrate that east London was going to be successfully developed.

The corporate supporter programme meant it was necessary to be extra-vigilant on brand protection matters. The Premier Partners each paid £1m in cash or VIK for the right to use the London 2012 marks. In order to use London 2012 IP it was necessary to sign a formal licence with London 2012. This was required pursuant to the terms of the licence between the BOA and London 2012.

2.3.18 Memoranda of understanding
Several memoranda of understanding were entered into with environmental and consumer groups. These were not legally binding but were a statement of intent at the time of signing.

2.3.19 Joint Venture Agreement (JVA)
The JVA was signed on 18 February 2005 during the Evaluation Commission visit. The JVA was signed between London 2012 and the stakeholders (DCMS, BOA, GLA) and essentially provided commercial freedom for LOCOG and allowed it to operate as a private, self-autonomous organisation. The JVA essentially meant that stakeholders would have sign-off on the yearly budget plan to ensure it was consistent with the seven-year plan. If the budget spend was within the yearly budget plan and consistent with the seven-year plan, stakeholders had agreed not to interfere. The JVA was effective as of the first LOCOG board meeting on 3 October 2005.

2.3.20 Freedom of information
The Freedom of Information Act 2000 (the ‘Act’) came into full effect on 1 January 2005 and provided for a general right of access to information held by public authorities in the UK. Although the main impact of the Act is on public authorities (of which London 2012 Limited was not one), it had important implications for London 2012 because it would be much easier for any person or company to access information held by public authorities, such as Government departments, the GLA and the LDA, which had been provided by London 2012 or related to London 2012.

The right of access under the Act entitles anyone who makes a written request for information from a public authority to receive that information. It covers any information held by any public authority at the time the request was made and is fully retrospective – that is, it applies to all information provided to the public authority before the Act came into effect and not just information provided after 1 January 2005.
The Act lists a series of exemptions in respect of information which would otherwise be available under the general right of access. The exemption for information provided in confidence (section 41) is the exemption most relevant to London 2012.

London 2012 considered how to protect itself from the disclosure of information by public authorities which it considered confidential – for example, confidential technical information relating to the bid or information regarding the Evaluation Commission visit which was useful to rival Candidate Cities:

- Information audit: determined what information had already been provided to and was held by public authorities. What were the consequences if that information were made public? If London 2012 was aware of specific information which should be held by the public authorities ‘in confidence’, London 2012 sought written agreement to ensure that it would not be disclosed.
- Internal procedures: London 2012 took steps to prevent unnecessary provision of information to public authorities and determined which information would be considered sensitive or confidential.

2.3.21 Transition planning
The JVA was clearly an essential part of the broader London 2012 transitional plan and safeguarded the status of LOCOG and its independence.

The Olympics Bill provided the statutory remit of the public bodies which would be tasked with delivering the Games. In particular, it set up the Olympic Delivery Authority to deliver public sector obligations for the Games, principally the necessary venues and infrastructure:

- The establishment of the Olympic Delivery Authority, its powers, duties, functions and coordination.
- The delivery of transport needs for the Games, including the necessary preparations in the lead up to 2012.
- Controls of marketing in connection with the Olympic Games, including the protection of Olympic intellectual property, restrictions on commercial association with the Games, the prohibition of street trading and outdoor advertising in the vicinity of Olympic venues and of ticket touting in connection with Olympic events.
- The Mayor of London’s power to prepare for and stage the Olympic Games.
Appendix 2.4: IT support

2.4.1 Set-up
The delivery of the office IT support was contracted to an outsourced company that was approached to offer a managed IT service including set-up and remote monitoring services. The company also acted as a hardware reseller and provided a complete one-stop solution for a start-up company. IT staff were sourced and recruited by the outsourcer and contracted out to the site. As virtually all of the office IT services were outsourced, this function became more expensive as the bid company grew.

Initially, London 2012 had a simple security structure with an email system, a print server, a file server and company data file and personal data file systems, plus a back-up to tape solution, all of which was housed in a lockable air-conditioned room.

At first, 10 fixed lines were used for all company telecommunications. Later a personal branch exchange was sourced.

Licences for Windows Operating Systems were included in the purchase costs of new machines (desktop and laptop). The main other licence products included licences for desktop publishing and email. All necessary licences were purchased from the IT supplier under a volume licence agreement.

There was an immediate small-scale need for mobile telephony which was satisfied by purchasing 10 retail boxed handsets on a standard consumer tariff. After several months, the phones were transferred to a business tariff which offered much better calling rates. After BT became the London 2012 telecoms Premier Partner, the business account was migrated.

2.4.2 Applicant Questionnaire phase
Aggressive growth took place during this phase. The initial office design scaled well and the onsite resource managed the day-to-day running and upsizing of the company. IT requirements were kept simple, and no specialised software was required.

2.4.3 Candidature File phase
A team of architects was brought in-house to help with the Candidature File submission. This radically altered the IT requirements for the office. Storage and back-up became an issue but, although resources were stretched, tight management of resource usage allowed the office to continue to function effectively. It would have been useful to have identified that resource requirement during the build phase of the systems.

Members of the bid team travelled to the Athens 2004 Games and IT support was required for the duration of the stay. Laptops had access to the London 2012 network and staff could therefore access emails and the internet.
2.4.4 Evaluation Commission visit
The Evaluation Commission visit entailed collaborative support with a number of corporate sponsors to provide a remote office environment to more than 50 per cent of the bid staff during the visit. London 2012’s telecoms Premier Partner, BT, extended a LAN extension service across to the hotel where the visit was centred, and a complete secured network was set up using consultants from the outsourcer. Additional equipment was hired where necessary.

2.4.5 Host City election in Singapore
Further collaboration with corporate sponsors enabled staff to access the London 2012 network remotely using a ‘Citrix’ gateway and a terminal server. All communications between Singapore and London were encrypted using a VPN tunnel for maximum security. This gave a much more flexible and useable system than had been the case in Athens. All staff were supplied with new phones with new numbers. Some key members of staff were provided with a back-up phone to cover all eventualities. Laptops were loaned locally and run through the London office firewall. This ensured little data existed on hard drives, thereby reducing the risk of data loss.

2.4.6 Summary
Good relationships were formed with a number of technology partners, including BT, a global software company and a print/reprographics company. These relationships were initiated by the Corporate Relations team and furthered by the IT department. The reasons for these relationships were to reduce IT operational costs by leveraging VIK, and to engage skills not owned by the bid team. This was balanced against a desire to ‘showcase’ technology and often to test new implementations.
Appendix 3 examines the approach taken to derive the content of the 17 themes as described in London’s Candidature File. Additional details are given on the different organisations that were consulted as well as details of specific agreements that were signed. The 17 themes were:

1. Concept and Legacy
2. Political and Economic Climate and Structure
3. Legal Aspects
4. Customs and Immigration Formalities
5. Environment and Meteorology
6. Finance
7. Marketing
8. Sport and Venues
9. Paralympic Games
10. Olympic Village
11. Medical Services
12. Security
13. Accommodation
14. Transport
15. Technology
16. Media Operations
17. Olympism and Culture

Theme 1: Concept and Legacy
Theme 1 sought to establish a Candidate City’s vision for an Olympic Games and how this vision fits into the city’s long term planning as well as what legacy is planned for the city.

Initially, this theme considered solely the planning of the Olympic venues but the message emanating from the IOC was that legacy of an Olympic Games was increasing in importance. The IOC had developed a distinct policy towards legacy over recent years and therefore this was regarded as an integral element in the concept behind the London 2012 bid. The content of the theme therefore clearly focused on legacy and sustainable infrastructure/regeneration. There were essentially two strands of work regarding this theme:

– Olympic Masterplan
– Legacy Masterplan
Olympic Masterplan: the first step was to engage a group of masterplanners: a consortium of architects, project managers and planning specialists was set up. This consortium was responsible for drawing up a Masterplan of the Olympic Park which would include all the venues and infrastructure needed for London to deliver the Games. It set out the location of the key Olympic facilities and their relationship with transport links, public spaces, the local environment and landscape.

Legacy Masterplan: the objective of the Legacy Masterplan was how best to build new neighbourhoods, provide new jobs, create park space and so on after the Games finished. In January 2004, a Legacy Board was established which consisted of representatives from the stakeholders, local boroughs, culture, education and sport. A legacy strategy was developed by a consulting company which analysed a number of different legacy elements (such as tourism, business, sport, etc) and established two legacy streams which would most benefit the bid, namely: sporting legacy and regeneration.

A principle was set by London 2012 that any permanent venue must satisfy one or more of the following criteria:

– Meet the needs of the local community
– Be part of an existing sports development strategy
– Become a national or regional training centre

Three venues had already been earmarked for development even if London were not awarded the Games: the Velopark, Aquatics Centre and Hockey Centre.

A London Olympic Institute represented a real legacy offering to the IOC and the Olympic Games. Located in the Olympic Park, the Institute would consist of:

– An emphasis on sustainable development within London policy.
– A decision to place the bid content within an overarching sustainability theme: Towards a One Planet Olympics. This provided context and coherence to what would otherwise have been an assemblage of diverse technical points.
– The integration of sustainability principles across the bid, especially in relation to legacy.

Environment was integral to the overall legacy concept, specifically:

– An emphasis on sustainable development within London policy.
– A decision to place the bid content within an overarching sustainability theme: Towards a One Planet Olympics. This provided context and coherence to what would otherwise have been an assemblage of diverse technical points.
– The integration of sustainability principles across the bid, especially in relation to legacy.
Theme 2: Political and Economic Climate and Structure
Theme 2 sought to provide the IOC with a clear understanding of the political and economic climate of the city and an evaluation of the jurisdiction and responsibilities at national, regional and local level when it comes to staging an Olympic Games.

A relatively simple theme to produce, the required content for the Candidature File was achieved through political liaison with a number of central/regional government departments and agencies. This particular theme was very UK- and London-specific and therefore a number of elements will not be transferable to a non-UK bidding city.

The principal sources for developing this theme included:

- Office of National Statistics
- HM Treasury
- parliament.co.uk
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)
- Greater London Authority (GLA)

Theme 3: Legal Aspects
Theme 3 sought to establish whether a Candidate City and its national, regional and local authorities understand and act in conformity with the rules relating to the Olympic Movement. The content of this theme focused on three areas:

- Protection of Olympic Marks and Symbols
- Guarantees from all relevant authorities
- Empowerment of LOCOG

Protection of Olympic Marks and Symbols
Registration of London 2012 Trade Mark: the London 2012 logo was registered as a trade mark and faced no third-party opposition to it during the opposition period. The IOC also required all bidding cities from an early stage (August 2003) to register the word mark of their city, plus the year – ie ‘London 2012’. There has previously been resistance from the Trade Mark Registrar to the registration of any such word marks in the UK (for example, Sydney 2000 application was rejected), as they were not seen to be ‘distinctive’ for trade mark purposes. This has not been the approach taken in other jurisdictions. Nevertheless, London 2012 was able to persuade the Registry that the mark was registrable on the basis of its clear association with the event in 2012 in London.

Ambush marketing: this required two different tranches of work: i) negotiating with the Government on legislation, and ii) negotiating agreements with owners of physical outdoor advertising space such as billboards, on transport and at airports. This theme crossed a number of different Government departments: DCMS as the lead department, Department of Trade and Industry for competition law issues, Department
for Transport in relation to aerial advertising and ability to stop banners being towed, etc. One additional legacy from the bid was a tightening up of the Olympic Symbol etc (Protection) Act 1995 and extension of its remit to the Paralympic Games, which did not have statutory protection.

Guarantees from all relevant authorities
The majority of commercial agreements were signed for the Candidature File submission but agreements were still being signed until May 2005.

Government: guarantees were sought from as many Ministers as possible, not just from the Prime Minister, in order to get all relevant departments committed to the bid.

Mayor: the Mayor’s guarantees were sometimes difficult to give because his powers are restricted by statute (the GLA Act). As such, he had to provide guarantees on the basis that the Olympic Bill would ensure there was provision stating that anything required to be delivered by him under those commitments would be intra vires.

Local authorities: there was an obligation on all local authorities which were involved in the Games to sign the standard undertaking produced by the IOC and to confirm that they would not hold any other important events during the Games. In London, all the local authorities hosting events were asked to sign this (11 boroughs) rather than all 33 boroughs. Each of the boroughs outside London hosting events also signed the guarantee.

Empowerment of LOCOG
Joint Venture Agreement: the JVA was signed on 18 February 2005 during the Evaluation Commission visit. The JVA was signed between London 2012 and the stakeholders (DCMS, GLA, British Olympic Association/BOA) and essentially provided commercial freedom for LOCOG and allowed it to operate as a private, self-autonomous organisation. The JVA essentially meant that stakeholders would sign off the yearly budget plan and ensure it was consistent with the seven-year plan. If the budget spend was within the yearly budget plan and consistent with the seven-year plan, stakeholders agreed not to interfere. The JVA was effective as of the first LOCOG Board meeting on 3 October 2005.

Transition planning: see section 7.

Olympics Bill: it was inevitable that legislation would be required if any city in the UK won the right to host the Games. There were a large number of measures (especially planning, countering ambush marketing and tax exemptions) which either did not exist in current legislation or were event-specific. The aim was to have the Olympics Bill passed as soon as possible after London was elected Host City. The reasons were: i) a number of the provisions (such as setting up the Olympic Delivery Authority/ODA) were central to ensuring delivery of the Games on time, and ii) the enthusiasm for the Games would be higher soon after the election. The aim of the DCMS was also to try to legislate for everything in one Bill, rather than have several Bills over the course of the seven years to the Games.
The Bill provided the statutory remit of the public bodies which would be tasked with delivering the Games. In particular, it set up the ODA to deliver public sector obligations for the Games, principally the necessary venues and infrastructure:

- The establishment of the ODA, its powers, duties, functions and coordination.
- The delivery of transport needs for the Games, including the necessary preparations in the lead up to 2012.
- Controls of marketing in connection with the Olympic Games, including the protection of Olympic intellectual property, restrictions on commercial association with the Games, the prohibition of street trading and outdoor advertising in the vicinity of Olympic venues and of ticket touting in connection with Olympic events.
- The Mayor of London’s power to prepare for and stage the Olympic Games.

The aim was to put the Bill before Parliament in autumn 2005 in the hope of it being passed by spring 2006.

**Theme 4: Customs and Immigration Formalities**

Theme 4 sought to establish the country’s customs and immigration formalities as they related to staging an Olympic Games. This section of the Candidature File was completed by the Legal team.

Discussion took place with different parts of Government, as this theme crossed a number of different departments:

- Home Office for visa policy and gun laws
- Foreign Office (UK Visas) in terms of issuing visas
- HM Customs for import and export
- DEFRA for food and guide dogs
- OFCOM and DCMS for broadcasting regulation

Again this theme was very UK-specific so there will be few transferable elements for a non-UK bidding city. This theme was relatively straightforward for the bid team to complete but two issues that required resolution were:

- The issue of the Olympic Identity and Accreditation Card to all accredited personnel (about 50,000-60,000 people).
- Ensuring that the UK’s gun controls did not prevent the Shooting events taking place.
Theme 5: Environment and Meteorology

Theme 5 sought to establish the general meteorological features of a Candidate City and its surroundings.

Environment was a key theme within the bid strategy from a very early stage. The emphasis was on sustainable development within London 2012 policy and a recognition that London and UK have a leading global role in this field and could gain competitive advantage in this theme. The specific approach on this theme had the following elements:

- Thorough, technical studies of the principal Olympic site.
- Emphasis on wider sustainability approach, not limited to ‘green’ environment.
- Integration of sustainability principles across the bid, especially in relation to legacy.
- Awareness of the international dimension and a need to appeal to wider Olympic movement.

Key activities

- Detailed appreciation of what goes to make up a ‘green Games’ and, crucially, a good knowledge of the IOC policies involved.
- Emphasis on an approach based around sustainability and related to issues of global concern, notably climate change.
- Establishment of Environmental Advisory Group which met approximately every two months to pool ideas to develop strategy and comment on early drafts of the theme content.
- Securing supporting statements from WWF and BioRegional for planning decision and presentation to plenary planning meeting in September.
- Securing VIK support from three environmental consultancies to conduct Environment Impact Assessments and provide Q&A.
- Input to London Development Agency (LDA)/Masterplan working groups on strategies for discharging planning consent.

Key relationships

The most distinctive aspect of London 2012’s environmental work was the relationship built with environmental and sustainability organisations. This was hugely important for gaining public support and for reinforcing the credibility of the environmental proposals.

Key partners were:

Local:
Lea Rivers Trust and other participants in the Environmental Sub Group of the Matrix Group. Most public consultation was done via the Masterplanning team.
London:  GLA environment teams  
LDA sustainability team and Masterplan team  
Environment Agency  
English Nature  
English Heritage  
Lee Valley Regional Park Authority  
British Waterways  
London Sustainable Development Commission  
Groundwork  
London Sustainability Exchange  
Government Office for London Sustainability Unit  
London First  
London Remade  
BioRegional  
Building Research Establishment  
Upstream  

National:  World Wildlife Fund  
SD Commission  
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)  
Department for International Development  
Society for the Environment  
Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management  
Chartered Institution for Water and Environmental Management  
International Institute for Environment and Development  
Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (London Wetlands Centre)  

Additional value was sourced from:  

- Defra: paid secondment  
- Engineering and environmental consultant: Environmental Impact Assessments for non-Olympic Park venues  
- Property and infrastructure consultant: Environmental Impact Assessment summary for Olympic Park venues  
- Sustainability consultant: hosting Environment Forum and analysis of bid books  
- Miscellaneous: input from non-Governmental organisations, statutory agencies and corporate partners  

**Theme 6: Finance**  
Theme 6 sought to establish the reasonableness of the financial plan/budget developed to support the operations of the Olympic Games, and the relevance of the financial guarantees provided to ensure the financing of all major capital infrastructure investments and to cover a potential shortfall by the OCOG.  

It was therefore important that Games Financial Planning gained an understanding of the overall Games finance picture in order to ensure that the Government’s funding package fitted seamlessly with the OCOG budget.
General approach
It was essential that detailed knowledge of the budget remained within the organisation. This was important during the development of the budget as Games Financial Planning needed constant contact across all themes to ensure that all changes affecting cost were captured. That said, the contribution from industry experts was essential. The approach was based on the following three tenets:

– Rigorous: triangulation of data where possible, using UK, Olympic and worldwide experts
– Prudent: ample provision made for contingencies
– Exhaustive: ensure every element was accounted for

LOCOG budget
An early understanding of the LOCOG budget was essential in order to ensure that revenues submitted in the Applicant Questionnaire were in keeping with a balanced budget. The first key task of the financial planners was to analyse the Arup Report, the PwC risk analysis of the Arup report and the resulting proposed Government funding package. A first draft LOCOG budget was constructed in November 2004 and was continuously developed as detail was added and knowledge gathered.

The Candidature File was submitted in November 2003 and included a summary budget table. The Comprehensive Data Book, although not required by the IOC until January 2005, was meant to provide the detailed information to the budget in the Candidature File and as such the detailed models for the Comprehensive Data Book needed to be completed by the time the Candidature File went to print.

Revenue and expense modelling and projections were made on the following items. Many of these areas required additional expertise from external sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IOC contribution</td>
<td>Sport events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP sponsorship</td>
<td>Olympic Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local sponsorship</td>
<td>IBC/MPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticketing</td>
<td>Games workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed merchandise</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin programme</td>
<td>Ceremonies and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philately</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal of assets</td>
<td>Catering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paralympic Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising and promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Olympic events and coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-LOCOG capital investment
The non-LOCOG budget was split as follows:

- Roads and railways
- Sport venues (competition venues, training venues)
- IBC/MPC
- Olympic Village
- Olympic Park infrastructure

Sport venues, IBC/MPC and Olympic Village costings were coordinated by London 2012 (working with consultants and architects).

LOCOG capital investment
A sport services company undertook the detailed costing of all the venues including temporary construction, furniture, fittings and equipment.

Cash flow
Cash flow was compiled based on information from the IOC in relation to when LOCOG would expect to receive the IOC contribution, and historical data on timing of each expenditure activity. Cash flow also took into account interest costs and interest income where applicable.

Theme 7: Marketing
Theme 7 sought to establish a Candidate City’s understanding of the complex intricacies involved in the development of a successful OCOG marketing programme. In order to derive the content of the theme, it was necessary to form a working group which incorporated other members of the London 2012 team beyond the Marketing team, including representatives from Finance and Legal.

Joint Marketing Programme (JMP)
The JMP required a negotiation process between the BOA and London 2012. The BOA, as a member of the IOC, have special dispensation to market the Olympic rights. The JMP, a standard form contract and IOC requirement, enabled London 2012 to market the Olympic ‘brand’ for the duration of the OCOG in return for compensation to the BOA for lost revenue as a result of not being able to market those rights for itself. Although not a requirement, a Joint Marketing Agreement was also agreed with the British Paralympic Association (BPA). Additionally, the National Governing Bodies (NGBs) signed an anti-ambush undertaking as set out in the Joint Marketing Agreement.

Ambush marketing
Olympics Bill: another requirement is for the host country to enact legislation that protects Olympic symbols and terminology from ambush marketing. Legislation existed through the Olympic Symbol etc (Protection) Act 1995 but the Olympics Bill was designed to provide additional protection. See Theme 3.
Outdoor advertising: This consisted of guaranteeing three types of outdoor advertising:

- General outdoor advertising space
- Public transport advertising
- Airport Advertising

Meetings were initially arranged with industry bodies (such as the Outdoor Advertising Association) which provided background information on the bid in order to gain their support. Poster contractors were then approached directly with regard to securing advertising space at a fixed price and standard form agreements were negotiated. The negotiated agreements covered around 99.75 per cent of the advertising spaces in London.

Olympic image
Research was carried out which analysed the ‘look and feel’ of previous Games.

Revenue generation: sponsorship, ticketing and licensing
These are the three main drivers of external OCOG finance and therefore it was important to evidence how these could be maximised. This essentially involved producing revenue forecasts for each, and required close liaison with the Finance team.

The forecasts for the three revenue streams were based on the following methodology:

- Extrapolations/trends from previous Games
- Local market characteristics specific to London
- Size and potential of the UK market
- Input from specialist consultants

In terms of domestic sponsorship (that is, outwith the TOP programme), the principle was to attract three tiers of sponsors (Premier, Major, Champion) who would contribute cash or VIK or a combination of both.

Ticketing forecasts used specialist input from Ticketmaster. It is worth noting that a balance needs to be struck between achieving high sell-out rates and maximising revenue for the OCOG. Additional breakdowns were calculated by sport, by venue and by stage of competition (such as qualifying v finals) and comparisons were also made with existing sports events in the UK.

Anticipated revenue forecasts from licensing used expert advice from EML Licensing. A commemorative coin programme was also established with the Royal Mint.
Lottery for the Games
A note was included to clarify that any income from the Lottery would be used to fund the development of the venues for the Games and not used as an additional revenue stream for the OCOG.

Sponsor hospitality
There was close liaison with the Sport team in order to ensure that sponsorship hospitality areas were adequately provided for in venue plans.

Theme 8: Sport and Venues
Theme 8 sought to establish a Candidate City’s detailed plans for sport and venues including venue location, competition schedule, venue layouts and so on.

Venue locations
Work on proposed locations of venues started much earlier than the launch of the bid and went through a number of iterations. The IOC’s response to the Applicant Questionnaire submission raised some concerns over the location of some venues. These concerns were taken on board and some venues were subsequently changed. See sections 3 and 4.

The Sport team identified which venues would be suitable and letters of intent were sent to the existing venues, with the assumption that full rights would be given for the non-existing venues (as they would be developed by the stakeholders). These were not legally binding in principle but were a first step towards venue use agreements which would be legally binding. The venue use agreements required each venue owner to guarantee that during the Games it would grant the OCOG exclusive use of the venue and respect its commercial rights and that it would comply with the clean venue appendix which was attached to the guarantee. Although not an IOC requirement at this stage, venue use agreements were negotiated with all the existing venues.

It is worth noting that the Paralympic Games adds a significant length of time to the venue use agreement. The finalisation of the Paralympic proposal was done in the same timeframe as the Olympic proposal.

Venue layouts
A total review of International Federations (IFs) and sports venues was conducted in conjunction with the NGBs. A consortium won the tender to create the Masterplan for the Olympic Park and pulled together the initial sports plan, which went through a number of iterations. One venue was added later – for Fencing, with a total of 12,000 seats – replacing a Paralympic Tennis venue. The three arenas planned for the Park saw their initial capacities increase following discussions with the IFs. The bid needed to take the overall strategic view and often this meant juggling the sports and venues available to create the best overall proposal, taking into consideration competition schedule, legacy use, prestige of the sport and UK popularity.
IF requirements
The IOC’s manual detailing IF requirements for the 2012 bidding process was high level; therefore it was necessary to establish the specific requirements of each IF. It was important to establish a good relationship early on with the IF so that the architects could be given a clear steer on their current thinking about layout/design. The IFs were shown clear and detailed plans of their proposed venue in order to develop an understanding of the operational issues around both the venue and sport. The location vis-à-vis the Village and other venues, proximity to central London, seating capacity and legacy were all important issues for IFs. Alongside this was understanding the needs of both International Technical Officials and National Technical Officials, and the issues surrounding minimum stay. Consent letters from each IF agreeing to the plans were all obtained by the Sport team in the course of their discussions.

Theme 9: Paralympic Games
Theme 9 sought to establish a Candidate City’s plans for the organisation of the Paralympic Games. Initially there were a number of views as to how the Paralympic Games theme should be managed within the context of the bid but it became clear that a fully integrated approach to both Games reflected the wishes of the IOC as well as resulting in synergies and efficiencies of scale with the Olympic Games.

Key stakeholders
The Government, the Mayor (GLA) and the BOA were all Paralympic supporters and practically committed to people with disabilities and the inclusion agenda. In addition to the three key stakeholders, engagement of other disability groups helped form the Paralympic plans, including:

– British Paralympic Association
– International Paralympic Committee
– London 2012’s London Organisations of Disabled People Group
– GLA Access Forum

Theme content
The fully integrated approach meant that the Paralympic theme, which centred on dates of competition, schedules and venues as well as on transport and accommodation, interfaced with a number of other themes:

Olympic Village: access consultants had been used for the Olympic planning application although it was necessary to utilise others with Games experience who understood the mutuality between design, Games use and legacy use. It was decided early on to provide a 100 per cent accessible Village in order to fulfil the vision of fully inclusive Games. It was possible to accommodate athletes and their support staff on the first three floors of 10 of the 17 blocks: very few athletes who use wheelchairs for daily living would need to be located above the ground floor.

Transport: Transport for London (TfL) was best-placed to deliver on the Paralympic component.
**Sport:** the initial view was that the Paralympic Games were another subdivision of Sport. However, it was then acknowledged that the Paralympic Games were an event in their own right. The increased use of temporary venues posed a challenge for Paralympic venue plan designers and operators, particularly in terms of spectator services.

**Legal:** the main areas of work centred on the issues of visas and immigration and the importation of guide dogs and other help dogs, and were easily resolved. The other major legal issue was to ensure that the Joint Marketing Agreement was signed with the BPA. The bid had to ensure that all the guarantees for venues, accommodation and other resources covered the 60-day period of both Games and not simply restrict agreements to the Olympic Games only. A trend within the Paralympic Games was the introduction of new sports and a reduction/erosion of other sports. This meant that all venues needed to be provisionally reserved as IPC requirements might change after the submission of the Candidature File and after the Games had been awarded.

**Olympism and culture:** cultural affairs formed part of the Paralympic discussions, in particular artistic works and education. The BPA’s existing Paralympic curriculum proved a useful tool and valuable relationships were established. The commitment to use disabled artists in both the dramatic and visual arts was another first for an Olympic bid.

**Finance:** as also expressed in the Olympic Village theme, there was a high degree of integration of budgets. The level of detail had to strike the right balance between Government contribution and income generation to show what might be possible for future Games. The 100 per cent subsidy of other bids did nothing to enhance the value of the Paralympic Games.

**Other themes:** these incorporated appropriate statements about the Paralympic Games which demonstrated an understanding of the inclusive agenda.

**Theme 10: Olympic Village**
Theme 10 sought to establish a Candidate City’s plans for an Olympic Village including location, layout and post-Games use.

The Olympic Village is such an important component of the overall bidding process that the IOC publishes a specific technical manual giving the requirements for this special venue. However, the technical manual was regarded as giving the minimum requirements rather than what was expected. The Village is one of the most significant parts of any bid in terms of cost, programme and delivery.
**Approach**
The approach taken to assemble an optimal Village proposal involved a number of stakeholders, combined with the use of key industry experts. The Paralympic expert was also the theme owner for the Olympic Village, and the degree of overlap proved advantageous.

The contribution of the Athletes’ Advisory Group was also important in testing what athletes felt was important and helped refine the plans. This also gave important credibility when it came to the Evaluation Commission visit.

Commissioning and managing the development of the Village plans was split between London 2012 and the LDA.

**Stakeholders**
A number of important stakeholders were directly involved in the evolution of Village plans although London 2012 took a clear lead role in the design and operations of the Village.

The LDA took the lead on securing planning permission and, through commercial discussions with Stratford City (a consortium of infrastructure and development companies), progressed the development of adjacent land, which included the southern half of the Village.

London 2012 was party to a three-way heads of terms agreement between the LDA and Stratford City which helped to create a framework for engagement and delivery of the Village.

London 2012 needed some certainty for the Candidature File and the LDA and GLA helped broker and agree a leasing arrangement which created an acceptable commercial framework. This was based on London 2012 paying a leasing fee which was equivalent to covering ‘abnormal’ costs due to the Olympic and Paralympic Games timeframe – that is, financing costs and other costs associated with an accelerated programme; the need to have all the development ready at once; the time needed for Games use; and conversion to legacy mode.

The LDA also led on site assembly and relocation discussions and acquired a strategic interest in the Village site when it purchased the East London University holdings. This was an important step forward as ownership of the land and increased confidence with regard to delivery were two critical aspects of the Village plan for the IOC.

The main forum where all planning, commercial and deliverability issues came together was the Masterplan Reference Group (MRG). This senior body spearheaded the issues and took responsibility for resolving them. The MRG met once every two weeks and included the GLA, London 2012, the Government Office for London, the DCMS and the LDA.
Village design and integration
The design of the Village was undertaken as part of the same instruction as the wider Olympic Park Masterplan.

A number of potential locations for the Village had been considered early on in the process. The Stratford City site was selected because of its ideal location and the need to integrate the Village and the Park to optimise security and logistics. Development of about half of the site was already being pursued by a Government/private sector consortium as a major regeneration opportunity.

The brief for the design team was to take the existing Stratford City Masterplan and see how best to optimise the need for a world-class Village with a sensible and high-quality legacy plan. The architects had little experience of Olympic Villages and their operational requirements, therefore specialist input from Village and Paralympic experts within the London 2012 team was critical in developing a solution which worked well both in Games and legacy modes.

In addition to the overall Masterplan, the Village design work included a series of detailed apartment layout plans/cross-sections and visuals and perspectives of what the Village might look like in Games and legacy modes.

London 2012 employed two professional access and inclusive design specialists for the Masterplan and Village design work.

Conclusions
The Olympic Village proposals were developed as a collaborative effort between a range of stakeholders working with staff and consultants. A number of critical issues came together which had an impact on other themes, including security, technology, the Paralympic Games, infrastructure and access, planning and so on.

Many of the more complex aspects of the Village plans that were outside the direct control of the London 2012 team were dealt with by the LDA and the GLA. These stakeholders proved to be very supportive throughout and created a manageable interface between the four local authorities, affected businesses/residents and other stakeholders.

Theme 11: Medical Services
Theme 11 sought to establish a Candidate City’s ability to provide a health system adapted to the needs of the Olympic Games which at the same time will not affect the normal health operations of the city. The theme also sought to determine whether a city can establish a doping control system consistent with the Olympic programme and WADA.
This theme is diverse and impacts on a number of other themes. However, the distinctive characteristics of any British bid in respect of healthcare are the inclusion and involvement of the NHS and the complexity of the UK’s healthcare landscape. The approach taken was to set up a working group with relevant industry and event experts. This group consisted of experts from:

- DCMS
- BOA
- London Hospital
- Drug Control Centre
- Department of Forensic Science and Drug Monitoring
- Health Protection Agency
- London Ambulance Service
- North East London Strategic Health Authority (NELSHA)
- Sussex Centre for Sport and Exercise Medicine, University of Brighton
- Homerton University Hospital

The medical theme consisted of the following:

**Impact on National Health Service**

Work was undertaken to anticipate the social issues after the Games: in other words, what impact will the Games have on London’s and the UK’s health landscape and what impact will they have on sustainable development? This was done through the inclusion of relevant metrics and indicators to forecast the effect of the Games on London. A Health Impact Assessment was carried out on the Olympic Park which confirmed the need for an environment which consisted of good-quality park areas with walking and cycling routes.

Before the London Olympic Institute (LOI) had been conceived, plans had already been drawn up to develop a Centre for Sports Medicine that would serve as a legacy after the Games. However, it was decided that the Centre for Sports Medicine should represent one of the three pillars of the LOI.

**General infrastructure and operational medical services planning**

The key to developing this aspect of the theme was to thoroughly understand the complex structure of the healthcare landscape and to streamline the chain of command in the NHS. In addition to the Working Group, a number of other health bodies were consulted and used to commission research on London’s plans, namely:

- Regional Public Health Group London
- London Health Commission (chaired by the GLA)
- London Sustainable Development Commission
- NELSHA
There were essentially two principal guarantees required for this theme. First, that the city of London would pay for all the operational requirements of the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Second, a reciprocal guarantee from HM Government that the development of medical infrastructure would be in line with the city’s overarching plans for health service provision.

**Emergency services overview**
The emergency services landscape within London is highly complex. There was a need to explain how the relevant parties would be coordinated through an integrated approach with appropriate chains of command. It was also important to demonstrate that sufficient response could be drawn upon for any eventuality while at the same time avoiding the diversion of resources away from maintaining the rest of London. The London Ambulance Service identified ‘blue light’ routes from venues to nearby hospitals. Voluntary organisations including the British Red Cross and St John Ambulance were also consulted and their numbers were included in the Candidature File using the model from the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games.

**Prevalence of natural disasters**
This element required little input given London’s low-risk status.

**Anti-doping procedures**
Anti-doping services are run by the IOC during the Games. It was necessary to demonstrate that the UK is a signatory to the WADA code and that WADA-approved facilities would be made available to carry out the analysis of samples.

**Equine health**
HM Customs provided input regarding the importation and exportation of animals and DEFRA demonstrated that the UK was essentially free of any equine diseases.

**Theme 12: Security**
Theme 12 sought to establish whether a Candidate City possessed the necessary infrastructure to guarantee total security, discreet but efficient, and to provide a safe environment in which the Olympic Games could take place.

A number of working groups were established in order to develop the content of this theme:

- MPs working group (including London boroughs and specialist departments)
- London 2012 internal security working group
- Private sector liaison
- Links to transport and design groups
Important relationships were also developed with the following key organisations and sectors in order to develop the security proposals:

– Home Office
– Metropolitan Police Service
– Borough police
– Security Service (MI5)
– Private sector

Two clear and key threads of work for the completion of Theme 12 emerged:

– Devising, developing and finalising the security staging structures and plans for an Olympic Games.
– Conducting research for inclusion in the Candidature File.

Theme 13: Accommodation

Approach

London hoteliers to support the bid. Following this, members of the Legal team negotiated guarantees and contracts for accommodation with all interested hoteliers.

In terms of student accommodation, a presentation was given to the members of the London Forum in the Higher Education (HE) sector asking for HE institutions to commit en suite accommodation in support of the bid. Again, guarantees were negotiated with the individual institutions. Once it was established which hotels and HE Institutions were supporting the bid, the locations of the various hotels and halls of residences were plotted on MapPoint software to form the accommodation maps required for the theme.

The London accommodation market has a greater supply than the recent Games Host Cities of Sydney, Vancouver and Salt Lake City so the key terms of the agreements were adapted appropriately. The key clauses in respect of room availability, reasonable rates and no minimum stay requirements were drafted according to the IOC requirements set out in the Theme 13 questionnaire.

Accommodation agreements

The agreements that were signed with London hoteliers and HE institutions were based on the accommodation agreements that had been approved by the IOC in respect of the Sydney 2000 Summer Games and the Salt Lake City 2002 and Vancouver 2010 Winter Games. Three categories of guarantee were required by the Candidature File:

– From the National Tourist Board: this guarantee was of the UK’s hotel rating system, London’s hotel room inventory and the list of total hotel room capacity. The guarantee was procured from the Chief Executive of Visit Britain with the addition of references to the relevant section of the theme setting out the UK hotel rating system, the inventory and the number of rooms in London.
– From individual hotels: these guarantees covered room availability, room rates, minimum stay requirements/block room waves (if applicable) and price controls. These guarantee letters were procured for hotel chains and individual hotel properties using wording based on the standard guarantee drafting. In addition, binding contracts were negotiated and signed by many of the hotel chains, based on the contracts approved by the IOC for the Salt Lake City and Vancouver Games and containing many detailed terms relating to the accommodation needs of the Olympic Family.

– From suppliers of ‘other accommodation’ (that is, accommodation other than hotels such as cruise ships and student accommodation): these guarantees covered use of such accommodation, possession and vacation dates, rental costs (if any) and financial guarantees for any required upgrade to the buildings (if applicable). Guarantees were procured from Fred Olsen Cruise Lines for the rental of an 800-berth cruise ship in Weymouth Harbour for the duration of the Olympic Games and from all the bodies operating/managing the university halls of residence listed in the hotel inventory.

The support of the British Hospitality Association was particularly important in securing the commercial agreements from the hotels.

**Theme 14: Transport**

Theme 14 sought to establish a Candidate City’s transport network and operational plans for the Olympic Games.

The Olympic Transport Strategy team was set up by TfL in the very early days of the bid and delivered a comprehensive, professional and compelling transport plan that ultimately had the support and buy-in of all the key stakeholders. The Mayor set up an Olympic Coordinating Group comprising key London stakeholders: TfL, GLA, LDA and DCMS.

**TfL Olympic Transport Strategy (OTS) team**

The OTS team was set up ahead of the bid company, London 2012. The Mayor asked TfL to appoint an OTS team from within its planning directorate. The team took a strong lead on transport matters from this point, developing programmes, costs, schedules of activities, IOC milestones, organisational requirements and stakeholder management, and identifying deliverers of requirements. Engineering consultants were appointed by the OTS team to develop a project execution plan.

**Olympic Transport Strategy development**

The following activities were undertaken to support the development of the overall OTS:

– Development of the transport strategy for the Olympic Family.

– Identification of transport requirements for the Olympic Park for use by the masterplanners.

– Desktop research using documents from previous Games.

– Fact-finding visits to Athens and Manchester by OTS team members.
– Funding for the OTS team successfully negotiated with DCMS.

– Outline transport strategy presented to external groups.

– Development of service levels and costs for Olympic Family and spectator plans.

– Modelling of spectator transport to confirm capacity availability.

– Cost profile for all transport projects agreed with DCMS and London 2012.

– Venue transport plans produced for each venue and client group (Media, Athletes and Technical Officials) and addressing key issues such as freight and the Olympic Route Network.

The OTS was signed off by key stakeholders including:

– Strategic Rail Authority

– Transport for London

– Department for Transport

– Department for Culture, Media and Sport

– London 2012

Memoranda of understanding and guarantees were struck with the main providers of services under the OTS. These were in the main coordinated by TfL and a list forms part of the Candidature File. Consultants carried out a value engineering exercise to validate and optimise the cost-effectiveness of the proposed transport schemes.

**Transport modelling**

Computerised models were developed to demonstrate:

– The impact of the Olympic Route Network on background road traffic throughout London.

– The acceptability of traffic levels on the redesigned Olympic Park loop road.

– The flow of vehicles within the Olympic Village Internal transportation network.

– Pedestrian flows at key Olympic stations and within the Olympic Park.

**Theme 15: Technology**

Theme 15 sought to establish a Candidate’s City’s ability to provide the necessary infrastructure to support Games technology with a specific focus on telecommunications requirements.

The main challenge in developing this theme was the significant time-lag between the submission of the bid and the delivery of the Games. As a result, there was a large degree of uncertainty regarding technological advances and the technology landscape over this period.
The principal areas that were addressed in the Candidature File were:

- Telecommunications infrastructure
- Spectrum management
- Regulatory framework

A working group was assembled, consisting of thought leaders who were experts in the relevant technology fields, in order to scope out the telecoms infrastructure and spectrum management elements of the theme. This working group consisted of representatives from BT, Imperial College and the Office of Communications (OFCOM), among others.

The working group pursued two strands of work: production of content for the theme and visioning and showcasing ideas for the future. While the theme was strategically of relatively little importance to the bid, its development was a good tactical move as it meant a great deal of thinking for the Games had been done well in advance.

The Athens Observer Programme proved very useful. The Programme consisted of a mixture of guided tours and access to the main technical areas of operations. It provided a good input to the technical themes of the bid. Valuable information was obtained on operational processes and the problems encountered. Experience was also gained from those who had delivered the 2002 Commonwealth Games in Manchester, and from previous Official Reports.

The theme impacted on many sections of the Candidature File, including security, environment and transport.

**Theme 16: Media Operations**

Theme 16 sought to establish a Candidate City’s ability to ensure that accredited media at the Olympic Games would be provided with appropriate facilities and services to ensure the best possible media coverage of the Games.

The IBC/MPC was initially designed as a wholly integrated facility in line with the recommendations of the IOC Media Guide and the Games Study Commission. However, there were concerns as to whether a combined facility would be a viable proposition to accommodate all of the media so extra space was created to permit separate catering areas for broadcasters and written press. The decision was taken to have a co-located facility in the Olympic Park.

The location of media facilities, competition venues, media accommodation and transport options were all planned in parallel.
**Theme 17: Olympism and Culture**

Theme 17 sought to establish a Candidate City’s plans regarding culture and education, including the ceremonies and events associated with the sport competitions, to ensure that the blend and culture expressed the true nature of the Olympic Games.

**Approach**

The challenge for the Culture and Education team was to find ways to respond to the fundamental aspirations of the Olympic Movement while at the same time creating a set of unique proposals that enhanced the bidding process and contributed to the development of an engaging and credible bid for London. In developing a winning formula for the Games in London, it was the Olympic Charter itself that provided the impetus for London to display one of its great assets – its dynamic cultural life.

**Key work streams**

In developing and delivering the cultural programme, the following work streams were prioritised:

- A Culture and Education Advisory Committee was created, drawn from all sectors of the cultural and education communities (both national and local institutions and individuals, including representatives from disability culture and education).

- A Stakeholders Steering Committee was created, which included membership from Arts Council England, the British Council, Creative London, DCMS, Department for Education and Skills (DfES), GLA, Heritage Lottery Fund, LDA, Council for Museums, Libraries and Archives, and London 2012. This committee assisted the team in developing ideas and securing support for the Games through relevant stakeholder bodies. Critically, this included additional financial resources from the Arts Council and DCMS which were essential in enabling the team to develop and deliver the proposals outlined in the theme.

- Creation of a cultural legacy work stream, comprising representatives from the Olympic boroughs of Greenwich, Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest and the London and UK-wide cultural and education sectors, to develop a matrix of initiatives for the legacy outcomes of both the bid and the Games.

- Strategic alliances with industry partners to aid the delivery of key initiatives, including the British Council, Sport England, Liverpool City of Culture, BBC and other media channels.
Theme content

Key programmes included:

- Olympic Friendship, launched at the end of Beijing 2008: a full-sized, ocean-going clipper on a four-year voyage around the world
- World Cultural Fair
- Festival of World Youth Culture
- International Shakespeare Festival
- Five Rings Museum project: a series of museum and gallery partnerships
- Olympic Proms
- Five-day Olympic Carnival to maintain the celebratory momentum in the lead up to the Paralympic Games
- London Olympic Institute, uniting sport, culture, health, education, the environment and the local community, and embedding the ideals of the Olympic Movement in a practical long-term legacy of learning, empowerment and research
- Torch Relay visiting the home countries of Nobel Peace Prize winners before focusing on the UK
- Opening and Closing Ceremonies

Legacy

Culture was one of nine work streams identified across the London 2012 legacy agenda. It was important in capturing and reflecting the opportunity provided by the Olympic Games to leave a lasting cultural legacy among the communities, cultural institutions and creative industries of the Olympic boroughs, across London as a whole and nationally. These focused primarily on the following two areas:

- **Education framework:** in July 2005, the five Olympic boroughs produced a framework with the aim of transforming the lives of learners. It was targeted at young learners to the age of 19, but had applications and linkage to the wider world of learning.
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- **London Olympic Institute (LOI):** it was planned for London to capture the legacy that the Games would leave for the Host City, host country and the Olympic Movement through the creation of a dedicated London Olympic Institute uniting sport, culture, health, education, the environment and the local community. The Institute would be created from a set of independent partner organisations and would initially have three core strands:

  - **Institute of Sport:** the new headquarters for the London region of the English Institute of Sport (EiS), offering world-class support to elite athletes and NGB performance programmes across the region from one major hub site.

  - **Sports and Exercise Medicine Centre:** a leading integrated centre of medical excellence in the diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation of high-performance athletes.

  - **Olympic Research Centre:** offering new opportunities for research, training and development across sport, culture, education, health and the environment. It would also provide a permanent home for the significant body of economic, social, cultural and environmental expertise left as a legacy of the Games.

The proposals for the LOI were developed jointly by a consortium of partner organisations including the DCMS, DfES, Department of Health, NHS, London Higher, Sport England, EiS and UK Sport, working closely with local authorities and agencies in east and south-east London and the BOA.
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