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The final report of the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games is contained in a number of volumes. It is the culmination of many years hard work by hundreds of people employed by the Organising Committee for the Commonwealth Games and the thousands of people who, in so many ways, lent their support to the organisation of the best ever Commonwealth Games.

The Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games was one of the proudest moments for this country in a year that also held the World Cup and HM The Queen's Golden Jubilee.

They were also a showcase for Britain on many different levels.

A showcase for British sport, rekindling the country's passion for a whole range of sports and sports stars as well as leaving a legacy of venues, equipment and inspiration which will benefit British sports stars of the future.

A showcase for British technology - from the design of the world's first ever interactive Baton, the centrepiece of The Queen's Jubilee Baton Relay which signalled the start of the 2002 Commonwealth Games, to the futuristic City of Manchester Stadium - an icon to British design, technology, architectural vision and building expertise.

The Games also showcased British flair, creativity and cultural diversity through the Opening and Closing Ceremonies and the Spirit of Friendship Festival.

But most of all the Games were a platform from which to showcase Britain's planning and organisational skills. It put into the international spotlight the country's ability to mobilise the right skills necessary to stage such a world-class event and the power to succeed when all levels of Government and private enterprise work together towards a common goal.

There are many people that deserve the thanks of the Manchester 2002 Board.

Firstly, the President of the Commonwealth Games, HRH The Earl of Wessex, for his leadership and support, and the Commonwealth Games Federation whose guidance helped to make these the best Commonwealth Games ever.

Our thanks and congratulations go to the stars of the Games - the athletes from the 72 Commonwealth nations who inspired us all with their determination to push forward the boundaries of human performance and achievement.

The Games would not have been possible without the support of our commercial Sponsors and Partners who, together with their staff, worked tirelessly to realise the dream.

We would also like to recognise the huge contribution made by our Host Broadcaster, TV rights-holders and the hundreds of media teams and organisations who so comprehensively covered the event and took the magic of the Games to all regions of the world.

Our Funders - Manchester City Council, Sport England and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport - not only provided the crucial funding required to stage one of the best sporting events this country has ever seen, but have together created a legacy that will benefit sport in this country and the people of the region for many generations to come.

Our heartfelt thanks goes to all M2002 staff whose commitment and dedication made these Games an organisational triumph.

No-one can ever know the level of gratitude we owe to our army of volunteers - even through the rain, the spirit of Manchester and Britain shone brightly through these remarkable people.

A final thank-you must go to the millions of spectators and supporters who created the electrifying atmosphere that made Manchester the best place to be on earth during the summer.

Our heartfelt thanks to everyone - you were all spectacular.

Charles Allen CBE, Chairman of the Organising Committee
Manchester 2002 Limited was established with a broad and challenging remit revealing that the Games has always been about more than just 10 days of sport:

- To deliver an outstanding sporting spectacle of world significance, celebrating athletic excellence, cultural diversity and the unique atmosphere of ‘The Friendly Games’.
- To deliver a successful Games on behalf of all competitors, spectators and stakeholders.
- To leave a lasting legacy of new sporting facilities and social, physical and economic regeneration (particularly around Sportcity in East Manchester).
- To set a new benchmark for hosting international sporting events in the UK and the long term benefit they can generate for all those involved.
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<td>Elite Athletes with a Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Technical Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sport Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Victory Ceremonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5.1</td>
<td>Medals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Medical Services to Athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Anti-Doping Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Sports Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>Pre-Games Testing Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Village Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Technical Officials’ Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Commonwealth Shooting Village - University of Surrey, Guildford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Team Welcome Ceremonies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.1</td>
<td>Sportcity Visitor Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>City of Manchester Stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Table Tennis Centre - Sportcity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>National Squash Centre - Sportcity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>National Cycling Centre - Sportcity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Manchester Aquatics Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Manchester Evening News Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>G-Mex Centre - Manchester (G-Mex, MICC, MPC, Fleet Depot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>Belle Vue - Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>The Forum Centre, Wythenshawe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>Heaton Park - Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>Road Walks - Manchester/Salford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>Marathon - Manchester/Salford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>Triathlon - Salford Quays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15</td>
<td>Bolton Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16</td>
<td>Rivington Park - Bolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17</td>
<td>National Shooting Centre - Bisley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>Training Venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19</td>
<td>Venue Tours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
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A1 Foreword
A2 List of Contents
A3 Acronyms and General Terms

B Functional Area Operations
B1 Workforce
B1.1 Human Resources (including Culture, Recognition and Outplacement)
B1.2 HQ/Administrative Centres
B1.3 Workforce Planning/Integration and Rostering
B1.4 Volunteer Programme and Venue Crew Operations
B1.5 Volunteer Centre - Heron House
B1.6 Pre-Volunteer Programme
B1.7 Uniforms

B2 Games Services
B2.1 Procurement and Logistics (including Asset Management and Asset Recovery)
B2.2 Rate Card
B2.3 Look of the Games
B2.4 Fitout
B2.5 Event Services
B2.6 Venue Communications

B3 Operations
B3.1 Health and Safety
B3.2 Accommodation
B3.3 Accreditation
B3.4 Main Uniform and Accreditation Centre, Fitout Centre and Warehouse
B3.5 Protocol
B3.6 Host Hotel
B3.7 Catering
B3.8 Cleaning/Waste/Environment
B3.9 Security
B3.10 Remote Vehicle Search Site
B3.11 Sportcity Mag & Bag
B3.12 Transport Operations Overview
B3.13 Fleet Operations - T1, T2, and CGA Fleet
B3.14 Bus Operations - T3, T4 and Sundry
B3.15 Public Transport
B3.16 Arrivals/Departures - Airports and Piccadilly Train Station
B3.17 Venue Transport Operations

B4 Commercial
B4.1 Sponsor Sales, Value-In-Kind and Fundraising
B4.2 Sponsor Services
B4.3 Ticketing
B4.4 Merchandising and Licensing
B4.5 Brand Protection
B4.6 Hospitality (including Sponsor Hospitality Village, Club Sport, Stadium Corporate Boxes, 2002 Club, Gold Club)

B5 Technology
B5.1 Technology Operations and Systems Integration
B5.2 Technology Operations Centre (including Helpdesk)

C Third Party Involvement
C1 Regulatory, Enforcement and Powers Group
C2 Physical Look of the City
C3 Emergency Services
C3.1 Greater Manchester Police
C3.2 Greater Manchester County Fire Service
C3.3 National Health Service
C3.4 Emergency Planning
C4 Chaplaincy Team
C5 Amateur Radio Station

D Appendices
The following are all the acronyms that appear in the report. For a full definition of each acronym please refer to the Glossary of Terms in Volume 1.

### General Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACD</td>
<td>Automatic Call Distribution</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACP</td>
<td>Accreditation Check Point</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;D</td>
<td>Arrivals and Departures</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGMA</td>
<td>Assoc of Greater Manchester Authorities</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFGB</td>
<td>Amateur Swimming Federation of Great Britain</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVM</td>
<td>Athlete Venue Meal</td>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC</td>
<td>British Broadcasting Corporation</td>
<td>Broadcast</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJ A</td>
<td>British Judo Association</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOA</td>
<td>British Olympic Association</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOH</td>
<td>Back of House</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSV</td>
<td>Bisley Shooting Village</td>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTA</td>
<td>British Tourist Authority</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATV</td>
<td>Cable Access Television</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCN</td>
<td>Contract Change Control Note</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>Closed Circuit Television</td>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC&amp;W</td>
<td>Catering Cleaning and Waste</td>
<td>CC&amp;W</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGA</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Association</td>
<td>CGA Relations</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGCE</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Council For England</td>
<td>CGA Relations</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFG</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Federation</td>
<td>CGA Relations</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGV</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Village</td>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Commentator Information System</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOGM</td>
<td>Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM S</td>
<td>City of Manchester Stadium</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM BO</td>
<td>Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting</td>
<td>Broadcast</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Crew Resource Centre</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Central Results System</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>Contemporary Services Corporation</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF</td>
<td>Critical Success Factor</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSV</td>
<td>Commonwealth Shooting Village</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWG</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Family</td>
<td>CGA Relations</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCM S</td>
<td>Dept for Culture, Media and Sport</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDI</td>
<td>Direct Dial In</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>Delegation Registration Meeting</td>
<td>CGA Relations</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAD</td>
<td>Elite Athletes with a Disability</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>English Bowls Association</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>Electronic News Gathering</td>
<td>Broadcast</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC</td>
<td>English Tourism Council</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVS</td>
<td>Event Services</td>
<td>Event Services</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Functional Area</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACC</td>
<td>Functional Area Crew Coordinator</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>Functional Area Core Team</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCO</td>
<td>Foreign and Commonwealth Office</td>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDL</td>
<td>Fleet Depot G-Mex</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFE</td>
<td>Fittings, Furniture &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOH</td>
<td>Front of House</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FON</td>
<td>Flags of Nations</td>
<td>Look</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOP</td>
<td>Field of Play</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC</td>
<td>Games Coordination Centre</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEM S</td>
<td>Games Event Management System</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFIS</td>
<td>Games Family Information System</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM AS</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Ambulance Service</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM CC</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Coordinating Committee</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM CFS</td>
<td>Greater Manchester County Fire Service</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM G</td>
<td>Guardian Media Group</td>
<td>Queen's Baton</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM LO</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Lieutenancy Office</td>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM P</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Police</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM PTE</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GONW</td>
<td>Government Office North West</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>Games Readiness Exercises</td>
<td>Games Control</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSSS</td>
<td>Games Strategic Sports Squad</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVN</td>
<td>Games Voice Network</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>Her Majesty</td>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoG</td>
<td>Heads of Government</td>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoS</td>
<td>Heads of State</td>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>Honorary Medical Advisor</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRP</td>
<td>Human Resources Professional</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBC</td>
<td>International Broadcast Centre</td>
<td>Broadcast</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Convention Centre</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDR</td>
<td>Intermediate Distribution Rack</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>International Federation</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFTD</td>
<td>International Federation Technical Delegate</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&amp;I</td>
<td>Inspections and Inventories</td>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>International Olympic Committee</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>Integrated Operations Contingencies</td>
<td>Games Control</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Intellectual Property</td>
<td>Brand Protection</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>International Paralympic Committee</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>Intellectual Property Rights</td>
<td>Brand Protection</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>Independent Sampling Officer</td>
<td>Anti-Doping</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITO</td>
<td>International Technical Official</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN</td>
<td>Local Area Network</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC</td>
<td>Local Relay Committees</td>
<td>Queen's Baton</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRS</td>
<td>Local Results System</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTV</td>
<td>Long Term Volunteer</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2002</td>
<td>Manchester 2002 Limited</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M A C</td>
<td>Manchester Aquatics Centre</td>
<td>Sport/Venues</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Manchester Aquatics Centre</td>
<td>Sport/Venues</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M AUC</td>
<td>Main Accreditation and Uniform Centre</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M CC</td>
<td>Manchester City Council</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M CGL</td>
<td>Manchester Commonwealth Games Limited</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M DS</td>
<td>Master Delivery Schedule</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M HE</td>
<td>Materials Handling Equipment</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M IDAS</td>
<td>Manchester Investment and Development Agency</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M PC</td>
<td>Main Press Centre</td>
<td>Media/Venues</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M WG</td>
<td>Management Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEM</td>
<td>New East Manchester</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>National Governing Body</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>National Paralympic Committee</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>National Squash Centre</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Sport Federation</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTO</td>
<td>National Technical Official</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volume 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWD A</td>
<td>North West Development Agency</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVP</td>
<td>Non-Valid Pass</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Outside Broadcast</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Volume 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Organising Committee</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGKS</td>
<td>Olympic Games Knowledge Service</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PABX</td>
<td>Private Automatic Branch Exchange Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAG</td>
<td>Policy Approvals Group General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMS</td>
<td>Protocol Information Management System Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM R</td>
<td>Private Mobile Radio Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Presenting Partner Queen's Baton Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Private Secretaries Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTN</td>
<td>Public Switched Telephone Network Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENAOC</td>
<td>Registered Not Accredited Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFU</td>
<td>Rugby Football Union Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG</td>
<td>Strategic Commercial Group General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCommsG</td>
<td>Strategic Communications Group General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Sport England General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>Security General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC</td>
<td>Sports Information Centre Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMG</td>
<td>Sport Management Group Venues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMT</td>
<td>Strategic Management Team General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNG</td>
<td>Satellite News Gathering Broadcast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Support Operations Centre Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCOG</td>
<td>Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>Single Regeneration Budget General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TER</td>
<td>Technology Equipment Room Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Technology Operations Centre Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQR</td>
<td>Technology Operations Room Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOV</td>
<td>Technical Officials Village Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPT</td>
<td>Transport Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>Table Tennis Centre Venues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVA</td>
<td>Team Vehicle Areas Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>Union Cycliste Internationale Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UoS</td>
<td>University of Surrey Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>Uninterruptible Power Supply Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAHO</td>
<td>Venue Accreditation Help Office Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCC</td>
<td>Venue Communications Centre Venue Comms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCP</td>
<td>Vehicle Check Point Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGM</td>
<td>Venue General Manager Venues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIK</td>
<td>Value In Kind Sponsor Services Volume 1 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIL</td>
<td>Villages Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIP</td>
<td>Very Important Person Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>Venue Operations Centre Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOE</td>
<td>Venue Operations Exercises Games Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOM</td>
<td>Venue Operations Manager Venues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOSA</td>
<td>Village Operations Support Area Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPC</td>
<td>Venue Press Centre Media Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>Volunteer Services Department Workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTM</td>
<td>Venue Transport Manager Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VXN</td>
<td>Venue Technology Manager Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAC</td>
<td>World Athletics Championships Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WADA</td>
<td>World Anti Doping Agency Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIG</td>
<td>Workforce Integration Group Workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A5 Glossary of Terms

The following are all the acronyms that appear in this document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>A Functional Area set up to provide and manage accommodation for Games Family and Sponsors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACD</td>
<td>Automatic Call Distribution</td>
<td>A means of allocating incoming telephone calls to a number of telephones for simultaneous answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACP</td>
<td>Accreditation Check Point</td>
<td>Personnel wanting to access venues and/or particular areas within a venue had their accreditation pass checked at these points for the relevant entitlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Process by which access to restricted non-public areas was controlled. Passes were issued by the Accreditation team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;D</td>
<td>Arrivals and Departures</td>
<td>A specific section, within the Transport FA which had responsibility for overseeing the arrival and departure of Games Family members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGMA</td>
<td>Association of Greater Manchester Authorities</td>
<td>The collective organisation of 10 local authorities within the Greater Manchester area which meets regularly to discuss areas of common interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>Asset Management System</td>
<td>A database system which allowed all assets to be tracked from procurement to the supply, delivery, use and, where appropriate, disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFGB</td>
<td>Amateur Swimming Federation of Great Britain</td>
<td>The National Governing Body for Swimming in the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVM</td>
<td>Athlete Venue Meal</td>
<td>Meals organised for athletes at their competition venues when they were competing and unable to return to the Village to eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC</td>
<td>British Broadcasting Corporation</td>
<td>UK based broadcasting company appointed by M 2002 as Host Broadcaster to provide the UK television and radio coverage of the Games, and to produce television coverage of the Games for use by other broadcasters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJ A</td>
<td>British Judo Association</td>
<td>The UK National Governing Body for Judo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOA</td>
<td>British Olympic Association</td>
<td>The Organisation which is responsible for the management of the British Olympic Team. The BOA's stated aim is to &quot;Develop and Protect the Olympic Movement in Great Britain in accordance with the Olympic Charter&quot;. It has two representatives on the International Olympic Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOH</td>
<td>Back of House</td>
<td>Operational areas of the venue which required some level of accreditation to access and were not open to spectators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSV</td>
<td>Bisley Shooting Village</td>
<td>Located at the University of Surrey, Guildford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTA</td>
<td>British Tourist Authority</td>
<td>The responsible Authority for the development of inbound tourism to the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATV</td>
<td>Cable Access Television</td>
<td>A system which provides television pictures over a cable, rather than an aerial. This was used to provide MPC, Athletes’ Village and major venues with live video pictures of multiple sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>Closed Circuit Television</td>
<td>Security system for monitoring streets, public spaces and buildings using a network of strategically located cameras.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCN</td>
<td>Contract Change Control Note</td>
<td>The process used at Games time to facilitate changes and additions to ordering of items such as FF&amp;E, IT etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC&amp;W</td>
<td>Catering Cleaning and Waste</td>
<td>A Functional Area within Operations, with responsibility for the management of the Games Family catering operation, the cleaning of sport and non-sport venues and the removal of waste and refuse from all venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>The highest-ranking executive, with ultimate responsibility for the implementation of M 2002 Board decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGA</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Association</td>
<td>The Commonwealth Games representative body in each affiliated nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGF</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Federation</td>
<td>The Governing Body of the Commonwealth Games, it is responsible for awarding the Games to the Host City and has a charter which governs how the event is to be conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGV</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Village</td>
<td>This was the official accommodation for athletes and team officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Commentator Information System</td>
<td>A system which provided summary statistics and athlete synopsis for use by broadcast commentators during sporting competitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOGM</td>
<td>Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting of all Heads of Government of Commonwealth nations to discuss areas of common interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>City of Manchester Stadium</td>
<td>The main stadium built for the Games and host to Athletics, Rugby 7s and the Opening and Closing Ceremonies. It will be the new home for Manchester City Football Club from August 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBO</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Broadcasting Organisation</td>
<td>The organisation established by the BBC to specifically provide the Host Broadcaster coverage and services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CEO - Chief Executive Officer
The highest-ranking executive, with ultimate responsibility for the implementation of M 2002 Board decisions.

CGA - Commonwealth Games Association
The Commonwealth Games representative body in each affiliated nation.

CGCE - Commonwealth Games Council for England
The Commonwealth Games representative body for England.

CGF - Commonwealth Games Federation
The Governing Body of the Commonwealth Games, it is responsible for awarding the Games to the Host City and has a charter which governs how the event is to be conducted.

CGV - Commonwealth Games Village
This was the official accommodation for athletes and team officials.

CIS - Commentator Information System
A system which provided summary statistics and athlete synopsis for use by broadcast commentators during sporting competitions.

CHOGM - Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting
Meeting of all Heads of Government of Commonwealth nations to discuss areas of common interest.

CMS - City of Manchester Stadium
The main stadium built for the Games and host to Athletics, Rugby 7s and the Opening and Closing Ceremonies. It will be the new home for Manchester City Football Club from August 2003.

COMBO - Commonwealth Games Broadcasting Organisation
The organisation established by the BBC to specifically provide the Host Broadcaster coverage and services.
COO - Chief Operating Officer
Reported to the Chief Executive Officer and was responsible for the day-to-day management of M 2002.

CRC - Crew Resource Centre
Function room, at the Village, where all Crew 2002 could go for information/support.

CRS - Central Results System
Compiled and stored the results from all sport competitions for publication.

CSF - Critical Success Factors
A series of indicators established to identify whether the Manchester Games could be considered to be a success.

CSV - Commonwealth Shooting Village
Located at Surrey University and home to all athletes and technical officials taking part at Bisley.

CWG - Commonwealth Games Family
Includes all representatives of the CGF and CGAs, Team Officials, Technical Officials and Competitors.

DCMS - Department for Culture, Media and Sport
The Government Department with responsibility for developing national sports policies.

DDI - Direct Dial In
Terminology for an external telephone call direct to an extension, without passing via a switchboard operator.

DRM s - Delegation Registration Meetings
Meetings held with each competing nation to confirm competitor numbers and team requirements for all aspects of the Games including Transport and Village.

EAD - Elite Athletes with a Disability
Athletes with disabilities competing in the first ever all-inclusive Games

EBA - English Bowling Association

ENG - Electronic News Gathering
The process of gathering and disseminating news services through electronic recording.

ETC - English Tourism Council
The organisation which promotes tourism in England including setting standards of tourist accommodation.

EU - European Union
Body of (currently 15) member states established to create closer economic, political and social ties and co-operation between the peoples of Europe.

EVS - Events Services
A Functional Area within Operations with responsibility for FOH Operations. They worked closely with Security on spectator access, Mag and Bag etc.

FA - Functional Area
Functional Areas were the divisions within M 2002 which had responsibility for delivering the key infrastructure of the Games including Accommodation, Accreditation, Security, Sport, Transport, Venues, Villages.

GCC - Games Coordination Centre
The Games time control hub and main operations centre, set up to monitor Games-wide activities and resolve any critical issues.

GEMS - Games Event Management System
M 2002 software applications that handled registration, job assignment, accreditation, sports entries and badge printing.

GFIS - Games Family Information System
The M 2002 internal Intranet, provided useful Games-related information for staff, athletes, officials and VIPs.

GFM - Games Family Meals
Catering services provided to staff, athletes, officials and VIPs.

GMAS - Greater Manchester Ambulance Service
The organisation responsible for the provision of ambulance and paramedic services within Greater Manchester.

FF&E - Furniture, Fittings and Equipment
This includes any furniture, carpets, fittings and other equipment required in a sport or non-sport venue.

FOH - Front of House
Areas within a venue which are designated for general circulation and which spectators can access.

FON - Flags of Nations
The flags of the Commonwealth nations represented at the Games.

FTSE - Financial Times Stock Exchange
The Financial Times Stock Exchange 100 stock index, a market cap weighted index of 100 stocks and shares traded on the London Stock Exchange. This is similar to the S&P 500 in the United States.

GOF - Games Official Family
Includes all representatives of the CGF and CGAs, Team Officials, Technical Officials and Competitors.

GMAS - Greater Manchester Ambulance Service
The organisation responsible for the provision of ambulance and paramedic services within Greater Manchester.
GMCC - Greater Manchester Coordinating Committee
This committee brought together the activities of key public sector agencies, MCC, Sport England, GM PTE, DCMS, GONW and Health and Emergency Services. It provided a strategic focus for their input and ensured public sector ‘buy-in’.

GMCF - Greater Manchester County Fire Service
The organisation responsible for providing fire services within Greater Manchester.

GMG - Guardian Media Group
A national press and publications media group which produced two key local publications at Games time as well as being a core Games Sponsor.

GMLO - Greater Manchester Lieutenancy Office
The GMLO was Protocol’s link to Buckingham Palace in organising Royal visits during Games time.

GMP - Greater Manchester Police
Police force with responsibility for policing within the Greater Manchester area.

GMPTE - Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive
The coordinating and monitoring body for certain aspects of bus, rail and tram operations within Greater Manchester, in partnership with transport operating companies who actually run the service.

GONW - Government Office North West
Representatives of UK Government Departments based in Manchester with a focus on the local delivery and coordination of their services.

GPRS - General Packet Radio Service
GPRS enabled networks to offer services such as colour Internet browsing, email on the move, powerful visual communications, multimedia messages and location-based services.

GRE - Games Readiness Exercise
Process of desk top and physical exercises designed to mirror potential scenarios at Games time and test Games readiness of M 2002 and key partners.

GSSS - Games Strategic Sports Squad
A team set up to assist competition managers in resolving major issues.

GVN - Games Voice Network
M 2002 internal telephone network connecting all venues.

HM - Her Majesty
Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

HoG - Heads of Government

HoS - Heads of State
Examples of Heads of State: Her Majesty The Queen; The King of Tonga.

HMA - Honorary Medical Advisor
An Executive Board position within the CGF.

HRP - Human Resources Professional
A group of 12 long term volunteers with extensive experience in human resources and recruitment who assisted M 2002 in the recruitment of volunteer leaders and specialist volunteers who then managed and supervised other volunteers.

IBC - International Broadcast Centre
The venue that housed the Host Broadcaster and TV rights-holders’ office and production space and where the rights-holders were provided with the TV feeds for each sports.

ICC - International Convention Centre
Purpose built conference centre used as the venue for Weightlifting.

IDR - Intermediate Distribution Rack
An equipment rack used to provide a specific area of a venue with voice and data services.

IF - International Federations
The Governing Bodies responsible for the development, promotion and administration of a particular sport at international level.

IFTD - International Federation Technical Delegate
An individual appointed by the respective International Federation to observe and report back on the operation of a particular sport.

I & I - Inspections and Inventories
The audit by Athlete Village staff with the Chefs de Mission conducted before they took charge of their allotted spaces. This was to inspect and sign off all rooms for damage and also issue keys.

IOC - International Olympic Committee
The IOC is an international non-governmental organisation and the creator of the modern Olympic Movement. The IOC serves as an umbrella organisation of the Olympic Movement. It owns all rights to the Olympic symbols, flag, motto, anthem and Olympic Games. Its primary responsibility is to supervise the organisation of the summer and winter Olympic Games.
Contingency plans designed to ensure the continued delivery of the Games in the event of unforeseen circumstances during Games time.

The collective name for Games branded properties such as the mascot, logo, vignettes, pictograms.

The International Paralympic Committee is the international representative organisation of elite sports for athletes with disabilities. IPC organises, supervises and co-ordinates the Paralympic Games and other multi-disability competitions on elite sports level, of which the most important are world and regional championships. It is an international non-profit organisation formed and run by 160 National Paralympic Committees and five disability specific international sports federations.

Approval from M 2002 for certain parties to use M 2002 Intellectual Property in accordance with the brand guidelines. Companies with Intellectual Property Rights still needed to seek M 2002 approval for each use.

Responsible for carrying out the doping control process from notification of the athlete selected to be tested through to dispatch of the sample to the testing laboratory.

Sports officials who are qualified to supervise and officiate at international standard sports events.

The data network within a venue.

Committees set up Local Authorities to organise community celebrations in their areas for HM The Queen's Jubilee Baton Relay.

Recorded results from all competition within a venue. The information was distributed immediately by both TV graphics and hard copy within the venue. Subsequent distribution to all venues (via GFIS) and worldwide web was undertaken by the Central Results System.

M 2002 volunteers who undertook long-term roles. They often assisted with office duties, special events and acted as drivers in the lead up to the Games.

The Organising Committee for The XVII Commonwealth Games.

The venue for Swimming, Diving and Synchronised Swimming competitions.

Key international arrival and departure airport for Games client groups.

Non-sport venue where the majority (excluding Media and VIPs) of Games client groups, especially workforce and competitors, were accredited and uniformed.

Local government organisation which provides a range of education, social care, housing, cultural, leisure, environmental and planning services for the residents of Manchester. It also has a duty to undertake activities likely to achieve the promotion and improvement of the wellbeing of the city.

Parent company of M 2002 Ltd.

A detailed daily 24hrs schedule of venue delivery and service vehicle movements, from venue bump-in to venue bump-out.

Equipment such as (but not limited to) forklifts, pallet trucks, scissor lifts and trolleys used to load, unload, handle and move goods from one point to another.

An organisation which exists to attract inward investment and jobs to Manchester, Salford, Trafford and Tameside.

The central venue for media services for accredited press media. Press conferences were also held in the MPC, attended by press and broadcast media.

A weekly M 2002 meeting involving the Chief Operating Officer, Sports Director, Technology Director, Workforce Director, Venue Director, Operations Director, and the Strategy and Integration Manager.

The Group discussed strategic issues relating to Games time planning and operations.

Venue used for the Track Cycling events.

New East Manchester Limited, established in October 1999, is the Urban Regeneration Company with responsibility for the coordination of all regeneration activities in the area a immediately East of Manchester City centre, encompassing 1,100 hectares. The company is a partnership between national (English Partnerships), regional (North West Development Agency) and local government (Manchester City Council) and the local business and residential communities. New East Manchester presents an opportunity for investment and regeneration on a scale unprecedented in an English city.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>National Governing Body. The Governing Body responsible for the development, promotion and administration of a particular sport at national level. Usually affiliated to the IF for that sport and responsible for overseeing competition at all levels and the entry of the national team into international competitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>National Paralympic Committee. The national committees affiliated to the IPC with responsibility to promote EAD sport within their particular country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>National Squash Centre. Venue used for the Squash competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Sport Federation. Also known as National Governing Body of Sport (NGB).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTO</td>
<td>National Technical Official. Officials qualified to supervise and officiate at national standard sporting events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWDA</td>
<td>North West Development Agency. The organisation responsible for sustainable economic development and regeneration of England's North West through the promotion of business competitiveness, efficiency, investment, employment and skills development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVP</td>
<td>Non Valid Pass. An un-laminated accreditation pass which did NOT provide access to a venue. The NVP had to be taken to the Main Accreditation Centre to be activated and laminated before becoming a valid accreditation pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Outside Broadcast. Outside broadcast is produced by television companies from outdoor locations and events, feeding pictures and sound to viewers around the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Organising Committee. The group responsible for the organisation of a multi-sport event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGKS</td>
<td>Olympic Games Knowledge Service. A department within the umbrella of the IOC that is responsible for the collection and presentation of data and information about Olympic Games and other major sporting events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PABX</td>
<td>Private Automatic Branch Exchange. A telephone system, which provides extension to extension dialling without routing the call onto the public telephone network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAG</td>
<td>Policy Approvals Group. A weekly M 2002 cross divisional forum which approved policies, discussed policy issues and other operating or FA issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDA</td>
<td>Personal Digital Assistant. A hand held computer, which can store downloaded emails and is easily synchronised with desktop PCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMS</td>
<td>Protocol Information Management System. PIM S allowed the collation and management of detailed data on VIPs attending the Games. As well as creating a detailed profile of each VIP, the system allowed VIPs to be linked to both sport and non-sport events so that detailed personalised itineraries could be created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMR</td>
<td>Private Mobile Radio. A radio system where users can communicate in a closed group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Presenting Partner. In raising the profile of The Queen's Baton Relay the organisation sought to work alongside a Presenting Partner, in this case Cadbury, who provided advertising, marketing expertise and sponsorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Private Secretary. A Private Secretary is the most senior official in either a member of the Royal Family or Government Minister's private office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTN</td>
<td>Public Switched Telephone Network. The terminology for the national telephone network within the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENOAC</td>
<td>Registered not Accredited. The status of an individual who was registered within the accreditation module of GEMS, but who could not be accredited as they were waiting for their individual access details to be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHBs</td>
<td>Rights Holding Broadcasters. Group of television networks who bought the rights to broadcast the Games in their home nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG</td>
<td>Strategic Commercial Group. This was a fortnightly M 2002 meeting involving the Chief Executive, the Deputy Chief Executive, and the Commercial Director. The Group focused on commercial issues relating to sponsorship, ticketing, licensing and other revenue areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCommsG</td>
<td>Strategic Communications Group. This was a fortnightly M 2002 meeting involving the Chief Executive, Creative Director, Communications Director, and the Commercial Director. The Group discussed strategic issues relating to Communications, Marketing and Press/Public Relations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actions from the meetings were circulated weekly to make key decisions and the issues as they arose. The group met Other Directors were involved in specific Operating Officer and Creative Director. Deputy CEO and Finance Director, Chief
This involved M2002’s Chief Executive, SMT – Strategic Management Team
Games venues, particularly at Sportcity. The contracted company responsible for security and stewarding services at many Special area within the Athletes’ Village

SEC – Security
A Functional Area within the Operations division, with specific responsibility for the security of all M 2002 venues.

SIC – Sports Information Centre
Specific area within the Athletes’ Village where all sport managers and athletes could obtain current information.

SLA – Service Level Agreement
Formed part of the contract with suppliers and contractors to measure the quality and timeliness of the services they provided to M 2002.

SMAM – Sports Marketing & Management
Sales agency appointed to sell sponsorship packages on behalf of M 2002. They also seconded staff to M 2002 to manage the sales process and sponsor servicing.

SMC – Systems Monitoring Centre
Based in the Technology Operations Centre, this monitored the systems used by key contractors and suppliers and the Games website.

SMG – Sport Management Group
The contracted company responsible for security and stewarding services at many Games venues, particularly at Sportcity.

SMT – Strategic Management Team
This involved M 2002’s Chief Executive, Deputy CEO and Finance Director, Chief Operating Officer and Creative Director. Other Directors were involved in specific issues as they arose. The group met weekly to make key decisions and the actions from the meetings were circulated to all Directors.

SNG – Satellite News Gathering
The process of gathering news using a small/medium size vehicle equipped with a satellite link and carrying camera equipment.

SOC – Support Operations Centre
An area in the Village for the Logistics, Fitout and Maintenance teams.

SOCOG – Sydney Organising Committee of the Olympic Games
The Organising Committee of the 27th Olympic Games held in 2000.

SRB – Single Regeneration Budget
UK Government funding provided to support locally implemented regeneration initiatives.

TER – Technology Equipment Room
The location within a venue which housed the wide area network equipment and provided the interface to the local venue network infrastructure.

TOC – Technology Operations Centre
A central location for remote control and management of all Technology network equipment located in all venues.

TOR – Technology Operations Room
The location within a venue where technology support and helpdesk staff were based.

TOV – Technical Officials’ Village
Accommodation provided for Technical Officials.

TPB – Technology Programme Board
A forum established by the Technology FA to review progress and issues with key technology suppliers.

TPT – Transport
A Functional Area within the Operations division with specific responsibility for the planning and coordination of Games Family transport services.

TTC – Table Tennis Centre
The venue for Table Tennis at Games time.

TVA – Team Vehicle Areas
Designated area for M 2002 accredited vehicles to park within the confines of the Village.

UKIS – United Kingdom Immigration Service
UK Government Department responsible for all areas of immigration, including people and goods.

UoS – University of Surrey
Location for the Bisley Shooting Village.

UPS – Uninterruptible Power Supply
A unit with capacity to power electrical equipment in the event of a mains failure.

VAHO – Venue Accreditation Help Office
This office assisted people who did not have the appropriate accreditation to enter a venue. It was usually located near security accreditation check points at individual or clusters of venues.

VCC – Venue Communications Centre
The area within a venue that monitored radio frequencies and relayed information to relevant parties.

VCM – Venue Crew Manager
The Manager at either a sport or non-sport venue responsible for the paid and volunteer workforce based at that venue.

VCP – Vehicle Check Point
The location where vehicles were checked before being allowed access to any M 2002 venue. Vehicles, drivers, passengers and cargo needed to have the relevant accreditation and permits to pass successfully through a vehicle check point into a venue. Vehicles were also subject to a more detailed inspection at the discretion of vehicle check point operators.

VGM – Venue General Manager
Senior manager with responsibility for all aspects of his/her venue operations.

VIK – Value in Kind
Goods and services provided by Sponsors and Providers in lieu of cash payment as part of their contractual agreement to Manchester 2002. This may be included as part of the overall value of the Sponsor’s contribution to Manchester 2002.
**VI - Villages**
A Functional Area responsible for the planning of three Games Village sites i.e. CGV, TOV and BSV.

**VIP - Very Important Person**
A term used to describe Commonwealth Games Family Presidents and General Secretaries and others including HoS and HoG.

**VOC - Village Operations Centre**
This was the area in the Village used by senior management of the village including the VGM, GMP and senior FA Managers.

**VOE - Venue Operations Exercise**
A desk top exercise conducted to test FA interaction and the management arrangements in place at each venue.

**VOM - Venue Operations Manager**
The senior manager responsible for all operational activity at each venue.

**VOSA - Village Operations Support Area**
An area in the Village which was a base for the Logistics and Technology teams.

**VPC - Venue Press Centre**
The area in a venue dedicated to the service requirements of press media, including access to results and technology infrastructure.

**VSD - Volunteer Services Department**
M2002 Department that oversaw all aspects of volunteer recruitment, placement and planning, Games time training, Crew operations at the venue, LTV administration and Games time/post-Games recognition.

**VTM - Venue Transport Manager**
The senior manager at a venue with responsibility for Games Family transport services.

**VXM - Venue Technology Manager**
The senior manager at a venue with responsibility for Technology.

**WIG - Workforce Integration Group**
Working group comprised of various functions that directly affected workforce and workforce issues. It was responsible for planning and implementing a coordinated approach to all aspects of preparing and delivering the Games time workforce (paid, volunteer and contractor). Core members of the WIG were Volunteer Recruitment and Placement, Training, Communication and Recognition, Uniforms, Workforce Accreditation, Workforce Planning, Human Resources, Venue Crew Operations and Technology.

**WADA - World Anti Doping Agency**
WADA is facilitating a broad consultative process for developing the World Code, a core document designed to provide a framework for anti-doping policies, rules and regulations within sports organisations and among public authorities; and to ensure harmonisation of anti-doping efforts across all sports and Governments. A main objective is that the World Code will be operational by the beginning of 2004, prior to the Athens Olympic Games. The existing Olympic Movement Anti-Doping Code remains in force as the basis for current international anti-doping rules and regulations until that time.

**WAC - World Athletics Championships**
Championships held every two years involving international athletes.
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B1 Introduction

Every city bidding for a major sporting event, particularly one of the top multi-sport events in the world spends considerable time, energy and resources assessing the financial, economic and social viability of the event.

There is no right or wrong answer and every city and every Games will deliver a different event, unique to its own place, time and cultural setting.

This report is not about answers but more about challenges and questions involved. The questions that M 2002 asked, the process the Organising Committee (OC) went through and most importantly the lessons learned during the planning and implementation of the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games.

It is only through sharing this information that the Commonwealth Games (and indeed other multi-sporting events) can raise the bar and communicate through sport.

“Sport is a great leveller. It brings together people from every background. It demonstrates the value of cooperation, teamwork and team spirit; it touches the need to abide by rules and regulations. Sport emphasises the importance of self-control and how to take victory or defeat with good grace.”

Her Majesty The Queen

There are many lessons and recommendations contained throughout this report, however, there are core fundamentals that are vital to all multi-sport events.

It is more than a sporting event. Whilst the sporting competition sits at the core, it is also the pebble that is thrown into a pond creating ever widening circles of opportunities that encompass more and more people and include ever increasing opportunities, activities and programmes that can use sport to develop host cities and communities and harness greater human values.

Partnerships provide not only funding but expertise and experience which is priceless and should never be underestimated particularly at every level of Government, from national to local and all key sporting bodies. From the crucial funding and strategic partners to operational stakeholders such as transport and the Police, national and regional stakeholders to the critically important sponsors, partners and supporters.

Organisational and operational planning are the life blood of a successful event – from designing and building the venues, through to holding test events, planning risk management, timetabling reliable transport and other essential services.

Infrastructure planning, construction and Games operations of venues, villages and transport not only provide the legacy but form the stage upon which the sporting drama unfolds. It is the physical and visible manifestation of years of planning, the public face of the organisation, the Games experience of both athletes and spectators.

With each major event sporting technology moves forward in leaps and bounds. It is important to remember that the technology landscape may well change over the planning and implementation period due to developments in timing and scoring devices, telecommunications, results services and even broadcast formats, such as the internet. By way of example, Manchester 2002 (M 2002)
was the first multi-sport event to pilot delivery of results to PDAs (Personal Digital Assistant) over GPRS (General Packet Radio Service). This will be standard in forthcoming events. The technology infrastructure and operating platforms for any Games must be flexible as it is initially created so far in advance of many functional needs.

People, (whether paid staff, volunteers or contractors), are the wheels that keep the Games moving forward both in the planning stages and during the event itself. The task of creating a workforce that is the equivalent of a FTSE 100 company and then disbanding the majority of staff post-Games is unique only to this type of event and takes great human resource skills and courage to meet both the needs of the Games and the needs of the individuals involved. Different skills are often required for planning and operational phases and individuals need to understand this and appreciate that their roles may evolve over time.

The financial and commercial requirements of an event of this scale provide the oxygen that keeps the organisation alive. Transparency, accountability and exceptional corporate governance are critical to ensuring funds are received in a timely manner. It is also important to remember that plans for every Functional Area (FA) will need to be reassessed in the planning, testing and operational phases so having adequate contingency funds is vital to operational success.

No event can achieve its full potential without creative and impactful marketing and communication strategies. Whilst so much is being created in terms of infrastructure, venues and legacies it is sometimes easy to forget that the signature of an outstanding event is full venues and community support and involvement at Games time. The media, together with marketing campaigns play a decisive role in influencing the public to attend and in shaping their memories of the event itself. Much of this work needs to be done many months before the Games through community and educational campaigns such as The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay and the Spirit of Friendship Festival.

If there was a multi-sport mantra it would have to be plan, plan, plan, test, test, test, communicate, communicate, communicate.

It is these core fundamentals that shaped the planning and implementation of the 2002 Commonwealth Games in Manchester. Many are lessons learned as the programme developed and grew. The following Executive Summaries illustrate the points made above and give further details and recommendations that may assist future cities hosting multi-sport events.

As you will see from the contents page, the report has been put together in sections, however, for ease of reference and for those who do not wish to go into great depth for every section you will find Executive Summaries of the key sections in this report immediately following this introduction.
The theory that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts is rarely more strongly tested than during any large-scale event. The Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games is testament to this theory. The Games could not have been as successful as they were without the partnerships that were formed to create the ‘best Commonwealth Games ever’.

There are three core stakeholder groups that worked in partnership with the M2002 OC in the seven years leading up to the Games and the 10 days of spectacular competition. These partnerships have created, and will watch over the legacies that the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games built for the city, the region and the country.

The three core stakeholder groups were:
1. Strategic and Funding Stakeholders
2. Operational Stakeholders
3. Regional Stakeholders

Strategic and Funding Stakeholders
When Manchester City Council (MCC) and the Commonwealth Games Council (CGCE) for England submitted its bid to host the 2002 Commonwealth Games it was supported by two powerful organisations that stayed true to the vision and the partnership right to the end - The Sports Council (revamped into Sport England in 1997) and the British Government.

For seven years, from 1995 when Manchester was awarded the 2002 Commonwealth Games to the Closing Ceremony on 4 August 2002, funding and support was provided for different elements of the Games through this partnership.

However, it was not until June 2001 that a formal tripartite funding agreement was signed by the British Government through its Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), Sport England and MCC.

The tripartite agreement established a strong financial and strategic foundation that had the skills, expertise and funding to stage a successful Commonwealth Games.

The strong collaboration that formed between the funding partners and the M2002 OC over the final year is in itself a legacy to future events both within the Commonwealth and here in the UK.
The key Funders, in partnership with the M 2002 OC, helped establish a definition of standards, major policies and definitive strategies for moving forward. The overriding objectives of the partnership were:

- To position the UK as a centre of international sport and to demonstrate the UK’s ability to host a major international sporting event. To view the Games as one means to strengthen sports participation at all levels.
- To strengthen the economic and social capacity of the Manchester and North West region, recognising the importance of capturing maximum benefits to justify the significant capital investment in facilities.
- To advance policies for greater social inclusion, promotion of diversity, access to sport and volunteering.
- To showcase Britain internationally and to raise the profile of the Commonwealth.

In practice the partnership worked on three important levels – on an operational level, a strategic level and on a monitoring/appraisal level. This took the form of the following:

i) Monthly meetings of the M 2002 Board, which oversaw the policies and plans required to deliver the Games on an operational level. Sport England and the DCMS had representation at each Board meeting.

ii) Meetings every two months of the Manchester Commonwealth Games Limited (MCGL) whose aim was to maintain a strategic overview of the Games. Its membership included key stakeholders of the Games, the Commonwealth Games Federation (CGF), CGCE, MCC from the North West region. Again Sport England and the DCMS had representation at each Board meeting.

iii) The Chairman of M 2002 held regular meetings with top-level representatives from the key partners. The aim of these meetings were to update Funders and partners and monitor progress.

In addition to the meetings outlined above a Finance Committee was established with responsibility for oversight of the Games’ financial and human resource budgets and for approving all but the very largest Games procurement contracts. All Funders were represented at Finance Committee meetings, which were chaired by an independent Chairman.

A strong financial and monetary regime, paved the way for cooperative and successful delivery in the lead up to and during the Games.

The key roles and responsibilities of the strategic and funding stakeholders are summarised below:

**Manchester City Council (MCC)**

- Procure and deliver sporting and non-sporting venues
- High quality of design of venues
- Legacy of city image and venues
- Host City
- Means of delivering economic, social and sporting legacy to the region

**Sport England**

- Provide a legacy for venues after the Games
- Ensure the sporting facilities were up to UK and world class standards
- Providing a legacy for Elite athletes

**DCMS**

- Promote the UK’s ability to put on major events and build world class venues.
- Post Games the facilities become part of the English Institute of Sport national network of facilities and sports medicine and sports science services.
Operational Partnerships

It would be foolish to infer that the Games were incident free, however the operational partnerships created as part of the Games enabled the event to run smoothly.

The leading organisations that formed the operational partnership included:

- Manchester City Council (MCC)
- Greater Manchester Police (GMP)
- Greater Manchester Public Transport Executive (GM PTE)
- National Health Service and Greater Manchester Ambulance Service
- Marketing Manchester
- Manchester City Centre Management Company
- Local businesses
- Local community groups
- Broadcasters, Sponsors and Partners

(Please note this is not an exhaustive list. There were a great many partnerships formed with other organisations that were instrumental in helping the Games run smoothly)

The benefits of the operational partnerships were many. The organisers ability to get the community and businesses behind the Games was thanks to the Manchester City Centre Management Company, the business groups and the local community groups. The power of all these groups working together created a community spirit that has not been seen in Manchester for many years. The shared pride in the city of Manchester pulled all community and business groups towards a shared and common goal.

The most extraordinary and priceless operational partnerships were those formed with the GMP and GM PTE. The two came together with MCC and the OC to create one of the most powerful and efficient partnerships of the Games.

GMP

The experience of the GMP was invaluable in the risk planning and management of the event. The close relationship that formed between M2002 and the GMP meant that issues were mitigated and dealt with quickly and efficiently and communication to other groups was handled consistently.

The Games provided GMP with a unique opportunity to work with local, regional, national and international partners to ensure that the Games and associated cultural and entertainment events ran smoothly and safely. The force learned a great deal about the effective liaison and implementation of effective partnership working arrangements which will provide a useful pool of expertise in the future.

GM PTE

It was recognised very early that the ability of Manchester’s transport system to effectively transport the thousands of spectators to venues and home again was paramount to the success of the Games.

The partnerships that were created between the Police, the City Council, local bus operators, national and regional rail networks and Manchester Airport will be carried forward to other projects and events in the future.

Over 75% of all spectators at Sportcity used public transport. General awareness of the potential of public transport in and around Manchester increased substantially and people who had never tried public transport or had not used it for many years became converts.

Broadcasters and Sponsors

The partnerships created with the BBC as Host Broadcaster and with Sponsors and Partners ensured the smooth running of many facilities and operationally vital value in kind services.
Regional Partnerships
The Commonwealth Games encompasses a lot more than sport. It is also an important opportunity to look at inward investment from businesses around the Commonwealth and the world, tourism and cultural development.

The Games generated more than 6,000 permanent jobs in the region and regional and national arts board funding assisted in the establishment of some long term cultural programmes in the North West including the establishment of a regional cultural festival - Cultureshock and an annual Commonwealth Film Festival that are hoping to continue in the region after their inaugural success as part of the Commonwealth Games Spirit of Friendship Festival.

Over 5,500 businesses registered as part of the Commonwealth Business Club which saw growth of 8% in the month after the Games compared to 4% growth in UK membership in the same period; eight key business growth sectors were developed and links were formulated with six key potential markets.

In addition the Regional Partnerships together with the Games helped Manchester secure over £600 million of public and private investment, nearly 30 million people will now consider Manchester or the North West as a possible business and visitor destination because of the improved image around the world and an estimated 300,000 extra visitors will visit the city and the region each year.

The key regional partners included:
- North West Development Agency (NWDA)
- Manchester Investment and Development Agency Service (MIDAS)
- New East Manchester (NEM)
- North West Tourist Board
- England’s North Country
- Cumbria Tourist Board
- British Tourist Authority

Regular meetings were held with MIDAS and NWDA and communication links were established so key messages and information could be shared across all Games’ stakeholders.

Legacy
One of the critical themes of the Games was Legacy and without doubt M2002 can be proud of the diverse legacy it leaves, the major achievements include:

- Perceptions about the UK and Manchester have been re-positioned through the success of the Games. The Commonwealth Games, as the most visible manifestation of the Commonwealth, has been enhanced significantly, for the future benefit of the CGF and future Games.
- A sporting and cultural infrastructure has been expanded which is giving increased momentum to the regeneration of Manchester.
- Learning from the experience of the Games there are a range of further issues which stakeholders will need to take forward. These include:
  - The basis upon which future national sports and cultural events based policies should be developed.
  - How sport can be given an even higher profile within the Commonwealth, and whether the delivery of an increasingly high standard Games effectively means only a few nations will be able to host them.
  - How Manchester can capitalise on its success generally but particularly in terms of its marketing, sporting and cultural activities.
  - How the North West region can harness the energy and commitment of the tens of thousands of volunteers to support the continued development of the region.
  - How sport generally in partnership with a range of agencies can become an even more successful engine of local and national achievement.

1 Public Sector Funders Panel
B3 Key Lessons & Recommendations

This section of the report presents a summary of the main findings of an independent report produced by KPMG and which was commissioned by the City Council, Sport England and the Government. It examines the local and national context for delivery of the Games, identifies the major elements contributing to success, reports on the lessons learned, presents benchmark planning and human resource models, other elements of best practice and comments on the implications for future bids to host major sporting events.

National Context
When Manchester bid for the Games in 1995, they had a limited national profile and one of the challenges for M 2002 was to develop this profile.

At the time of the bid there was little national co-ordination of major sporting events and funding. The Government became an active partner of the Games in 1999. Sport England was an active partner at all stages, providing capital funding from the outset and operational funding in 2001. As a result of the Games the UK has been repositioned internationally as a potential host of future sports events.

- The reputation of sporting quality, organisations and infrastructure in the UK has been boosted.
- Government is now more aware of the implications of hosting major events and the importance of future bids having national support.
- Sports bodies have become more aware of the skills pool available in the UK and in due course will develop and maintain a database for events organisers.
- Coordination of tourism and promotion worked well and the British Tourist Authority (BTA) will build on this experience.

Local Context
It was Manchester City Council that orchestrated the bid to host the 2002 Commonwealth Games. Early planning and associated budgets were based on the size, scale and performance standards set at the Victoria Commonwealth Games in 1994 and these changed significantly. The partnership funding package, signed in 2001, enabled the successful delivery of organisational plans.

For MCC the Games were a key point in the regeneration of East Manchester and a means of leveraging significant investment into the area. They were set in the context of the wider and much longer term local regeneration strategy that had been an accepted regional and national priority since the mid 1990s. Sustainable after-use of venues was also an important and well established priority.

East Manchester had also become the focus for several initiatives (New Deal for Communities, SRB5, Urban Regeneration Company) which used the Games as a focal point, adding to the critical mass of impact.

The plan for beyond 2002 was already in place at Games time and further milestones will continue to be achieved in the post-Games period. This helped to achieve ‘buy-in’ from local residents who began to see the Games as part of a wider regeneration strategy of more relevance to their lives.
Successful delivery of the Games has generated local and regional benefits in a number of areas:

- Manchester has been placed on the international map as a quality venue enhancing its international reputation as a vibrant multi-cultural city.
- Showcasing new facilities and infrastructure has created a positive image for Manchester and the North West.
- Manchester now has an opportunity to re-brand and reposition the city and region.
- The city can further develop its future sporting and cultural events strategy from a position of strength.
- Attracting sports governing bodies to Manchester will build a critical mass and provide an impetus for attracting future events.
- The volunteer database can be used to support future events and wider regeneration objectives.
- Manchester has demonstrated its ability to deliver enhanced levels of service in areas such as street cleansing and city dressing, raising public expectations and further enhancing its image and reputation.

According to an analysis undertaken by independent consultants, Cambridge Policy Consultants, the Games generated 6,000 permanent jobs in the North West region, £600m of public and private sector investment, nearly 30 million people will now consider Manchester and the North West as a possible business and visitor destination because of the improved image around the world, and an estimated 300,000 extra visitors will visit the city and region each year.

Key Elements for Success

By 2001, the Public Sector Funders and M2002 had defined the shared objectives in relation to the Games. Key indicators of this success included:

- TV audiences of more than one billion.
- Stadia full for 90% of events.
- The biggest ever Games with 17 sports and 5,717 athletes and officials (15% more than the previous Games).

The factors which contributed to the success were:

- The leadership of MCC and effective partnerships with operational partners, critically, between MCC, Sport England and Government. These partnerships were built over time through workshops, operational reviews and the formation of task groups. They worked well on formal and informal levels. Bodies such as the GMPTE and GMP were able to play to their strengths.
- Strong and effective financial management was undertaken and strong cost controls were exercised.
- A small group of key decision makers were charged with the authority to commit resources to resolve issues quickly in the period leading up to and during the Games.
- The development of critical success factors for the key stakeholder groups established a focus for action and the leadership of GMCC and M2002 reinforced these through close monitoring of performance against the standards defined by the critical success factors.
- The key partners ensured that the Games were adequately funded and established an appropriate contingency that was managed firmly.
- Partners made great efforts to ensure that both the city and the North West region were fully behind the Games. This ensured huge support for the Games from local residents, through the volunteer programme, and ultimately through spectators.
- MCC ensured that the Games were wholly relevant and indeed central to the long term development of the city and East Manchester. The benefits of this strategy were clear to both local people and the media.
- Key people in M2002 were highly motivated and paid great attention to detail in planning the Games.
- At Games time, the commitment and enthusiasm shown by volunteers and staff from all partner organisations helped to resolve issues quickly and provided organisational resilience.
- The facilities were of a world class standard and, through the use of banners, the city and venues were bright and vibrant helping to engender a feeling of excitement and pride.
- In terms of the scale of the event, the organisers selected a range of sports and venues that would suit the city. Manchester was big enough to deliver the programme and small enough to
master the detail. Furthermore, there was a real local sense of going the extra mile ‘for the sake of the Games’.

- From a public relations perspective there was strong management of expectations. M 2002 and its partners did not over-promise. This helped to ensure positive coverage in the run-up to and during the event.
- The Games were sold as more than 10 days of sport. The package of the Baton Relay, Spirit of Friendship Festival, Festival Live and Ceremonies enhanced the product on offer to Sponsors and Broadcasters.

**Other Factors Contributing to Overall Success**

A number of other factors were also regarded as important to the success of the Games:

- A lot of time was spent cultivating the relationship with the BBC as Host Broadcaster, not just at a senior level but across the departments. This paid dividends for the marketing of the Games (for example, nightly coverage of The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay which helped to create national awareness). The quality of the host broadcast operation, providing high quality TV coverage, gave potential overseas rights-holders confidence to invest resulting in a TV audience of over one billion.
- The marketing strategy was vital in raising interest from the media, TV and public. Key elements included the use of high profile athlete ambassadors, the staging of landmark events, strategic advertising on TV, radio and press, publicity associated with high profile sponsorship deals, The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay, the timing of approaches to market in terms of brand exposure, and promotions for ticketing and merchandising.
- Innovations such as the commitment to integration of Elite Athletes with a Disability (EADs) and the extensive use of cutting edge sports presentation enhanced the entertainment spectacle for spectators and television viewers.
- The Games got off to a good start due to the success of the Opening Ceremony, smooth transport and accreditation arrangements, high pre-event ticket sales (linked to pricing policy) and good weather.
- A vibrant city centre that included Live Sites attracted crowds wanting to share in the Games atmosphere. Trade in stores, bars and restaurants increased markedly during the Games.
- High quality print and broadcast media coverage was a great advantage.
- Excellent performances from home nation athletes increased enthusiasm still further and provided a boost for sport in the UK.
- The sponsorship programme was highly successful in terms of revenue generation, especially when set against the context of the worst media recession for some years.
- Volunteers made a huge contribution to success providing thousands of friendly, welcoming and helpful ambassadors for the Games and the city of Manchester.
- The quality of the public information for visitors was very high.
- The way that spectators embraced the Games was a huge contributor to their success; the sense of anticipation built over many months and the atmosphere created by the Sport Presentation team engendered a real sense of occasion experienced by the crowds at the venues and the TV audience at home.
- The ticketing strategy ensured full venues which added to the atmosphere, encouraging many personal best performances from athletes.
Key Lessons Learned

Key lessons have emerged from the interviews and subsequent analysis undertaken by KPMG. They can be grouped into five broad areas: strategic, planning, organisational, operational and financial.

Strategic
- At the bid stage, it is essential that a clear vision of the scope and scale of the event is developed and shared with the funding partners. This vision will determine the delivery process.
- Successful staging of a multi-sport event requires a set of defined, shared objectives and an understanding of the context within which the Games are to be delivered with strategic buy-in from key stakeholders including the Government, the Host City, the OC and Sport England.
- The scale and scope of a major event, particularly a multi-sport event, will change and this should be recognised by Funders. This uncertainty will require a significant contingency particularly in the early stages of the event.
- The personal involvement and support of the Prime Minister is critical to the credibility and importance of the event for Government, the public and private sector interests.
- A dedicated team within Government is fundamental to coordination of their input to the Games and integrated working with stakeholders.
- Government is only likely to be a full partner when it has a financial commitment to the event.
- The Greater Manchester Coordinating Committee (GMCC) (convened April 2001) was critical to maintaining a focus on key areas such as transport and security, creating effective partnerships and building trust for Games time.
- Separating responsibility for construction of capital facilities and operation of the Games was the right approach and worked successfully in Manchester.
- Strong support from the CGF is required to obtain information from CGAs and to raise the profile of the Games with Governments of the Commonwealth and International Sports Federations.
- The Games can be used more widely to celebrate the Commonwealth, sport and multi-culturalism.

Planning
- Transfer of knowledge from previous OCs would be hugely beneficial, hence the involvement of the CGF in the Olympic Games Knowledge Service (OGKS) project will significantly assist future bidding cities leaving a lasting legacy for these beneficiaries.
- Senior managers from the OC (and external parties where applicable) must buy into an agreed planning timetable in order to ensure effective programme management. The overall timetable will aid procurement and the management of organisational change from a bid group, via a planning team to a delivery vehicle. It should ensure that significant changes do not occur within six months of the event.
- The early appointment of a Chief Operating Officer (COO) can help to drive the operational planning process consistently and ensure good communication of planning and delivery timetables.
- Critical Success Factors and related performance standards should be identified, defined and agreed by all stakeholders.
- Operational input from the OC is highly desirable when setting the specifications for the capital build programme.
- Strong support from NGBs during the Games and in the two years leading up to the Games is very important.
- The CGF should consider how host cities can be provided with better information on athlete numbers to assist the planning process. Athlete numbers submitted by CGAs six months out and 30 days out differed significantly leading to late changes in the sports programme which had a negative impact on athletes, broadcasters and spectators.
- There is value in setting aside sufficient time to run simulations to test issue resolution protocols with key partners in order to refine Games time operational plans and the authority framework.
Organisational

- A strong senior management team is critical to success, with strong leadership, financial, commercial and operational skills to build a team with a culture of achievement working to an agreed plan with clear performance standards.
- A small core team with overview of the operational, financial and commercial requirements is fundamental to success.
- At senior management level it was beneficial to appoint some general managers without a specific portfolio to provide organisational cohesion and provide a flexible ‘trouble-shooting’ resource in the 12 months prior to the Games.
- From the outset the OC should have a strong Sport team that can develop relationships with the NGBs and other sports bodies, drawing in expertise and resources as well as driving sport within the organisation.
- The organisation requires people with appropriate experience to be brought in at the right time to provide effective leadership and coordination at a senior level. Previous events experience is vital for certain roles such as FA and venue heads. Once these key people are in place, many operational positions can be filled by competent managers with appropriate skills and knowledge of the role but little events experience.
- The structure should facilitate communication and decision making, and be flexible, acknowledging that delivery plans will evolve.
- A matrix structure, with strong venue teams, is desirable from an early stage to ensure that coordinated plans are developed for FAs and venues. This will help ensure consistency in scope and service level planning. For financial reasons M 2002 was not able to appoint large venue teams until early 2002.
- Devolved decision making and accountability is needed, particularly at Games time.
- Volunteer commitment, determination and enthusiasm are vital to the success of the Games and concerns in the UK over a lack of volunteering culture proved to be unfounded. Indeed, in certain areas, long term volunteers could potentially have done even more.
- The Pre-Volunteer Programme (PVP) was critical to the success of the volunteer programme by engaging the community four years prior to the Games.
- A strong commitment to volunteers through events, training and recognition creates a large and flexible workforce willing to work long hours.

Operational

- MCC and GMPTE links with key contractors (such as transport providers) were useful in ensuring contractor performance.
- Leaving delivery of public transport to the GMPTE worked well, allowing them to play to their strengths.
- Stewarding and static guard security require different skills and it is not necessarily the best solution to use one company to meet both requirements.
- The timing of the letting of contracts is critical to ensure efficient, cost effective delivery and minimise contractual disputes. Contracts were not finalised by M 2002 until the scopes of services were sufficiently well defined, prior to which heads of agreement were entered into between the parties.
- Ensuring that contracts with Sponsors were watertight avoided major conflict and misunderstandings.
- Buying power can be maximised by working through partners and their key contractors. However, the ability of key contractors (security, catering, cleaning, transport) to meet the needs of an event of this scale needs to be carefully scrutinised.
Financial

- The bid budget is critical as it provides the basis for Funders’ buy-in and commitment. The budget should be based on the scale and quality of event as defined in the vision, supported by appropriate due diligence.
- Potential bidders should factor all the potential costs and income noted below into their final decision, ensuring that all affected parties understand the likely ‘hidden burden’ on them, and be confident that adequate funding is available to bridge the difference between the commercial costs and income before bidding.
- Major ‘visible’ costs for venues include: capital costs and contingency; licensing, commissioning and funding for pre-event operations; fitout and look.
- Major ‘visible’ costs for Games operations include: staffing, operational (revenue) costs and sports delivery; ceremonies, relay and other events; operational contingency.
- Major ‘hidden’ costs are absorbed by public services (police, fire, health, transport), key stakeholders (MCC, Government, Sport England) and other parties (such as BTA, NWDA).
- Major public sector funding sources include Lottery funding (Sport England), National Government (DCMS) and Local Government.
- Major sources of commercial income include sponsorship, ticketing, broadcasting rights, licensing and merchandising.
- TV rights and sponsorship markets fluctuate widely and bidders should set manageable targets that can be revised upwards later if achieved.
- A percentage contingency, determined by the proximity to the event (the further out, the higher the contingency) should always be built into budgets.
- To the extent that major costs are not quantifiable (because elements are traditionally absorbed by third parties) efforts should be made to ensure that third parties understand the extent of the potential hidden costs that they will have to bear, and are prepared for this.
- The existence of an independent Finance Committee is essential enabling the Board to focus on strategic issues.
- Strong financial management was a significant factor throughout the history of M2002 and peaked at Games time with daily financial reports presented to Funders, projecting the latest financial outturn. This enabled decisions to be taken quickly in full knowledge of the financial consequences.
- The contracting strategy (with clearly specified deliverables), risk management/insurance obligations and payment profiles (minimising risk exposure), and sign-off procedures ensured that all departments had full knowledge of requirements and understood their responsibilities. This minimised disputes over service delivery and ensured strong operational and financial control and that costs were maintained within budget.

A Benchmark Planning Model

Various planning models and associated timescales have been suggested as ideal for delivering an international multi-sport event as large as the Commonwealth Games. The broad phases and recurring themes are set out below:

Period I

Strategic Planning Phase (‘understanding the product’)

Suggested timescale from four years to two years out:
- Define aim and set a strategy consistent with this phase of work (the process should involve all key stakeholders in order to provide consensus for future planning).
- Gain buy-in from key stakeholders and national and international sports bodies.
- Ensure all plans for capital projects are agreed and financed with early completion dates.
- Appoint strong operational leadership to drive the planning and delivery process. Ideally, develop an operational management structure to ensure consistent planning and good communication. Relevant experience is key.
- Ensure that the process of change from bid group to OC is managed effectively.
Set a detailed planning and delivery timetable to provide structure and focus for the organisation.

Assess the skills mix required for the different planning and delivery stages. Recruit appropriately ensuring early joiners understand the need to vary and enhance the skills mix over time.

Undertake a rigorous risk assessment.

Only address long lead-time issues in detail.

Preliminary budgets should reflect the early stages of planning and high level of uncertainty and include significant contingency.

Consider the projected legacy benefits and agree arrangements to ensure they are captured.

**Period II**

**Tactical Planning Phase (‘developing operational plans’)**

*Suggested timescale from two years out to six months out:

- Ensure that aims, strategy and the planning timetable are communicated, understood and accepted. Secure firm commitment from operational managers.

- Set scope and service levels (core deliverables) for the entire organisation ensuring that scope is appropriate to strategy and consistent across FAs and venues (and that Funders are involved in this process to approve an appropriate budget).

- ‘Experts’ should be involved at this stage (including sports experts). This should ensure that a reliable scope is created early in the planning process.

- Employ key staff and ensure good communication and financial accountability with devolved management.

- Develop plans to deliver the agreed scope and service levels and further develop the budget to match these objectives (again ensuring buy-in from Funders). Confirm that FA and venue planning is focused on the core deliverables and critical success factors and that there is information sharing and effective coordination between FAs and venue teams.

- Within the bounds of the agreed scope and service levels, ensure that decisions made at this stage are informed through operational advice and not excessively constrained by financial considerations or other factors.

- Commit sufficient time and resources to undertake contingency and continuity planning, creating flexible plans which can respond to operational issues as they arise.

- Develop a fully funded test event strategy using existing scheduled events wherever possible. Strike a balance between testing all areas of the organisation and operating test events efficiently from a financial perspective.

- Only consider nice-to-haves when core planning is substantially complete and the relationship between the budget and core deliverables is fully understood. Do not attempt to perfect plans too early.

- Ensure that a strong contract management team is in place and that key contracts are signed as early as possible once service scope deliverables are clearly defined.

- Ensure that the legacy organisation is in place and appropriately resourced. Prepare any baseline studies and agree the nature of any long term monitoring.

**Period III**

**Operational Delivery Phase (‘test, refine and deliver’)**

*Suggested timescale from six months out to Post-Games:

- Ensure that the process of change from the tactical planning to delivery phase is managed effectively.

- Significant planning changes should be minimal except for emergency action or responses to unforeseen situations.

- Run test events, planned to mimic as closely as possible the real thing and to test core deliverables. Build in time to distil the lessons learned from these events and feed them into the refinement of operational plans.

- Refine operational plans in a venue based environment.

- Host the event, ensuring in advance that appropriate authority and communication lines exist within the organisation, and with partners, to provide flexibility and responsiveness to changing situations at Games time.

- Evaluate legacy benefits and retain adequate resources to capture and measure downstream benefits.
**A Benchmark Staffing Model**

The plan for Human Resources (HR) should be developed by senior managers at a strategic organisational level in consultation with experts having multi-sport event experience. It should recognise that the skills mix required will evolve and care should be taken in managing the expectations of staff recruited early as to their title and responsibilities so that they remain motivated as the team expands.

Once a consensus on the appropriate HR structure has been reached, it should be cascaded down to create a solid core structure with flexibility to develop and grow. The management skills of the OC need to evolve to reflect these forthcoming changes.

**Elements of ‘Best Practice’**

The diagram below illustrates the 14 elements considered by M2002 senior managers as key to the successful delivery of a multi-sport event on the scale of the Commonwealth Games. Within each element, the key aspects are:

1. **Ownership/Leadership from the Principal Stakeholder**
   - Act as the ultimate risk bearer.
   - Scrutinise, guide and assist the OC.

2. **National Government Buy-In**
   - Support the Host City at bid stage.
   - Ensure continuous involvement throughout the planning and delivery phases.

3. **Agreed Funding**
   - Establish a core operating budget.
   - Confirm major revenue cost elements.
   - Confirm capital costs.
   - Identify and maintain contingencies.

4. **Sports Programme**
   - Consider capital and operating costs in the context of commercial income from each sport.
   - Deal with local issues (such as the creation of new headquarters for NGBs).
   - Consider the effect of timing on operations.

5. **Appropriate Location**
   - Define the overall scale and impact of the event.
   - Consider appropriateness of existing venues.
   - Review capacity of existing infrastructure.
   - Consider the local passion for sport.

6. **‘Fit’ with Local Aims**
   - Reinforce existing/planned regeneration initiatives (physical, social and cultural).
   - Ensure relevance to local people.

---

**EVENT SUCCESS**

---

1. Ownership/Leadership from the Principal Stakeholder
   - Act as the ultimate risk bearer.
   - Scrutinise, guide and assist the OC.

2. National Government Buy-In
   - Support the Host City at bid stage.
   - Ensure continuous involvement throughout the planning and delivery phases.

3. Agreed Funding
   - Establish a core operating budget.
   - Confirm major revenue cost elements.
   - Confirm capital costs.
   - Identify and maintain contingencies.

4. Sports Programme
   - Consider capital and operating costs in the context of commercial income from each sport.
   - Deal with local issues (such as the creation of new headquarters for NGBs).
   - Consider the effect of timing on operations.

5. Appropriate Location
   - Define the overall scale and impact of the event.
   - Consider appropriateness of existing venues.
   - Review capacity of existing infrastructure.
   - Consider the local passion for sport.

6. ‘Fit’ with Local Aims
   - Reinforce existing/planned regeneration initiatives (physical, social and cultural).
   - Ensure relevance to local people.
7. ‘Fit’ with Wider Context
   - Exploit national events or special occasions (such as The Queen’s Golden Jubilee).
   - Avoid association with failure of other bids and sporting projects.

8. Separate Entity for OC
   - Ensure the OC is able to focus on delivery.
   - Consider the need for special powers.

9. Focus on Core Deliverables
   - Identify and work with key opinion-formers.
   - Establish critical success factors.
   - Ensure joint-ownership from all stakeholders.

10. Agreed Strategy and Model
    - Secure agreement on overall strategy ensuring a ‘fit’ with local aims and national objectives.

11. Effective Programme Management
    - Develop a procurement timetable.
    - Establish an effective change management process.
    - Develop and continuously review a detailed planning timetable.

12. Financial Control
    - Establish strong financial control.
    - Ensure independent scrutiny.

13. Effective Organisational Management Structure
    - Ensure quality of leadership from OC and Board members.
    - Promote cohesive management at senior level.
    - Invest in experienced staff at the right time.
    - Communicate decisions to relevant staff and third parties.
    - Create a flexible structure (recognise that plans will evolve).
**Implications for Future Bids**

The Commonwealth Games is the single most popular manifestation of the Commonwealth, and the strongest vehicle to promote the Commonwealth. However, the scope and scale of the Games are not fixed by the CGF and are therefore defined by the OC and its stakeholders/ funding partners. If the scale and service levels for the Games continue to increase, only a small number of Commonwealth nations will be able to afford to stage the Games in the future. M2002 has pushed up the scope and scale of the Commonwealth Games. Potential future hosts should work in partnership with the CGF to influence the scope and service level.

Other key lessons have emerged from the bidding process experienced by Manchester:

- At the time of the Games planning, Government lacked a long-term strategy for attracting major events. A national long-term strategy for attracting major events is needed and Government should drive this.

- Hosting a major event should be part of a long-term strategy for a city. The strategy should dictate the location. If hosting a major event is not the best way of achieving a strategy, choose something else.

- Having established the rationale for bidding, success factors need to be defined and adequate funding identified to achieve them as early as possible.

- There needs to be a national plan for the UK which defines the role that sport can play in achieving national objectives. Individual events should be appraised in the context of that plan as well as local and regional contexts.

- Leadership of the OC and the range of partners whose input is critical to success is key to drive the vision and ensure integration around a common purpose.

- For future events there is a need to review the governance base to ensure maximum efficiency and timely delivery.

- Because of the importance of the Games to the Commonwealth, consideration should be given at Commonwealth Heads of Government Meetings (CHOGM) to the role played by the Games in achieving wider objectives for the Commonwealth.
B4 Evolution of the Organisation

Overview
Manchester 2002 Limited was formed to deliver the Commonwealth Games and by its nature was a project-based organisation. The project underwent several phases, which broadly can be classified as follows:
- Strategic Planning – brand building, marketing and TV sponsorship sales (1996 to 2000)
- Operational Planning – awareness raising, TV and sponsorship sales, ticketing launch (January 2000 to December 2001)
- Operational Stage (January to July 2002)
- Delivery (June to August 2002)
- Wind-Up (August to December 2002)

These periods overlap in many cases as each FA made the transition from one phase to another at different times but as a model it is illustrative of the evolution of the organisation and is used as a vehicle throughout the remainder of this section.

The following diagrammatical structures represent the major transitional phases that occurred in the organisation’s life.

M 2002 Management Structure  September 2000

Shaded positions indicate members of Senior Management Team
Strategic Planning Stage (1996 to 2000)

Manchester 2002 Limited was established in August 1996 as the company to deliver the Commonwealth Games. A General Manager was appointed in July 1996. A Director of Financial Planning who was actually on secondment from KPMG, was appointed in May 1997 shortly followed by the appointment of a Marketing Manager. A Chief Executive was appointed in December 1997 and in February 1998 the Director of Financial Planning joined M2002 full time as Finance Director. The Director of Sport and Venues joined in 1998.

During this stage of the company's life, the emphasis was on brand development and orientation, financial planning, commercial activities and developing a business plan for the Games.

This small group of people were supported by an equally small administration team. The team grew again in April 1999 with the appointment of the Commercial Director. The strengthening of the team's commercial focus was crucial to the development of marketing, merchandising and the brand for the Games.

The Chief Executive appointed in early 1998 left in November of that year, whereupon the Finance Director took over the running of the company. A second Chief Executive was appointed in May 2000 with a revised role of ambassador and political leader reflecting the increased profile of the Games. The Finance Director was promoted to Deputy Chief Executive and Finance Director reflecting his broad remit and experience across all aspects of the Games.

Operational Planning (2000 to December 2001)

Raising the Benchmark - The Sydney Olympics 2000

The Sydney Olympics was a significant factor in shaping Manchester's Games. These Games were the most successful in the history of the Olympic movement and set new standards for international multi-sport events. Plans for Manchester's Games were already ambitious in terms of available budget but the Olympics raised the standard to such a point that these plans had to be revised if Manchester's Games were to be seen as a success.

Staff from M2002 went on a fact-finding mission to Sydney in an observer capacity and experienced first hand the success of the Games. M2002 used this opportunity to recruit experienced personnel from Sydney.
Concept of Operations, Work Packages, Budgets and Games Time Policies

Concept of Operations, reports examining and proposing FA plans, were produced. These then formed the basis for Work Packages which established cost estimates for each operational area.

Owing in large part to the revised expectations for Manchester’s Games, further funding was secured from funding partners in July 2002.

Following the approval of Work Packages, Concept of Operations and the establishment of budgets, each FA produced draft policies outlining methodologies for delivery of activities. These operational policies were approved by a panel of representatives of key FAs.

In order to ensure that policies were known and understood, briefings were held with all FA managers. A programme of briefings was also embarked upon to brief all other staff on a range of topics that they needed to be aware of and these continued throughout the Tactical Planning phase and only finished in May 2002.

Staffing

This phase of the organisation was characterised by a rapid increase in staff numbers, particularly MCC secondees. This in turn presented problems of accommodation which were compounded by the need to establish venue teams, populated by representatives from key FAs (Sport, Venues, Logistics, Technology) within Commonwealth House.

Volunteer Programme

The launch of the Volunteer Programme on 17 May 2001 represented a significant milestone. Launched in conjunction with Adecco, the Official Staffing Sponsor, the event received excellent media coverage. With little advertisement nearly a thousand people a week were volunteering. In February 2002 the number of people on the volunteer database was around 22,000, far more than would be needed, therefore, significant attention was focused on plans to manage the oversubscription.

Key Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Management Positions / Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>01/11/1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>01/07/1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Director</td>
<td>01/04/1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>01/01/1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chief Executive / Finance Director</td>
<td>06/02/1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI Commonwealth Games (Kuala Lumpur)</td>
<td>01/09/1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Director</td>
<td>19/04/1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan American Games</td>
<td>01/10/1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Director</td>
<td>19/06/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit of Friendship Festival Senior Manager</td>
<td>04/08/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Olympics</td>
<td>01/09/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Games Director</td>
<td>30/10/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Director</td>
<td>20/11/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venues Director</td>
<td>01/01/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Director</td>
<td>11/06/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Athletics Championships Edmonton</td>
<td>01/07/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Operating Officer</td>
<td>02/07/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Director</td>
<td>02/07/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Director</td>
<td>28/08/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Director</td>
<td>03/09/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Fitout</td>
<td>22/10/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonies Senior Manager</td>
<td>07/01/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Winter Olympics</td>
<td>01/02/2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operational Stage (January to August 2002)

Move to Venues and Team Building

From February 2002 departments started relocating to their operational venues. The first to move out were Logistics, Fitout, Look and CAD, which moved to Bessemer Street, the location of the Games warehouse, closely followed by Accreditation. The decision to relocate was primarily to locate venue teams together as the organisation became operational.

Venue teams were also formed within Commonwealth House. This was a major milestone and critical to the success of the project. By enabling the formation of venue teams the process of building teams that would function as a unit at Games time, was achieved.

To supplement the natural team building processes, team-building sessions were held within the Executive, venue teams, and FAs to build strong bonds between people.

In March 2002 the Sportcity venue teams relocated to the Squash Centre within Sportcity. This represented a major milestone in terms of taking ownership of several venues and helped to facilitate decision-making at the venue level.

For many of the divisions within M 2002 the operational period was 13 July to 4 August 2002 when teams began to arrive. However accreditation and uniform distribution commenced on 20 June 2002 and the Village’s ‘soft opening’ was on 10 July.

Test Events

Starting in January 2002 and running through to June 2002, the organisation embarked on a series of test events aimed at testing each of the main venues and the venue teams that would manage them at Games time. A small team was established to set up the test events before handing over to the appropriate venue teams for the delivery of the event. Test events provided information to inform and improve the operation of venues at Games Time and proved an invaluable tool. Test events are reported in detail in volume 2.

Operational Reviews

In April 2002 a thorough analysis was carried out across all venues and FAs to review operational plans and establish a baseline for service delivery. When agreed, this baseline was the base for all future operational plans and was subject to change control management.

In May 2002, more detailed reviews were carried out with venue teams, FAs and, key constituent groups (i.e. Athletes, Media, Broadcasters, VIPs and Spectators). This process identified issues that needed addressing by FAs, venues and external delivery partners.

Critical Success Factors

In June 2002, the senior directors of M 2002 convened an important two day meeting to identify the critical operational aspects necessary for Games success. The meetings re-confirmed the service level standards required to deliver operational areas for the Games Family client group. This work was linked to the rollout of critical success factors, outlined how successful delivery is measured for major operational areas such as Transport, security and Catering. For further information on the design and function of critical success factors refer to section C7.4.

Volunteer Programme

The number of volunteer positions had grown from approximately 8,500 in February to 10,500 in May 2002 with the major increases in numbers being in Security and Transport. The number of people who originally volunteered, was around 22,000. However, as a result of some attrition and the matching of requirement with volunteers’ skills, M 2002 did not have a ‘real’ surplus of volunteers and actually found it difficult to recruit sufficient Security volunteers.

The primary tools for the integration of volunteers were job specific training and issuing of rosters. Both of these told people what they would be doing and when they would be doing it. It was intended that FAs should ‘own’ their volunteers and whilst many were well prepared for this, others were not and as a consequence integration of volunteers was patchy in some areas.
Staffing
As a consequence of the gaps that were discovered through the test event process, the need for additional people and primarily paid staff members continued. Owing to the immediacy of the need, a large number of direct hires were facilitated at this time.

The last few weeks before the Games and indeed during the Games, appointments were made by seconding large numbers of staff from MCC.

Delivery
During the last few weeks prior to the start of the Games the pace of the organisation quickened further. Morale was high, paid staff redoubled their commitment and there was a real sense of excitement. This was most evident in the hours that people worked, typically paid members of staff were working 12 hour days, six or seven days a week. In the final week before Games time and during the Games the number of hours was 12-17 hours a day, seven days a week. The deployment of volunteers was one of the most important factors for Games delivery. Their commitment and enthusiasm was evident in all their work and won praise from whomever they came into contact with.

The Opening Ceremony on 25 July 2002 was met with high praise from the vast majority of representatives of the press, broadcasters and other media and set a tone of excitement and anticipation for the Games.

The first few days of competition were set against warm and humid weather conditions. FA Managers and Venue Managers encountered many and various issues that generally were resolved without needing to be referred to the Games Coordination Centre (GCC). This was in the main due to the strength of the teams that had been established and the preparation they had undergone, but also to the commitment and dedication of all people, whether paid staff or volunteer, to make the Games a success.

After the first few days functions and venues quickly established themselves and resolved what difficulties there were, establishing a rhythm to their activities.

Wind Up (August to December 2002)
With the Games having been a success, attention switched to winding up the company's activities in the most efficient manner possible. The Sport, Venues and Operations divisions were the first to wind up, with only a handful of staff remaining to assist with contract resolution, payment of creditors, disposal of assets and completion of final Games reports.

The Finance division, which included Procurement, continued at the same pace it had during the Games, with the emphasis on concluding contracts, resolving disputes, settling accounts and disposing of assets.

The sister location to the Games Headquarters, Heron House, was vacated at the end of August 2002; all staff, including those from venues who were needed to complete wrap up works were relocated to Commonwealth House.

An End of Games Report Team was established by redeploying existing staff members and where necessary and appropriate, staff were also redeployed to support the disposal of assets.
Overview
As an introduction to the workforce related sections found in volume 3, this overview gives a summary of the vision and mission of the Workforce division and the major areas of responsibility held:

- The successful recruitment of Games experienced staff through the identification of a careful balance of locally born personnel and internationally multi-sport experienced staff.
- The development of a workforce with a consistent Games philosophy, combining similar ideologies and delivery expectations.
- The delivery of successful training and recruitment of an enthusiastic volunteer workforce supporting the Manchester ethos.
- Establishing a clear and structured workforce plan for the organisation that embraces the elements that are unique to the Games environment.
- Implementing an efficient and proactive HR department to identify and select the required workforce to support Games delivery.
- Delivery of a quality uniforming department reflective of Manchester’s character and with the aesthetic qualities to satisfy public expectation.
- Provision of an ongoing legacy through the work of the Pre-Volunteer Programme that continues to achieve the link between skill and competency based learning outcomes for the participants of the programme.

Workforce Planning
The overall scale and complexity of the Games grew over the course of the project and a greater number of people with previous experience of multi-sport events were required.

Test events and the testing and verification of systems used for Workforce, identified a number of gaps and necessitated the appointment of additional paid members of staff and volunteers.

Although Workforce led the recruitment and interview process a baseline document was produced to identify in what areas staff would be required. The plans for paid staff, volunteer and contractor numbers and positions were brought together via the review of each programme plan establishing a baseline of final numbers.

Over the course of the Games, the HR department successfully recruited 690 staff from a variety of Games related locations and through the secondment of MCC staff. The initial HR plan transformed over time in line with the needs of the organisation.
Retention strategies
As the Games was a short-term, ever changing project there was the potential for staff to suffer from stress or sickness.

A motivation and retention plan was, therefore, put in place to ensure that those in positions of high importance would be retained and would not present a de-stabilisation effect for the organisation. The premise for this approach had the desired effect, as the vast majority of staff were committed to seeing the project through to the end to ensure future career advancement and via association, personal prestige.

Recruitment Challenges
Although quite a number of staff were recruited from an international pool of qualified professionals, the effects of bringing in people from different events did have implications. Despite M2002 having a clear vision, each group of people from different events had their perspective of how a multi-sport event should be organised, which necessitated a prolonged settling in period, (particularly those working in operational areas) as significant time was required to meld experience and cultural attitudes together.

Volunteer Services
The Volunteer Centre as the hub of volunteer development and recruitment, saw an unexpected uptake of an enthusiastic and willing community drawn together to make up the majority of the workforce. With the marketing and promotion of the Volunteer Programme and the Games, 22,000 volunteer applications were received.

The crew culture concept was well received by volunteers and was the cornerstone of a valued and caring workforce. The reward and recognition plans were well organised and well within the budget.

The Training Programme was a success and started with a spectacular Orientation Evening, leaving all volunteers wanting to remain part of the Games and Crew 2002. Ongoing training met many obstacles, however, with time and effort and valued judgement training, both job-specific training and venue orientation were successfully achieved.

The concept that underpinned the recruitment, training, rostering and deployment of volunteers was the Volunteer department who facilitated the process in cooperation with FAs. FAs had the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that all components were delivered and had the support of the Volunteer department and the Rostering department along with their own Functional Area Crew Coordinator (FACC) to balance the workload. M2002 acknowledged that a good balance of home grown and international experience was required and strived to align this philosophy with specific job requirements.

Uniforms
A bold and characteristic Manchester statement was made through the use of strong colours and the unique ‘flat cap’ to give Crew 2002 a uniform to be proud to wear. The uniform proved to be a great success, standing out in the crowd and providing a clear and important focal point for spectators and clients. The distinctive uniform shone through brilliantly on televised coverage with a true and reflective statement made to encapsulate the Manchester spirit.

The programme met many challenges along the way, however, including some initial negative media coverage of the uniform. Although the media were at times derogatory, it raised the profile of the Games in the public eye and attracted more interest from the general public.

The Workforce Planning department worked closely with the Uniform department to establish quantities to be ordered. Orders were placed after a review had taken place to reduce volunteer numbers and although reasonable contingency was accounted for, the actual number of additional staff (both paid and volunteer) rose considerably higher than anticipated.

Quality control was an issue with the re-order and re-supply of garments and as a result M2002 undertook their own quality tests to ensure that the product delivered met the standards expected.

Business uniforms were seen as a mark of ‘status’ by staff and the overall team often had difficulty distinguishing their necessity and requirement. In effect, business uniforms should have remained restricted to Directors and Board.
The Uniform Centre was a huge success, it was designed well, reducing the level of queuing, with sufficient numbers of staff and good changing facilities.

Despite detailed analysis of size ratios being carried out using data from Sydney 2000 and sampling of the volunteers, difficulties were experienced supplying uniforms to people of a smaller size and this should be given attention for future Games committees.

Pre-Volunteer Programme
This programme will continue to provide a lasting legacy for Manchester and future sporting events throughout the UK. Started in early 1997 this Programme provided the foundation for the roll-out of the overall Volunteer Programme. The role of the programme enabled socially excluded groups to become part of the Games and learn critical career forming skills to assist them in establishing a long-term career. The Programme promoted self-esteem, learning, and opportunities that led to long-term employment or fulfilled the competency based learning outcomes embedded in the programme to achieve a recognised qualification.

Key Lessons and Recommendations
- Develop clear organisation structures, with well defined reporting lines for each phase of operation of the organisation.
- Recruit appropriately skilled and experienced individuals within the organisation that integrate effectively with the existing team.
- Look to bring people on as early as possible who have the desire and ability to learn and who are flexible and committed.
- Have a fully integrated workforce plan and info technology system that will enable critical examination of people needs.
- Maximise the use of long-term volunteers (by bringing them on early to supplement paid staff positions). Use of secondees should be a selective process and ensure that the organisation's requirements can be met by secondees with appropriate skills and experiences.
- Have a small panel of people to act as decision makers on change control and variances to recruitment plans.
- Recognise that staff will be recruited from the global event market place as well as the local market and structure packages accordingly recognising the risk that staff may look for a new job before the end of the Games.
Overview

When Manchester won the right to host the 2002 Commonwealth Games the city was overjoyed at the obvious triumph achieved and evident from the crowd gathered at Albert Square on 3 November 1995, the support was unprecedented. However, outside the North West of England the awareness of Manchester hosting the Commonwealth Games was minimal.

Northern grit, hard work, teamwork, quirkiness, creativity, friendliness and a genuine desire to succeed under the most adverse criticism are the core values that underpin the city and it was these values that would sell the Games to the rest of the Commonwealth.

In September 2001 the Creative department was formed to consolidate the themes and messages that would sell the Games to the UK public and the rest of the world.

The Creative department was headed up by a Creative Director and consisted of the following FAs:
- Ceremonies
- Communications and Marketing
- Brand Integration and Public Information
- Special Events
- The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay
- Spirit of Friendship Festival

Ceremonies

Opening and Closing Ceremonies have become essential to the overall success of major sporting events. They are a combination of sport and entertainment and provide an opportunity to make global statements reflecting the personality of the Host City and Host Nation.

The Opening Ceremony, in particular, plays a key role in forming the vital first impressions for visitors and media and sets the stage for the events that follow. Most importantly the Ceremony provides an inspirational welcome to the athletes of the Games and welcomes a worldwide TV audience on behalf of Manchester and its communities.

This was perhaps most vividly demonstrated through the international acclaim for the host cities and countries that staged the Opening Ceremonies of the Barcelona (1992) and more recently, the Sydney Olympic Games.

Following the success of Barcelona and Sydney, the primary objective for M2002 was to achieve a perfect start for the 2002 Commonwealth Games in Manchester.

The Ceremony was also designed to convey key messages and images about the contemporary culture and energy of Manchester to the world by showcasing key “Made in Manchester” moments that would portray Manchester as a city of regeneration and renewal for the new millennium.

- The Opening and Closing Ceremonies were held on 25 July and 4 August 2002 at the City of Manchester Stadium.
- The City of Manchester Stadium hosted a live audience for each Ceremony of 38,000 people including Her Majesty The Queen, The Prime Minister and Heads of States from across the Commonwealth.
- 20 million people across the UK watched the Opening and Closing Ceremonies coverage on the BBC’s domestic UK broadcast.
- A further one billion people watched both Ceremonies on the worldwide rights-holding broadcasters programming.
- There were over 10,000 cast members in both Ceremonies – with an additional 5,000 Athletes and Technical Officials in the Opening Ceremony.

After 11 days of world-class competition, Manchester said farewell to the best ever Commonwealth Games with an official goodbye signifying a message to the rest of the world to ‘seek peace’.

The Closing Ceremony celebrated the power of sport to inspire the human spirit both on and off the sporting field with a series of moments that also reflected the innovative capacities, cultural diversity and creativity of the Host City.
Entertained by headline acts and clutching and waving 38,000 flags of St George, the capacity crowd waved their final goodbyes to The Queen and the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games amid dazzling fireworks displays and a last rousing rendition of Land of Hope and Glory after a night and ceremony of joyous fantasy that brought the curtain down on the best ever Commonwealth Games.

M2002 engaged Jack Morton Worldwide to produce both Ceremonies, further details of which are included in volume 4.

**Media Services**

M2002 appointed Matchtight Media to scope, plan and deliver a range of services to news agencies, journalists and photographers, a client group that is generally regarded as very demanding. These services were delivered successfully and encompassed the Main Press Centre, Venue Sub-Press Centres, Press Tribunes and other work areas at venues. Details of the Main Press Centre layout are included in section D8 of volume 2 (G-Mex). Media operations across the Games are described in further detail in section C2 of volume 4 (Media Services).

Located close to the main media hotels, the MPC operated at full capacity every morning and evening throughout the Games. More than 100 paid staff and volunteers met the needs of 655 journalists and almost 300 photographers. Facilities included the Games News Service and Press Office, 300 workstations/terminals, a media conference centre and help desk. The layout and design of the split-level site worked well creating a comfortable and efficient working environment for staff and media personnel. Feedback from users was very positive. Venue Sub-Press Centres were configured along similar lines to the MPC in order to simplify the orientation process for journalists.

**Communications and Marketing**

“The city that led Britain into the industrial revolution thus led the country out of the organisational dark ages in sport, in the rain, with a spirit that even the Olympics should envy.”

*Paul Hayward, Daily Telegraph*

“Hail Our Golden Games. They will be remembered for their perfect organisation and fun atmosphere” – *Daily Express*

“Roaring success… the Commonwealth Games were as much a triumph for the city of Manchester as they were for the medallists” – *David Walsh, The Sunday Times*

These are just a taste of the headlines that the UK’s national print media wrote following the enormous success of the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games. The headlines accurately captured the mood of the city and the country as the Games drew to an end. It was the most fitting end to four years of media relations, communications and marketing.
The Communications and Marketing department fell under a number of different executive directors over the period of two years before the Games. However, for the last year a Communications Director was appointed to manage public/media relations, marketing, website, call centre, print and publications.

The first full time Press Officer was appointed in March 1999 and was supported by part time and freelance assistance throughout that year. A second press officer was appointed in January 2002 with additional support being supplied by freelance assistance and personnel from the Marketing department for major events such as countdown days to go activities, Sponsor announcements, venue unveilings and general updates on progress.

The Press Office team continued to build during 2001 as major media events were put together for the launch of the Volunteer Programme, ‘One Year to Go’ activities and the launch of the ticketing programme.

The key communications objectives were to:
- Communicate as widely and as frequently as possible ‘top line’ key messages.
- Extend coverage via partner and sponsor organisations.
- Provide support to internal communications and marketing initiatives with a framework of core messages e.g. the Public Information Strategy.
- Generate awareness of each stage in the ticketing sales campaign and updates on ticket sales from launch through to the last events during the Games.
- Promote the Spirit of Friendship Festival and The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay – events that built awareness of the Games.
- An external public relations agency (Capital PR) was hired to direct and implement media relations programmes for these two programmes as well as the implementation of the media strategy for the Ceremonies.

**Press Coverage and Key Statistics**
- One billion people watched the Opening and Closing Ceremony worldwide.
- Approximately 20 million people watched the Opening and Closing Ceremonies in the UK.
- The coverage generated in regional weekly and daily newspapers had a combined circulation of approximately 2.5 billion.
- The coverage generated in national newspapers had a combined circulation of approximately two billion.
- 60,000 articles / programmes talked about the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games from January – August 2002.
- 1,530 articles were written about the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games in national newspapers from January – August 2002.
- 55,000 articles were written about the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games in regional weekly and daily newspapers from January – August 2002.
- 2,500 Radio and TV programmes covered stories about the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games from January – August 2002.

**Marketing**
The Marketing department worked across all FAs delivering marketing solutions for requirements including milestone events, brand visibility, revenue generation (ticketing, hospitality and sponsorship), internal communications, public information, and constitutional commitments.

This required the Marketing department to function as an internal consultancy, where expertise and capacity was available in-house and as a project management group when external expertise and/or capacity were required.

A total of 29 people worked in the Marketing department made up of people seconded from MCC, externally recruited staff and volunteers. The ratio between all these groups remained fairly equal.
The largest component of the advertising programme was to deliver a £1.5 million advertising campaign to launch ticket sales on 15 November 2001, and to satisfy the aspirations of the external marketing board and key stakeholders. This involved print, poster and TV and radio campaigns. The ticket launch was hugely successful. The message was simple:

- Manchester was the destination in 2002 to see the biggest ever multi-sport event in Britain.
- Manchester was the party city in Britain.
- A ticket to the Games was the invitation you needed, to be at the party.

The key to the success of the Marketing campaign was drawing together all interested parties and working together in partnership. This meant recognising each client group’s objectives and ensuring that their own messages were promoted under the umbrella of the 2002 Commonwealth Games. Following the success of the Games, The Daily Telegraph newspaper commented: “Behind the scenes there was some exceptionally savvy marketing which exploited Manchester’s reputation as a city that thinks a table is for dancing on.”

Key Marketing Statistics

- Over 600 separate publications produced (by in-house and external agencies) on time and below budget.
- Website was a major success with over 70% of all tickets being sold via the web and over one million hits during the 11 days of the Games.
- The final consumer research carried out after the Games in Manchester showed that the Manchester Commonwealth Games:
  - made me feel more positively about the city - 54% agree
  - will encourage people and businesses to move there - 61% agree
  - has improved its standing as a world class city - 81% agree
  - showed the world the UK can stage the big events - 90% agree

Brand Integration / Public Information

The purpose of developing an integrated marketing strategy was to achieve the most cost effective means of promoting the Commonwealth Games to the largest possible target audience by bringing together all external organisations that were planning to invest in Commonwealth Games related marketing, thereby ensuring both cost-efficiency and synergy in Commonwealth Games related marketing.

The overall aim was to ensure best value from the considerable amount of public money invested from a variety of different sources in order to ensure that the Commonwealth Games would be a commercial and critical success, but also that this unique opportunity would be maximised in terms of legacy impact for the people of Manchester.

The Creative Director of M2002 also undertook an external role as chair of the overall Regional Marketing Board, ensuring that M2002’s work was integrated with the activities of the partners represented on the Regional Marketing Board.

The Public Information Strategy was developed to ensure an integrated strategy for all partners, providing a strong structure for the effective:

- Delivery of key messages.
- Provision of appropriate and timely information.
- Exploitation of communication and promotional opportunities.
It was recognised that the delivery of a successful integrated programme would enable:

- The actual and perceived success of the Commonwealth Games.
- Optimisation of revenue.
- The delivery of added value to the Games experience.
- Effective legacy development.
- Counter potential negative media coverage.

The programme was developed to fulfil the needs of both stakeholder organisations and specific target audiences.

Stakeholder organisations had a requirement both to:

- Proactively communicate key messages, which would influence target audience behaviour (e.g. use of public transport).
- Provide relevant, accessible and timely communications which satisfied the target audience information requirements.
- Proactively communicate key messages, which would influence target audience behaviour (e.g. use of public transport).

**Special Events**

Festival Live brought the city of Manchester to life during the Games for over a million visitors. The street theatre and city centre entertainment will be long remembered by the crowds gathered in public gardens and squares watching the latest action on giant TV screens.

Festival Live was the programme of street entertainment and large screen sport and ceremony coverage which took place in Manchester city centre, on the Sportcity Plaza and in the Commonwealth Games Village during the 10 days of the Games (note the entertainment at the Village commenced on 20 July in line with athlete arrivals). It also encompassed an ‘Athletes Club’ based externally to the Village specifically designed to enable athletes to leave the Village but remain within a controlled environment close to the city centre. This ran for six days during the Games. There were also community activities in East Manchester. The Special Events Unit was a collaborative project between M2002 and MCC and was co-funded by both parties.

BBC Live Events were appointed to project manage the entertainment and they in turn sub-contracted Manchester International Arts to programme the entertainment. It was hailed as a success both anecdotally and through independent research as creating a welcoming and vibrant atmosphere for visitors to the city.

The use of the screens to show live action in the city centre at Piccadilly Gardens and Exchange Square effectively turned these locations into venues in their own right. Additionally they were used extensively by members of the public for watching the Opening and Closing Ceremonies as well as the sporting action.

**The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay**

Symbolising the drive of human spirit, the Baton Relay was a cornerstone of the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games, The Queen’s Golden Jubilee Year and the Opening Ceremony.

The world’s first interactive baton – which translated the heartbeat of the runner into blades of flashing light – attracted millions of spectators as it visited Commonwealth nations in all six regions of the world, establishing links between the diverse peoples and cultures of the Commonwealth in the countdown to the Manchester Games.

Assisted by a host of celebrity Baton carriers including Sir Roger Bannister, Lord Sebastian Coe, Steve Cram, Sir Bobby Charlton, Sir Steve Redgrave and George Best. Her Majesty The Queen launched the Baton Relay on its epic world record journey from Buckingham Palace on 11 March 2002.
After returning to the United Kingdom on 6 June 2002, the Baton was relayed across the country by 5,000 Baton carriers, many of whom were community heroes who had made inspirational contributions to their families and communities by overcoming great personal challenges or hardships.

The Baton’s spectacular aerial arrival at the Opening Ceremony and the handover to Her Majesty The Queen by Manchester hero girl Kirsty Howard, with the assistance of Manchester United footballer David Beckham, helped to make the Ceremony so memorable.

In the course of its 64,000 mile odyssey, the Baton visited 24 Commonwealth nations in 87 days (including 69 separate air journeys; travelled for 50 days in the UK, journeying over 5,000 miles through 500 towns, assisted by 33 convoy support vehicles.

The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay team was responsible for managing the delivery of the Baton Relay event throughout the United Kingdom and supporting the CGF in delivering an international itinerary incorporating Commonwealth nations.

The mission for the Baton Relay was to deliver a national road event that attracted media and community support for the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games. By the end of the Baton Relay the event was recognised as one of the largest community based road events of its kind in the United Kingdom.

Spirit of Friendship Festival

The Spirit of Friendship Festival generated a level of cultural activity unprecedented in the UK. Over 2,000 events around the country celebrated the festival of the Games leaving a cultural legacy that will remain in the minds and imaginations of children for many years to come.

The Spirit of Friendship Festival had four distinct strands: Sport, Culture, Education and Community. Schools, local community groups and local festivals joined Commonwealth icons in literature, film and music to create a vibrant display of Commonwealth culture.

The carnival atmosphere burned brightest in and around Manchester in the lead up to the Games, however, the party spirit reached out and embraced all areas of the United Kingdom communicating the ideals of the Games such as friendship, diversity and equality, linking Manchester to other UK regions and Commonwealth nations.

“Diversity key to success” – Financial Times
“Commonwealth grooves” – Financial Times, Arts Week
“Truly a fine showcase for the musical wealth and diversity of the Commonwealth” – Evening Post, Bristol

Key SOFF Statistics

- 10,000 young athletes participated in the Sport England Active Talent Camps.
- 75,000 children from 3,000 schools participated in their own mini Commonwealth Games.
- Every school in the UK (33,000) received a Commonwealth Curriculum Pack.
- More than 2,000 events took place nationwide – from the Shetland Isles to Plymouth.

Summary

OCs must not overlook the impact on both the local community and the national and international communities, that the creative elements of such an event can deliver. It is a chance to showcase to this audience the richness and depth of talent, innovation – tradition and non-tradition of the Host City and its people.

Ceremonies do this through the music, dance and creative talents of the show, however, so can many other forms of communication. Once Games spectators have arrived inside the city the responsibility is then on the city and its the organisers to expand their knowledge of what the city and its people stand for.

Every experience needs to have a quality control that ties back to the image of the city and what the city wants to portray to all visitors – from colour schemes to words on a page or images and graphics on maps.

Every aspect of the spectator experience has a creative element and provides an opportunity to deliver a positive message. For this reason it is vital that all key communication roles to external audiences stay together under one department head to ensure consistency of that message.
Overview

The Games were a huge commercial success with more than £56 million raised from sales of sponsorship, TV rights, tickets, merchandise and accommodation. The actual commercial income generated was £4 million greater than projected in 2000, when the Games final budget was prepared and this was principally as a result of the unprecedented numbers of ticket sales.

The commercial income was more than double that raised by previous Commonwealth Games and more than three times more tickets were sold than any previous Games.

Public Sector Funders, including the Government, Sport England and Manchester City Council provided £73 million towards M2002’s operating costs of approximately £130 million.

Official Sponsors and Partners contributed approximately £27 million in a mixture of cash and value-in-kind (VIK) products and services and in addition provided a significant level of marketing support for the Games. The Sponsors made a huge contribution to the success of the Games, providing a level of support that extended beyond their contractual obligations and included critical services, such as transport, staff, food and beverages for athletes and volunteers, uniforms, technology, legal, media, and healthcare services, offices, office equipment, furniture and stationery.

TV income net of the costs of the Host Broadcast services, provided by the BBC, was more than £12 million, with TV rights-holders transmitting the Games to more than one billion TV viewers across the Commonwealth. More than 1,500 hours of TV coverage were available to rights-holders broadcasting up to 18 hours of Games footage a day during the event.

Sales of 900,000 tickets generated approximately £14 million, which was £3.4 million greater than had been projected. Record spectator numbers were achieved with an overall sales level of more than 90% of capacity and many of the events sold out, including the morning heats for Athletics. Licensing, merchandise, catering, accommodation and other income generated a further £4 million.

Stringent financial management systems were operated by M2002, enabling a high level of cost control and financial monitoring prior to and during the Games by the M2002 Finance team, an Independent Finance Committee and the Public Sector Funders. Of the original £25 million Contingency Fund, as at 31 December 2002, £9.3 million had been committed and £15.7 million remained uncommitted. The most significant charge to the contingency relates to telecommunications costs of £7.3 million, following the Administration of Atlantic Telecom. However, more than £3 million of value was generated from the Atlantic sponsorship deal, which is more than £1 million greater than the amount received from the majority of Games’ Sponsors. Other contingency costs, net of savings, amount to £6 million, against which £4 million of additional revenue has been credited. The major items included in the additional costs of £6 million relate to enhancements to the Athletes’ Village, Security, Transport, Fitout and Look.

Manchester City Council incurred a further £13 million of operational costs directly, relating to human resources, stadium licensing and operating costs and the costs of preparing the city for the Games.

Capital costs of venues amounted to £170 million, including £111 million for the City of Manchester Stadium, £16 million for the English Institute of Sport, £32 million for the Aquatics Centre, £4 million for the Regional Hockey Centre at Belle Vue, £6 million for shooting facilities at Bisley and £1 million for Lawn Bowls at Heaton Park. The contribution by Sport England Lottery Fund, towards these costs was £123 million, with the balance funded by Manchester City Council, the Lawn Tennis Association, Manchester Universities and others.

According to independent estimates, Commonwealth Games legacies – which will be ongoing for years to come – have already helped Manchester to secure more than £600 million of public and private investment for Manchester and the region.

- The equivalent of almost 6,300 full-time jobs, comparable to the Sydney and Barcelona Olympics.
- An extra 300,000 visitors a year, spending an extra £18 million in the revitalised Host City.
- Several hundred local businesses benefited with £22 million generated from planning and preparations associated with the Games.
- Manchester harnessed the enthusiasm and energy of the Games to rejuvenate the spirit of the region as well as its urban infrastructure.
- In addition to the usual short term economic boost and higher international profile associated with such sporting events, Manchester used the Games to strengthen the sporting, social and economic fabric of the city and the North West region of England providing a lasting legacy for all.
**Projected Revenue Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Revenue</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV Rights</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticketing</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing, Concessions and Accommodation</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Sector</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M CC</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>130.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TV Rights**

TV revenue of £12.1 million is stated net of broadcasting costs and agents’ commissions. Broadcast rights were sold to 11 companies as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Broadcaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>BBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Seven Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>ABC Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Pacific Region</td>
<td>ASBU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>CBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand and Pacific Islands</td>
<td>TVNZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>SABC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>TV Asahi Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Television Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sponsorship**

Sponsorship was sought within key business sectors and potential sponsors were offered packages at various levels including top tier Sponsors, Official Partners and Providers to the Games.

Of the total sponsorship income of £26.7 million (net of agents’ commission), £14.5 million was achieved in cash and £12.2 million as budget relieving VIK.

In addition enhanced VIK sponsorship, which was not budget relieving of more than £1 million was received and significant additional marketing benefits.

Top tier Sponsors, and their VIK product, were:

- **Adecco** - supplied a number of key managers to run the volunteer programme.
- **Addleshaw Booth** - provided legal resource either through secondment of lawyers to the Games or through the provision of legal advice.
- **ASDA** - the main products provided by this Sponsor included the uniforms, food and water for staff and volunteers.
- **BUPA** - provided healthcare insurance for the Games Family.
- **Cadbury** - this Sponsor performed a mail out service for our ticket application forms and provided cereal and chocolate bars for inclusion in staff and volunteer food.
- **GMG** - allowed advertising within its products and produced and distributed the Official Games Newspaper, the Official Souvenir Brochure and the Official Games Magazine.
- **Imperial Leather** - provided soap products for use throughout the Games.
- **Manchester Airport** - marketing support.
- **Microsoft** - provided IT systems infrastructure and consultancy services.
- **Rover** - provided motor vehicles for the Games transport fleet, and marketing support.
- **United Utilities** - marketing support.
Official Partners and their VIK product, were:

**Bruntwood** – provided M2002 with its Head Office building, Commonwealth House on a rent and service charge free basis.

**Coke** – provided soft drinks for staff and volunteers.

**Claremont** – provided office furniture for Commonwealth House.

**First** – provided buses for Games Family transport.

**Guilbert** – Provided stationery for the various offices and operational areas of the Games.

**Interbrew** – provided beer and wine, for resale to the public and for the hospitality operation.

**The Trafford Centre** – provided marketing support.

**Virgin Trains** – provided rail travel for the Games Family.

**Xerox** – provided all the photocopying equipment and fax machines required for the Games.

### Ticketing

900,000 tickets were sold against the original budget of 614,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Total sold</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>330,449</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>27,159</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing</td>
<td>24,677</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Ceremony</td>
<td>27,946</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>25,670</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diving</td>
<td>7,770</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>29,231</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>50,173</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judo</td>
<td>24,454</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Bowls</td>
<td>17,592</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>63,016</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Ceremony</td>
<td>31,649</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby 7s</td>
<td>127,525</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>15,790</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>20,665</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronised Swimming</td>
<td>4,239</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis</td>
<td>14,247</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weightlifting</td>
<td>6,369</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>16,153</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics Dress Rehearsal</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Dress Rehearsal</td>
<td>33,476</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>900,061</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ticket Sales - geographic analysis

**Within Greater Manchester:**
- Within M60: 10.5
- Outside M60: 21.2

**Outside Greater Manchester:**
- Within 2 hours:
  - Cheshire: 10.8
  - Yorkshire: 6.2
  - Lancashire: 6.1
  - Midlands: 7.7
  - Wales/Cumbria/Merseyside: 5.3
- Over 2 hours:
  - London and the South: 20.8
  - Other: 10.0
  - Overseas: 1.4

**Total: 100.0**

### Licensing, Concessions and Accommodation

#### Licensing

Licensing income consists of royalty payments of between 10% and 15% on sales of licensed product. Licences were granted to 64 companies, each of whom were contracted to pay minimum guarantees prior to the Games. Sales reports, obtained on a monthly basis, established how much was payable in royalties.

#### Concessions

Concession income was derived from a percentage of sales through the merchandising and catering outlets. Merchandising was subcontracted to a main retailer. The main retailer purchased stock from the licensees, operated the superstore at Sportcity and operated outlets at all venues including the Airport, the Trafford Centre and the Arndale Centre.

Catering at Sportcity, which included the provision of hospitality services and spectator catering, was subcontracted to one catering provider. The main caterer provided the hospitality catering, operated the spectator outlets within the Stadium and subcontracted the spectator outlets within the Sportcity Plaza.
**Accommodation**

Accommodation income was generated from athlete overflow accommodation and from the Games accommodation agent.

As specified in the CGF Constitution, teams were entitled to 18 days of free accommodation. Any requirements in excess of this level would be charged to the relevant team at a specified rate. The costs associated with this were provided within the main expenditure budget.

Sportsworld were chosen as the accommodation agent. They were contracted to pay M2002 an agreed fee for each room night booked through their system.

**Other**

Other income includes bank interest, hospitality income and the income generated from the sale of assets after the Games.

Bank interest was mainly derived from short term treasury deposits. The provision of hospitality was sub-contracted to the main catering supplier, Sodexho. The contract was based on a profit share arrangement between M2002 and Sodexho. Assets purchased by M2002 have been disposed of to various sources. Assets were sold by an independent auctioneer.

**Expenditure Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Corporate Services</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue Fitout</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Division</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonies</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Work Packages</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>130.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finance and Corporate Services**

The main areas of spend within this division were:

**CGF Assemblies** - The Commonwealth Games Federation and its members met in Manchester in 2001 and 2002. M2002 provided the accommodation and travel requirements of the delegates.

**Travel** - The main spend within this category was travel subsidies payable to all participating nations per the CGF Constitution. These were paid in three tranches. The first of 10% was paid in December 2001, followed by 30% in April 2002 and the final 60% after the Games.

**Acquisition/Fitout of Office Space** - The main costs recorded within this work package are the VIK costs for the occupation, and office furniture fitout, of Commonwealth House.

**Outside Legal Costs** - These costs were primarily the VIK charges from Addleshaw Booth for the provision of legal resource and advice.

**Insurance** - This category of costs included Primary Games Insurance, Medical Insurance from BUPA, Cancellation and Abandonment Insurance, Insurance Broker’s Fees, Risk Management Plan, Uncovered Losses and Unrecovered Excess.

**Materials Management and Logistics** - The main costs within this work package related to the provision of furniture at the Athletes’ Village and the provision of logistics labour.

**Contractors Costs** - The main contractor costs within this work package were the provision of Adecco VIK volunteer management staff, the costs associated with Games readiness planning and the costs associated with checking accessibility requirements at venues.
**Venue Fitout**

The main areas of spend within this division were:

**Temporary Power** - Consisted of the provision of the generators, fuel and cabling required to meet additional power demands at venues. Approximately 20,787 Kva of electrical power was provided via 88 generators and 16 kilometres of cable. Also included the provision of air conditioning.

**Temporary Structures** - The main elements were the provision of 322 tents and marquees, 80 cabins, 476 temporary toilet and shower units (including 98 disabled units), 280 storage containers, 20 kilometres of temporary fencing and 18 kilometres of pedestrian barriers. Also included service and cleaning charges for the toilet and shower units.

**Temporary Seating** - Provision of 24,000 temporary seats to increase spectator capacity at eight sports venues.

**Rigging and Sports Lighting** - The rigging element represented the cost of the labour and equipment required to rig lighting, public address systems, banners etc at venues. The lighting cost was incurred in providing the level and consistency of lighting required by the broadcasters and press.

**The Look** - Consisted of the provision of all items used to decorate venues and project the image of the Games. Included approximately 3,900 banners, 2,800 flags of nations, 18,500 signs and decals, and 26 kilometres of fence fabric. Also included the costs of providing installation crews and design services.

**Site Adaptation and Exhibition Works** - Consisted of all construction and building works required at venues to bring them up to Games time readiness. Examples include ground works, carpentry, painting, road works and plumbing/drainage works. Also included the cost of reinstating venues to their original state after the Games.

**Venue Hire** - Hire fees payable for the hire of sport and non-sport venues. In certain cases also included utility and other operational costs incurred by M 2002 during occupation of the venues. Major costs were incurred hiring the G-Mex Centre, MEN Arena and Manchester Aquatics Centre.

**Workforce**

The main areas of spend within this division were:

**Volunteer and Other Clothing/Uniforms** - The cost of providing Games time uniforms to 12,200 volunteers, technical officials, contractors and staff. The majority of these costs were met as part of the VIK contract with ASDA. Items supplied included flat caps, polo shirts, casual jackets and trousers, business suits, water bottles, shoulder bags and umbrellas.

**Volunteer Support** - This majority of the costs incurred within this work package related to the cost of providing free car parks and travel on all public transport for the volunteers, staff, technical officials and athletes during July and August.

**Human Resources** - The workforce of M 2002 mainly consisted of directly recruited employees, secondees from MCC and volunteers. Excluding volunteers, the headcount peaked in July 2002 at 690 staff. This consisted of 393 direct hires and 297 MCC secondees.

**Sport**

The main areas of spend in this division are:

**Event Presentation** - Event presentation is the product that ensures the event is presented in a manner conducive to the spectator. Manchester 2002 utilised the services of two companies. Fast Track were used to present the Athletics event at the Stadium and Great Big Events were used to present the events for all other sports.

**Medical Services Management** - This package allowed for the provision of all medical services to athletes and spectators.

**Anti-Doping Control Programme** - This work package provided for the contract with UK Sport for the independent operation and control of the anti-doping programme. Over the course of the Games there were 978 urine and 14 EPO tests.

**Sports Equipment and Supplies** - This work package provided for the purchase or hire of the equipment necessary to operate the Games. For each major piece of equipment a hire versus buy exercise was conducted and the most commercially viable option followed. This resulted in a large proportion of the equipment being hired for the duration of the Games.
Test Event Support - This work package provided for test events to be conducted in all venues prior to the Games. The level of involvement taken by M 2002 across the test events varied considerably. This ranged from observer status at the Cycling World Championships at the Velodrome to a fully manned event at the Stadium.

Operations
The main areas of spend within this division were:

Athletes' Village - Manchester
The contract provided a 30 acre site, consisting of 3,340 bedrooms in six different Halls of Residence, along with some of the University's conference and sporting facilities. The hire of the site was during the period 1 June to 31 August 2002, exclusive access during this time varying with different areas of the site.

The revenue foregone agreement included the standard weekly hours of staff, therefore during the hire period M 2002 had approximately 180 University staff who were redeployed into various Games time roles.

Other major costs within this work package related to the provision of housekeeping which covered the cleaning of 3,500 bedrooms over the period from 10 July to 4 August and a team of logistical support staff to maintain Village operations.

Security
The major provider of security was Showsec International who provided stewarding at all venues. Showsec also provided access and egress control at all venues with the exception of vehicle depots and specialist search teams. The maximum headcount provision was 725 in any given 24 hour period for combined asset protection and access control with 1,240 stewards at peak operations during Games time.

Marpol Security provided the security at the vehicle depots and additional security for specialist areas including access control to the firework site for the Opening and Closing Ceremonies.

Rapiscan provided the security equipment that included 72 x-ray machines, 148 magnetic arches and 400 hand held metal detectors.

Guardian Executive provided specialist search teams covering bomb searches, asset protection during bump-out and technical training for other sub-contractors. Peak provision was 56 personnel operating across the Manchester venues.

Desa provided guard dogs as a sub-contractor to Showsec International and were present at four competition venues and two non-competition venues. This provision included specialist bomb and drug sniffer dogs.
Cleaning and Waste Management

Cleaning
Contracts were signed with Executive Group for cleaning services at Sportcity and the Athletes’ Village. Apart from the Aquatics Centre and the IBC, all other contracts were signed with the incumbent cleaners at each venue. Cleaning services were generally supplied on a unit rate basis, with a fixed fee for a basic level of service and unit rates for additional services. In addition, Cussons provided shower gel for Athletes and officials in the Village and liquid/bar soap for all other areas as part of a VIK arrangement.

Other suppliers providing consumables included Ardale, who supplied over 110,000 translucent plastic bin liners and Glasdon UK, who designed and manufactured 740 clear bins.

Waste Management
Greater Manchester Waste provided waste processing, bins, waste containers and transport under a VIK agreement to all Manchester venues. In total approximately 1,000 tonnes of waste were collected, of which 16.5% was recycled. Separate waste bins were provided for recyclable and general waste to facilitate this process.

Accreditation
Almost 100,000 accreditation passes were issued to the volunteers, staff, athletes, technical officials, contractors, VIPs, participants in the ceremonies and members of the emergency services.

Bus Charter
Approximately 200 buses and coaches were hired to transport spectators, athletes and officials to venues in and around Manchester and Bisley. These costs included the VIK supply from First.

Vehicle Fleet
This work package covered the cost of hiring 940 cars from MG Rover, 100 mini-buses, 43 motor cycles and a variety of other cars, lorries and vans.

Catering

Public Concessions
Concession outlets were in place throughout the Sportcity domain and at Bolton Arena under contract with Sodexho Prestige, providing catering services on a ‘user pays’ basis to the general public. Under this contract M2002 paid a fixed and variable fee for the service provision, and received a royalty on all sales made.

For all other sporting venues, the incumbent caterer provided the ‘obligatory’ catering requirements as part of the overall venue hire agreement.

Athlete Catering
Sodexho Prestige were also appointed to provide the athletes’ catering requirements in the Village and at competition venues. In total over 300,000 meals were prepared at the Village, comprising up to 2,000 meals per hour as part of a 24 hour, seven day service.

Staff/Volunteer Catering
The majority of the catering for staff and volunteers was provided by ASDA under a VIK arrangement, whereby sandwiches, fruit, crisps and bottled water, periodically supplemented with a hot food option were provided to staff and volunteers across all venues. Similar arrangements were in place with Cadbury, Fredericks, Kraft and Coca Cola.
Technology
The main areas of spend within this division were:

Software and Services – The expenditure within this work package consisted of the non Microsoft software. This included software for the helpdesk, Firewall, Antivirus, Autocad and network monitoring.

Hardware and Services – Expenditure within this package incorporated all the non contract specific hardware and included 237 TVs and 61 video recorders.

Compaq – The contract with Compaq provided for the lease of over 1,600 PC's, 180 servers and other components as required. Compaq services extended to consultancy work and the building, installation and bump-out of equipment at venues.

Atlantic – Atlantic Telecom were the main Communications Sponsor prior to going into liquidation in October 2001. The expenditure incurred within this work package related to the VIK product obtained by M 2002 up to liquidation. This was mainly incurred on telephony systems.

Microsoft – The expenditure within this work package relates to the IT systems infrastructure and consultancy as provided under the VIK Sponsor agreement.

Xerox – Expenditure mainly consisted of the provision of 377 printers and support as part of their VIK Sponsor agreement.

Wide Area Voice and Data Network – This work package related to the provision of the WAN to 38 sport and non-sport venues.

Local Area Network – This work package related to the provision of the LAN to 38 sport and non-sport venues.

In Venue Cabling – Provision of cabling at all venues.

CATV – Provision of cable television at 31 of the 38 venues.

Private Mobile Radios (PMR) – Provision of 3,071 handsets to over 36 venues and the associated project management and consultancy.

Timing Scoring and Results – Swiss Timing were contracted to provide timing and scoring across all venues. Delta Tre provided the central and local results service.

Sport Presentation – Costs associated with the provision of pictures through videoboards at the major sporting venues and Live sites.

Testing – A test lab was set up within head office to allow thorough testing of all systems prior to live operation.

Games Enabling Systems – The expenditure within this package included the cost of Gold Medal for the Games time accreditation system, Viewpoint Logistics for asset management and a rostering system from GMT Planet™.

Intranet/Website Planning – The majority of costs within this package were through the VIK Sponsor agreement with Microsoft.

Marketing
The main areas of spend within this division were:

Call Centres and Information Centre – The majority of costs were for setting up the operation and then providing the staff to operate the call centre prior to and during the Games.

Brand Marketing – Costs within this package included the costs of promotional events, PR consultants, banners and hoardings, the Spirit of Friendship Festival and the Athlete Ambassadors (e.g. Roger Black, Tanni Grey-Thompson and Jonah Lomu).
**Special Events** - Costs were incurred on various events including Commonwealth Day celebrations and the Festival Live programme of activities during Games time.

**Media Services** - This package included costs for the provision of 20 venue managers, 30 news information staff based at the Main Press Centre and four venue photo and press managers.

**Publications and Printing** - This included the design, artwork and printing of a vast range of posters, guides, flyers, brochures and reports.

**Commercial**

In order to generate commercial revenue a total of £5.6 million was incurred on ticket promotional advertising, commission payable to the ticketing agents, Ticketmaster UK, direct costs of selling and distributing tickets and Sponsor servicing charges.

**Advertising and Promotion** - The Games’ media buying agency, Manning Gottlieb Media, placed advertisements in numerous national and regional media in the period leading up to and including Phase 1 of the ticket sales campaign. This was supplemented by advertising within the Guardian Media Group, as part of their VIK sponsorship.

**Sponsor Sales Programme** - Costs were incurred on various events during the project including Sponsor workshops in addition to the provision of promotional literature and corporate merchandise.

**Ticketing Sales and Operation** - The Games’ official ticketing agents, Ticketmaster UK, were contracted to generate ticket sales at a commission rate per ticket for sales originating by mail order / telephone / box office, and for internet sales.

A total of 900,000 tickets were sold.

**Ceremonies**

The main areas of spend within this division were the Opening and Closing Ceremonies. £10.5 million of these costs was funded by the Department for Media, Culture and Sport.

**Other Work Packages**

The other main areas of spend were:

**CGF/CGA Contractual Payments**

These costs relate to contractual payments made to these bodies.

**Indirect Expenditure**

These costs included office overheads.

**The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay**

This package provided for the management and operation of The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay.

This involved transporting the Baton and its associated support team around the British Isles for a 50 day period prior to the Games.
Overview
The Commercial division was responsible for the generation of revenue through the sale of sponsorship rights; tickets and merchandise, alongside the strategic development of an integrated Marketing and Communications plan to support the revenue objectives.

The Commercial department led in the development of a strategy to establish the Games as a national programme of events and activities, which eventually evolved into the inclusion of other major events raising the profile of the Games; like the Spirit of Friendship Festival and The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay. These programmes were seen to be essential parts of the development of the rights package - giving Sponsors, broadcasters and licensees a longer time frame and a broader geographical area, to leverage their profile.

Planning
The strategy and tactics of both the Sales and Marketing plans were preceded by an intense period of product development, and during 1999 this occupied the majority of the work for the Commercial department. It was essential that the ultimate vision for the Games reflected a strong commercial message, which matched the aspirations of the key commercial partners – particularly Sponsors and broadcasters.

Key criteria identified included:
- Quality of venues (for the display and use of Sponsor promotion)
- Size and make up of live audience
- Extent of TV coverage (domestic and international)
- Quality of competition
- City dressing/Sponsor recognition
- Government support
- A genuinely national programme of events and activities supporting the Games in communities and schools
- Positive links with The Queen’s Golden Jubilee year

The objective of the product development phase was to develop an image that signified a unique opportunity for UK companies to increase or create a positive image with a large audience. This was essential to justify the levels of investment required. Alongside this product development work, the Commercial department began a carefully managed PR strategy, aimed at key opinion formers, to create a supportive platform for the Games – a platform in which business, Government, broadcasters, media and the public would support the vision of the Games and therefore project a positive image for commercial sales.

The development phase was also essential in engaging the Commercial department into the overall operational plans of other departments. This was essential to communicate to other departments the expected goods and services being provided as VIK by Sponsors, but also to reinforce the likely attitudes and demands of Sponsors. The aim was to establish an understanding and awareness of key Sponsor aspirations in areas such as:
- Involvement in planning and strategy
- Levels of brand exposure
- Opportunities to use the Games as a case study
- Opportunities to influence consumer perceptions and behaviour
- Opportunities to showcase products and personnel
- Determination to enforce category exclusivity
Television and Broadcast Rights

The sale of broadcast rights was led by the Deputy Chief Executive/Finance Director who worked very closely with the Commercial Director on the sponsorship deals. This was vital, because of the fundamental importance of the sponsorship agreements to the procurement process and to maximise the value of each deal to M 2002.

Of all the broadcast agreements, the Host Broadcaster and domestic rights-holders were the single most important element of the marketing plan. The scale of these agreements and extent of coverage committed to by the BBC was absolutely critical to making progress with sponsorship agreements. The BBC broadcast more than half of Games coverage on a combination of BBC1 and BBC2. The same applies to the major overseas markets (particularly Australia) – where certain sponsor targets were interested in exposure. With TV exposure via signboards, still the most important judgement criteria for the majority of Sponsors, the quality and reach of TV coverage had a direct relationship to the ultimate success of the sponsorship campaign.

Sponsorship

The original revenue target for sponsorship was set extremely high at £37 million net of agency commissions. The scale of this challenge can best be illustrated by comparison to the sponsorship revenue generated by other recent sports championships held in England:

- Euro ’96 £30 million
- Rugby Union World Cup 1999 £18 million
- Cricket World Cup 1999 £11 million

The target was driven by the expenditure projection rather than on historical precedence. The unique nature of the Commonwealth Games as a multi-sport event meant that the proportion of the revenue requirement delivered as VIK was higher for M 2002 than for other events.

The M 2002 sponsorship strategy presented a unique opportunity for brands to integrate their products and people into the delivery of the Games alongside a number of other unique selling points that distinguished it from previous Games and from other UK events:

- **The largest multi-sport event ever held in England** - a once-in-a-life-time opportunity
- **Mass appeal** - 72 nations across 17 sports appealing to all socio demographic groupings
- **National event status** - part of a year of celebrations including The Queen’s Golden Jubilee

Alongside the overall framework, M 2002 developed sophisticated and flexible sponsorship packages that maximised the opportunities for all Sponsors whilst simultaneously enabling some or all to obtain an area of exclusivity of association to distinguish individual Sponsors from one another.

Pricing

The strategy required a Sponsor hierarchy with different levels of investment, securing clearly differentiated rights packages. The price points were established as follows:

- **Official Sponsors** £2 million plus
- **Official Partners** £1 million
- **Official Providers** £250,000
- **Friends of the Games** £20,000

Sales were driven by the key principal of category exclusivity that demanded a top down approach focusing on the top tier (£2 million plus) of Sponsor agreements first. Only when the market had been exhausted and it was clear that no deal was possible within a business category at the £2 million price point were lower levels of investment considered.
The priority targets were established against business need for VIK support – particularly the Technology department for IT and Telecommunications.

The bulk of sponsorship income was, as expected, drawn from a family of Sponsors and Partners numbering 20 companies at Official Sponsor or Official Partner level. The core income was supported by a family of other Official Providers who supplied goods and services at discounted rates and a number of non-exclusive ‘Friends of the Games’ drawn predominantly from the North West business community.

The following list gives an overall list of Official Providers with the relevant VIK product provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Provider</th>
<th>VIK Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interflora</td>
<td>Flowers (medal ceremonies and hospitality areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft</td>
<td>Coffee and tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHL</td>
<td>International carrier services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenker</td>
<td>Freight forwarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generale Location</td>
<td>Temporary structures, furniture and fittings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pindar</td>
<td>Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laminex</td>
<td>Accreditation pass laminating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Rue</td>
<td>Security paper for accreditation passes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester Waste</td>
<td>Waste management and collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avesco</td>
<td>AV services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longville</td>
<td>Temporary power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Brown</td>
<td>Temporary structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericks Dairies</td>
<td>Ice cream products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generale Location</td>
<td>Furniture and fittings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panasonic</td>
<td>Plasma screens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUMA</td>
<td>Team England kit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ticketing Strategy**

The ticketing strategy was developed in pursuit of maximising attendance through a policy of affordable tickets made easily available.

The ticketing campaign should be viewed as one of the major successes of the Games with over 90% of all available seats being occupied – a figure comparable with the Sydney Olympics and well in excess of previous Commonwealth Games.

The enormous success of the ticketing campaign attracted some very positive media coverage and a sample of the positive coverage can be found below.

’Sensibly, the authorities here sold half the tickets for £10 or less, with the result that over 750,000 members of the public were able to see the 174 ticketed sessions’.

*The Daily Telegraph, 5 August 2002.*

‘It is no surprise that Manchester has sold twice as many tickets as any previous Commonwealth Games’.

*Sunday Times, 28 July 2002.*

‘Nearly 800,000 tickets have been sold and thousands a day are still being snapped up. Around 400,000 people watched the track and field events at the stadium, making it the most successful athletics event ever staged in Britain.’

*Manchester Evening News, 3 August 2002.*

The most important element of the strategy was the decision to implement a public lottery or ballot during October/November 2001, Phase 1. The very fact that a ballot was selected had the immediate effect of creating a sense of urgency amongst the ticket buying public. The lottery generated requests for in excess of 500,000 tickets, which translated into over 300,000 sales.

Importantly, the lottery process demonstrated a huge preference for e-commerce with over 70% of applications being made via the web. This gave M2002 an instant database for regular communication (at minimal cost) to support subsequent ticket marketing. Of particular importance were those who had logged in their details but not registered, and those who were unsuccessful in their lottery selections – this created an immediate, freely accessible target audience for Phase 2 sales.
All responsibility for ticketing systems (printing, retailing, mailing, box offices etc.) was outsourced to Ticketmaster in order to de-risk the management of the process but M2002 retained strategic control of sales and marketing to maximise revenues.

**Merchandising, Licensing and Brand Protection**

Merchandising was viewed, as more than just a revenue stream – it was also seen as an essential element of the marketing and promotional mix, a vehicle through which the greatest number of people could become involved with the Games.

The guiding principle within the department was to de-risk the OC by out-sourcing all manufacture and retail to third parties in return for royalty payments supported by minimum guarantees. However, the programme was managed directly by M2002 rather than via a master licensee in order to maximise revenues and retain control of the programme. This was particularly important in persuading retailers to stock the products made by licensees.

**Corporate Hospitality**

Corporate hospitality sales were broken up into four categories:
- Sponsor Hospitality (dedicated marquees in exclusive village)
- Non Sponsor Hospitality (tables within communal facility)
- Gold Club Membership (10 day pass to executive suite within Stadium)
- Corporate Boxes within stadium (Sponsors and non-sponsors)

The hospitality programme was outsourced to de-risk the OC, with a single contractor taking responsibility for marquees and food. However, as with Ticketing and Licensing, M2002 retained close management of the sales and marketing to maximise take up and revenue.

**Collaboration for Success**

The successes of the sponsorship, ticketing, licensing and corporate hospitality programmes were all closely interdependent upon one another, with cross selling a prerequisite. Clearly Sponsors were major purchasers of tickets, licensed products and hospitality but without significant education and persuasion their spend in these areas would have been significantly reduced.

The success of the ticketing programme had a very real impact on the later stages of sponsorship sales and also on licensees who were able to plan with greater certainty the likely levels of interest in their products (and for retailers who could see the demand).

The success of sponsorship and ticketing made the demand for corporate hospitality high (for some events it was the only way to get a ticket) whilst the quality and success of the hospitality programmes fed back into additional Games time purchase of tickets and merchandise.

In planning future Games the interdependence and management of these programmes from a single commercial overview is highly recommended.
Overview

Pre-Games Organisation and Planning

A small Sport team comprising Senior Sport Managers (full-time) and Competition Managers (part-time) was recruited and in place prior to Sydney 2000. By that time detailed planning for the Sport Programme had already begun in conjunction with most other FAs and a wide range of external bodies including the CGF, 72 CGAs, 18 IFs, NGBs and Sport England.

During 2001 the Sport team was structured into four departments (Operations, Services, Pre-Games Events and Medical) and by Games time the workforce had expanded to 74 full-time staff and almost 1,500 volunteers.

Technical Committees (NGB staff and sport volunteers) were appointed for each sport two years out from the Games. Nearer the Games, 19 International Technical Delegates were invited to advise on the planning process and observe the Games.

Recruitment and management of Technical Officials (TO) required close collaboration with IFs, IFTDs, CGAs and NSFs. More than 1,000 were appointed, a third from outside England. All English TOs were appointed by 31 December 2001 and IF Panel Delegates by 28 February 2002.

In the lead up to the Games, and for the first time in their history, the OC communicated directly with each TO rather than through their respective CGAs and NSFs. This innovative approach proved to be highly successful in resolving personal problems and organisational issues whilst preparing for the Games.

The team worked closely with FAs and venue teams to ensure that the needs of athletes and technical officials were met and that effective plans were developed for all training and competition venues. Detailed planning focused on the FOP and services to athletes, particularly EADs but encompassed close collaboration with Villages, Broadcast, Media, Protocol, Transport, Catering, Accreditation and Technology.

Sport was specifically responsible for other aspects of the Games:
- Pre-Games Testing
- Victory Ceremonies
- Sport Presentation
- Medical Services to Games Family and spectators
- Anti-Doping

Establishing a testing plan, budget and team to deliver the pre-Games Events Programme was a key early priority involving full consultation with Sport England and NGB officials/volunteers with inputs from IF TDs. A wide range of operational requirements were tested at three events in 2001 and 20 events in the six months prior to the Games.

Preparations for up to 300 Victory Ceremonies at 14 competition venues also began early and another small team was established to deliver the programme in conjunction with Protocol, Look, Fitout and the Host Broadcaster.

Sport Presentation was contracted to a specialist and experienced third party approximately six months out from the Games. The contractor worked closely with Competition Managers, Venue Teams, Fitout, Victory Ceremonies, Sponsor Services, Press Managers and the Host Broadcaster to deliver what was widely regarded as a quality product.

Medical facilities for athletes and other members of the Games Family also included provision of the Village Medical Centre as well as first-aid services for spectators. These facilities encompassed primary care, sports medicine and emergency services.
The head of Medical Services was appointed in February 2001 and excellent working relationships were soon established with local health services and a team of specialist advisors. Planning activities involved procurement of medical equipment and consumable items; contracting of first-aid, paramedic, ambulance and diagnostic services; recruitment and training of medical staff; specifying all services and design of medical areas at venues and villages.

Between 15 July and 7 August 2002, Medical Service recorded 4,750 contacts with athletes and other members of the Games Family. During the Games, 2,000 spectators were treated by first-aiders.

Medical Services were also responsible for Anti-Doping and a small team was established in 2001 working in partnership with UK Sport and the Medical Commission for the Games appointed by the CGF Honorary Medical Advisor. Testing of athletes (including EADs) occurred in all sports and at all venues including the Games Village. Almost 1,000 test samples were taken during the Games, the highest number of samples processed for any event in the history of UK sport.

Table Tennis and Triathlon attracted encouraging entries and the quality of the Triathlon competition was world class. There were three sports that attracted support from less than 10 nations (Diving, Synchronised Swimming and Mountain Bike Cross Country).

Similarly whilst the Squash competition was considered of World Championship standard, the dearth of doubles courts and competitions around the world would suggest that for future Commonwealth Games, a team event may be more relevant than a sub-divisional doubles event(s).

All three team sports; Hockey, Rugby 7s and Netball were very well supported by CGAs and proved to be attractive to both spectators and the media. The CGF’s selection/qualification policies did impact negatively on the quality of participation in some cases as representation from each of the six CGF regions took precedence over world rankings. For example, India did not participate in the men’s Hockey competition (Pakistan were the Asian representative) and also Canada (World rank 13) were preferred in the Netball competition to Cook Islands (World rank 7).

**Overall Impact**

In regard to the competition and event schedule, Manchester was the first Commonwealth Games to open with Athletics and close with Swimming rather than in reverse. This was done mainly to avoid a clash of dates with the European Athletics Championships. This worked well and did not have any adverse impact upon the Games (apart from a very demanding overnight transition from the Opening Ceremony). It ensured that, for the host nation England, the Games started well and there was greater media and public attention for many of the other sports in the programme as they reached their climax towards the end of the Games.

The Games attracted a million spectators. Ticket sales to the public reached 700,000 of which the most significant were Athletics (316,000), Rugby 7s (110,000), Netball (48,000) and Hockey (46,000). Estimated crowds at the various Road Events (free of charge) exceeded all expectations helped by good weather in the first half of the Games. In Manchester, figures supplied by the BBC broadcast helicopter indicated that 120,000 spectators watched the Triathlon event and 80,000 people lined the Marathon course. At Rivington corresponding figures for the Cycle Road Race, Time Trial and Mountain Bike event were 65,000, 38,000 and 50,000 respectively.
B10 Venues Division

Overview
The Venues division was separated from the Sport and Venues division in October 2000.
The venue team initially focussed on issues relating to construction and development of venues, ensuring that all of the necessary Games’ requirements were incorporated into new-build facilities.

The Team
The Venues division was made up of a combination of existing personnel, new hires and staff redeployed from within the organisation. A specific communications support team were employed to educate staff on the importance of venue communications and a Games wide venue focused coordinator was appointed to monitor delivery timelines at Games time.

Venue Planning
After the establishment of the Venues division, the Venue team initially focussed on issues relating to construction and development of venues, ensuring that all of the necessary Games’ requirements were incorporated into new-build facilities.

Later in 2000 the focus of the team moved to operational planning. Part of this process was to develop CAD drawings for each venue, which focused on basic space planning and room allocation and served as the basis for detailed venue plans.

During the latter part of 2000 and the early months of 2001, the Strategy and Integration team helped the Venue teams to develop a standard method for planning and operating venues and the development of clusters of venues to streamline planning and management. It was planned that this would lead to a structure where cluster managers were responsible for four venues, with operations managers deployed to each venue to deliver operations. In addition a core team of six key venue staff would be present at each venue and would manage FA planning and delivery.

At Games time the venue structure shifted to a central Venue General Manager (VGM) for each venue and a Venue Operating Manager (VOM) appointed to assist in maintaining operational issues in the venue. The Cluster Manager structure was abandoned as the ongoing responsibility within the last two months before Games time became too great to support the original premise.
In early 2001, the Policy Approval Group (PAG) was established by the Strategy and Integration team and was chaired by the Director of Venues. The purpose of this group was to develop policies across all FAs to allow for a coordinated approach to the development of venue operating plans. With this coordinated approach in mind, a concept was established on the premise that information required to build the venue operating plans needed to be gathered in a specific sequence to consolidate the next phase:

This process involved using lead venues to determine consistent operating standards and develop a three step process to delivery:

**Venue Planning and Delivery**

1. **Room Layouts with FF & E, Technology & Services** → **Operational Drawings & Room Data Sheets** → **Venue Fitout**
2. **Venue Overlay & Fitout**
   - **Identification of Staffing Numbers** → **Recruitment of Staff** → **Training & Team Building**
3. **Staffing**
   - **Lead Venue Operational Plan** → **2nd Venue Operational Plan** → **Individual Venue Operating Plans** → **Event Run Sheets / Conduct Pre-Games Events / Contingency Planning**
4. **Operational Planning**
   - **January - June 2001** → **June - December 2001** → **January - June 2002**

**Preliminary Stage**
This involved the determination of space for all venues and the planning on the lead venues.

At the end of the first quarter of 2001 all the existing Cluster Managers and the Strategy and Integration team agreed the structure of the venue operating plans. These were structured around four major components:
- Venue facts and key FA deliverables.
- Event reporting.
- Venue operating policies.
- FA specific plans.
Major Planning Stage
This stage involved the major planning component for the venue and was initiated between June and December 2001. Within the five clusters that nominally existed, each venue was planned in a four week cycle:

Week 1: Constituent Walkthroughs
This involved the lead for each constituent group ‘walking through’ the venue. This was a ‘day in the life’ exercise which outlined where the groups would move to in the venue, and the services they would expect. These constituent groups included:

- Athletes, Team and Technical Officials (Sport)
- Broadcast and Written Press (Media Services)
- VIPs (Protocol Services)
- Sponsors (Sponsor Services)
- Spectators (Event Services)
- Staff (Volunteer Services)
Week 2: Operational one-on-one Reviews
These involved the Cluster Manager, Logistics Manager, Technology Manager, Workforce Planning Manager and Accreditation Manager. These were conducted to undertake operational reviews and validated the following key aspects:
- Staffing numbers for each FA
- Technology per FA
- Furniture, Fittings and Equipment requirements
- Accreditation access requirements per position

Weeks 3 & 4: Issue Resolution and Production of the Venue Operating Plans
Any issues captured during the previously conducted meetings were resolved as far as was possible and the first draft of the venue operating plan was produced.

Games Preparation Period
This was the final preparation period which involved finalising any planning and then undertaking the Venue Readiness Programme.

Venue team activities were those that each team undertook specific to their venue. A review of venue operations was conducted for the everyday running of the venue, contingency planning, and desk-top and venue-based operational exercises.

In addition, key FAs, such as Technology and Security appointed individual VXMs and VSMs to manage the appropriate services in targeted venues. On occasion, some Transport managers, Security and Technology managers were multi-skilled with responsibility across several venues, similar to the original ‘cluster’ model but in most cases this was adopted only when considered feasible in relation to the location and workload at each venue.

When an Event Services department was also established, with responsibility for the planning of all spectator activities, marshalling and client servicing. (This department was subsequently re-positioned to the Operations division to expedite issues encountered with security.)

The planning of fitout was integral to the development of the venues, particularly in relation to scope of requirements and budgets. A central Fitout delivery team was formed in December 2001 and to ensure that the significance of fitout was fully recognised by the rest of M2002, this team was treated as a separate division.

Imbedded in the Venue division structure was the operation and directional management of the non-sport venues.

At Games time the operation of venues Games wide was outstanding and the professionalism displayed by staff was exceeded the expectations set by the OC in early planning stages. The final delivery at the venues was first class and deserve the greatest praise and credit for making the Games a success. The leadership displayed by the VGMs was outstanding and the attention to detail and daily management provided by the Operations Managers and Coordinators ensured the success of the Games.

The OC had travelled a long way since the introduction of a Venues division and an enormous amount of high-quality work was achieved, much of which serves as a great legacy for sport and events in this country. Credit goes to all those who showed the drive and leadership to make the event truly world class and in the final summary world famous.
Non-Sport Venue Planning

In contrast to the sport venues, the non-sport venues required a significantly different approach to the accepted planning process for other venues.

The planning strategy for the non-sport venues was based on the following key elements being fulfilled:

- Location of an appropriate venue/space locations for each listed venue.
- Finalisation of venue hire agreements on agreed terms.
- Liaison with key FAs in determining their needs.
- Liaison with key external parties.
- Establishment of fitout and operating budgets for each venue.
- Complete Work Packages for each venue.
- Lead planning phases, both space and staffing.
- Space planning finalisation for each venue.
- Management of accurate CAD plans for each venue.
- Completion of Venue Operating Plans and Venue Contingency Plans for each venue.
- Venue Operation Managers appointed at all required venues during Games time.

The Non-Sport team worked with a number of venues in a facilitation capacity to enable the occupants to move into the venue in a smooth and uninterrupted fashion. Examples of this include the Call Centre, a venue solely developed to house Technology and the support function for staff.

Once a venue's location and fitout needs were identified, it then became the responsibility of the space owner to make use of the venue and guide the Non-Sport team to design it to their own specifications.

The exception to this was the management of the hospitality venues and the Sponsor related venues located in Sportcity Plaza. Non-Sport venue management took the lead in managing venue fitout and management of the Hospitality Village, the major catering pavilion known as 'Club Sport', the 2002 Gold Club lounge for VIPs plus all major hospitality provided in Corporate boxes.

The catering contracts for these areas were jointly managed by the overall director for Catering and the VGM for hospitality venues. To report the activity in this area the Non-Sport venues department delivered feedback to Commercial Director, Venues Director and Catering Manager. As the activity in this area was specific to the Sponsor client group the majority of venue progress was reported to the Commercial division and the Catering Manager.

Key Lessons and Recommendations

- Establish the Venues division early and of sufficient strength. Assign a designated person responsible for each venue from as far out as possible so there is a consistent approach and level of historical knowledge.
- Provide sufficient central resources for those responsible for venue planning to manage the programme and resolve issues.
- Consider any ‘turn key’ solution contract options closely before sourcing. Better results can be achieved both financially and operationally by splitting up the contracts.
- Ensure the revenue generating venues are managed by a balance of highly experienced staff and operational staff.
- Have in place a fitout programme that partners the Venue Planning teams from the outset.
- Establish a ‘virtual’ venue team which has responsibility for determining policy and approach. This allows a realistic approach to the planning and problems of planning.
- Utilise an issue resolution database to resolve any venue issues, consider using an off the shelf system to suit the needs of the organisation.
Overview
The remit of Villages was to plan and operate three separate villages including the Commonwealth Games Village for the majority of Athletes and Team Officials located at the University of Manchester Fallowfield Campus, the Technical Officials’ Village, located in the student village off Oxford Road and the Commonwealth Shooting Village, located at the University of Surrey. The total client population of all three villages was 6,600 from 72 nations.

Commonwealth Games Village (CGV)
At the end of 2000 a staffing structure was approved and the basis of the masterplan for the CGV was in place. Planning for the Commonwealth Shooting Village (CSV) and the Technical Officials’ Village (TOV) also commenced in 2000.

By the end of 2000 it was apparent that the site for the CGV required some major capital and access works to accommodate M 2002 needs.

A working group comprising the various statutory authorities was set up to review the plans as they progressed including fire regulations, multiple occupancy, access, Police and environmental health. This early input proved invaluable to the preparation and operation of the site.

Difficulties were encountered with implementation of capital works, due to the time restriction where works could only take place during term time with the remainder during holiday periods.

By mid 2001 many of the key positions in the CGV structure were secured and planning for Games time operations moved forward with a number of service level reviews taking place to match desired standards with the budget available.

Several changes took place within the structure of the Village during the planning period with responsibility for fitout, capital works and look moving to the newly formed Fitout team. Client responsibility remained with the Villages team. This proved a successful collaboration and delivered an excellent end product.

Following long deliberations it was agreed in early 2002 that the logistics and support operations requirements of the CGV required separate funding and should be operated as a separate entity within the Village team, with procurement remaining a central function.

In early 2002, members of the M 2002 Board and Funders conducted a review of the service standards at the Village and it was agreed that an additional £1.1m budget allocation was required.

Planning for space allocation was complicated by lack of information on numbers participating and necessitated the reservation of several overflow locations in the event that the numbers exceeded those expected.

A bar code scanning system was developed to monitor the 18 nights of free bed allocation and was also used to monitor catering usage. This proved to be extremely useful in helping to refine catering quantities and reduce waste.

An advisory group made up of athletes and experienced Games personnel, met on a regular basis during the last six months before the Games in order to focus effort and resources on customer service levels. It is recommended for future Games that a similar group of this nature is formed a year prior to the Games as it is an invaluable element of planning.
A major consultation programme was undertaken in the area surrounding the CGV, which involved community groups, residents and businesses. Regular information was provided to the community on proposals for the Village. Presentations and community visits were organised by the Villages team and house-to-house calls were made on request. An open day was held in June 2001 and a dedicated consultation help line was provided. This programme, though time consuming, proved highly successful with no objections being received to planning applications and closing of public rights of way and public roads, during the Village operating period.

The CGV and overflow accommodated 5,176 athletes and team officials and had a Village Operations workforce of 880.

During Games operations the main issues which presented a challenge for the Villages team were housekeeping and security. The housekeeping contractor performed to a below average level on the deep clean operation, but problems arose with the housekeeping and staffing levels had to be increased significantly to reach the required service levels. A specialist housekeeping contractor would be recommended in future.

A strong Police presence was required at the Village to provide additional support to the security company. GMP were located with the Village Operations Centre and built up strong links with the Villages team and proved a valuable resource.

Games time - Chef’s Meetings

At Games time there were a range of associated services provided by the Village to assist the Chef de Missions in managing their delegations. These services included the daily Chef de Mission meeting and the associated services provided at the CGA Services Centre. The CGA Services Centre dealt with the following: transport requests/bookings/enquiries, arrivals and departures enquiries, ceremonies information, finance proxy nominations/payments, rate card orders and the catering ancillary items desk for each delegation on behalf of the Chef.

The Chef de Mission meetings also held throughout the Games were a popular forum for CGAs to raise and escalate Games related issues. Chef de Mission Meetings commenced on 16 July and continued on a daily basis thereafter until the closing of the Village on 7 August. Two pre-meetings were held prior to 15 July and any CGAs who were on site during the soft opening period were welcome to attend.

The Chef de Mission meetings were a successful forum to discuss pertinent team delegation issues and ask questions of the OC regarding the services provided. The agenda comprised of a mixture of Village specific issues and other Games-wide issues.
Commonwealth Shooting Village

The Commonwealth Shooting Village (CSV) was located at the University of Surrey although it was originally intended that the competitors would be accommodated at the Bisley Shooting venue.

The CSV accommodated 541 athletes and team officials and 75 technical officials with a staff of 33 including volunteers.

In early 2001, it became evident that to bring the accommodation up to an acceptable standard, a substantial amount of investment and infrastructure work would be required and additional temporary structures would be needed to reach the number of bed spaces required. The University of Surrey (UoS) was identified as a suitable alternative location approximately 20 minutes drive from the venue. A portion of the site was hired to accommodate athletes and team officials and a separate adjacent block was hired for Technical Officials. The hire agreement was on a commercial basis, with UoS retaining responsibility for housekeeping and linen, and providing catering in one of their restaurants to M2002 specification and standards. This was not a secure site but M2002 did supplement the University security staff to maintain a patrol around the Village area.

Up to and during operations the main challenges were recruiting volunteers and staff as there was a smaller catchment area to recruit from. This also affected M2002’s ability to provide training within the timescale.

During the operating period communications and control between the CGV Operations Centre and the CSV were tight with a Duty Manager from the VOC staying at Surrey and assisting the CSV Manager.

Technical Officials’ Village

The Technical Officials’ Village (TOV) was located in the Student Village building in Manchester owned by Jarvis Group. This was a self contained building with a large underground car park facility. The TOV accommodated 1,000 Technical Officials and had approximately 48 staff including volunteers.

Site hire was based on a bed night quota, with a minimum number guaranteed. Jarvis retained responsibility for housekeeping, linen and sub-contracted catering to Sodexho. This accommodation was normally used for students and during initial negotiations in early 2001 Jarvis indicated that they intended to refurbish the majority of the block, however, only a small amount of repainting and carpet replacement in hallways was carried out. The building was not refurbished to the anticipated standard and was deemed unacceptable as M2002 originally established in the contract. Consequently, during the hand-over period in early July 2002, M2002 had to invest in a number of improvements to the building and a deep clean to all bedrooms was conducted.

During Games time the TOV operated efficiently and successfully and feedback from Technical Officials was very positive.

Conclusion

All three Villages operated successfully and provided a high quality ‘home away from home’ for the athletes and officials. The Villages team worked diligently to ensure that each client group was well cared for.

The greatest challenge during operations was ensuring that volunteer attrition rates were kept to a minimum, to avoid re-training and ensure continuity of service levels. Due to the operational period of the Village this was a major challenge.

No major incidents or accidents occurred in any of the Villages. Communications were strong between the Villages with daily reports being received in the CGV Operations Centre from the satellite Villages and a combined report was tabled for the GCC every evening.

There were several Royal and VVIP visits to the CGV and overall the publicity and feedback from all stakeholders and client groups was exceptionally positive, which was a credit to all those who worked within the Villages team.
B12 Operations

Overview
The Operations division comprised the following FAs:
- Villages (VIL)
- Security (SEC)
- Event Services (EVS)
- Transport (TPT)
- Accreditation (ACR)
- Catering, Cleaning & Waste (CCW)
- Accommodation (ACC)

One of the major challenges for the organisation was to clearly define and gain overall acceptance of service standards for each area. Specialists in a particular area, both consultants and staff had a tendency to gold plate service standards or set them in line with the recent Sydney Olympics.

A major part of the problem was that there was not a consistent benchmark for the Manchester Commonwealth Games. In general, service standards were set higher than all previous Commonwealth Games, but below the Sydney Olympics. It therefore took a long time to turn this into precise deliverables, for example, for transport; an acceptable waiting time for a bus or for catering; the number of different menu options and even the quality of meals.

Management of FAs
Programme management operated throughout the planning stages with each FA being responsible for developing its own plans and monitoring progress. Support and guidance was provided by the central strategic planning team who ensured that FAs maintained their timelines and delivered in line with overall objectives.

In August 2001, a dedicated Programme Manager was assigned to the division which improved the level of management control both within the division and centrally. Success was still, however, dependent on FAs embracing the process and so results were mixed.

During October 2001, the organisation went through an Operational Efficiency Review which was intended to define/redefine service levels and better match operational aspirations with available budget.

Volunteers
The Operations division overall had the largest number of volunteers required to assist in the operation of functions and therefore had the biggest recruitment and training challenge. Each FA was responsible for its own recruitment, communication, job specific training, rostering and deployment.

For the future it may be beneficial to introduce a specific Volunteer Operations team responsible for the recruitment and training of all volunteers in the division in order to alleviate the huge job of recruitment and training required.

Budget Control, Procurement and Project Management
The division held a large budget with each FA Manager accountable for their own budget lines and with hindsight, it would have been beneficial for the Operations division to have had a dedicated position earlier to assist the FAs with budgets, procurement and contract management activities.

The sourcing of contractors and suppliers was a joint effort between the Procurement department and the appropriate FA, with the FA responsible for defining and drafting large sections of the tender documents. FA Managers should have the necessary expertise to prepare detailed scopes of work, specifications, and service levels in order to work in an Operations environment.
FA Specific Overview

Security

The events of 11 September 2001 necessitated a reassessment of the security strategy for the Games. The impact, although largely confined to Sportcity, was significant and introduced new planning and coordination challenges for virtually all FAs.

From the security contractor’s perspective, 11 September added an additional dimension to the scope and they found it very challenging to deliver the increased numbers of staff required by M 2002. Paid security staff were supplemented by large numbers of volunteers and additional security companies were deployed for discrete areas of the Games operations.

The security contractor had a significant challenge to recruit, train and retain a large number of staff who were required to work long shifts for up to 25 days. Given that the majority of staff were recruited months in advance of the event, the recruitment, training and retention programme had to allow for a high rate of attrition. Ensuring that sufficient security personnel were available at the right time at each venue was a significant operational challenge during the Games and a large number of reserve staff would have been beneficial.

M 2002 used the same contractor for both static guarding and security. However, the skills and experience required for these two functions are quite different and whilst there are synergies to be gained from using one company, this should not override the need to have very experienced operators in both areas. The decision to use large numbers of volunteers in security and stewarding positions was not in the original principals established by M 2002 in conjunction with the Police and the sports ground licensing authorities. However, the decision resulted in a positive outcome and the volunteers were found to be more customer focused.

Event Services

The Event Services FA originally formed part of the Venues division but was transferred into Operations to help support the Security FA following on from the decision to use volunteer stewards.

The EVS team were extremely strong in planning, training and delivery and were the major contributor to the high level of customer care. To take on the challenge of Volunteer Event Stewards with only three months to go and produce such high service standards on the day was a major achievement.

Transport

Event experienced transport staff are needed in this area, with a good understanding of Games Family requirements and service standards. This is important for all services but critical for the Games Family Bus Services where demand is difficult to define, complex to satisfy and subject to change up to the last hour.

A Games experienced ‘customer services manager’ is an essential member of the Transport team and should be employed a minimum of 12 months out. Their role should be to develop the brief for each customer group (sports, broadcast, press, technical officials) and to work closely with the bus operator in defining service requirements.

A major factor in the success story was employing a national bus operator with a large local operation to supply and operate the Games Family bus fleet. The combination of local management, strong local knowledge and a large national driver pool was invaluable.

A significant limiting factor for any bus operation is driver availability (numbers, driver hours and route knowledge). With an 18 hour x 25 day operation this requires a huge resource commitment and a major planning, training and logistics exercise.

Estimating the required number of vehicles is dependent on service standards, passenger numbers and route lengths – all factors which are unlikely to be finalised until shortly before the Games commence. To deliver M 2002’s requirements, the bus operators’ initial assessment was for 75 low floor buses with an additional 40 coaches for Opening and Closing Ceremonies. The number of vehicles increased as the number of athletes and officials increased. Service levels were increased and the criticality of transport to the Games was recognised. 100 low floor buses were actually used and were supplemented by 40 coaches and 25 x 17 seater mini buses for normal operations and a further 50 coaches for Opening and Closing Ceremonies.
The coaches were used for the sundry shuttles, for periods of peak activity (broadcast work buses, Sportcity evening VIP bump-out, team transport, private hires etc) and as contingency. The 25 mini buses provided a combination of flexibility and rapid response which proved to be invaluable.

As part of the requirement to service the VIP population and the CGA teams, M 2002 was provided with 935 Rover vehicles which formed the overall T1 and T2 fleets. In addition to these vehicles 61 Galaxy people movers were procured for the use of teams and Chefs de Missions of each CGA. The VIP and CGA team car fleets worked extremely well and delivered a high standard of service.

The volunteer drivers generally had good experience and very few incidents were reported. The cars themselves were reliable and suffered little damage.

A challenge to any Games transport system is navigation, given that the majority of bus drivers will be recruited from outside the area. M 2002 invested heavily in driver training, maps and the use of volunteer bus guides who teamed up with drivers on the more complex routes. Additional ‘way-finding’ signage could have improved the operation at major intersections and entrances and especially indicating where a number of services interacted. The late appointment of the coach company meant that their drivers received limited training prior to deployment and this placed considerable pressure on the dispatchers.

Key Lessons and Recommendations of Transport Operations

The main lesson learnt from the planning stages was the need to put as much, if not more, emphasis on the human side of the fleet operation as the hardware. Fleet Operations employed in excess of 1,450 volunteers – this is a big challenge and requires a dedicated and appropriately experienced staffing structure to manage the recruitment, training and rostering demands. Similarly, understanding and managing the expectations of the Protocol department (VIP Fleet Client) and CGA Relations department (CGA Team Vehicle Client) throughout the planning stage pays dividends at Games time.

Emphasis should also be placed on planning the larger and more heavily trafficked venues particularly those located in city centre locations, alternative routes and dedicated lanes. The venue teams must look at the global transport picture including pick up and drop off zones for spectators (able bodied and disabled), public transport, taxis, goods delivery vehicles, maintenance vehicles, staff vehicles and parking to ensure that the transport service to the venue is effective. Emergency services ‘blue’ routes need to be maintained or alternatives agreed with the various agencies. The venue transport plan must also be responsive to any increase in security levels.

As transport plays a major role in the Arrivals and Departures (A&D) process, close working relationships need to be established with operators of the main A&D transport gateways. Airport operators, in particular, must come to the table early in the planning stage and ideally airport staff should be seconded into the Transport team. The A&D goal is to establish a seamless ‘end to end’ process with cooperation from all departments.

The Joint Transport Steering Group formed 12 months out, played a fundamental role in the success of the Games transport strategy. Made up of senior representatives from the MCC, GMPT, GMP and M 2002, the Steering Group set out to achieve a fully integrated and highly successful transport plan covering Games Family and public transport, traffic management, park and ride operations, venue parking, signage and communications.

It would have been effective to introduce a specific Volunteer Operations team responsible for the recruitment and training of all volunteers in the division to assist in the work of recruitment and subsequent training.

Accreditation

Accreditation is a broad, and detailed operation with a strong interrelationship to Technology. The support of Technology allows for the supporting software and hardware requirements to be given the necessary attention to assist the process of developing accurate, interrogated and reliable entries.
Accreditation relied heavily on the development of an effective and multi-functional database. The operational process was highly dependent on the efficiency of the computer applications provided to support it. In the case of the Games, the selected process was a two stage process based on the issuance of non-valid passes (NVP), which required substantial development of the software application; Gold Medal Systems, to support it. In addition, the Games in Manchester were the first major event to provide online accreditation over the internet; which necessitated a complex in-house support team to monitor and upload the entries.

The prototyping, integration and testing of the lamination and badging technology was also a major focus, in particular the testing of lamination processes due to the difficulties Sydney 2000 faced in this area.

Overall there were over 40,000 people accredited into 39 categories broadly encompassing Games Family, Workforce, VIP’s and Sponsors, Media, Broadcasters and Contractors. The Media Accreditation Centre, Midland Hotel and the National Shooting Centre were the four locations identified to issue and distribute accreditation and uniforms.

Accreditation registration forms where also issued, received and returned in hard copy by mail, and then the pre-determined accreditation category and personal information for both on-line and hard copy entries were inputted into the GEMS database for recording and validation purposes.

Athletes and Team Officials were accredited at the MAUC with 5,717 accredited over a period of 12 days. The Media and Broadcasters were accredited at the Media Accreditation Centre located at Heron House, with up to 3,996 Media and Broadcasters accredited over a period of 19 days.
The Accreditation FA operated a standardised coding system, using categories and sub-categories to define individual access privileges to specific areas. These categories were referred to as the Accreditation Privilege Matrix and this was agreed and formulated in the early stages of planning prior to the Games.

Each category was accredited by three variables (codes, colours and numbers) in order to distinguish the status of the accredittee. These three variables were then divided into overall status types which defined the organisation or client group each accredittee belonged to. To overlay this process a three letter venue code was applied to the accreditation defining the areas where access was approved. The diagram above gives an indication of the code and categories of the matrix.

Accreditation registration forms were issued, received and returned in hard copy by mail, and then the pre-determined accreditation category and personal information was entered onto the GEMS database for administration and record purposes.

At Games time there was an Accreditation presence at 14 sport venues and three non-sport. Dependent on the status each centre issued day passes, replacement accreditation passes, upgrades and zone entitlement alterations.

The largest and most challenging customer group for Accreditation was the paid workforce and, in particular, catering, cleaning and security contractors who employ the biggest numbers and tend to recruit ‘late’ in the programme. It is important that Workforce have a dedicated manager in place to expedite and monitor contractor recruitment to ensure the accreditation process is not delayed.

Catering, Cleaning & Waste (CCW)

The overall deliverable of this department was to ensure that all Games Family meals were delivered in accordance with contracted or stipulated requirements, as well as ensure that public catering was available at all venues within controlled pricing and delivery standards. The Cleaning and Waste group was responsible for putting in place the cleaning standards and service levels at all venues, and implementing a waste streaming operation that would deliver clean venues while making a positive contribution to the environment through recycling and minimisation of waste products.

The main components of the CCW programme are as follows:

- Obligatory Catering
- Athlete Feeding
- Public Catering/Concessions
- In Kind Food Management
- Hospitality
- Cleaning
- Waste Management

Obligatory Catering

The obligatory contracts primarily covered volunteers, staff/contractors, performers for ceremonies and in terms of range of food, example menus, food prices, volumes of meals, volume of consumption etc technical officials.

From the outset the focus for the CCW group was to deliver the best products at the keenest price. The nature of this requirement meant that the deals that were negotiated for the delivery of food services were based on a very thorough breakdown of component cost. Food costs, labour, overheads, and profit margins were negotiated in great detail. The result was a standard formula with different variables for every catering contract.
The formula was based on the following:

- A fixed and variable fee for each component of the food service, i.e. each item of food had a cost associated with the delivery as well as the service/delivery.
- Fixed fees for equipment and project management.

For all venues except Sportcity and the MAC, the existing incumbent caterer was utilised to prepare and/or deliver the obligatory catering. Given the nature of the obligatory food service, the majority of the food was standard across all venues, with the primary function of the incumbent caterer being to manage the VIK food products.

The use of the incumbent caterer was the correct decision. The concept of trying to put in a master food contract would have been unworkable, and would not have delivered a better service than that supplied through the incumbent caterer.

**Athlete Catering**

Sodexho were appointed to deliver the athletes’ catering requirements in the Village and at competition venues. The contract was based on establishing unit prices and quantities for all food and labour components, and working directly with Sodexho to plan all infrastructure components. M 2002 took a highly active role with the project management, cost control, and quality control of the catering.

The key to success with the CGV was a turn-key solution for the supply, project management and infrastructure of food services. Had M 2002 taken on infrastructure, or had a third party been employed to project manage the venture, the operation would have been difficult to deliver given the inevitable changes to scope, schedule and specifications.

In order to satisfy the Games Family client group a significant level of effort was placed on creating meals that satisfied the cultural and dietary requirements of athletes and team officials from 72 nations. A selection of 10 main dishes was offered at every meal identifying the correct balance of ingredients required for competing athletes.

In total a staggering 300,000 meals were prepared at the Village with an enormous shopping list consisting of the following:

- 7,000 kgs of rice
- 8,000 kgs of pasta
- 5,500 kgs of seafood
- 8,600 kgs of beef
- 6,800 kgs of poultry
- 90,000 eggs
- 75,000 loaves of bread
- 20,000 litres of milk
- 300,000 pieces of fruit
- 25,000 kgs of cheese

The contractor successfully achieved the challenge of producing up to 2,000 meals per hour and providing a service round the clock for just over 19 days.

The Athletes’ Village contract provided incentives for the contractor to meet or exceed budget, providing a 75/25 share of savings between M 2002/Sodexho. This proved to be successful and gave Sodexho a good incentive to control costs.

**Public Concessions**

At almost all venues the existing incumbent caterer was engaged to supply public concessions. In all but the case of Bolton Arena and Sportcity, the concession contracts did not provide for any royalties to be returned to M 2002. In most cases venues were hired at a minimal fee, therefore, it was important for the venues to generate revenue from catering sales to help compensate for the low fee.

M 2002’s primary role in managing the public concession food sales was to ensure a consistent standard of delivery and product range across venues in accordance with spectator patterns and expectations. The management of Sponsor exclusivity is key to this consistency and protection of Sponsors’ brands, and marketing rights.

The largest and most complex catering operation was at Sportcity. As the venue was a new facility with no incumbent operator, and no past experience to predict crowd behaviours for this
type of event, this posed a major challenge for the CCW team. Additionally as is the nature of an event such as the Commonwealth Games, the service requirements were subject to change throughout the planning of the event. For instance the size, shape and components of the Stadium Plaza changed a number of times during the planning phases. Ultimately, Sodexho’s expectations of consumer spending were directly opposite of what they had expected. Sales at concessions on the Stadium Plaza were greater than internal stadium concessions, but the profit margin for Sodexho on the outside (contracted) concessions was less than the Stadium concessions that they managed.

The overall price strategy was designed to attract the spectator to the vending and public concessionaire areas by offering a wide variety of foods, selling Games associated products and avoiding the temptation to overly inflate prices to achieve commercially driven profit targets. Pricing strategies were as follows:

- A typical meal would cost a consumer approximately £5.75 (sandwich, coffee and packet of crisps)
- A soft drink £1.50
- Alcoholic drink £2.90
- A tea or coffee averaged out at £1.20

The Sodexho Sportcity contract combined obligatory and public catering. The contract required a fixed fee to be paid to provide the project management, and some of the fixed overheads.

**VIK Product Management**

The nature of the catering contracts, and the nature of the ASDA sponsorship (providing the majority of the components for obligatory catering) meant that M 2002 was required to provide a great deal of hands on management of VIK product.

The requirement of providing catering management is essential to successful operations. To maximise the effectiveness of all VIK elements a sponsor support budget that provides funding for the necessary personnel, warehouse space, and trucks/contracts requires significant support necessitating a close working relationship between the Catering and Sponsorship teams to ensure that the optimum contracts are agreed for better service delivery and revenue perspective.

The need to have operational people with food management experience involved in the marketing deals was clearly demonstrated in Manchester.

**Hospitality**

The hospitality programme was primarily carried out at Sportcity under contract with Sodexho Prestige. Consisting of the Sponsor Hospitality Village, Club Sport, Boxes and the Gold Club, the programme successfully combined tickets and catering/entertainment. The nature of the contract was primarily a revenue/cost sharing formula between M 2002 and Sodexho Prestige.

Some quality of service issues were experienced in respect of catering in the boxes at Sportcity, demonstrating the need to ensure that the caterer has a clear understanding of the quality of service required and the infrastructure required to deliver it.

Each package offered varying levels of services and entitlements but allowed local businesses and Sponsors the opportunity to supply their own clients with a unique Games experience in association with the spirit of the Games. Some examples of packages are listed below:

**Club Sport**

The Club Sport hospitality facility at Sportcity was available for companies and Sponsors wishing to entertain guests at the Games. Hospitality packages ranged from £230 to £495 per person, with a combination of ‘A grade’ event tickets and dining options. All packages included reception drinks, a meal and access to a dedicated corporate shuttle service between the city centre and Sportcity, together with an exclusive gift and event programme. In addition, Club Sport had a daily entertainment programme and TV screens where guests could watch the action from other venues.
In total, 93 Club Sport packages were available, including special Gala events for the Opening and Closing Ceremonies.

An example of a complete package is below:

- Access to the exclusive Club Sport Official Corporate Hospitality Facility
- Arrival reception of champagne
- Four course luncheon served with selected wines
- Complimentary bar, including wines from around the world
- Continuous coffee and pastries
- Reserved ‘A’ grade tickets to chosen events
- Dedicated corporate shuttle service between city centre and Sportcity venues
- Daily entertainment throughout the Club
- Exclusive gift for each guest
- Host service
- Guest wallet containing the day’s itinerary and information per booking
- Colour televisions
- Programme of events
- Floral decoration

Corporate Boxes
Corporate Boxes at the stadium were available in the first instance to Sponsors and then to other corporates. Initially, these were purchased for the duration of the Games and the price included tickets for the seats immediately in front of the box. Due to the minimal infrastructure inside the Stadium, only a basic level of catering was available which the box-holders ordered directly with the contract caterer. More substantial catering was available in Club Sport or in the Sponsor Hospitality Village for those Sponsors with marquees.

Stadium Gold Club
The Stadium Gold Club was a large 200-seater glass facing corporate box overlooking the FOP in the Stadium. Corporate packages to this facility offered unlimited access to all sessions held at the Stadium and limited food and beverage. Access was via a transferable credit card type pass and guests also had access to the corporate shuttle system and supplemented meal prices at Club Sport.

Sponsor Hospitality Village
All Games Sponsors and Partners had the opportunity to take a marquee in the exclusive Sponsor Hospitality Village at Sportcity. The price of the basic option was £85,000 and included the marquee, standard furniture and fittings and a limited amount of catering. Sponsors were able to choose their own catering style and interior design of their marquee and upgrades were available at an additional cost. Event tickets were not included in the package, however could be purchased separately at a group rate.

In summary, the Catering area proved to be one of the success stories of the Games with minimal negative press coverage and glowing reports from Games Family representatives and the public. The key headlines of Games can be summed up by the impressive volume of meals served to key clients. These included over 487,000 meals to Games Family, 270,000 to VIPs and Sponsors, 320,000 to workforce and contractors, 600,000 meals to the media and broadcasters, and finally Games wide concessionaires provided a total of one million meals to spectators.

Cleaning
The cleaning contracts for all venues except the International Zone at the Athletes’ Village, the Aquatics Centre, the International Broadcast Centre and Sportcity were negotiated with the incumbent cleaners on a unit rate basis, resulting in a fixed fee for a base level of service and unit rates additional services. This decision was the most effective contracting strategy and was very successful. As is described in the detailed section it is important to recognise the issue of construction waste generated during fitout and decommissioning. This needs to be included in the scope of services, including general site cleanup after fitout and decommissioning.
Waste Management
The waste management team set objectives for reduction and streaming of waste. The key to this programme was education of staff, volunteers, venue operators, concessionaires, contractors, and public. The programme's success was enhanced through the link to a city/national recycling/waste management programme and the cooperation of Greater Manchester Waste.

Overall the success of the team was in large part due to the fact that it was not seen as an intrinsic part of the CCW objectives. Other OCs have suffered from waste management programmes being managed and delivered by independent committees attempting to deliver the 'environmentally friendly Games' objective. In M 2002's case, reducing waste was simply an outcome of the programme rather than a single focus.

Overall the CCW programme was a success for M 2002. All budget reduction targets were exceeded, all milestones met on time, and all deliverables and scope requirements met. The impact of the largest and most visible venue (Sportcity) being a greenfield site was not appreciated by the organisation until the last few months prior to the Games.

The nature of the contracts that were implemented required a higher degree of management than initially had been scoped. The very effective management of VIK products would not have been possible without the contract management strategy implemented by CCW.

Ultimately the success of the CCW programme was due to the very hard work spent educating vendors, contractors, suppliers and concessionaires to understand what the components of the programme were, how control measures were being implemented, how changes were to be managed and communicated.

Accommodation
Sportsworld, the Official Accommodation Supplier, in conjunction with the Accommodation team, provided a professionally run booking service to Games Family and spectators attending the Games. Sportsworld were appointed in May 2000 and succeeded in generating revenue of £117,000 in royalties on hotel bookings.

The number of room nights booked through Sportsworld greatly exceeded expectations, over 51,000 room nights were booked through Sportsworld by members of the Games Family and the general public. Considering the conservative estimate by M 2002 was 27,000 room nights. To complement this, the M 2002 Accommodation team booked a further 14,000 room nights in university student style accommodation for staff and contractors.

Sportsworld liaised with over 60 well-known hotels in the Manchester area to provide accommodation. This process was facilitated through the work of M 2002, working closely with the Manchester Hoteliers Association (MHA) to disseminate information. As a quality control measure, the MHA worked closely with the hotels to ensure expectations on price and customer needs were managed effectively. This was successfully managed plus no negative PR was experienced both in advance of the Games and during the Games period.

The Accommodation team ensured that accommodation requirements of clients were met to a high standard by the accommodation suppliers. In particular, the written media, Host Broadcaster and Rights-holding Broadcasters were a high priority, as their requirements equated to over 40% of the rooms booked via Sportsworld.

The number of hotel room bookings made by the general public equated to 10% of the rooms booked via Sportsworld.

Overall all elements of the Operations department displayed a major shift in the delivery of service seen at other Commonwealth Games. The standard of service combined with the significant number of adjustments made by the team as a result of major worldwide events is a testament to the professionalism and impeccable abilities of the staff and supporting volunteers involved with the event.
Overview

The scope of the technology provision for the Commonwealth Games was vast and complex, explained here is the broad strategy adopted, the organisational approach established and the major suppliers that assisted in the delivery of the function right throughout the Games.

An event like the Commonwealth Games brings its own unique challenges. In handling these challenges it is imperative that these are recognised early on in the planning process, and that allowance is made for an extended development phase – well over 18 months – following planning and preceding Games time operation. These have the following implications:

- Technology's needs for planning, scoping and requirements guidance, substantially pre-dates the client areas’ ability to supply them. This brings with it a risk that late on in the programme pressure will be applied to accommodate changes.
- The difference in the ‘shape’ of the technology programme as compared with the rest of the organisation means that policy and service requirements e.g. for budget delegation tend to arrive at different times.
- The need for standard project management tools (change, issues, risk management) arrives for Technology much earlier in the process.

Scope of Technology

The scope of the M2002 Technology Programme included information technology, telecommunications and audio-visual for the Games. Lighting and power were out of scope, and were provided by Fitout. The accounts system (Platinum) had already been procured by Finance division and was an inherited item within the Technology division.

The major objectives for Technology were to provide a professional technological service in the following areas (in priority order):

- The provision of a timing, scoring and results service to support the competition in venue.
- The provision of a results service via other channels particularly for use by broadcast and media.
- The provision of accreditation software and badging/lamination technology to support the accreditation process.
- The provision of other applications and infrastructure technologies to support other aspects of the M2002 Games operation.
- The provision of office technology to support the M2002 organisation before the Games.

The primary clients for the Technology division were:

- Sport (including competition management and the IFTDs).
- Broadcast (primarily COMBO but including other RHBs).
- Media (primarily through M2002 media services i.e. Matchtight).
- Accreditation.

All divisions made use of basic office technology (email, word processing, slide production, telephony) and most had specific requirements for applications or communications technology (radios, mobile phones) at Games time. These requirements however were prioritised behind timing, scoring and results requirements.

The complete scope for Technology division became:

- The provision of a timing and scoring service for each competition.
- The provision of results/event management software in each venue.
- The provision of and results service, delivered over a variety of channels including the internet.
- The provision of a system to allow athlete biographies to be merged with data received from CGAs.
- The provision of a volunteer registration and accreditation database system and associated badging and lamination technology.
- A variety of additional applications to support the operation in such areas as logistics, telephony services, including mobile phones, a resilient data network capable for supporting the application services.
In-venue cabling.
- Personal mobile radios.
- Televisions in all venues, including the provision of a cable TV network from the IBC to other venues.
- PA systems in most venues.
- Video screens and scoreboards.
- Video walls in the Media Press Centre and the CGV.

The integration of Technology into overall Games wide functions and client related services is represented by the two following flow-diagrams:

The Major Systems

The Relationship to Broadcast
The following page captures some of the Games Family Information Service (GFIS) and broadcast graphics.

**Outcomes**

In summary, the Technology programme was highly successful recognising the following elements:

**Pre-Games**

- Virtually no website down time and a useful operational tool pre-Games; 75% of volunteer applications, 80% of ticket sales through the website. The website itself also won two national awards.
- Volunteer registration, both online and paper, live on the originally planned date (17 May 2001). This operation continued without unplanned down-time right up to the Games.
- First multi-sport event to provide accreditation over the internet (around one third of applications for accreditation came in through this route, especially from some of the larger CGAs and many of the contractors).
- The transition from the original telecoms provider (atlantic) to an alternative from October 2001 was handled with no cessation of service apart from a reduction in internet access rights, despite the rapid shut-down of atlantic by the administrators.
Games Time

- TV graphics were extremely reliable and well received.
- The Commentator Information Systems were reliable and very well-received - especially the touch-screen solution deployed for Athletics, Cycling and Netball and in the OB trucks. The fully Windows-compatible touch-screen solution was a very recent product from HP/Compaq.
- Results consistently delivered to GFIS and internet within two to three minutes of final confirmation in the venue.
- Print distribution service levels consistently achieved (10 minutes to each drop after officialisation).
- GFIS heavily used by broadcast and media.
- First multi-sport event to provide ‘info’ over the internet - very effective in particular for remote broadcast production and to support the laptop-based modus operandi of journalists.
- The first multi-sport event to pilot delivery of results to PDAs over GPRS (pilot led by Microsoft with selected users).
- Good feedback on the website (emails to webmaster).

### Technology services provided at each venue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Technology Services</th>
<th>Local Results</th>
<th>Commentator Info</th>
<th>GFIS</th>
<th>Game Voice Network</th>
<th>PMR</th>
<th>CATV</th>
<th>Rate Card Services</th>
<th>Video Boards</th>
<th>Plasma Screens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Hall (GVA)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Vue (BVC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessemer Street (BES)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton Arena (BDA)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Manchester Stadium (CMS)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Games Village (CGV)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth House (CHS)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Hospitality Village (CHV)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Depots (FDA)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games Co-ordination Centre (GCC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Mex Centre (GMX)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton Park (HPK)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron House (HHS)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron House Media Accreditation (MAC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron House Protocol Accreditation (PAC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron House Technology Operations Centre (TOC1)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Broadcast Centre (IBC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Convention Centre (ICC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Press Centre (MPC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Airport (MAN)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Aquatics Centre (AQU)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Evening News Arena (MEN)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland Hotel (OHH)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Cycling Centre (NCC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Shooting Centre - Bisley (BS)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Shooting Village (NSV)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Squash Centre (NSC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccadilly Station (PIC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay (QJ BR)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivington Park (RA)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford Quays (S4Q)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Hospitality Village (SHV)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportcity Domain (SCD)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportcity Domain Centre (SCDK)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Media Press Centre</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis Centre (TTC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Officials’ Village (TOV)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston Court (GVB)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wythenshawe Forum (WYF)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

M 2002 worked in partnership with a number of public sector agencies and private companies to deliver the Games and their associated legacy. These third parties, ranged from MCC through to other 'host' local authorities, the Police, the GM PTE and Government departments, who all helped to deliver a great variety of key services and infrastructure, ranging from the dressing of buildings through to spectator transport and the protection of Royal visitors. These were all vital for the successful delivery of the Games.

This section of the report provides an overview of the third parties involved. For convenience it sets out third party input at two primary levels - strategic and operational.

Strategic Level

Manchester has a strong tradition of partnership working which has been responsible for the delivery of substantial and tangible developments (for example, two Olympic bids, and the infrastructure that they secured, and the rebuilding and remodelling of Manchester city centre following the IRA bomb in 1996). With such a tradition, M 2002 was readily able to engage key public and private sector partners in determining the strategic direction of the Games. In this respect, M 2002 developed very close formal and informal working relationships with MCC as Host City (and Funder) and, therefore, one of the key stakeholders in the Games. The City Council provided leadership and had the ability to bring key third parties - not least Government, GM PTE and Greater Manchester Police (GMP) - together to develop and sustain, and where necessary lead, the partnerships required to deliver the Games.

It also ensured that the Games were wholly relevant to the long-term development of Manchester. In particular, it did this by assuming responsibility for the delivery of many of the Games' venues, including for example Sportcity, Belle Vue and Heaton Park. All of which have a long term sustainable post-Games use which will bring benefits to Manchester and its region for years to come.

The funding partners - the Government, represented by DCMS, Sport England and MCC. All parties formally met at the regular Board and Finance Committee meetings of the Funders’ Panel and at the monthly Greater Manchester Co-ordinating Committee (GMCC). The funding partners ensured that the Games were adequately funded and were instrumental in helping M 2002 develop the critical success factors influencing the success of the Games (see section 7.4).

Several other key third parties such as GMP (and via GMP, the other two emergency services), GM PTE, Government Office for the North West and the National Health Service. As well as meeting them informally, M 2002 met them formally, and the Funders, at the GMCC. This Committee, which was convened and chaired by the Chief Executive of MCC, was established so that key public sector agencies could assume a collective sense of responsibility for the Games.
Meeting monthly until Games time (and then daily during the Games themselves), one of the GMCC’s first tasks was to clearly define the key deliverables from each of the external partners and then put in place arrangements for overseeing their delivery. This was achieved by setting up five lead groups, each chaired by a member of the GMCC: Regulatory, Enforcement and Powers; Physical Look of the City; Public Information, Visitor Services, Events and Media; Transportation Planning and Security, Contingency Planning and Emergency Services. In doing this, it provided a mechanism through which, in particular, progress in the development of the Games transport, security, look and communications strategies could be monitored and the key linkages between each could be developed and kept under close review. The GMCC also played a crucial role in the development, agreement and monitoring of the critical success factors. (More detail of the work of the GMCC’s lead groups can be found in volume 3 section C)

A range of other agencies including New East Manchester Limited, Manchester Investment and Development Agency Service (MIDAS), Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the North West Business Leadership Team who, among other activities were crucial to the delivery of the legacy of the Games, including the North West Economic and Social Single Regeneration Programme.

As well as working with M2002 to deliver the Games these third parties, and others, in particular the other host local authorities, made great efforts to ensure that Manchester and the region were fully behind the Games. This ensured huge support for the Games from local residents, through the Volunteer Programme, and ultimately through local ticket sales and the ‘buzz’ they created around Manchester at Games time.

Operational Level

At an operational level a wide variety of agencies worked with M2002 to deliver the Games. By way of illustration as to exactly what this involved, MCC and the other host authorities (including; Bolton, Chorley, Guildford, Salford, Surrey Heath and Trafford Borough Councils, together with Lancashire and Surrey County Councils) worked with M2002 to:

- Resolve issues around access, parking and transport for Games Family, spectators and other visitors and to put in place appropriate Games time arrangements to ensure that these groups could get to and from venues, their accommodation and other destinations without any difficulties. (GMPTE and GM P were also centrally involved in the planning and delivery of these arrangements).

- In the case of the road events, sort out the temporary highway and, in some cases, footpath closures necessary to allow them to happen.

- Put in place mechanisms to protect the M2002 brand and the interests of Games Sponsors and licensed merchandisers outside venues and/or along the routes of the road events.
Keep residents and business directly affected by Games events informed about how their planning was progressing and their likely impact.

Address licensing and environmental health issues.

With the help of the local Police, address security issues and with them and other parties (including, especially, the fire, ambulance and health services) to develop contingency and emergency plans.

Keep the streets clean around venues, along the processional pathways and on the routes of the Road Events themselves and to arrange for the disposal of litter and refuse and the removal of graffiti, fly-posting and fly-tipping.

Dress venues, key processional routes and buildings with bright and vibrant banners and/or with flowerbeds, planters and horticultural features, such as topiary, to help engender a feeling of excitement and pride (town and city centre management companies were also centrally involved in this and other activities).

Encourage local businesses and residents to dress their premises.

Provide Games related visitor information services, including printed materials (such as maps and guides), staffed information points and accommodation booking services.

Support the promotion of The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay, which included:
- Working with the Police’s National Escort Group to agree the route.
- Assisting and supporting the Relay itself by, for example, providing crowd barriers, organising temporary road closures and/or traffic diversions.
- Encouraging local people to volunteer to take part in the Relay or to watch and support the relay along its route.
- Organising celebratory events mark the passing of the Relay through their borough, including community events and official, often civic, receptions.

Organisation of cultural and community events and initiatives as part of the Spirit of Friendship Festival.

Promotion of Games time volunteering and help in the recruitment of volunteers.

Encouragement of staff secondment to the M2002 workforce.

Co-ordination of press and public relations activity to ensure the delivery of positive messages about the Games (GMPTE and GM also played an integral part in this activity).

An honourable mention should also go to the numerous other local authorities across the United Kingdom which also worked to make The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay the success that it was. Many also organised events as part of the Spirit of Friendship Festival and played their part in getting people from across the UK to enter into the spirit of the Games and the Commonwealth.

Conclusions
A key element in the success of the Games was undoubtedly the drive and hard work of a whole host of third parties from the public and private sectors. The work of a number of them, not least MCC and the eight other host local authorities, GMPTE, GM, Department for Culture Media and Sport and Sport England, deserves a special mention.
Overview

The 2002 Commonwealth Games in Manchester are described as the world’s first ‘Inclusive Games’ because they were the first multi-sport event to fully include disabled athletes within a combined sporting programme.

The 10 days of sport were embraced by a single Opening Ceremony and a single Closing Ceremony within which disabled athletes and able-bodied athletes participated as equal members of a unified national team. Every single medal won counted in the overall medal table.

The sporting programme for Elite Athletes with a Disability (EADs) was developed on the basis of the recommendations made by the CGF’s Working Party on Disability Sport in 1997. The Working Party had analysed Commonwealth athletes’ participation in past Paralympics and had consulted with National Paralympic Committees and Commonwealth Games Associations. As a result of this work a shortlist of potential sports was developed for inclusion in future Commonwealth Games.

In order to arrive at this shortlist, the Working Group developed a number of guiding principles. It recommended that from 2006 host cities should adhere to the principle of ‘universality’, so that disabled athletes with a range of impairments might compete. It recommended that there should be a balance of gender within the programme and that events should not normally require the use of prohibitively expensive equipment. Based on this work it was recommended that the sports programme for EADs be comprised of Swimming, Athletics, Lawn Bowls, Table Tennis and Powerlifting.

As a city proud of both its historical commitment to civil liberties and its track record in promoting access for disabled people, Manchester committed to the principles of inclusivity and universality in 1998, by deciding to stage the first ever ‘Inclusive Games’, eight years before it would have constitutional force in Melbourne. And so in 2002, 154 EADs competed in 10 events across five sports – Swimming, Athletics, Lawn Bowls, Table Tennis and Powerlifting.

M 2002’s Mission Statement and the Access Team

“To ensure that the information, processes, services and events provided by M 2002 to the public and the Games Family are accessible to disabled people.”

M 2002 wished to extend the definition of the ‘Inclusive Games’ to beyond the field of play (FOP) – by delivering a truly accessible event, not just to disabled athletes, but to disabled spectators and disabled volunteers as well. It established the Access team in January 2001 to ensure that all M 2002 divisions and FAs worked towards the mission statement described above and complied with the Disability Discrimination Act (1995).

One of the first pieces of work that the Access team undertook was to encourage a uniformity of attitude towards disabled people by developing a corporate language and applying it in all M 2002 publications, both internal and external. This corporate approach to terminology was important, particularly in the context of a sports-based organisation, because it reconciled two very different models of disability. The medical model of disability is used in sport primarily because classifications for competition are medically assessed.

However this model is not favoured in a civil liberties context because the medical model is essentially prescriptive. The M 2002 corporate model is the social one, which recognises the right of a disabled individual to define themselves and in so doing to describe, with the legislative support of the DDA, their reasonable expectations for ‘equivalent’ service.
Under the principle of ‘One Games - One Medal Table’ it was important to design a single set of victory podia. It would have been unsatisfactory to provide a different set of podia for disabled athletes, or worse still none at all. In an Olympic and Paralympic context, the events are distinct enough for the concept of equivalent treatment never to be raised. So whilst the Olympics and Paralympics run in parallel, they are segregated events. Consequently their fitout can be different.

The challenge in Manchester was to reflect the inclusion philosophy in a podia design that allowed all athletes to participate in their victory, in the same way whilst at the same time recognising the spatial constraints of 15 diverse venues holding 17 different sports and including a mixture of team events. Since this has never been done before the Access team’s role was to ensure that design of the podia was as innovative as was the decision itself to stage the first ever Inclusive Games.

Venues
A key component of the work of the Access team was to audit and review the Games time venues, to ensure that disabled people would enjoy equivalent physical access. This included both sport and non-sport venues. The access reviews involved assessing, not just the existing buildings and structures, but also the temporary overlay and fitout.

The process commenced with a physical review of each venue and its environs, after which key staff were consulted on the planned operation for that venue. Each review concluded with a schedule of recommendations for inclusion in mainstream Games time planning. The reviews addressed access issues of relevance to disabled people with different impairments, including those with sensory and mobility impairments.

Villages
The ‘inclusion philosophy’ was well demonstrated in the Athletes’ Village. The access audit conducted here delivered improvements and modifications to the built environment. The guiding principle behind this work was to ensure that ALL athletes, irrespective of their national team, gender, sporting specialisation or impairment, could experience their Village in the same way - by enjoying the same status and receiving the same services.

Ticketing and Seating Services for Disabled Spectators
The Access team’s work ensured that there were wheelchair positions, companion seats, easy access seats and induction loops at all sport venues. Having secured this provision, it was important to convey service provision information in the ticket application form and on the website, so that spectators could make informed decisions about the service that best met their needs. From the beginning of ticket sales, the Access team monitored the up-take of seating requests from members of the public. Approximately 1,700 wheelchair positions were sold along with a comparable number of companion seats. There were 2,000 requests for easy access seats and 125 requests for access to venue induction loops. This level of commercial demand demonstrated public confidence in the 2002 Commonwealth Games as an ‘accessible’ event.
Recruitment and Training of Crew 2002
The Access team worked closely with Workforce and the Volunteer Centre to ensure that the volunteer application form, the interview process and the job assignment procedure itself, did not discriminate against disabled people. In addition, a small fund was established to hire equipment and aids for disabled Crew members where such provision would assist the individual in performing their duties. Disabled people were well represented amongst Crew 2002, of the volunteer workforce around 3% identified themselves as disabled people.

In preparing the generic training programme for Crew 2002, emphasis was placed upon the delivery of a clear message of 'equality'. In practical terms this became 'Disability Etiquette' training for all volunteers, which included a video and printed material.

Accessible Communications
M2002 fulfilled its obligations under the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) by ensuring that there were no obstacles to prevent disabled people from obtaining information about the Games or from communicating with the organisers. To this end all publications were available, on request, in large print, audiotape or braille - for people with visual impairments. The ‘alternative formats’ telephone number was always advertised on publications along with the minicom number, so that people with hearing impairments could make and receive ‘text’ phone calls to and from M2002. Whilst electronic mail offered faster communication opportunities for many people, it was a particularly welcome medium for disabled people with hearing impairments, since it supplemented textphone provision.

In addition, M2002 liaised with the Royal National Institute for the Blind (RNIB) to ensure that people with visual impairments could access www.commonwealthgames.com website successfully. One of the main developments was the ‘text-only’ version of the website whose operating language and presentation was enhanced to support the needs of the entire community.

At Games time hearing-impaired spectators were able to book sign language interpreters for events at the City of Manchester Stadium including the Opening and Closing Ceremonies. The intention was for interpreters to sign key speeches and to describe the atmosphere within the Stadium.

Spectator Information - Parking and Transport
The Spectator Guide, which was issued with all tickets, contained a detailed section for disabled spectators. It described the various ways of getting to and from the venues during the Games. Ensuring that disabled people had a range of transport options from which to choose was essential - identifying those choices clearly and in advance in the Spectator Guide was equally important.

All venues had drop-zones for disabled visitors and all venues provided parking for disabled spectators in possession of Blue Badge parking permits. Blue Badge parking locations were identified in the Spectator Guide. A journey planning service for disabled spectators was offered by GMPTE. Every bus from Piccadilly Train Station serving the venues was wheelchair accessible, with services from Victoria Train Station attaining 95% accessibility. Other elements in the transport strategy included Metrolink which is fully accessible to wheelchair users and the city's fleet of black hackney taxis.

Conclusions
The pre-Games planning was particularly commended by the Office of Government Review team and the Disability Rights Commission. During the Games praise was received from David Grevenberg, the Director of Sport for the International Paralympic Committee:

“My impressions since I have been here in Manchester are excellent. I really don't think organisers have left a stone unturned. I have tried while I am here to walk through the athlete experience and I am confident that the level of service is equivalent to the non-disabled athletes. I am also impressed with the way the Games organisers have employed the principle of inclusivity across all aspects of the organisation from embracing local ambassadors for disabled sport in your Marketing to the Pre-Volunteer Programme.”
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Chief Executive’s Office
The Chief Executive’s Office was the central department responsible for maintaining an overview of the OC from a directional, political and strategic level. The Office dealt with issues that arose within the organisation and community groups and established a series of awareness campaigns and seminars to ensure that pertinent issues affecting M 2002 were given purposeful intervention.

The key functions of the Chief Executive’s Office were as follows:

**Correspondence**
Any correspondence addressed to the Chief Executive (CEO) was addressed and responded to. The Chief Executive’s Office received letters and requests from over 300 local authorities and independent organisations on a weekly basis. The department took an active role in liaising with the various departments within M 2002 to provide relevant information and guidance to respond in a consistent and objective manner.

**Community and Local Authority Liaison**
Community liaison was an important role of the Chief Executive’s Office. The main focus was to maximise community involvement by using existing links and appointing Local Authority Liaison Coordinators.

Local Authority liaison was a key role within the Chief Executive’s Office, responsible for raising Games awareness, sharing information within their communities and encouraging communities to become involved in the Games. Local Authority Coordinators were asked to maximise community involvement and take responsibility for the profile of the Games in their community liaison area.

The CEO regularly made contact with the coordinators via a Local Authority Bulletin and held regular information sessions at Commonwealth House for all coordinators, which were well attended. The coordinators also attended two venue tours to update them on progress and provide an opportunity for them to ask questions and undertake research.

The Community Fact Pack was launched in July 2001 and circulated to the Local Authority Coordinators, all schools in the North West and other public organisations such as libraries, community centres etc.
Chaperones for Minor Athletes

The Chief Executive’s Office developed guidelines for the Chaperone arrangements provided to minor athletes at Games time reflecting key elements predetermined by British Law. There was a presence in the Athletes’ Village at Games time to ensure policy and procedures were followed and maintained a general overview on child protection issues.

The Office liaised with the QJ BR team to ensure all Volunteer Shuttle Bus Hosts and Drivers were Police-checked to enable them to work with children.

Information Disseminator

The Chief Executive’s Office were conscious of the need to make as much information available as possible to staff. The pace of growth in the organisation required the communication to be timely and the main form was via the Staff Bulletin, Team Briefings and the Weekly Events Schedule with ad hoc ‘everyone e-mails’ supporting the process. Monthly Staff Information Forums took place to share information on specific departments with the rest of the organisation.

In addition M 2002 worked with the New East Manchester Forum and provided a link from the Office by attendance at Resident Forums and community ‘drop in’ sessions. The aim was to share information, answer queries and note issues.

The role of the Chief Executive’s Office ranged from implementing awareness campaigns, liaising with key community groups and working with minority groups to assist in the integration process pioneered by the work of the Games. In essence the work of the department was well-received and enthusiastically supported by the CEO of M 2002.
Overview

The Commonwealth Games Association (CGA) Relations programme was a pioneer programme built specifically for the Manchester Commonwealth Games, to service the 72 Commonwealth Games Associations. The programme was split into two distinct phases; pre-Games operations and Games time operations. Initially in the pre-Games phase the programme established the primary communication and information flow link between M2002 and CGAs and the CGF. In the transition phase to Games time, CGA Relations switched to a proactive operational role at the Athletes' Village resolving and escalating issues that were not resolved as a front line services provider.

CGA Relations key client groups were:
- Athletes and Team Officials (CGAs)
- Commonwealth Games Federation (CGF)
- Commonwealth Games Family
- Staff / Workforce

CGA Relations were responsible for:
- CGF Executive Board meetings and Evaluation / Audit visits
- CGA Publications (Chefs Dossier, Chefs Manual, Annual reports, CGA Bulletins)
- CGF General Assembly 2001
- CGA Visits
- Recruitment of Volunteer CGA Assistants (300)
- CGA Services Centre - CGV
- Delegation Registration Meetings (DRMs)

The Team

The CGA Relations team comprised of a Programme Manager, three Relations Officers responsible for two regions each, a Volunteer Coordinator that managed the recruitment, training and supervision of a volunteer CGA Assistants workforce of approximately 300 people, an Operations Manager that looked after all Village operations as well as the set up of the DRM process and the Village move in and out. An Administrative Assistant also supported the team.

Only two of the seven staff members were a direct hire with previous Games experience, the remaining five were all recruited via MCC. Although the recruitment from MCC presented challenges, due to lack of multi-sport event experience, the team worked cohesively and effectively towards the common goal of Games success.

The recruitment and training of volunteers was crucial to the CGA Assistants programme. Recruitment was in advance of the major recruitment drive for M2002, and the staff encouraged minority groups to volunteer as well as different cultural organisations, to ensure that the diversity of the Commonwealth was fully represented.

Job specific training commenced in October 2001 with a select group of 72 CGA Coordinators, and in January 2002, full training sessions commenced on a monthly basis for 300 volunteers, focussing on key areas of the organisation that would be of relevance to their positions such as Villages, Sport, Accreditation, Transport, Protocol, customer services and cultural awareness.

The CGA Services team, reported directly to the Deputy CEO in the lead up to the Games to ensure that sufficient support was given to issues affecting CGAs. At Games time, the CGA Services team became an integral part of the Senior Village Management team and in the previous six months, had regularly attended Village Management meetings including workshops and team building exercises. The excellent working relationship with the Village team made it a seamless operation in the eyes of the CGAs.

The overall staff breakdown at the Village is reflected in the chart opposite:
Venue Involvement

CGA Relations were present at two key venues; the Main Accreditation and Uniform Centre (MAUC) and the CGV:

- **MAUC** – July 3 – 24; Conducting the DRMs. The MAUC Venue team provided support to the team prior to and during move-in, which significantly accelerated the establishment of facilities and meeting rooms for the DRMs.

- **CGV** – The team moved to the CGV ahead of schedule on June 15, to facilitate their integration with the corresponding Village FAs. This minimised delay once Games time issues became a reality and the responsibilities of the individuals from the Village team were identified. This also allowed for Games time exercises to take place, and fully integrate with the Villages team.

On average CGA Relations would deal with at least 20-30 requests a week and 30-40 queries a day at FOH of the CGA Services Centre during Games time. Queries varied greatly from simple questions (for e.g. where to buy meal tickets) or to more complex issues that required CGF involvement (e.g. requirement to accredit more officials, or enter additional athletes).

The number of queries decreased tremendously once the teams were settled in the Village and the Games commenced. There was a peak towards the end of the Games (check out, accounts, wrap ups) and around both Ceremonies (mainly associated with ticket allocation).

General venue fitout overlay and FF&E was in place on schedule and was of an appropriate standard. Technology was operational the day the team moved to the Village, which was very well received as the team were still receiving daily requests via email from external agencies.

The most important element of CGA Relations was to maintain key interactions with each FA. The success of the CGA Relations operation was almost entirely dependent upon other FAs providing the updated information that CGAs required. The team’s role was to ensure that information was flowing and that it was consistent with M2002 policies and procedures.

Legacy

- Having a CGA Relations department was a first for a Commonwealth Games, and was very much appreciated by the CGAs. This allowed CGAs to feel that their concerns and queries were being attended to, and followed up. In addition, due to the fact that only a few CGAs managed to visit Manchester beforehand, the large majority of specialist needs was facilitated by the CGA Relations team prior to arrival. This department certainly brought the Commonwealth Games a step closer to the Olympic model.

- CGA Relations made a huge difference in the service level provided to CGAs and is something that Melbourne 2006 have already invested in.

- Through the CGA Assistants programme, strong links, friendships and perhaps even future opportunities were developed between volunteers and CGAs. A number of volunteers have expressed a desire to volunteer in Melbourne, providing a major opportunity for Manchester based personnel to broaden their experience.
Key Lessons and Recommendations

- Early integration with the Villages team should be the top priority for the team six months out from the Games.
- It is important to attend CGAs regional meetings and to meet individually with CGAs as only the larger CGAs actually visited Manchester and it is often the smaller, CGAs that need the support and additional assistance.
- More education needs to happen with CGAs on the overall arrival and DRM process, as many Chefs de Mission may be new to their role and inexperienced.
- It is very important to appoint regional staff at least 16 – 18 months prior to the Games, to allow for working relationships to build.
- The CGA Relations department should be the main point of contact for all dealings with CGAs, ensuring that a consistent and professional approach is achieved, and this policy is adhered to throughout the organisation.
- Protocol should be clear on responsibilities of the CGA Assistants.
- On occasions there was confusion as to the access privileges of CGA assistants who were accompanying their allocated Chef de Mission to an event. Accreditation was appropriately sought for these assistants as sufficient clearance to fulfil their role. Clear guidelines detailing the requirement for supplementary accreditation in VIP areas requires clarification before an event and for future OCs a systematic accreditation check of CGA Assistants should be sufficient. Therefore it is recommended that all CGA Assistants are granted access only to the Village and, upon signing in to their designated shifts, an all venue access pass is given, thereby avoiding any abuse of venue access entitlements when volunteers are not on shift.
- Administrative support is needed to assist with the large volumes of information sent to volunteers in the last six months leading into the Games, especially during the training phases.
- It is important to have the pre-DRMs face to face, two months prior to Games time to make operations smooth upon arrival, particularly in the production of accurate accreditation passes.
- It would be beneficial to conduct a Chef de Mission Seminar in the Host City approximately four to six months prior to the Games. This would allow the OC to obtain much needed information from CGAs that is often difficult to obtain until arrival. In addition to the process of information gathering, the seminar could be utilised as an education process for all CGAs ensuring that the process in the months prior to arrival and at the Games themselves is clearly understood. Although the General Assembly is held in the Host City a year out, this is too soon and the audience (Presidents and Secretary Generals) are not the individuals who manage issues for the CGAs during Games time.
C2.1 Observer Programme

Overview
The CGF/CGA Relations department established the M2002 Observer Programme to ensure that future OCs and bidding cities could experience the Games in person. The programme facilitated the first-hand approach that made Manchester so unique, enabling key organisations the opportunity to make operational observations of Manchester’s delivery processes.

Although the Manchester 2002 Games are presented within the arena of Commonwealth nations, the M2002 Observer Programme reached beyond this membership and welcomed future OCs, bid committees and sport bodies from around the world to take advantage of this opportunity.

To facilitate and maximise the representatives’ participation and to better respond to the needs of the delegations, two levels of participation were created for the observer groups. These were:

1. Operational Observers
2. Workforce Secondment Observers

Operational Observers
The Observer Programme offered the chance for delegates to meet and share Games related issues and to discuss and compare the intricacies of their planning and operations.

Workforce Secondment Observers
This Observer Programme category offered the opportunity for delegations to send their own staff prior to the staging of the Games, to fulfil a workforce role during the M2002 Games. Considered as ‘on-the-job-training’, gave the observers a first hand opportunity to work and experience the specifics of the Games operations.

Each application was assessed to establish the needs and availability of job openings. Workforce secondment staff were assigned a specific job and were treated the same as the rest of the Games workforce with the same level of responsibility and commitment as the M2002 workforce and M2002 policies/procedures were expected to be adhered to.

Observer Programme key client groups were:
- Commonwealth nations future Games OCs.
- Commonwealth nations future bid committees.
- Worldwide future Games OCs.
- Worldwide future bid committees.
- Independent major Games or sporting event affiliate groups/individuals.
- M2002 suppliers.

Observer Programme staff were responsible for:
- Identifying potential participants.
- Promoting the programme to potential participants, groups, agencies.
- Recruiting delegations and providing information about relevant services and registration process (travel, accommodation, visa requirements, programme opportunities, etc.).
- Observer Programme two day seminar (presentation and venue tours). Following the two day seminar, staff were tasked to book the daily tours and facilitate meetings for the delegates.
- Observer Programme dinner, luncheon and reception.
- Booking tour and meetings for delegates on a daily basis.
- Promoting the availability of M2002 Games suppliers for meetings and/or presentations.

The Workforce Secondment Observer level Project Manager was responsible for:
- Identifying potential participants.
- Promoting the programme to potential participants.
- Disseminating the respective information (travel, accommodation, visa requirements,
respective job description, etc.)
- Accepting and revising each application and resume.
- Coordinating with the M2002 HR Department for the placements.
- Coordination of the induction sessions for each group of secondment staff.

The Team
A Project Manager was appointed to manage and liaise with all future OCs and serve as the central point of contact for all issues and queries relating to this programme.

With the exemption of the Project Manager, the Observer Programme staff were recruited solely for Games time delivery of the programme.

During Games time, as a result of the intensity of the programme format, the first week of the programme dictated intensive long days to facilitate the workload. The core staff were scheduled and assigned to tasks that could only be undertaken days prior to the Games.

As a first phase, the Observer Programme staff were assigned to assist with the registration and coordination of a two day seminar. Acting as tour escorts and hosts, the rapport with the delegates was quickly established and set a positive tone for the remainder of the Games.

The Games time headquarters for the Observer Programme was at the Midland Hotel, the Official Host Hotel. The M2002 Protocol team’s willingness to allocate space for the Observer Programme added to the final product immensely in terms of presentation, value and sharing of resources.

Following the two day seminar, staff were tasked to book the daily tours and facilitate meetings for the delegates.

The Project Manager was the only member of staff directly involved with this aspect of the Observer Programme. The liaison with other M2002 departments and FAs was the key to the coordination of the secondments.

Once each delegate was accepted for placement, the respective FA was responsible for the job specific training and the scheduling of shifts and any other work related issues.

The success of the programme speaks for itself, over 380 operational observers were involved in all aspects of the Games from Logistics to Sport operations. Inclusive to the Games experience was the observation of the GCC and the major decision making partners involved in the Games. The insight gained in this area offers a major opportunity for future Games organisers to further predict the level of intervention required to host a major event.

The most popular non-sport venue to visit was in fact the GCC and predictably the most popular sport venue was the City of Manchester Stadium.

Key Observer Programme Partners and Contacts
Some of the key partners involved with the support of the Observer Programme included:
- Schenker Ltd, who provided a number of internally employed staff to assist the Observer Programme during Games time.
- Business club @THE GAMES (based at Bridgewater Hall)
  This organisation was associated with the Observer Programme to act as an advisor to international business groups giving insights into the economic and commercial benefits of a hosting a major event.
- M2002 Games’ Suppliers – Suppliers that provided large allotments of staff gaining experience and knowledge of Games infrastructure and allowed them to work closely with the Commercial department and the Observer programme.
Venue Involvement
The Observer Programme depended heavily on each venue to ensure the success of the programme. Tours and meetings with key staff were available to the programme delegates because of the link with the venue management teams (sport and non-sport venues) and the Sport Competition Managers.

Weeks prior to the Games, each venue management team was asked to identify the dates and times tours would be available in their respective venue(s).

Starting on 17 July 2002 through to 4 August 2002, venue tours were booked for Observer Programme delegates on a daily basis.

When possible venue management offered tours during competition and/or training times to offer additional value to the tour.

Legacy
The Observer Programme offers a genuine legacy delivering a real educational opportunity for all 200 participants to more accurately estimate the benefits of hosting a major event. The long-term benefits, beyond the observer’s visit to Manchester, ensured that future bidding cities submit a more accurate bid application with specific estimates on the operational requirements and financial investment required.

In addition, the link between M2002 Observer Programme and the Business Club @THE GAMES, (MIDAS) proved to be a valuable partnership. Observer delegates who sought information about the hosting municipality, the legacy issues and the impact of Games on a city were able to source their information from the Business Club representatives.

A number of delegates stayed in Manchester to attend the Bid to Benefit Conference to assess the state of preparedness required for a major bid, a major advantage to see future bidding organisations through to the final bid process.

Key Lessons and Recommendations
- There is an obvious need for future Observer Programmes to continue to assist in educating future hosts, regardless of the Games (or event(s)) scale, duration and/or location.
- Such a venture requires total commitment from the OC to be willing to expose all aspects of the event; both positive and negative.
- OCs should consider the presentation and scale of such a programme early in the planning phases. Preparation time must be devoted to the programme in order to meet overall objectives. As a result of the affect the programme has on venue staff and the venue activities, the more time allowed to plan the programme, the more supportive venue management will be.
- A minimum of six months should be granted to the planning and delivery of an Observer Programme at a Commonwealth Games.
- In a location similar to Manchester where accommodation availability was limited, the rapport developed with the Official Games Accommodation Supplier, in this case Sportsworld Travel is vital.
- In the case of Manchester, the two most heavily scheduled days of the Observer Programme occurred on the first two days of competition. This proved to be extremely demanding on all aspects of operations and should, if feasible, be avoided in the future.
- Time allowing, the programme schedule should run over a minimum of three days therefore allowing for presentations, tours and informal time for delegates to enjoy the atmosphere of the Games. In addition, all aspects of the Games should be addressed in the programme. By extending the programme to a three day format, this would allow for the inclusion of all operational areas.
- In addition, an Observer Programme needs to be able to offer a wide variety of options to the participants. Expertise and Games experience is essential to create a schedule that incorporates Sport, Operations, Venue involvement and FAs.
Overview
The Broadcast Programme of M2002 established key liaison channels to ensure that matters involving Broadcasting enabled the Host Broadcaster (COMBO) and Rights-holding Broadcasters the appropriate support services to produce an unbiased and professional television and radio coverage of the 2002 Commonwealth Games and to oversee the coverage whilst providing expert advice to enable improvement where appropriate.

The Broadcast department also worked with the Rights-holding Broadcasters to ensure the level of services required by them was met by M2002 and to ensure that COMBO provided the necessary broadcast services to allow them to establish the services and elements required to produce good programming.

The Broadcast department concluded the finalisation of contracts in respect to the broadcast rights to the Games, the negotiation of new contracts for the broadcast rights and the implementation of these contracts.

The contract with the BBC to provide Host Broadcaster services and purchase the UK TV Rights was concluded in February 2000.

This guaranteed M2002 high quality broadcast footage of the Games and provided a strong platform to sell the TV rights overseas.

The Deputy Chief Executive, working with advisors, was responsible for the TV contracts and direct liaison with the Host Broadcaster and TV Rights-holders until the appointment of the Broadcast Manager in December 2001.

Under the terms of its contract with the BBC, M2002 was responsible for providing the building in which the International Broadcast Centre (IBC) was based and the BBC as Host Broadcaster was responsible for providing broadcast footage of all sports to each of the overseas TV Rights-holders at the IBC.

The Broadcast department oversaw the planning, layout, design and operation of the IBC and pioneered the procedures established for the broadcast rights within the premises, the security levels and the transportation services to the IBC and the level of services provided by M2002 within the IBC.
The Team
The role of the Broadcast Manager was a difficult role to fill as few people had the experience to understand the responsibilities of a TV Rights-holder and the workings of an OC. It eventually took M 2002 more than 12 months to recruit the right person who ultimately started just eight months prior to the Games.

Two Broadcast Liaison Officers were appointed, the first commenced on 17 June to operate at the venues in the Manchester area and the IBC. The second officer commenced on 8 July specifically to operate at the Shooting venue in Bisley, Surrey.

During the Games three volunteers worked for the Broadcast team. Their responsibilities included the collation of media and press information, the distribution of M 2002 information to all Broadcasters at the IBC, general office administration duties e.g. photocopying, printing and computer operation.

From mid July 2002 the Broadcast Manager and other members of the team were based at the IBC, which enabled the team to be close to the Host Broadcast management and the International Rights-holders.

IBC Venue Management
Whilst not directly responsible to the Broadcast Manager, the IBC had a venue management team as any other Games venue, the team comprised:
- Venue General Manager (VGM), overall responsible for the services provided to the IBC by M 2002.
- Three Venue Operations Managers (VOM) operating a three shift system to cover the operating hours of the IBC.

See the next section for further information about the IBC.

Key Partners and Contacts
As the name implies the Broadcast Department dealt directly with the Host Broadcaster (COMBO) and the Rights-Holding Broadcasters, these were:
- BBC Host Broadcaster (COMBO - Commonwealth Games Broadcasting Organisation)
- BBC Television Sports
- BBC Radio 5 Live
- BBC Interactive
- BBC Nations and Regions
- BBC North West
- Seven Network Australia
- ABC Radio Australia
- Asia Pacific Broadcasting Union covering India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Brunei, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Malaysia
- CBC Canada
- South African Broadcasting Corporation covering the African continent
- Television New Zealand covering Fiji, Tonga, Cook Islands, Samoa and Nauru
- TVJ Jamaica
- CYB Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation
- TV Asahi Japan
- NBC News USA
- The Broadcast department also dealt with many sporting federations associated with the Games, too numerous to mention individually, and several CGAs and Sponsors.
- Many non Rights-holders were in Manchester during Games time, these included Sky News, ITN, HTV, three Australian TV Networks, Nine Network, Ten Network and ABC, African Networks, TV3 New Zealand.
Venue Involvement

The venues had to provide space for the Host Broadcaster (COMBO) to set up the required outside broadcast compound within each venue and space for the cameras and associated television equipment required within the venues to produce the Host Broadcast coverage of the Games.

The OB compounds, Host Broadcast and Rights-holding Broadcasters staff that operated from these compounds, whilst not under the direct control of the VGM, had to conform to the operational guidelines of each venue (set by M 2002) and the standard health and safety regulations as imposed by local government.

The space provided at each venue was found to be more than adequate for COMBO with easy vehicle access to the compounds.

The M 2002 services provided to the Host Broadcaster and the Rights-holders at each venue included:
- Access control
- Transportation
- OB compound cleaning and waste
- OB compound security fencing
- General security as required
- Fitout (some scaffold constructions for cameras and cable bridges)
- Fully equipped commentary boxes including CATV, telephones, CIS, results and timing.
- The Fitout team provided cladding for scaffolds and commentary boxes

Operational hours for Broadcasters in each venue were two hours prior to the start of competition and one hour after the completion of competition.

The Broadcast team, in association with COMBO, met on a regular basis with all Sport Competition Managers to discuss the sport schedule and rules and regulations of each sport. Rights-holding Broadcasters had a presence at each of the Sports Schedule meetings and were the first recipients of any changes to the sport schedule during competition.

At each venue, Fitout provided the commentary position desks and associated scaffolding used by the Rights-holders. Broadcast liaised on a regular basis with Fitout to ensure the facilities being provided were necessary and conformed to the required standards. The most time consuming element for Fitout in association with COMBO were the costs and height of the scaffolding required for the appropriate camera angles and associated control platforms.

Broadcast had a great deal of involvement with the M 2002 Commercial department to ensure the camera positions gave maximum exposure to the Sponsors’ branding. Broadcast gave advice to Commercial on a regular basis relating to the ‘broadcast guidelines’ of the Commonwealth Games relating to on-screen credits and logo exposure.

M 2002 Technology played a major role in the design and look of graphics results and timing associated with the Games. All on-screen graphic design and layouts followed a consistent approach and the functionality of these were engineered to link with the operations of television.

Legacy

The Host Broadcast television and radio coverage of the Games will continue to be a lasting memory for Manchester and the Commonwealth of the best organised Commonwealth Games ever. The television and radio coverage was unsurpassed in Commonwealth Games history and provided an inspirational insight into each of the 17 sports within the Games. The new sports included in the Commonwealth programme also drew huge audiences and new-found support.

The knowledge gained by the Technical Delegates is now digitally recorded as a series of benchmarks for all sportsmen and women to strive towards in their quest for future sporting glory.

The IBC, housed in the MANCAT building, was fitted with a new roof and walls, upgrading of internal washrooms, the addition of wheelchair access, landscaped gardens and upgraded perimeter fencing. This all provided much improved facilities for the College. The majority of the improvements were planned irrespective of the Games and M 2002 provided a financial contribution towards the work.
Following consultation with and the approval of the Host Broadcaster and M 2002, all internal construction, aesthetic elements, lighting, ceilings and broadcast suites are to be left for the benefit of the students at M ANCAT.

**Key Lessons and Recommendations**

- It is difficult to find a Broadcast Manager with the right level of experience and therefore recruitment needs to start early to be able to appoint this person in time to participate fully in the venue planning process.

- Graphics, animations and virtual graphics form a major part of television sport production. Adequate time, money, staff and facilities, prior to the Games, are required for Technology and Broadcast to work closely together to develop these new production techniques.

- Ensure that all FAs, Directors and Venue Managers are aware of the importance of Broadcast and the Media.

- The importance of accurate CADs at all venues form the benchmark of Broadcast operations at all venues and should not be under-scoped.

- Provide a bespoke transportation system for all Broadcasters for daily travel from their hotel to the IBC and suitable arrangements for pick-up and return from the airport.

- Ensure that Rate Card facilities are set at sensible prices with good quality goods. Broadcasters will accept reasonable charges if goods are of a suitable standard.

- The IBC includes considerable amounts of high value equipment and needs to be treated as a highly secure venue.

- The CGF should give further consideration to the time for receipt of entries to the Games. Late changes to entry numbers by CGAs resulted in late amendments to the sport schedule, most notably the loss of one morning’s Athletics session. As a consequence, other sports sessions had to be re-scheduled to fill the gap that had been created in the TV Rights-holders schedules.

**Key Statistics**

Seven Network Australia’s coverage of the Commonwealth Games was outstanding and M 2002 received the following feedback on the level of the viewing public in Australia during the Games.

An independent research survey revealed that 79.7% of people watched Seven’s coverage of the XVII Commonwealth Games. The highest national peak audience for Seven’s coverage was 2,744,207 on Day 5 (19:30-23:00) which saw Australia begin its campaign in the swimming pool. The highest average national audience was also for Day 5 with 2,156,173 people tuning in to Seven.

Seven’s coverage of the Opening Ceremony attracted a peak national audience of 2,303,841 and an average national audience of 2,084,601.

The Closing Ceremony, which Seven aired live and delayed, attracted a cumulative national average audience across the two broadcasts of 1,624,865 people.

The Baton is delivered to the Stadium during the Opening Ceremony.
C3.1 International Broadcast Centre

Overview
The International Broadcast Centre (IBC) was scoped and designed as the major international broadcasting area for the Commonwealth Games. The Host Broadcaster, COMBO and the BBC domestic, made up the major client group along with eight other major international broadcasters. The BBC provided the infrastructure and workforce necessary to ensure that the IBC was able to provide the best possible broadcast coverage of the Commonwealth Games. M2002 supported this commitment by providing a highly secure venue, technology support, a cleaning and waste service, plus a Venue Operations Manager to interface with the COMBO management team.

The Venue
The IBC was an independent facility specifically catering for the Broadcast client group. The venue’s proprietor, MANCAT – the Manchester College of Arts and Technology, was located on Whitworth Street in Openshaw. The MANCAT Administration block, where the staff and administrative team were located, remained in operation for the period of the Games and was located at the northern end of the building facing Whitworth Street. Because of the close proximity of the Administration Block to the IBC, the area housing MANCAT staff was included within the secure perimeter and M2002 controlled access to this space via the FOH Mag & Bag facility. All MANCAT staff entering the Administration block were required to undergo full security screening.

The IBC was a 9,786 square metre facility made up of 16 broadcast compounds and 25 editing suites purpose built and commissioned by COMBO. The facility had the capacity to service up to 800 broadcasters in full operating mode. Hall A (1,500sqm) consisted of the Master Control Room, Commentary Control, Quality pixel control, Highlights office, Switch rooms, Rate Card and Booking Offices, Technology Master Control and the COMBO central offices. Hall B (3,000sqm) consisted of the Broadcast suites including BBC Domestic, South Africa Broadcast Corporation (SABC), BBC Interactive, Television New Zealand (TVNZ), Hall C housed (3,234sqm) BBC Nations/Regions and Radio, 7 Network Australia, Radio/TV Malaysia, Australian Broadcasting Corporation (Radio), BBC Domestic Radio, BBC News. Hall D (2,000sqm) included the Restaurant facility, Games area, Logistics Compound and Security Access Control.

COMBO established a layout that provided essential working areas for the constituent groups within the Broadcast team. The M2002 Rate Card team interfaced with the COMBO Utilities Manager to determine the requirements in each studio and editing suite for each of the Broadcasters. This was inclusive of all carpet, desk, internal fittings, furniture, technology requirements, telephony equipment and electrical supplies.

Externally M2002 managed all external access points, transport flows, load zones back and front of house, security control zone and car park areas. There were car parks available for up to 120 vehicles as part of M2002s commitment to the operation and the Broadcasters.

The Competition
Whilst no actual competition occurred at the IBC, the results of all competitions were crucial to the success of this facility. Minute to minute results were delivered to each Broadcaster within 15 minutes of the event, to ensure programming deadlines were adhered to. The IBC volunteer team of nine network runners carried out this task on a 15 minute shift pattern. Broadcasters including BBC, BBC Nations and Regions, BBC Interactive, CBC Canada, Seven Network Australia, TV New Zealand, South African broadcasting corporation and Malaysia TV could also access the internet and GFIS but paper copy results were heavily relied upon and utilised by many of the Broadcasters.

The Team
The team consisted of Operations Managers in the areas of Venues, Security, Transport and Technology. There were also a large percentage of the workforce contracted to perform duties in the IBC along with paid staff and volunteers.
**Venue Operations Managers**

There were three VOMs appointed to the IBC with two VOMs appointed later in June and July, to assist the first VOM to pull together planning requirements and attend COMBO meetings. Given it was a 24 hour operation, initially a 24 hour shift pattern was established with two major day shifts and an overnight shift. However, after four days it was determined that operations would be based on a 19 hour shift pattern consisting of two nine hour shifts (overlapping) and one ten hour shift. During the five hours that there was no M2002 presence the venue was protected by a uniformed Police Officer, night-shift staff of 11 Security staff, a dog patrol and a COMBO Duty Manager.

**Technology**

The Technology Manager was a shared position between the MAUC and IBC. This caused a major staff shortfall as peak activity for the IBC coincided with peak activity at the MAUC. Although these venues were closely located, the VXM was required to work up to 16 hours a day to service both venues and additional contractors had to be added to support the venue.

**Transport**

Transport services were well received by the Broadcasters and although the Host Broadcaster expressed major doubts before the Games, applauded the professional operation and range of services available. Broadcasters were supplied with a dedicated coach service transporting Broadcasters at peak times from their hotels to the IBC direct. This service is highly recommended for future OCs as the Broadcast client group tends to demand a high quality and timely bus service, purpose-built to their needs. Although the media shuttle delivered regular services to the IBC, these services were, in the main, not utilised by the Broadcasters.

**The Venue**

**Security**

Security of this venue was at 100% search level, with a vehicle check-point at entry where all vehicles were subject to random searches and mirroring. All pedestrians when entering the secure perimeter were subject to a mag & bag search before entering the venue and all deliveries were subject to both the Master Delivery Schedule (MDS) and the goods pallet x-ray facility before delivery into the IBC.

The interior of the building was patrolled by security staff and externally the venue was fitted with a series of strategically located CCTV cameras in the surrounding areas around the building. This level of security was deemed necessary given the crucial importance of this venue to the overall Games success and risk assessments carried out by Security confirming the venue could be the target for security breeches.

**Key Lessons and Recommendations**

- Responsibilities between M 2002 and COMBO needed clearer delineation. COMBO had limited experience with operational specifics but were determined to be consulted on every decision made at an operational level.
- Commence planning at the same time as other venue planning cycles commence.

**Key Statistics**

The IBC was the central hub for all broadcast activity for the 2002 Commonwealth Games although it was managed and run by COMBO, M 2002 had operational functions to deliver involving the following FAs:

- Security Workforce : 1 April – 30 August 2002
- Technology Support Operation : 25 May – 9 August 2002
- Cleaning and Waste Operation : 20 May – 6 August 2002
- Venue Operations : 15 June – 4 August
Overview
Without detailed and effective planning it would not have been possible to deliver a successful Commonwealth Games.

Given the scale and complexity of the undertaking, it was necessary to divide the work into a range of FAs for planning and budgetary purposes. As a result, in excess of 200 separate work packages were defined to guide the delivery of the various elements of the Games and collectively, these formed the Games Master Programme.

For each work package, a high level project delivery plan was developed by the Programme Management team working in conjunction with appropriate FA and VGM. These plans were intended to identify major activities, delivery timelines and key milestones. More detailed operational (low level) planning was undertaken within each of the FAs and venue teams.

A fully integrated programme showing dependencies and operational links between the various work packages was defined. Nearer the Games it was also possible to include links to third party delivery plans that had been developed externally and independently.

Progress monitoring against the agreed high level plans enabled senior managers and Funders to assess performance and initiate remedial action where necessary.

The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay and Spirit of Friendship Festival were planned independently and delivered largely through third parties. Both events were launched four months out from the Games on Commonwealth Day 11 March 2002. Plans for specific events scheduled at Games time such as the Baton arrival in Manchester and the Royal Gala performance at the Bridgewater Hall were developed in conjunction with relevant FA managers and third parties.

Programme Development
Programme management activities were adapted during the three years prior to the Games to meet the changing requirements for planning and progress reporting. The delivery team was recruited accordingly and their successive phases of work can be summarised as follows:

To December 1999:
- No separately staffed Programme Management team.
- Identification of broad areas of activity and general timelines.
- Definition of work packages and broad scope of work.
- Progress reporting at a strategic level by senior managers.

January - October 2000:
- Creation of a small planning team (three posts) reporting to Deputy Chief Executive.
- Confirmation of work areas, key milestones and general procurement timelines.
- Refinement of work packages and scope of work in conjunction with FA managers (not all of whom had been appointed).
- Progress reporting at strategic and (where appropriate) tactical level.
- First cut of Games Master Programme (November 2000).

November 2000 - March 2001:
- Formal establishment of Programme Management team (five posts) reporting to Deputy Chief Executive.
- Further refinement of work packages and scope of work in conjunction with FA managers (most of which had been appointed).
- Monthly progress reporting on FAs and work packages.

April 2001 - April 2002:
- Appointment of Chief Operating Officer (COO) with responsibility for Programme Management activities and the transition from the planning phase (focusing largely on FAs) to the delivery phase (focusing on venues, procurement and third parties) represented in the diagram below.
- Programme Management team (expanded to nine posts) reporting directly to COO. From this
team, individual programme managers were assigned to support and monitor third parties and specific areas of the organisation (Sport, Technology, Workforce, Operations, Creative and Communications, Finance and Venues).

- Further refinement of work packages and scope of work in conjunction with Directors, FA and Venue Managers.
- Introduction of change management controls, issue reporting/resolution and risk register.
- Internal fortnightly progress reporting on work packages by FA.
- Identification of inter-relationships and dependencies within work packages across all FAs and venue teams.
- Refinement and monitoring of procurement timelines.
- Identification and monitoring of key third party deliverables, associated timelines and risks.
- Third cut Games Master Plan (October 2001), fully integrated representing a benchmark for monitoring progress and enabling ‘what-if’ scenarios to be explored in relation to the potential impact from identified risks.
- Monthly updates/refinements of Games Master Plan to April 2002.
- Progress reporting on Games Master Plan, procurement timelines and key third party deliverables to senior managers and external scrutiny teams.

**May – July 2002 (Games Time):**

- Disengagement of the Programme Management team; some staff transferring to Games time roles, others assigned to FAs (Technology, Operations and Creative) where further refinement of delivery plans was required.
- Weekly issue reporting/resolution via senior management groups.
- Identification, weekly monitoring and reporting on achievement of Games Key Milestones.
Application Software and Reporting

MS Project planning software was adopted as the standard tool for developing, maintaining and reporting on project delivery. Working with FA managers, the Programme Management team ensured that a project plan was drawn up for every work package identifying the key tasks, delivery timelines and major milestones. More detailed plans were developed by some FAs (particularly those in Technology and the Operations division) using the same software. Until late 2001, these plans were sufficient for progress reporting and the sharing of information across the organisation.

From October 2001 these FA project plans were fed into the Games Delivery Programme maintained using Primavera planning software which was a more powerful and flexible application for reporting purposes. More than 10,000 activities and major milestones were captured into a fully integrated and logic-linked programme.

Legacy

Through the various activities of the Programme Management team, a wealth of detailed planning knowledge has been gathered and recorded which can be used when preparing for future Games.

Key Lessons and Recommendations

Lessons have been learned in a number of areas:

- Ensure that programme managers are accepted and trusted as an integral part of each FA enabling them to work closely and productively with other project planners, senior managers and directors.
- Plan early but do not try to capture plans in too much detail when two years out from the Games – focus on high-level activities and key milestones in order to inform staff recruitment and procurement planning.
- Allow sufficient flexibility in delivery timescales to deal with major areas of uncertainty. For example, a number of early milestones were missed because athlete and VIP numbers, service standards and final budgets were not confirmed.
- Detailed delivery plans must be developed in conjunction with FA and venue teams to ensure accuracy, completeness and buy-in, particularly from senior managers.
- Seek to identify and capture inter-relationships and dependencies in order to understand the real impact of failing to meet a key milestone.
- Effective project planning can bring simplicity and understanding to a difficult and complex process such as procurement. For example, the mapping of all procurement packages led to a realisation that a bottleneck in the process would quickly be created due to the nature of the financial approval process. Delegated levels of financial approval were duly altered to facilitate this process and avoid delays.
- Adopting user-friendly project planning software is essential to ensure the necessary buy-in from the organisation but more powerful reporting tools may be required to meet the requirements of senior managers and funding partners.
Overview

The Strategy and Integration Programme was established in February 2001 to provide a strategic organisation-wide lead to the approach to planning of the Commonwealth Games. The CEO and DCEO tasked the Strategy and Integration Programme with providing a timeframe and template for these planning phases.

The principal aims were as follows:
- Roll out of planning principals and tools.
- Management of policy development process.
- Development and management of cross-organisation communications forums.
- Establishment and support of operating policy and approval group (Policy Approvals Group) for all operational activity.
- Implementation of programme for moving organisation from functional-based to venue-based operations, involving both functional and venue-based planning.
- Implementation of an organisation-wide data repository that held all relevant planning information and templates in order for M 2002 staff to obtain information and to assist them in their roles.
- Development of Games time organisational operating structure.
- Development of reporting and communications procedures with external agencies such as GMP, emergency services etc, establishing a city-wide organisational structure.

The primary goal of the programme was to ensure that the planning suited the size and level of the event. The key aim was to allow venues and FA streams to work more closely together and work to a Commonwealth model as opposed to an Olympic model.

Given the nature of the programme it was intended that the team would effectively cease to exist once these programmes had been successfully planned.

At the end of 2001 the focus of the Strategy and Integration Programme altered to look at the final delivery of the venues programme including the implementation of a contingency preparation process and venue-based operational Games Readiness Programme.
Key successes for the programme were:

- The implementation of a planning structure for M 2002 in November 2000 establishing a clear structure of how the organisation would progress through to Games time.

- The development of key criteria as to how the Games would be run allowed Strategy and Integration to be the vehicle to progress planning and outlined the processes that needed to be implemented for this to occur. This included Games wide, FA and venue specific strands which were intended to ultimately create the ‘whole’. The major components and activities of this overall plan - outlined later in this section - remained fundamentally unchanged through the life of the organisation up to and including the Games, contributing greatly to the overall success of the Games.

- The overall principals and concepts behind the structure of the venue teams and how they are required to report to the GCC including the proposed Games Readiness Exercises was communicated to venue teams early on and was successfully implemented before the Games.

- Minimal integration within the organisation.

The original appointment of a Programme Manager was made with a view to delivering an integrated approach to the Games. However, this was difficult to achieve as certain parts of the organisation continued to deliver information and planning strategies in separate functional and divisional structures.

The Team

The structure of the programme had four staff positions with the following roles:

Programme Manager
Led the team to implement the agreed planning objectives and disseminated them Games wide.

Assistant Manager
The major role was to manage specific projects and activities related to developing components of planning and preparation activities.

Integration Coordinator
Coordinated the finalisation of the planning process documents, i.e. policies, strategic plans and procedures, to be ready for the first major milestone of 2001 and ongoing milestone delivery up until Games time.

Information Coordinator
Responsible for managing the ‘Games data’ system – an intranet based facility which held organisational information that was used across the organisation for planning and preparation activities.

Having experienced some of the difficulties associated with integrating FAs into venues, the following structure would have been more appropriate for this department:

- The department should have a dedicated Venue Integration Manager who would assist the Director of Venues with the development and implementation of the venues based programme. Given the workload required for multiple venues in different locations they would require a coordinator or assistant to support this role.

- A Database Manager would look after the requirements for central data repository; establishment of functional and venue based electronic operating plan templates, policies and procedures etc. It would be an advantage if the position was based within Strategy and Integration rather than shared with Technology as there is a significant amount of dedicated work involved in developing and updating information for the central database.

- Functional Programme/Executive Support Manager would look after the establishment and servicing of various decision making groups and also be principally involved in helping to develop the Games time Operations Centre (GCC equivalent) and its procedures.

- Integration Projects Coordinator would look at key items that require development - e.g. overall Games wide contingency process and developing/confirming interactions and communications channels with external agencies e.g. Government; emergency services.
Key FA Partners and Contacts
Internally, the Strategy and Integration Programme interacted with all FA programmes within the organisation. This was part of the planning process as well as providing the key communications forum that was attended by FAs. The Functional Area Core Team (FACT) meetings were held every fourth Friday. The key items covered in this forum were:
- Outlined functional specific policies.
- Report back on current topical issues.
- Outline of upcoming venue and Village planning activities.
- Introduction of FA planning activities.

Games Wide Involvement
The approach to planning was undertaken in a three phases. These were developed based around the amount of time left between when the planning phases began and when the organisation was ready. The key dates established were:
- All venue team managers and key staff in place by 1 April 2002.
- Organisation to be Games-ready by 15 June 2002. This was one month prior to the opening of the CGV.

An overview of the original approach for FAs can be seen below:

1. The Initial Phase (February - June 2001)
During this period the levels of service and activity were agreed with each of the FAs. Each FA was asked to produce a work package report outlining their requirements. These levels of service were then agreed with Senior Management. Each FA then used these agreed levels of service to produce their Functional Strategy Papers and Detailed Functional Plans.

2. Major Venue Planning Phase (July - December 2001)
The activity that was undertaken during this period involved taking the information and level of activities planned by the venue teams and delivering them into each of the venues so that an integrated venue operation was delivered.

As part of this, FAs were able to use this period to further refine their operations by determining how they would operate at the point of the delivery and how they would resource their operations for determining staffing, technology, vehicles, FF&E and space. The intention was to ensure all planning was confirmed by the end of 2001 to allow for operational preparation to take place in 2002. However, with Executive Management changes came changes to agreed levels of service and overall planning documentation, which in turn necessitated a review of all plans during October/November of 2001.

At this time the Policy Approvals Group (PAG) was established by Strategy and Integration and chaired by the Director of Venues. This was established to allow a forum for FAs to have a policy revised or a new policy approved.

3. Operational Preparation Phase (January - July 2002)
This period focused on final operational preparations. The key items that FAs concentrated on were:
- Development of FA specific contingencies relating to their own functional operations.
- Involvement in the development of venue-specific and major contingencies.
- Finalisation of staff recruitment and rostering of staff.
- The involvement in and conduct of the following training:
  - Leadership
  - Orientation
  - Job Specific Training
  - Venue Training

Participation of key FA staff in venue preparations programmes - such as the venue desktop and venue operational readiness exercises proved invaluable.
Venue Involvement

Strategy and Integration provided the planning cycle, timings, processes and support tools for the delivery of the venue preparation and implementation programme. Once delivered, it was planned that the Venues division would be responsible for managing the delivery of the programme. As described above, it became apparent that Strategy and Integration should have a staff member physically located in the Venues division to support this function.

The original programme involved the establishment of a ‘core’ team responsible for the management of planning and delivery of each venue. This would reduce the requirement for paid staff at each venue at Games time by allowing greater acceptance of responsibility amongst key managers.

The venue involvement process and integration of FA functions into clusters can most easily be represented by the following diagram:
Legacy
The key items that were developed by Strategy and Integration were and remain in the M 2002 Legacy department and are as follows:

1. Work Package
The CEO and DCEO agreed that there was a requirement to determine with each FA what level of service was to be provided and how. The work package documentation was developed which formed the basis for the meetings held to agree these.

2. Functional Area Strategy Paper
This outlined what the FAs did at Games time and the requirements and interactions they required prior to the Games to achieve this. It included information relating to:
- Description and scope of services.
- The dependencies that the FA had on other FAs or groups.
- Proposed Games time structure for the FA command or management.
- Outline of key activities in six month blocks.
- Risks and contingencies for the FA both in planning and operations.
- Resource requirements to achieve the programme.

3. Detailed FA Plan
Further developed from the FA Strategy Paper, this outlined:
- Deliverable development: breaking down the deliverables for each six months (from 18 months out) for the FA.
- Outline of what the FA would do at the venue for each of the predefined M 2002 operational phases - to be provided for sport venues (generically); non-sport venues (by venue); Villages; major command centres.

4. Operating Policies
These were the ‘rules’ that each FA developed to outline how the FA would operate (e.g. restricted items information; rules on accreditation access).

The policies were written by each FA. Other affected FAs were then asked to comment and sign off on the policy and then each policy was approved by Senior Management.

5. Operating Procedures
These outlined how the ‘rules’ would be implemented. The FA would develop these and inform other interested or affected FA of the content.

6. FA Contingency Plans
Each FA was asked to develop contingency plans (see section C7.2) for items which were most likely to affect their operations. Each FA produced a list which was reviewed by Strategy and Integration with an external Risk M anagement consultant from Marsh (Marsh have a high level of experience in multi-sport events). These plans allowed the FAs to provide information to their staff in the venue teams in a concise and consistent manner. This information was also used to help educate the venue teams during the operations exercises.

Key Lessons and Recommendations
- Clarity of service standards is fundamental to successful delivery and to plan effectively these need to be clearly defined and agreed by senior management as early as possible.
- The key advantage of having a Strategy and Integration department is the provision of assistance that can be made available to ensure a consistent Games wide approach is taken to planning and that this approach is continued throughout the different phases of Games preparation.
- Ensuring that the Strategy and Integration team and Programme M anagement work cohesively to achieve milestone listings and deliverables is essential for the success of the programme.
- In turn, adopt a simple change management process for approvals of budget variations or new positions. This will assist the efficiency of FAs particularly when work demands become increasingly busy.
- Establish programme with enough prior planning for the programme to have impact.
- Ensure that aims of the programme are clearly understood and committed to by the FAs, venue teams and the overall organisation.
Overview
The introduction of the Finance Committee and the development of its terms of reference gave the Funders a level of comfort and reliance on the operation of M2002. The Funders gained confidence in the financial operation of the Games through clear and detailed reporting.

The team, systems and reporting changed considerably within the two year period prior to the Games. The resultant team and systems provided suitable control for the Games but would have benefited from establishing the final reporting systems at least a year prior to the Games. This would have freed up management resource to be assigned to future issues.

The size of the operation allowed strict financial control to be implemented across all revenue and expenditure streams that has contributed significantly to the successful final financial position of the Games.

Financial System Development
Budgeting
The implementation of the Games’ Financial Systems commenced in summer 1997 with the introduction of a budget planning tool called Events 97. The system was used to collate budget data from a zero base and facilitated the initial assessment of projected expenditure for the Games.

Accounting
During the second half of 1998 the task of selecting and implementing a financial accounting system commenced. This process culminated in the decision to implement a SQL based system named Platinum 7.2. General Systems, a local reseller of the Platinum system, assisted with the design and implementation of the application, which went live in March 1999. The procurement of the system was tied in with a ‘Friends of the Games’ sponsorship package which resulted in a relatively small cash outlay combined with a significant VIK investment.

The Platinum system evolved from a small number of transactions per month to significant volumes in summer 2002, as follows:


Throughout most of the project, M2002 used a MS Word based template for the purposes of raising internal requisition forms. These forms, once approved by the Divisional Director, Procurement and Finance, were used as the basis of raising formal purchase orders which were then communicated to suppliers.

However, as the pace of procurement activities increased in the months leading up to the Games it was decided to implement a Contract Change Control Note (CCCN) system. The approval of requisitions during July and August was performed by the Divisional Director and Cost Manager by way of the CCCN system. These commitments were recorded on an Excel based Games time reporting system which interfaced with the GCC.

The Platinum system was not integrated with the asset management system, ViewLogistics. The latter was implemented as an MS Access based standalone asset tracking system in summer 2001. This system was operated and maintained by a separate asset tracking team, with no direct link to the accounting system. The lack of such an interface was deemed to be a shortcoming in the planning stages and ideally both the ViewLogistics and Platinum system should have been integrated for the purposes of tracking purchase orders to assets.
Reporting
The budget was initially developed on Excel. Once the budget had been agreed and the business went into the operational planning phase a more flexible system was required. An Access database solution was presented as the most suitable solution. This allowed quick and efficient changes of the budget and real-time reporting of actual spend and committed costs.

In spring 2001 the method of forecasting Games’ expenditure was enhanced with the introduction of Crystal Reports and the Budget Reporting Application (BRA). As a result of the Events 97 system being unable to interface with the recently upgraded SQL 2000 version of Platinum, the BRA was successfully developed in-house. This application continued to operate in tandem with the Platinum system through to the end of the project.

Payment Processing
The increasing volume of payment transactions necessitated the introduction of an application to remit payments electronically to both suppliers and contractors. Consequently, in autumn 2001 the NatWest BankLine application was successfully installed and interfaced with the Platinum system for the purposes of extracting payments data. Ultimately, 90% of payments from the Games HQ were being processed electronically via BACS, which helped to increase the speed and security of payments, whilst also reducing payment processing costs.

The Team
1998 – 2000
Prior to 2000 the team consisted of four personnel and was focused on developing and agreeing a delegated budget, system development and transaction control.

2001
In April 2001, coinciding with the rollout of the delegated budget, the Finance team was expanded to enable effective financial control of the budget.

The Finance team was broadly split into two areas, i.e. the transaction and reporting team and the divisional team. The former, based in Commonwealth House, was primarily tasked with controlling the sales, purchase and nominal ledgers. The latter team, based with their division or FA, worked closely with the operating divisions to ensure up to date financial information was available on a divisional basis.

Transaction, Sales Ledger and Reporting
This transaction and reporting function was responsible for managing the processing of transactions within the sales, purchase and nominal ledgers. The revenue and sales ledger had a dedicated staff of two personnel as did the budgeting and reporting section.

At Games time, to enable reporting to be expanded to cover daily reporting and draw down of contingency, a team of three secondees from KPMG were utilised at the GCC.

The following gives a breakdown of where the Finance team were recruited from:

Purchase Ledger
Control of processing transactions through the purchase ledger involved the largest number of staff. The Assistant Financial Controller oversaw the operation of purchase ledger processing and payment. This was achieved with a core team of seven at Games time. This included the core team and was enhanced with four temporary staff to cope with increased volumes during and after Games time.

Divisional
A qualified accountant was assigned to each division and in some cases, (notably Operations due to its size and complexity) to an FA within a division.

The assignment of accountants within the divisions is detailed on the organisation chart overleaf.
Managing and Reporting Finance Committee

Terms of Reference

The primary responsibility of the Finance Committee was to monitor and oversee the delegated Games Operating Budget in order to report to the M2002 Board.

More specific responsibilities were:

- Ensuring that M2002 maintained proper accounts and related records.
- Ensuring that systems were in place for all employees and creditors to be paid by their due date and that such systems were effective.
- Ensuring that all income was correctly accounted for and that income receivable was collected promptly.
- Approval of financial statements.
- Ensuring a robust and effective risk management process was maintained by M2002.
- Monitoring and overseeing an effective Internal Audit function.
- Approving contracts up to £1.25 million.

The Finance Committee would approve the mitigation of variances within divisional budgets up to £500,000 and between divisional budgets, and from the operational funding reserve, up to £250,000.

The Deputy Chief Executive would have authority to approve the mitigation of variances within divisional budgets up to £200,000 and between divisional budgets, and from the operational funding reserve, up to £100,000.
Committee Structure
The Committee consisted of a number of independent members and M2002 personnel. In addition, representatives of each of the Funders attended each meeting.

Members
Jim Michie - Chairman and Independent Member
Wade Martin - Deputy Chairman and Independent Member
Robert Hough - Independent Member
Sir Christopher Chataway - Independent Member
David Leather - M2002 Deputy Chief Executive and Finance Director
Bernard Ainsworth - M2002 Chief Operating Officer

Observers
Sean Holt - Sport England
Richard Paver - City Treasurer: MCC
Mike Hill - DCMS
Ruth Lowry - PricewaterhouseCoopers on behalf of the funders

Financial Control
Revenue and Cost Control
Qualified accountants were assigned to revenue and each major cost category. A revised forecast was produced on a monthly basis. This formed the basis for any changes to the flexed budget.

Cash Management
Treasury
Treasury management was performed by the Financial Controller under the direction of the Finance Director. Excess funds were put on short term deposits of varying periods depending upon future expected cashflows.

Payment Control
Approved and validated invoices were submitted for payment by the Transaction team. These were subject to detailed review by the Financial Controller, General Manager of Finance and the Finance Director.

Electronic payments could only be presented for bank processing by the Financial Controller and approved by the Finance Director. One individual could not process electronic payments.

Payments up to £10,000 could be approved by the General Manager of Finance or the Finance Director, neither of whom had access to the bank processing system. Payments in excess of £10,000 required two signatories.

Financial Reporting
Management Accounts
Management accounts were produced on a monthly basis and formed the basis of the financial information presented to the M2002 Board and Finance Committee.

The Management accounts contained an analysis of each revenue stream and each work package detailing costs incurred to date and future commitments which in total represented the latest forecast.

Games Time Reporting
During the Games there was a need for real time reporting. This was to ensure that any events that had a financial impact were assessed and the appropriate funding, if required, drawn from the contingency.

This was performed by a team of accountants who manned the GCC around the clock and produced a daily report detailing all material events that would require funding.
Key FA Partners and Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact Names</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Sean Holt, Ian Fytche</td>
<td>Funder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>Robert Raine, Mike Hill</td>
<td>Funder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>Richard Paver</td>
<td>Funder – City Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PricewaterhouseCoopers</td>
<td>Ruth Lowry</td>
<td>Advisors to Funders (esp. Sport England &amp; DCMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPM G</td>
<td>Bill Enevoldson, David Amison</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPM G</td>
<td>Graham Odlin, Maria Carr</td>
<td>Corporation Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst &amp; Young</td>
<td>Jan Gregory</td>
<td>M 2002 External Auditors – also provider of audit resource</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 18 Official Suppliers for the Games - please refer to the Sponsor Sales and VIK section of volume 3 for details.

Venue Involvement

The divisional team was aligned to FAs and the main transactional team were centrally located and visited venues as required. The main venue involvement at Games time was cash handling and the distribution of petty cash for each of the venues.

Key Statistics

Indicated below is a chart indicating the progression and processing frequencies of purchase orders, purchase invoices and payment transactions.

Key Lessons and Recommendations

- The Finance department were able to deliver higher than expected revenue and lower than expected expenditure resulting in lower than anticipated draw down of contingency funds.
- There was an acknowledgement, by the Funders, of the content and format of work produced by the Finance department and their subsequent reduction in the level of review work required by their respective auditors, i.e. PWC.
- The timeframe for closure of major contracts were longer than anticipated. The main factor contributing to this position has been the delay in receiving final documents from third parties/suppliers. As a consequence contracts have had to be extended for employees to adequately process and validate the transactions.

Key Financial Statistics
C6.1 Internal Audit

Overview
The Internal Audit function of the Commonwealth Games was established to provide an assurance to the Finance Director and the M2002 Board and to its Funders that a satisfactory control environment existed within M 2002, and that all key risk areas were identified and addressed. In support of this, an internal audit strategy document was prepared and agreed with the Board and the Finance Committee. This strategy was based upon four key principles, as follows:

- A clear focus on areas of high risk.
- An understanding of fundamental control systems.
- The need for early involvement of the audit function in advising on risk and control implications.
- The need for flexibility in the audit plan to address new risks or issues as they arise.

The Audit Team pre-Games focussed on assessing key systems to ensure they had the capability of generating accurate financial and operational information. Procurement, contract management and forecasting were three key areas of attention. This period was also used to identify all areas that would require audit attention during the Games themselves, to prepare detailed audit programmes to address those areas and to identify sufficient, suitably qualified resource to carry out those programmes.

During the Games themselves, the audit focus was on having a clear, credible presence across the venues and Villages to carry out the pre-planned audit work, identify and address any unforeseen issues as they arose, and to be a visible deterrent to those seeking to override the control environment in place.

Post-Games, the audit focus was on contract management closure and asset disposal, ensuring that M 2002 received the income to which it was entitled and paid only those costs that were incurred and asset losses were kept to a minimum.

The Team
The Internal Audit team increased through the peak phase of Games time operations and remained at this level over the following period:

Games time
Pre-Games team augmented by eight secondees for a five-week period over Games time – 15 July to 16 August.

Leading into Games time the structure of the Audit team developed from a small team of two to a team of internal auditors recruited from two major partners; three from Ernst & Young, the Games’ external auditors, and five from M CC. The services these positions provided were in effect ‘donated’ by the partnership organisations. Prior to Games time, all these individuals were given job specific training, comprising the following:

- Daily audit work programmes.
- Reporting procedures.
- Shift patterns.
- Operating procedures, including accreditation, transport, meals, communication etc.
- Venue familiarisation.

The Games time auditors were distributed across the Games as follows:

- Two at the Sportcity cluster, responsible for audit work within the City of Manchester Stadium, Velodrome, Squash Centre and Table Tennis Centre as well as the Sportcity Plaza surrounding the stadia.
- Similarly two auditors were given responsibility for the City Centre cluster, incorporating the G-Mex, M ICC, MEN Arena and the Aquatics Centre.
- Auditors were also allocated to the Villages and the Parklands and Road Events clusters.
Key FA Partners and Contacts
Close relationships existed with all the Funders and their advisors, and with a number of suppliers where there was a need for a significant level of audit attention. Key external contacts were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Funder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>Funder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>Head of Internal Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>(Provider of audit resource and contact with District Auditor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PricewaterhouseCoopers</td>
<td>Advisors to Funders (esp. Sport England &amp; DCMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst &amp; Young</td>
<td>M 2002 External Auditors – also provider of audit resource</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Venue Involvement
As part of the training secondees visited the venue clusters to which they had been assigned in order to meet venue/Village management prior to the Games, so that their roles and responsibilities could be clarified in advance. Close links were forged from the outset and in effect venue management were immediately made aware of any issues identified by the auditors that had an impact on their venues.

Internal Audit had a close relationship with all venues and Villages, with a presence at all locations throughout the Games. Auditors were present full-time at the venues and Villages from the commencement of operations through to the end of the bump-out phase, carrying out a range of audit tests set out in a predetermined daily audit plan.

As a requirement at the end of each shift the auditors prepared a shift report highlighting issues arising, which was faxed to the Games centre for Internal Audit. All shift reports were reviewed and a summary audit report was e-mailed to the GCC for consideration at the daily 06:00 meeting.

Although the Audit team were not directly part of the Venues and Villages team, all auditors developed a close rapport with venue management, informing them of issues as they arose and addressing any issues that venue management raised. Direct reporting lines remained to the Head of Internal Audit but with a venue focus.

Key interactions were established with Finance and Commercial, in reviewing controls over revenue generation and the recording and reporting of costs and revenues, but there were also important interactions with a number of operational areas (Catering, Cleaning, Waste, Security, Transport etc) where significant costs were being incurred during the Games time period that required close tracking.

Key Lessons and Recommendations
- At the outset, a formal audit strategy should be developed and agreed with the Board/Finance Committee (or equivalent body).
- Obtain buy-in to the audit plan from all external audit bodies and incorporate their requirements into the audit strategy as far as possible. This will help gain acceptance of the strategy by Funders.
- Develop strong relationships with third party operations (retail partners, licensees, caterers etc) well in advance of Games time.
- Ensure that all FAs, particularly venue management and accreditation, clearly understand the role of the internal audit function and their venue-based requirements.
- Use test events as much as possible to familiarise Games management and third party contractors with the audit process and to assist in the training of the audit team.
Overview
The overall mission of the Risk Management team was to prevent and minimise the impact of unexpected losses during Games time operations, and to minimise the financial impact of such losses.

The Risk Management team managed all systemic operations for the function during the Games period in coordination with the Finance and Administration department.

Risk Management worked extensively with sport and non-sport venues prior to the Games and throughout the Games period to identify and prioritise any high-risk environments or specific functions that had an elevated risk.

The Team
The Risk Management were responsible for providing the following services for all aspects of the OC:
- Risk identification and assessment
- Safety and loss control services
- Incident reporting and investigation
- Claims management
- Claims settlement

Risk had a number of teams to fulfil specific portfolios within the programme which performed specific roles to guard against unnecessary risk. A team of ‘Loss Control Specialists’ were primarily responsible for addressing the physical hazards of venue facilities and operations. These specialists liaised extensively with each of the venue teams and with venue owners to assess the risks evident in the working environment, preparation areas and the surrounding spaces used by M2002 to operate the venues.

A further team of ‘Risk Coordinators’ were responsible for completing and analysing incident reports, and assessing exposures to loss from venue operations.

Finally a team of ‘Claims Specialists’ were employed to respond to incidents and were responsible for conducting incident/claims investigations.

The Risk pre-Games structure is on the following page.

Venue Involvement
Risk Management operations were based in a Risk Coordination Centre in close proximity to the GCC. All Risk staff were based at the Risk Co-ordination Centre and the relevant personnel were deployed to venue sites when required to document incidents, conduct claims investigations, and conduct loss control site safety inspections. It was expected that Loss Control Specialists would conduct site inspections on a rotating basis, visiting each sport venue and specific non-sport venues every second day during the Games operations period.

Risk Management had a presence at each of the 36 sport and non-sport venues. The methodology for Risk Management’s involvement at the venues and Villages was as follows:

Venue Safety Risk Assessment Checklist
- Staff were required to complete the document for their venue, at least one checklist daily for specific venues.
- Staff were also required to complete a Daily Summary Report on risk control issues and deliver it to the VGM.
- Staff had to document the level of compliance/non-compliance to the recommended modifications at venue locations (physical and operational modifications).
- Reports were undertaken as necessary on specific venues where Venue Site Inspections or General Health & Safety Audits were required.
Games Time Structure

ACE Europe Milestones, Risk Control & Claims Management

City Centre Cluster Managers
- G-Mex, MPC & MICC Representatives
- MEN Arena Representatives
- Manchester Aquatics Centre Representatives
- NPC Parking Depot Representatives

Sport City Cluster Manager
- City of Manchester Stadium
- National Squash Centre
- Indoor Tennis Centre
- National Cycling Centre

Parklands Cluster Manager
- Salford Quays Triathlon & Walks
- Salford Quays Marathon
- Belle Vue Regional Hockey Centre
- Heaton Park

Peaks Cluster Manager
- Mountain Biking
- Bolton Arena
- Road Cycling
- Bessemer St (MAUC)

Non-Sport Cluster Manager
- Games Coordination Centre
- National Shooting Centre
- Commonwealth House
- Heathrow Airport

Bisley Cluster Manager
- Bisley Shooting Village
- Bessemer Street Transport Depot

Commonwealth Games Villages Manager
- Commonwealth Games Village (CGV)
- Technical Officials Village (TOV)

Risk Coordination Centre

Manchester Aquaatics Centre Representatives
- Redver Street Transport Depot

RCC Administrator

Risk Control Centre

Hospitality Marquees
- Wythenshawe Forum

Remote Vehicle Search Site Logistics Compound

Manchester Airport (A&D)
- Piccadilly Train Station

Manchester Girls High School Transport Depot

MEN Arena

National Squash Centre

Bessemer Street Transport Depot

Transport Depot

Heaton Park

National Cycling Centre

Manchester Girls High School Transport Depot

International Broadcast Centre

Manchester Airport (A&D)

Heathrow Airport

Bolle Vue Regional Hockey Centre

Road Cycling

Manchester Airport (A&D)
**Assist with Crew 2002 Incident Report Cards**
- The Risk Management team collected cards from the VCC daily at assigned venues and delivered them back to be entered into the incident reporting database.
- On occasions the Risk Management team would make on-site recommendations to assist in the resolution of issues.

**Assist with Claims Investigation**
- The team were required to have the completed claim forms for accidents reported to Risk Control by RCC and/or VCC.
- Interview M2002 staff regarding accidents.
- Assist ACE with accident investigation.

**Risk and Hazard Reduction**
- Part of the tracking process within the Risk team was to ensure that, where appropriate, risks and hazards were reduced via a standard daily audit of the venue.
- Where this was not appropriate, the VGM and Fitout staff were tasked to ensure that risks and hazards were eliminated from their workspaces.

**Complete Risk Management Daily Report**
The following steps were required to be taken by venue staff and reported back to Risk Management:
- Complete a summary of issues and loss data for assigned venues/clusters (for inclusion in the daily Risk Management Report).
- Review accidents reported in Venue Accident Book and correct as necessary.
- Risk Management had a legal obligation (part of UK regulations) to report the incidence of any injuries or accidents that occurred during the Games. The reporting body RIDDOR acts as a health and safety executive that records elements of risk existing (reporting of injuries, diseases and dangerous occurrences) in the UK.

**Legacy**
The development of new skills with regard to project management and event management, creating the potential for a joint approach when dealing with future issues concerning Health, Safety, Risk Management and Risk Control within MCC.

**Key Lessons and Recommendations**
- It is essential to procure a Risk Financing Programme as early as possible.
- Require the insurance carrier to place loss control and claims staff within the Games OC through all the following periods:
  - fitout
  - bump-in
  - move-in
  - Games operations
  - move-out
  - bump-out
  - decommissioning
- Integrate Risk Management and Health & Safety early in the planning process.
- Require Risk Management and Health & Safety reviews of all Games fitout planning.
- Ensure compulsory attendance of all venue senior management team to Health & Safety training sessions.
- Provide risk assessment training and assistance to venue senior management teams and FA management.
- Ensure all risk assessments are completed six months prior to test events.
C7.1 Issue Management

Overview
The Issue and Risk Register was utilised by all of the divisions within M2002 to track their own issues through to resolution. The issue and risk register was a Windows based application which allowed the easy registering, categorisation and subsequent management of issues affecting individual divisions/workstreams.

Each issue entered onto the system would be allocated an individual reference number. Once entered, issues could be updated and viewed by those with access to the system.

Issues were allocated a ‘level’ from 1 to 5. Guidance was provided as to which level to allocate, however Level 1 was reserved for issues that needed to be dealt with by the weekly directors meeting and formed a set of weekly milestone achievement targets.

From March 2002, all directors met weekly for two hours on a Monday evening. This was the Directors Issues Meeting and had a number of standard items on the agenda as follows:

- Commissioning/transition planning
- Test events
- Contracts
- Changes to baselines/overlays
- Staffing
- Games preparedness

In addition to standard items on the agenda, the meeting would discuss any Level 1 issues that were on the Issue and Risk Register. Level 1 issues were those that could not be resolved at a FA level and required discussion at a Directors meeting to progress them further.

Following the meeting, the actions arising would be circulated and the Issue and Risk Register would be updated to reflect the latest position in respect of Level 1 issues. A printout from the Register would then be circulated to Directors for resolution.
C7.2 Contingency Planning

Overview
Contingency planning formed a strategic part of the development of the Games wide Risk Management and Venue Health and Safety programme for the Games. The process of contingency planning was not implemented in isolation to the overall strategy for planning. The process of development was completed in consultation with a steering group representing FAs and venues. The group worked in conjunction with the Games Readiness team and the GCC to formalise the process of decision making at both a venue level and a more strategic GCC level.

Contingency plans formed an integral part of the decision making process both in developing the scenarios for the Games Readiness Exercises and in progressing the framework for resolution of issues during Games time.

The roll out of contingency planning was instigated through the VGM’s and FA Managers. Via a desk-top and ‘whites of the eyes’ facilitation process. The majority of the scenarios were developed through the venue health and safety review process. This process assisted venue teams in identifying where the venue had structural or physical weaknesses how to establish a plan to support these scenarios.

The contingency planning facilitation included the identification of 10 realistic factors common to all venues, with the capacity to affect the venue or FAs by compromising the normal operation of the venue:

**Competition Delays, Postponement or Cancellation**
Competition delays, postponement or cancellation can all have a major effect on many areas but in particular Broadcast, Technology, Catering, Cleaning & Waste. This scenario establishes the priority order of communication flow between the Broadcast Centre and Technology to delay the time of the Broadcast. Priority is initially given to Broadcast, however because of the severity of the delay a chain-reaction of processes are discussed to inform venue communications as to which FAs need to be informed of the delay.

**Weather**
The second major contingency identified was a response to adverse weather conditions. As this is considered a high priority contingency and is dealt with by the GCC, a delegation process is undertaken to reach the command centre of the venues. Priority is given to exposed or outdoor venues and intervention weather specialists are required to define the severity of the conditions, predict the length of time it should continue and the rate the overall danger to competitors and technical officials. Major elements to consider within this contingency were the securing of temporary structures, ensuring there are adequate standby fitout personnel to intervene where necessary and ensure special equipment such as electrical items and exposed objects likely to cause danger to individuals are safely positioned.

**Staff Shortage**
The third contingency defined in the overall top 10 list is the scenario relating to major staff shortages with the potential to disrupt the operations to a venue. This contingency requires the intervention of Volunteer Services following an action plan to bring the venue up to its original volunteer capacity. The contingency details temporary measures to be put in place by the venue team to ensure the integrity of the venue, requiring the team to deploy existing staff to the more essential positions, until the full operations team is restored.

**Utility Failure**
The utility failure contingency requires the joint-effort of a number of stakeholders to coordinate the restoration or replacement of power or water to a venue. The Broadcast area takes priority over all other areas in the venue therefore the priority is to ensure that broadcast activity is reinstated as quickly as possible. The contingency resources established to maintain the continuation of the session is of paramount importance. The deploying of technical staff to initiate battery supplied units and portable PA systems is considered of equal priority to maintain communication with the spectators at the venue.
Technology Failure
An incident of technology failure can affect a wide range of stakeholders in a venue requiring a back-up system to facilitate the continuation of work for Swiss timing, Delta tre, Fast Track, and Broadcast. Often this contingency also requires the intervention of Sport to determine the length of delay or whether it constitutes a full delay to the schedule. This contingency for Sport is particularly pertinent if the sport is dependent on timing devices or automated scoring to conduct the event.

Damage to Structures
This contingency requires the intervention of Fitout and possibly Look but in particular the Health & Safety Officer in the venue to determine the danger to spectators and degree of intervention. This contingency is designed to have minimal affect on the continuation of event with the goal to secure structures without spectators being alerted to the problem.

Crowd Surges
Crowd safety in the UK is given a high priority and the ability to intervene at venues requires a specific intervention plan to reflect the design of the venue. The contingency must identify all exit points and predicted pinch points of major thoroughfares. In the event of this occurring crowd surge specialists were deployed to establish a plan to intervene. FAs responsible for the implementation of controlling crowd safety are Security and Event Services staff including guides providing a way finding function on the concourse or plaza areas.

Increase in Security
This contingency involves the intervention of the GCC in consultation with GMP to issue a release detailing the scale of the threat to venues in closest proximity to the threat. In the event that the threat is not as specific advice is taken from intelligence services to advise of the threat-level on a scale of 1-5 (1 being the most severe) to instigate an action and evacuation plan consistent with the venue.

Bomb Threat
This contingency explains the required response to a coded or telephone message bomb threat. Venue managers and volunteers were required to be trained in the receipt and subsequent action should a threat or package be found of a suspicious nature in a venue. The escalation should occur direct from the VGM to the GCC who determines the response and ongoing investigation. Police and special intelligence resources would be consulted to initiate an investigation and coordinate the contingency reaction.

Evacuation
The evacuation contingency can take place in two forms as a partial or full evacuation. This contingency discusses the actions required to initiate a partial evacuation and a full evacuation. Full evacuation has a major consequence and is only initiated once all interventions are exhausted after advice is given to do so by emergency services and the GCC. Evacuation procedures are captured in a detailed Venue Evacuation Plan (a legal requirement of the operation of any venue) and these procedures are then rehearsed with emergency announcements and systematic communication of evacuation procedures.
C7.3 Games Readiness Exercises

Overview

GCC Operations 28-29 June 2002
The aim of the GRE was to rehearse Games wide command relationships, coordination and communications within and between command centres and senior/executive decision makers.
The GRE achieved the following objectives:
- Employed Games wide command, coordination and communication arrangements and policies.
- Rehearsed information flows and decision-making processes.
- Rehearsed reporting protocols and meeting schedules.
- Rehearsed escalation and resolution of complex (multi-body) issues/incidents.
- Developed/rehearsed contingency plans and arrangements.
- Confirmed clear role identification and differentiation.
- Identified operational shortfalls which were addressed prior to the Games commencing.
The GRE was a critical step in the final planning stages of the Games resulting in the following:
- Integration of the participating organisations/bodies with optimum inter-agency cooperation, communication, and alignment.
- Rehearsed and validated procedures, reporting protocols and plans in a 'safe and cooperative' environment.
- Games wide transition from a 'planning mindset' to 'operations', which built staff morale and confidence in meeting the task ahead.
- A team that identified, escalated and/or resolved issues in an efficient and effective manner, thereby reducing misunderstandings between areas that have natural overlaps and dependencies.
The INOCON Group LLC (Inocon) was contracted by M2002 to provide Games Readiness activities as part of M2002's Games Readiness Project. Inocon focused on activities designed to develop and rehearse integrated operations within and between the Operational (Bronze), Tactical (Silver) and Strategic (Gold) levels of the Games command, coordination and communication structures.
The following Games Readiness activities were designed, developed and delivered by Inocon:
- Identify, map and validate 'Top 10' Integrated Operations Contingencies (IOC).
- Venue level Desktop and Venue Operations Exercises (VOE).
- Games wide Readiness Exercise (GRE).
Games Readiness Exercise
The M2002 GRE was undertaken on 28-29 June segmented into two days. The first day was used to exercise M2002 operations and the second included external agencies. The GRE was designed to simulate two days of the Games (29 and 30 July) including competition schedules, daily run sheets, programmed meetings and other scheduled activities.

The GRE exercised five geographically dispersed command centres, the majority of M2002 FA Heads, Directors and Senior Executives and key executives responsible for emergency services and Government within the Greater Manchester region. Approximately 12 major, 50 minor and numerous ‘noise’ scenarios were used to exercise participants.

Objectives
The aim of the GRE was to rehearse Games wide command relationships, coordination and communications (C3) within and between command centres and senior/executive decision makers.

The key objectives of the GRE were to:
- Employ Games wide C3 arrangements and policies.
- Rehearse information flows and decision-making processes.
- Rehearse reporting protocols and meeting schedules.
- Rehearse escalation and resolution of complex (multi-agency) issues/incidents.
- Develop/rehearse contingency plans and arrangements.
- Confirm clear role identification and differentiation.
- Identify operational shortfalls to be addressed.

The GRE management team focused on the tracking of how scenarios were handled and to identify or observe where a lack of integrated operations impacted upon successful resolution of an issue involving more than one function or agency.

Observations were usually first noticed within the Exercise Management Cell when monitoring resolution of scenarios; then confirmed by witnessing interactions between exercise participants and/or during informal and formal debriefs held during and after the GRE.

In the main, the GRE management team found M2002 external agency structures and concepts of operation to be generally sound. FA Commands (FAC), external agencies and the GCC demonstrated a strong understanding of their internal operating procedures and processes despite the GRE being the first opportunity for many to substantially practice their Games time operations.

Key Lessons and Recommendations
- Future Games should undertake similar readiness exercises prior to entering into Games operations. M2002 identified some key areas for improvement and this exercise set a foundation for Games decision-making functions at the GCC.
C7.4 Critical Success Factors and Pro-active Risk Management

Overview

Amongst the work undertaken by Funders and by key partners (such as GM PTE and the GM P) via the GMCC were two interrelated exercises intended to assist them and M 2002 better allocate resources to deliver the Games successfully. These exercises were:

- The identification and clear definition of the factors which would make the Games a success in the eyes of all key stakeholders.
- The definition and agreement of mechanisms for the proactive management of a variety of potential Games time operational risks. The majority of these potential risks were directly related to the delivery of the critical success factors.

Work was undertaken from late in 2001 to define what became known as the ‘Critical Success Factors’ (CSFs) which could guide M 2002, Funders’ and key partners’ decision making and assist in the determination of outputs which all the stakeholders agreed should represent a basis for quantifying future success.

Whilst there were a number of different criteria that Funders and the various stakeholders identified to justify their participation in the Games, it was important that the Games were a success. A number of different components underpinned this work:

- Public sector bodies, especially MCC, looked to deliver economic and social benefits from the significant levels of investment made.
- The Games became a benchmark for the UK delivering a successful sporting event. This was especially important for Government and UK sports governing bodies in light of the UK’s recent record on the delivery of major sporting facilities.
- The sports events had to be of the highest possible quality.
- Both visitors and residents should have a positive Manchester experience whether or not they attended Games sports events.
- Sponsors should derive the benefits they sought through association with the event.
- The Games should be delivered to budget.

Previous experience from major multi-sport events confirmed Funders’ view that effective organisation was particularly important in terms of meeting the needs of athletes, officials, journalists, VIPs and sponsors and that, as early organisational set-backs were difficult to counter, positive reactions from the outset of the Games would be key to perceptions of their success.

The work focused on identifying the CSFs for the different constituent groups and determining the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) by which these CSFs could be measured. Examples of this included:

- For athletes, their transport arrangements needed to be effective from the day they arrived at the Games with Games Family transport services operating within 5 minutes of the scheduled timetable; and their catering provision should be timely and meet their dietary requirements – measured by reference to the range of services, including casual dining and provided within five minutes at any service point.
- Critical for journalists, the CSFs focused on efficient and timely accreditation arrangements, well run transport services and efficient operation of the main and venue-based press centres.
- For spectators clear and straightforward procedures for accessing tickets were key, they required high quality and comprehensive information and the ‘look’ of the city and the Games to provide a welcoming, attractive, colourful and festival atmosphere.
A matrix was developed which matched each CSF against its own set of KPIs and the actions required to achieve each. A lead agency was also identified as being responsible for the achievement of each CSF. As this work unfolded the service standards that underpinned the work of M 2002 and partner agencies were examined to determine whether the service standards agreed would deliver the proposed KPIs. The matrix also identified opportunities for testing the KPIs prior to the Games, either at specific ‘test events’, simulated activity and/or in consultation with representatives of the different stakeholders. Other key partners (especially GM PTE and GM P) were encouraged to test their own operations at the scheduled, or alternative, test events.

The testing process identified a small but important number of shortfalls between the KPIs and service standards then being proposed. For example, the process identified the need to increase the Games Family Transport vehicle fleet to enable a reduction in waiting times, the need for additional spectator car parking capacity and enhancements to the Athletes’ Village accommodation and catering provision. Funders were then able to take timely decisions relating to releasing additional resources to secure the required improved service levels. Ongoing monitoring arrangements were established to ensure that any non-delivery of service levels could be quickly identified and addressed. All M 2002 FAs and the affected key partners were subsequently required to identify how the CSFs would be monitored and reported upon at Games time. This work then led to a detailed assessment of risk management arrangements and contingency planning and ultimately to the development of a proactive approach to risk management.

**Proactive Risk Management**

Essentially, the Games faced two types of risk:

- Those that were more within the control of M 2002 and its partners and could therefore be proactively managed and mitigated either prior to the commencement of the Games, or, if necessary, during the Games themselves.

- Those that were outside M 2002’s and partners’ control (for example, security threats and severe weather) that a level of contingency planning management was put in place.

Essentially, though, the Games organisers could only react to these risks once they had occurred.

As Games time approached the GMCC began to place increasing emphasis on ensuring that manageable risks were proactively managed where possible, for example through early warnings, monitoring and identifying mitigating actions to reduce or eliminate them. Key partners agreed with this approach and that there were known ‘pinch points’ within their own operating plans that could be identified and proactively monitored to provide the early warnings required. Each agency identified these pinch points and mechanisms for monitoring and mitigating them and then fed them into an overall Games pro-active risk management strategy.

Particular emphasis was placed on transport, given the crucial influence it would have on the Games’ success. MCC’s Traffic Management Group assessed the likely traffic conditions and junction approaches on all Games Family and spectator transport routes to identify potential congestion points (action had already been taken to introduce revised Games time traffic signal timings and restrict access and parking for non-Games traffic on appropriate routes). A series of meetings and site visits helped to formulate traffic management measures and detailed operational plans that could best address these problems without creating further congestion points elsewhere on key Games routes. A similar review of traffic arrangements for The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay, the Marathon and the Triathlon was also undertaken.

The Games Coordination Working Group, chaired by the COO, spent most of one of its last pre-Games meetings sharing and discussing key risk areas in order to contribute to the development of the risk management work. The key conclusion from this session was that transport or transport-related issues accounted for the majority of pinch points from all agencies.

An example of a pinch point identified at one of these sessions was the failure to assemble the athletes in time to board the transport to Sportcity for the Opening Ceremony parade and/or a hold-up in their transport from the CGV to Sportcity. Using Crew 2002 workforce to gather the athletes and deploying active traffic management to minimise the journey time, was identified as the best way of mitigating this risk.
Overview

The Games Coordination Centre (GCC) was the central communication and coordination facility for the Games. It provided information, issue tracking and resolution, reporting and decision-making systems enabling M2002 to manage the conduct of the Games. The main function of the GCC was to provide operational support to venues, FAs and external bodies while recognising that the majority of decision-making occurred at the venue level.

The GCC operated on a 24-hour basis as the central command and coordination nucleus for the Games, providing strategic responses and decisions to venues, FAs and external bodies as required. The main functions of the GCC included:

**Internal to M2002**

1. **Facilitating Decisions** - from M 2002 Executives, FA Commands or the COO when an issue requiring resolution was received.
2. **Communication** - of decisions to relevant persons and groups, maintaining daily informal and formal communication to venues and FA Commands.
3. **Issue Tracking** - monitoring the status of issues received into the GCC, assigning responsibilities and seeking resolution through appropriate channels.
4. **Trend Identification** - through daily analysis of available data, enabling early identification and rectification.
5. **Coordination** - of information received into the GCC from venues and FA Commands.
6. **Risk Identification** - of ad hoc and formally reported information received into the GCC, filtering and prioritising into relevant risk order.
7. **Compilation** - of daily reports, deciphering key information and distributing as necessary through the relevant reporting mechanism.
8. **Distribution** - of formal and informal information, including daily reports and weather status updates.
10. **Central Information Provider** - receiving feedback from and providing briefing to Call Centre staff needing responses to external queries.

**External to M2002**

1. **Facilitating Decisions** - from GM CC, Funders Panel and other external bodies when an issue outside M 2002’s remit was received into the GCC.
2. **Communication** - of issues and decisions affecting external bodies, maintaining daily informal and formal communication to external bodies.
3. **Coordination** - of information received into the GCC from external parties command centres, i.e. M CC/GM P/GM PTE/GM AS/GM FS.
4. **Distribution** - of GM CC Brief and other ad hoc reports to external bodies.

**Pre-Games**

**Test Event Weekend - GCC Operations 15-16 June**

M 2002 activated the GCC for the first time over the Pre-Games Event weekend of the 15 - 16 June. The function of the GCC during the multi-sport/multi-venue operating environment achieved the following:

- Confirmed the reporting function from VGMs to the GCC, specifically Belle Vue, Heaton Park, Rivington and City of Manchester Stadium.
- Confirmed the reporting function from FAs, specifically all those participating in pre-Games events.
- Confirmed reporting function from VCCs where applicable.
- Utilisation of the Games Issue Tracking System (GITS).
- Tasking senior management or appropriate body with the responsibility of resolving issues that were escalated to the GCC.
- Report compilation and distribution, including the distribution of the Games Daily to venue teams and FAs.
- Activated the GCC as a conduit for M 2002 Command and Control.
- Activated communication links between the GCC and GMP Gold Control.
- Activated informal communication between other external agencies as required.

The GCC operated in a live multi-event environment, which provided an opportunity to test process, and procedures that the GCC planned to utilise during the Games. The Pre-Games Event weekend of the 15-16 June provided a unique opportunity to vet GCC operations prior to going into the Games Readiness Exercise and the Games themselves.

**The Venue**

The GCC was based in Heron House located in Manchester city centre, close to the Town Hall and MCC headquarters. The building required minimal overlay modifications the majority being the installation of office partitions and temporary CCTV cabling.

The GCC was not a stand-alone venue as the remainder of the floor was occupied by centrally based M 2002 FAs in addition to the Media Accreditation Centre. The general room layout of the Main Operations Room worked well, with key partners and M 2002 FAs integrating well.

Emergency Services were grouped together in close proximity to MCC/GM PTE and Security, Sport and Transport were co-located to ensure any schedule changes at competition or training venues were supported by the transport network and were discussed immediately as issues arose.

Media was based within the Main Operations Room allowing early escalation of issues to the Media Information Group (MIG). The MIG consisted of representatives from M 2002 and all key partner agencies. The M 2002 Media team worked through the Issue Response Plan (IRP) developed by the GCC which highlighted potential issues that would be escalated to the GCC during the Games. The media team determined in advance what their response would be to the issues contained within the IRP and established what the media line would be and agreed which agency would take primacy on each issue. This advanced planning proved to be invaluable.

The Main Operations Room was a tight area of space forcing the co-location of groups and agencies that facilitated a higher standard of communication.

The GCC structure was best represented by the following diagram:

**Games Coordination Centre (GCC)**

The GMCC managed the overall operations of the city at Games time. Sitting within this structure, M 2002 independently operated the GCC where the specific command and control of the event was managed.
Key representatives from the bodies that constituted the GMCC were physically represented within the GCC. This model facilitated the most efficient flow of communication both internally (GCC – Venues) and externally (GCC – External Body) allowing issues to be resolved at a faster rate. Operating within this manner ensured M2002 did not operate in isolation and there was a city wide understanding of the impact of day to day decisions.

Independent to the GCC, each external body had their own reporting structures in place and maintained a central report to the GMCC ensuring continued integration between all groups. Each body appointed a deputy to each of their key positions during planning stages continuing through to the completion of the Games which guaranteed continuity of operations in the event of the primary contact becoming unavailable.

**Decision Making within the GCC**

The COO had ultimate responsibility for all decision-making within the GCC, recognising that the bulk of GCC decision-making was delegated to M2002 Directors and FA Commands as appropriate, within agreed parameters and within scope of their defined responsibilities. The COO worked closely with the DCEO/Finance Director. In the event that the COO wasn’t contactable for a decision, responsibilities were transferred to the DCEO/Finance Director for resolution.

**Daily Report Requirements**

Finance reports showing expenditure commitments against budget were submitted by each budget holder (mainly FAs and venues) overnight allowing a finance report to be compiled by 06.00 each day for the Finance Director.

Risk and internal audit reports were also submitted to the Finance Director for discussion at the GMCC meeting.

There were no other formal written reports required for submission to the GCC, as issues were escalated as they occurred via phone. Some venues, FA Commands and external agencies did submit end of day reports by choice, however the information had already been communicated to the GCC during the course of the day.

**Daily Reports Distributed**

Daily Reports distributed from the GCC were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Type</th>
<th>Distributed To</th>
<th>Time Submitted</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Games Issue Summary</td>
<td>COO, M2002 Executives</td>
<td>06:00 daily</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games Daily</td>
<td>VGMS (including Villages), FA Managers, M2002 Executives, external body representatives</td>
<td>By 06:30 daily</td>
<td>Fax, Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Finance Report</td>
<td>Finance Director</td>
<td>06:00 daily</td>
<td>Hard copy, Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMCC Brief</td>
<td>GMCC members</td>
<td>09:30 daily</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather Status Report</td>
<td>Venue General Managers</td>
<td>By 06:30 daily, hourly status reports as needed</td>
<td>Fax, Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alerts/Bulletins</td>
<td>VGMS (including Villages), FA Managers, M2002 Executives, external body representatives</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Text Messaging, Email, Fax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Team**

The VGM for the GCC commenced on 1 March 2002, which commenced the initial planning for the GCC. Prior to March, the GCC was at the concept/strategic development stage.

The Deputy VGM was appointed in May 2002, with the remainder of GCC positions commencing in early July. All GCC staff were redeployed from other positions within the organisation where there was no requirement for a full time Games time presence (Programme Management, Contract Management, Legal, Directors PAs).

Job specific training was a keen focus in late June and early July. Training needed to be completed prior to the Games Readiness Exercise which took place at the end of June. The exercise itself proved an excellent training tool and was the most beneficial exercise carried out to prepare staff for their Games time roles.
Positions were as follows:

**GCC Venue General Manager and Deputy Venue General Manager**

The role of the VGM and DVGM:
- Led GCC operations, overseeing the successful implementation of all facets of GCC operations.
- Maintained communication with COO and Senior Management including updates of issues and incidents, preparing and briefing COO for internal and external meetings.
- Conducted briefings ad hoc and per formal meeting schedule.
- Facilitated decisions within the GCC, through the Duty Executives, COO as appropriate, M 2002 Directors or external agencies.
- Responsible for ensuring key issues were tracked and decisions were communicated promptly and efficiently to affected stakeholders such as venue teams, FA Managers or external agencies.
- Filtered information received into GCC for either reporting or issue tracking.
- Maintained communication links with venues and FAs.
- Managed the GCC Operations team.

**GCC Duty Executive**

The GCC Duty Executive had the following responsibilities in the GCC:
- Designated lead on issue management within the GCC; delegating as appropriate to FAs, external agencies or GCC Operations team.
- Ensured external agency and FA desks within the GCC were provided with information in a timely manner.
- Ensured that two way communication was maintained with external agency and FA desks.
- Primary adviser to COO on issues relating to their specific area of expertise, facilitating COO decisions.
- Provided necessary feedback to COO or GCC Operations Managers for incidents and issues that were escalated, ensuring Games Information Tracking System (GITS) was maintained with current, accurate information.
- Duty Executive were responsible for identifying impacts of issues that may not have been identified by the broader GCC.
- Regularly updated the GCC Main Operating Room with verbal updates on Games status.
- Assigned an appropriate issue level to new issues.
- Assigned issues to Duty Executive/Executive support.

**GCC Operations Manager**

**Operations Support:**
- Coordinated GCC support activities/information.
- Vetted issue updates that came in via the central support line both verbally and through delegation.
- Monitored status of issues, prompting Duty Executive to close as required.
- Backed up/overnight input and maintenance of GITS.
- Frequently checked the weather status via GFIS/Met Office.
- Checked and actioned incoming GCC emails.
- Produced and distributed GCC Bulletins.
- Assisted in issue resolution through communication with affected groups.
- Proactively assisted in trend identification.

**Executive Support:**
- Assisted the GCC Duty Executive with issue resolution, dissemination of information and tracking of communication with Directors, relevant FAs/Venues, external agencies as required.
- Utilised the Issue Response Checklist to ensure all affected stakeholders were informed in a timely manner of issues impacting upon their operations.
- Supported the Duty Executive as required.
- Worked closely with Operations Support to ensure issue resolutions/updates were inputted into GITS promptly and efficiently.

**FAs represented in the GCC:**
- Sport
- Transport
- Security
- Media
- Finance
- Legal/Contract Management
- Roster of FA Management on call 24/7

**External Agency Representatives in the GCC:**
- MCC
- GM PTE
- GMP
- GM CF5
- GM AS
- Showsec
- DCM S

Staffing levels were accurate for the majority of the time, however it became very quiet in the last three days, and fewer staff were needed. Overall there were 17 paid staff in the GCC Core team acting as a support for the decision making bodies and Senior Directors present. Staffing for the GCC was difficult to predict as a major incident could occur at any time with no advanced warning, requiring high levels of support personnel to assist in resolution.

Ideally, the position of Support Operations Manager and Executive Support could have been merged if the staff filling the posts had the right background: previous Games experience and/or sound operational background. With the resources redeployed into these roles, it was necessary in this instance to create two roles, one with a more operational focus and one more process/coordination of information focused.
Key Lessons and Recommendations

- Full time Technology support is required for first few days of operations, as there were several requirements for assistance particularly relating to communication mechanisms (text message mechanism, conferencing facility, GITS). Due to the staggered bump-in of communication operations into the GCC, receipt of information from venues was a phased in process over a period of a few days.
- Establish the requirements of other agencies as early as possible, regarding space allocation and technology resources.
- Provide an opportunity for GCC staff to see some of the venues, to promote staff morale.
- Staff redeployments for the GCC need an overall knowledge of Games operations. (Redeployments were difficult to secure due to managers reluctance to deploy staff on the agreed dates).
- Invest quality time in building rapport with external agencies well in advance of the Games, (this proved invaluable for M 2002).
- GMP - Clear lines of communication must be established with each agency prior to the Games to ensure that there are no delays in the information being communicated to the GCC and out to the venues and other agencies.
- GMAS - Key statistical information provided daily ambulance transfers, which proved very useful. GMAS provided an on-call 24/7 service with specific Games contacts and with a roving presence in the GCC.
- MCC - having a full time presence in the GCC, MCC were able to assist with many of the issues that were escalated to the GCC that affected the city Games wide.
- Sport - competition schedule change process was meant to be coordinated through the GCC, but several times the schedule changed without going through a formal consultative process. This created problems with system data not matching the actual competition schedule. A lot of the changes related to athlete numbers varying in different events.
- Media Services - Media worked very well within the GCC, they often were informed of issues prior to any formal escalation to the GCC from media contacts out at venues and these were efficiently passed onto the GCC. The GCC had a Commonwealth Games clippings service which was a popular feature providing information to the GCC team.
- Security were located full-time in the GCC and the majority of issues that were escalated to the GCC impacted upon Security in some way. They are a recommended feature of the GCC core team.
Overview
M2002 entered into 577 contracts in order to deliver the Games. Contracts were signed in the following areas: broadcasting, sponsorship, licensing, IT and telecommunications, consultancy, procurement (supply/hire of goods and services and/or equipment), catering, cleaning and waste, venue hire, accommodation, Local Authority and other public sector, transport, The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay and minor works contracts. Goods and services with a value less than £30,000 were procured on M2002’s standard terms.

From January 1996 to March 2001, general legal advice was provided to M2002 by Addleshaw Booth & Co externally except in relation to company secretarial services which were provided by MCC. The main focus during this period was on the sale of broadcasting rights, sponsorship and licensing and general Games planning.

From March 2001, the in-house team comprised one qualified solicitor supported by a trainee solicitor both to provide legal advice, manage the executed contracts list and to coordinate the legal advice provided by Addleshaw Booth and Co and MCC. In November 2001, a senior manager from United Utilities was appointed to facilitate the preparation of a contract management system for M2002. The Addleshaw Booth & Co solicitor secondment to M2002 began on 18 February 2002 and the M2002 in-house solicitor appointment began on 9 April 2002. An MCC team comprising five qualified solicitors, previously operating from the Town Hall, began a full time secondment to M2002 during May 2002.

The Team
The legal service to M2002 was provided by an in-house legal team eventually totalling 12 in number, comprising eight qualified solicitors; one M2002 in house solicitor, one solicitor seconded from M2002’s Official Lawyers, Addleshaw Booth and Co and six solicitors seconded from MCC with four support staff. Specialist advice particularly in relation to the areas of broadcasting, sponsorship, licensing, IT and telecommunications was provided directly by Addleshaw Booth & Co under the terms of their Official Sponsor agreement. Specialist advice particularly in relation to local authority law, procurement, company secretarial services, road closures and data protection was provided by MCC. Additional administrative support in managing the contract process was provided by the Contract Management team.

A separate but essential part of the overall team was the Contract Management team which provided a direct link with client FAs and developed and managed the Contract Matrix as a tool for tracking progress on contract sign off. The Contract Management team gave essential administrative support to the Legal team thereby allowing available time to concentrate on giving legal advice and drafting legal documentation.

Key FA Partners and Contacts
Legal provided a Games wide service so instructions were received across all FAs. The key partner FAs were, however, Commercial, Broadcasting, Procurement, Venues, Villages, Operations, Fitout and Transport. The key external partners were the CGF, MCC, DCMS and Sport England (the Games funding bodies), other local authorities in which Games events were to be held, GONW, GM P, GM PTE, GM CFS, GM AS and the NHS.

Venue Involvement
During the Games, members of the Legal team were present at the GCC both as part of the formal operational team and also as part of the Finance/Legal Desk to assist in issue identification and
resolution of new issues. The team were required to collate information that M2002 might need to investigate potential or future claims. While the main focus was on resolution of brand protection issues arising during the Games, a number of other potential legal disputes were identified and resolved during the Games. As additional support to the Legal team, working at the GCC, Legal team members and Addleshaw Booth & Co were available on call if there was a crisis management situation requiring additional staff.

**Key Lessons and Recommendations**

- As part of the overall planning process identify at the outset the various specialist areas required to be seconded or employed in the team and the likely volumes of legal advice required. The timelines for delivery are a critical planning tool used to adopt a phased approach to completion e.g. initial phase involving sale of broadcasting rights/Host Broadcaster, their sponsorship deals and the venue hire, licensing and procurement contracts.

- Develop strategies/policies to deal with the delivery of legal advice to certain key areas e.g. brand protection, commercially ‘clean’ venues and the monitoring and amendment requirements where appropriate.

- Create a specific project management plan for legal services and monitor it regularly. Match specialist skills to the phased delivery milestones and react quickly to the need for additional resources. Any delay on delivery in early phases directly impacts on the delivery in later phases.

- Make early contact with local authorities and other public sector partners to develop key relationships and understand timescales for relevant statutory processes which can impact significantly on the delivery of the Games.

- As part of the early planning process develop a suite of standard contract documentation in all appropriate areas. Including both long and short form contract pro-formas and adopt a strategy for use. Where appropriate, precedents should provide clarity, to venue owners and contractors who are not specifically legally astute, but a concise and clearly written contract of a shorter nature can be a more efficient approach.

- Create a specific matrix detailing the contract management progress on identifying all contracts and progress monitored. This will also create an early warning system for identifying contracts which may impact on other contracts and/or other FAs. Emphasis should be on meeting ‘corporate’ needs and not individual FA needs so as to provide economy of scale.

- Explain the need for client FAs to take ownership of their own contracts via dedicated Contract Managers and provide sufficient and clear instructions to Legal and/or Procurement FAs. Recognition of the role of the Contract Manager is fundamental to overall delivery and they must have the requisite skills to identify the FAs’ requirements at a sufficiently early stage to allow contracts to be drafted appropriately. The Legal team should be proactive in supporting any necessary training required.

- The use of letters of intent should be limited in extent and if required should limit any financial exposure. Limit the use of heads of agreement as this usually involves the use of legal resources which may be better spent on negotiating the draft agreement.

- Delays in signing contracts can impact negatively on the negotiating position and may cause operational problems with contractors and suppliers. Where the contractor/supplier is delivering prior to formal sign off, the longer the period of negotiation takes the more likely it is that specific ‘operational’ issues will then occur and further delay sign off. There is a need for close interrelationship between the other key delivery support FAs particularly Finance, Procurement and Risk Management.

- Introduce a contract sign off procedure that involves formal agreement and ownership by key parties: the relevant Director; relevant Contract Manager; Finance; Legal and Risk Management.
Overview
From the outset, no formal records management system was implemented into the M 2002 organisation and the management of records (both paper and electronic) evolved separately within each FA. Retrieval of electronic records were controlled through the allocation of access rights to common files (identified as Games wide data) which were accessible to all staff via the Games intranet. There was no system for storage of objects or audio-visual material.

In November 2001, a small Steering Group was established with representatives from M 2002, MCC and the North West Regional Legacy Team to scope the work associated with information archiving and the ‘Remains of the Games’. This was the first time such an exercise had been undertaken for a major sporting event in the United Kingdom and there were no formal guidelines on how to proceed, although a report from the Sydney Olympics set the broad parameters.

The Steering Group reviewed legacy aspirations and legal obligations before recommending an appropriate records management strategy to the Senior Management team in January 2002. In October 2002, a strategy was agreed for dealing with electronic data files held on the central file servers.

On completion of the project, relevant material forming company records and the permanent archive were delivered to MCC for retention and further administration. The objects collection and supporting documents were retained by the Regional Legacy team for exhibition purposes, general enquiries and further legacy work.

The Team
A Records Manager and Records Assistant were appointed in March 2002 to implement the agreed plan guided by the Steering Group. In September 2002, three additional staff were recruited via a third party contractor to assist with the post-Games sorting and cataloguing of paper records. The following month, a records management consultant was appointed to coordinate the archiving and transfer of Games data held electronically. The target completion date for all this work was December 2002.
Records Management and Archive Programme

A Records Management and Archive programme was instituted within M2002 in March 2002 with the following objectives:

- To record, track and safeguard important records produced or received by M2002 during the course of its business and remaining lifespan of the company. The term ‘records’ included electronic, photographic and video material plus objects.
- To ensure that company records would be retained for appropriate periods to meet administrative, financial, auditing and legal obligations.
- To build up a permanent archive collection relating to the 2002 Commonwealth Games and their legacy. This collection was intended to document the organisation, planning and delivery of the Games and the associated Legacy Programme. As such it would become an information rich collection complemented by audio-visual materials and objects some of which could be displayed in a post-Games touring exhibition.

Pre-Games Period

During the pre-Games period the Records Management team identified key sets of records for archiving and plans were drawn up for the collection and transfer of relevant documents after the Games. This process was managed in the following way:

Introduction and Education – A series of meetings were held with key staff in each FA and venue team to introduce them to the programme and its objectives. Views were sought on potential problems associated with data collection and the document transfer process.

Surveying and Scheduling – Records Management staff visited each FA to locate and evaluate major record series. Where possible, retention periods were assigned to each set of records and relevant material was earmarked for the permanent collection. At this stage only paper records not captured as electronic documents were surveyed.

Recording – Information gathered during these surveys was recorded on a database. Retention schedules were produced and copied to FA Managers for verification.

Advice and Support – A note on Records Management best practice was emailed to all Directors and FA Managers in December 2001. Records Management staff also provided general advice on filing and storage systems.

Post-Games Period

In the immediate aftermath of the Games, FA and venue teams were supplied with standard storage boxes and requested to pack relevant materials for delivery to the Records Management team in Commonwealth House. Approximately 700 boxes were collected at this stage.

Further material (100 boxes) arrived in September and October as FA teams completed their final work. Financial, Legal and HR files (approximately 200 boxes) were the last to be received as these records remained active the longest. Creation of the various archive sets was managed in the following way:

M2002 Company Paper Records – The expanded team began the process of sorting, cataloguing, labelling, final boxing and disposal of paper records and other material. Additional records were captured from central file servers through the processes of printing off important records, writing to CD-RW and generating reports from databases. Approximately 600 boxes together with a database recording the contents of each box and relevant retention periods, was eventually transferred into the custody and administration of MCC, the legal successors to M2002.

Permanent Archive – The archive collection was catalogued on proprietary archive software compatible and used by Manchester Libraries Archives and Local Studies Unit. The collection was labelled and transferred to the Manchester Central Reference Library for permanent storage in 100 standard archive boxes.

M2002 Electronic Records – By October 2002 the company had generated 860,000 data files held on the central file servers in a variety of formats including word, spreadsheet, database, project, graphic and image. In addition, almost 750,000 e-mail communications were stored in 2,100 separate accounts. In consultation with senior managers from M2002 and MCC, a sub-set of key
documents was identified from the various existing datasets. These were copied into a separate directory and converted to read-only (PDF) format with full indexing. A user-friendly menu system was also created to support document retrieval. Finally, the folder structure and back-up procedure was fully documented before preparing a complete and comprehensive set of back-up tapes containing all M2002 data files (including e-mail). Key files and back-up tapes were transferred to MCC to support further work associated with M2002 and the Games.

**OGKS Website** - In regard to M2002 electronic records, a similar but separate exercise was undertaken between September and December 2002 in conjunction with Olympic Games Knowledge Services (OGKS) (an IOC subsidiary company) commissioned by the CGF to publish Games data onto its website. The CGF’s primary intention was to make this information available through subscription to cities bidding to host the 2010 Commonwealth Games. Relevant data (in excess of 20,000 document files held in a variety of formats) was identified, consolidated and transferred to OGKS headquarters in Lausanne, Switzerland.

**Key Lessons and Recommendations**

- Establish a records management strategy as early as possible, ideally at the point the company is initiated, to implement centralised filing systems. Ensure buy-in from senior managers and offer support to FA teams.

- Do not underestimate the scale of records management and archiving work associated with a major multi-sport event, particularly the staffing resource requirements in the post-Games period and the space required for interim storage and sorting.

- Major sporting events generate interest from many quarters and the demand for information will be considerable. Take full account of potential legacy when compiling the permanent archive.

- Use of electronic storage media and a well designed intranet can reduce the amount of paper documents created during Games delivery. Note that Sydney 2000 collected over 10,000 boxes of material for subsequent sorting – although a much smaller event, the figure for Manchester was 1,000.
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D1 Local Authorities

Overview
While a select number of local authorities, namely Bolton, Chorley, Guildford, Salford, Surrey Heath, Trafford and Lancashire and Surrey County Councils, worked with M2002 to deliver the Games themselves, dozens of others from across the UK also got involved in other ways, namely, in broad terms, by:

- Working with M2002 to organise The Queen's Jubilee Baton Relay.
- Organising a variety of activities aimed primarily at raising general public awareness about the Games, the opportunity to become involved and embracing the spirit of the Games and the Commonwealth itself.
- Organising activities intended to maximise the legacy from the Games (over and above those specifically included in the Games legacy programme).

This section of the report considers a variety of activities which fall within these broad headings. It does so by theme, rather than by council. Firstly, however, consideration is given to how this activity was coordinated.

Coordination
At the specific suggestion of M2002 many local authorities and especially those in Greater Manchester and the North West of England, identified or appointed an officer with the specific remit of:

- Acting as a point of contact between M2002 and the local authority.
- Coordinating the delivery of Games related activity.
- Acting as a reference point for residents, businesses and organisations within the borough who wanted to get involved in the Games in some way.

In many cases the Coordinator headed up a team of other council officers and, where necessary, personnel from external agencies who were vital to the delivery of specific activity. This was especially the case in the councils who were hosting Games’ events where a multi-disciplinary multi-agency team would be pulled together. In Bolton, for example, a small core team was set up under the guidance of a Chief Officer, which included an overall Games Coordinator, the Council’s Pre Volunteer Programme Coordinator and an administrative assistant. Day-to-day support was provided as required by other officers, in particular by the council’s Marketing and Tourism/Promotions managers. This core team, with assistance of other officers (such as Traffic Engineers) and colleagues from partner organisations (such as the emergency services), met at regular intervals (at least every fortnight) from early in 2001. The work of the officer team was itself overseen by a formal Policy Planning Group comprising elected members and lay members representing, amongst others, the Town Centre Company. This group acted with the full delegated authority of the Council and had special responsibility for Bolton’s involvement in the Games.

M2002 briefed the local authority coordinators via a monthly bulletin. The 10 coordinators from the Greater Manchester local authorities (including Manchester) were also regularly briefed via M2002 convened meetings.

Hosting Games Sports Events
In general terms, the work of local authorities who helped deliver the Games themselves included:

- Helping to resolve issues around access, parking and transport for Games Family, spectators and other visitors.
- In the case of the Road Events, sorting out the temporary highway and, in some cases, footpath closures necessary to allow them to happen.
- Assisting in the protection of the M2002 brand or the interests of Games Sponsors and licensed merchandisers outside venues and/or along the routes of the Road Events.
- Keeping residents and businesses affected by Games events informed about how their planning was progressing and their likely impact.
- Addressing licensing and environmental health issues.
- Working with M2002 and the Police to address security issues and with them and other parties to develop contingency and emergency plans.
- Keeping the streets clean either around venues or on the routes of the Road Events themselves and arranging for the disposal of litter and refuse.
- Dressing key roads/streets (‘processional pathways’) and buildings. In most cases this was done using the dressing materials supplied by Flying Colours on behalf of M2002. In some, however, local dressing themes and colours were adopted. In Bolton, for example, the ‘brand’ adopted, which, while it complemented M2002’s own venue dressing, reflected the borough’s unique involvement in the Games.
- Encouraging local businesses and residents to dress their own premises.
- Providing Games related visitor information services, including printed materials (such as maps and guides), staffed information points and accommodation booking services.

Officers from the six councils (including Manchester) who were hosts to the Road Events also met as group, with M2002’s Road Events team, to develop a shared, best practice, approach to their organisation.

The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay
The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay (the Relay) offered an opportunity for people and communities from across the UK to participate in the Games. It also provided an opportunity to showcase the UK to the world. Local councils played a critical role in the Relay’s organisation and were each encouraged by M2002 to bring together a Community Planning Group to provide a borough focus for that process. These groups, which were made up of representatives from the local council and the local Police, tourist information officers, local community representatives and others depending on local circumstances:
Worked with M 2002 and the Police’s National Escort Group to agree the Relay’s route.

Assisted and supported the Relay itself by, for example, providing crowd barriers, organising temporary road closures and/or traffic diversions and organising or providing logistics compounds for the convoy’s stops and overnight stays.

Encouraged local people to volunteer to take part in the Relay itself.

Organised celebratory events along the route to mark the passing of the Relay through their borough, including community events and official, often civic, receptions where the Relay runners and support personnel and local dignitaries, residents and business people could meet.

Promoted the Relay and encouraged local people, including (especially) school children, to watch and support the Relay along its route.

In some cases (for example, Oldham, Salford, Stockport, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan), undertook the dressing of sections of the Relay’s route.

**Awareness of the Games and the Commonwealth**

Activities intended primarily to raise general public awareness about the Games, and the opportunity to become involved in them, and to encourage local residents to embrace the spirit of the Games and the Commonwealth itself were organised by many local councils. They included:

- A wide variety of cultural and community initiatives as part of the Spirit of Friendship Festival. Local authority initiatives were at the forefront of the delivery of the Festival which ran from 11 March until 10 August with its primary focus as raising the profile of the Games and the Commonwealth. Many councils provided small grants to help local community groups meet the cost of organising their own events and celebrations.

- Participating in the Adopt a Nation initiative which M 2002 promoted and which was embraced enthusiastically by many North West councils (for example, Wigan adopted Australia, Trafford - Jamaica, Bolton - New Zealand, Salford - South Africa, Chorley - Ghana, and Stockport - Malaysia). The initiative was aimed at providing towns and cities with an opportunity to develop friendship links by adopting one of the Commonwealth nations. Councils then organised Games time visits and receptions for their adopted team’s members and officials and themed events, such as exhibitions and developed elements for the local schools’ curriculum to reflect the links. Many of the adoptions built on already established links, such as via a large local community from that nation or existing cultural exchanges.
Information dissemination. Many councils produced Games specific newsletters and leaflets and/or included information and articles about the Games in existing civic publications. Council press and public relations departments also used press releases to feed the local media with Games related stories, much of which were intended to promote the Games or to get across key messages (for example, councils in the Manchester area used the media to disseminate information about Games time transport arrangements).

Plus, of course, The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay and the dressing of buildings and streets helped to raise public awareness and encouraged people to embrace the Games and the Commonwealth.

Legacy

Over and above the work undertaken as part of the formal Games legacy programme, in particular the North West SRB Programme (which is described elsewhere in this report), the Games provided many local authorities with an opportunity to organise their own activities with a distinct legacy focus. These included:

- Local sports development and health promotion activities.
  - As a result of the interest generated by Stockport providing one of the swimming training venues, the local council organised local swimming galas.
  - Blackburn with Darwen Council promoted leisure cycling activity on the strength of the local interest generated in the Games Cycling events due to the borough’s proximity to Rivington.
  - Bolton Council used the Games to develop two strands of activity: (1) a badminton development officer has been appointed to work with local schools and clubs to co-ordinate coaching and development initiatives; and (2) various cycling related initiatives, including the purchase of cycles and other equipment and a programme of group visits for young people to the National Cycling Centre. The annual Horwich Village Cycle Race was also resurrected after a ten year gap on the back of enthusiasm created by the Games.

- Tourism development.

The Games were seen by many councils as a significant catalyst to further develop their local tourism ‘product’. Not only did they give councils, and their partners, an opportunity to try and put the borough ‘on the map’, but they also provided a focus for enhancing the local visitor ‘experience’ such as improvements to the delivery of local tourist information services. For example, Bolton Council created the Bolton Tourism Business Forum to improve the exchange of information and ideas between ‘providers’, it improved local visitor signing and introduced longer opening hours at local information centres.

Another, perhaps less obvious, legacy benefit from the Games has arisen from the, often, innovative ways of working and/or close partnership work between council staff and other organisations that their delivery necessitated. The legacy benefits, which might help to improve the delivery of council (and other agencies) services in the medium to longer term, a result of the Games, include:

- The strengthening of existing partnerships.
- Different approaches to partnership working.
- The development of new partnerships.
- Different approaches to service delivery.

Conclusion

Local authorities across the UK played a critical role in the delivery of a variety of Games related activities. These helped the nation embrace the spirit of the Games and of the Commonwealth and contributed to the feeling of the overall success of the Games. They also helped to realise a great plethora of local opportunities and benefits. Many councils have expressed a wish to continue to work positively with partner organisations to ensure that the benefits and lessons learned are not short lived and that future opportunities are fully explored and successfully developed for the longer term benefit of the whole community.
UK Immigration worked closely with Accreditation regarding Visa procedures and with Transport to confirm Arrival/Departure Operations at London Heathrow, Gatwick, Brize Norton and Manchester Airport. Quarterly steering meetings were held in the 18 months prior to the Games to confirm details and facilitate Games Family arrivals.

**Visa Requirements**
Although the normal visa application process applied, M2002 worked very closely with UK Immigration to ensure processes were undertaken in a streamlined fashion. UK immigration were supplied with on-line access to the Accreditation programme (GEMS) in order to verify applications. UK Immigration formally arranged for the Foreign Office to waive the cost of the visa for Games Family to participate in the Games on behalf of M2002.

**Airport Arrival/Facilitation Process**
M2002 defined its expectations of UK Immigration Airport Operations.

M2002 and UK Immigration determined the method for resolving Games time issues (i.e. establishing a process when a Games Family Member arrived without a valid visa) with a clear contingency plan supporting the arrival of the passenger.

**Data Sharing between M2002 and UK Immigration**
M2002 granted read access to the accreditation database (GEMS) to allow UK Immigration to effectively process visa applications in line with their accreditation. This was arranged via a PC supplied by M2002 and installed in UK Immigration’s offices at Manchester Airport. This enabled UK Immigration to assess applications for a Visa prior to arrival, as well as at the entry points when passengers stated that they were Games Family members.

To streamline the airport Arrival process, M2002 supplied Games Family Arrival and Departure data to UK Immigration.
M2002 Interactions with HM Customs & Excise (HM C&E)

HM Customs & Excise provided a dedicated planning team at M2002's request in April 2001. This team provided information, points of contact and interpretation for all Games related activities and were critical to M2002's successful ability to provide information and smooth processing for teams on entry and exit. M2002 worked with the team in the 18 months prior to the Games.

HM C&E also provided assistance with the departure and arrival operations of The Queen's Jubilee Baton Relay in and out of the UK during its international route.

Firearms - Bisley/Heathrow Arrivals/Departures

HM C&E and M2002 worked together on the Firearms Importation and Exportation procedures to deliver the following:

- Temporary import procedures on arrival in the UK when firearms travel as accompanied baggage.
- Sending firearms by freight.
- All bonds, duty and VAT were waived for non-EU residents competing in the Games.
- M2002 provided detailed arrival and departure information to HM C&E and liaised closely to ensure a smooth arrival and departure process was in place.

Airport Operations

Manchester Airport

Key principles between M2002 and the Airport Working Group included:

- A&D Information supplied to HM C&E.
- M2002 were given authority to have an airside roving presence to ‘meet and greet’ M2002 VIPs and assist with queries and coordination in the Baggage Halls.
- Royalty, Heads of State and Government at the discretion of Greater Manchester Lieutenancy (GML) were met airside by GML.
- All other bespoke VIPs were met airside by the Head of Protocol or their representative.
- Representatives of teams were allowed on airside to assist AAS with wheelchair reconciliation.

Heathrow and Gatwick Airports

No airside ‘meet and greets’ were required at either of these airports, however, firearm coordination key principles were agreed as this airport was the primary arrival zone for all Shooting athletes.

Importing Medical Items

HM C&E issued a technical guidance note to all CGAs regarding the importation of medical items into the UK. This was distributed to all participating nations and no incidents were recorded during the Games.

Freight

A Freight manual was completed by Schenker with assistance from HM C&E and issued to all CGA teams. Information agreed for the temporary importation of goods and the related freight charges was offered as a service by Schenker. These services were communicated and offered to the CGA teams prior to arrival.

Client Communications

HM C&E provided input into communications to all the client groups via the manuals, dossiers and email. This was critical information for Games Family members prior to arrival.
A wide range of public sector agencies and private companies were engaged in a variety of ways in the delivery of the Games. Some, like GMPTE and GMP, played a prominent and highly visible role, while others, such as M C C’s Sportcity Project Team and the Confederation of British Industry (CBI), played a less prominent, but equally important one. This section of the report records the input of the Sportcity Project Team, MIDAS, the CBI and similar organisations. The work of GMPTE and GMP is recorded elsewhere.

**Key Partners Forum**

Beginning early in 2001, meetings were held every two months involving M 2002 and key stakeholders/partner organisations from Manchester and the North West region to ensure that they were briefed on preparations and progress in respect of the Games organisation. Convened as the Key Partners Forum, the meetings also provided an opportunity to provide updates on Games related or legacy issues from a range of perspectives.

Four key sectors were represented at these meetings:
- Organisations representing different local communities – for example, Manchester Council for Community Relations and the NW 2002 Economic and Social programme.
- Local and regional government and public sector services – represented by M CC, GONW and GMPTE.
- Local business community – represented by MIDAS, Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the CBI, Manchester Airport, Manchester City Centre Management Company and the North West Business Leadership Team.
- Marketing, arts and tourism sector – represented by Marketing Manchester and North West Tourist Board.
At each meeting, the M2002 CEO would report on the preparation of venues, the recruitment and training of volunteers, the development of the sports programme, the signing of sponsorship agreements, progress of ticket sales and other operational issues as well as updating partners on the organisation of the Spirit of Friendship Festival, The Queen’s Jubilee Baton Relay and the Games time cultural events programme. Each stakeholder was then able to provide information on their own organisation’s work in support of the Games.

An open forum at the end of each meeting allowed discussion of Games related matters and helped to strengthen networks, enhance information exchange and promote partnership working. Other initiatives benefited from the bringing together of key partners. Examples include development of the Business Club, arrangements for city dressing and the clean-up programme, enhancing the roles or participation of schools and local community groups, and legacy initiatives.

**Delivery of the Games**

Public sector agencies and private companies were involved in a number of key areas. For example:

- A project group led by the Sportcity Project Team was established to plan and deliver the new facilities at Sportcity and the associated infrastructure. The group included New East Manchester Limited, Laing, AMEC, British Waterways, GM PTE, Transco, ASDA Wal-mart, English Partnerships, Manchester City Football Club and Sport England.
- Owners and/or managers of venues such as the M E N Arena, Bolton Arena, National Cycling Centre, National Shooting Centre and the Sportcity Project Team worked with M2002 to develop operational plans and deliver them at Games time.
- M2002 negotiated with owners and managers of venues such as Lancashire County Cricket Club and Manchester United Football Club to provide spectator parking.
- New East Manchester Limited provided the interface between M2002 and local communities in the area around Sportcity. Newsletters, leaflets and public meetings were used to keep residents and businesses fully appraised of plans for the Games and their likely impact.

**Business Club and Bid to Benefit Conference**

Prior to the Games, senior officers from MCC met with key partners from the business sector of Greater Manchester to explore and develop legacy opportunities. The main thrust of early meetings was the dissemination of information on the Games and its anticipated impact. Later, partners were able to share information and coordinate their programmes in relation to the Games.

Plans for a Games time Business Club and post-Games conference emerged from discussions on potential legacy benefits.

Hosted by MIDAS and based at the Bridgewater Hall in Manchester city centre, the Business Club ran throughout the Games. It was presented as a forum for UK companies to make contact with other major business interests both nationally and internationally capitalising on commercial opportunities associated with major events such as the Games. On 30 July the Club met at Manchester Metropolitan University moving on to Liverpool University before returning to the Bridgewater Hall for the remainder of the Games.

Also hosted by MIDAS, the ‘Bid to Benefit’ Conference ran from 5 – 7 August and was based at the Lowry Hotel at Salford Quays. Keynote speakers from Manchester and other countries were invited to address an international audience of delegates, demonstrating the legacies and potential benefits that could be derived from hosting major international sporting events.
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E1 Legacy for Sport in the UK

Overview
The Games provide a magnificent legacy for UK Sport, Sport England and the British Olympic Association as a result of the integral involvement each of these organisations had with the Commonwealth Games.

Sport England, as one of the major funding partners of the Games, placed themselves in a prime position to benefit from the tangible assets and benefits of the Games.

- Legacy of English Institute facilities. These facilities were enhanced significantly by the fitout overlay, many of which remain as permanent features in the venues.
- The legacy of Games equipment (see volume 2, section B8) gives an overview of the amount of sport equipment procured for the future use of Sport England.
- Overall legacy that exists with the wealth of personnel experience gained by association with the Games.

The Team
Experience was gained by placing key staff in strategic positions within the Games structure. There were also many other placements made to service FAs. A number of staff were employed from the Salt Lake Winter Olympics who were dispersed throughout the organisation to service direct FA requirements and a number of personnel from UK Sport were contracted to work in press and media.

One area that was important to the success of the Sport division, was the work of the Games Strategic Sports Squad (GSSS). The GSSS was under the direction of the Pre-Games Event Manager and had responsibility to work alongside the Competition Managers and to assist them to make sport related decisions.

Their main role was to ensure that play started on time on the first day of each of the sports, through their involvement with competition preparations.

Elements of their work also included liaison with the Broadcast team in the event of a delay.

The Games Strategic Sports Squad consisted of the following positions outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position at M2002</th>
<th>Secended From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observers at M2002 Board meetings (2)</td>
<td>Sport England, West Midlands Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sports Manager</td>
<td>UK Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Strategist (2)</td>
<td>UK Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Anti-Doping</td>
<td>UK Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Doping Manager</td>
<td>UK Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Games Events Programme Manager</td>
<td>UK Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games Strategic Sport Manager (3)</td>
<td>British Olympic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director of Sport Operations</td>
<td>Salford City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director for Pre-Games Events</td>
<td>Manchester City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sport Manager</td>
<td>Bury Metropolitan Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Manager</td>
<td>Seconded from Stoke-on-Trent City Council (Fenton Manor Sports Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOH Coordinator Athlete Movements (Village)</td>
<td>World Championship Indoor Athletics Core team Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Athletes Mix Zone Manager (Stadium)</td>
<td>World Championship Indoor Athletics Core team Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix Zone Assistant</td>
<td>World Championship Indoor Athletics Core team Birmingham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Venue Involvement
The staff above brought a range of skills and experience in the dynamics of sport and major events. Their interaction in the venue was primarily with the Competition Manager and the Sport Directorate for the appropriate sport.

The concept was to place these people in ‘hot spots’ from areas identified during the pre-Games periods that they could utilise the relationships they had with the Governing Bodies and International Sports Federations to facilitate issue resolution.
This in some cases required them to follow the transition overnight to ensure that training could commence on time the next day and the event would be able to start on schedule.

**Third Party Involvement**

- The main liaison that occurred in this area was with the IFTDs, NGBs and communicating the information back to competition management and M2002.
- The role was to facilitate efficient communication and foster good relationships. Many of these people were already well known and well respected within specific sports and the BOA representatives in particular had excellent relationships with the IOC Members and many of the IFTDs.

**Key Lessons and Recommendations**

- The OC’s personnel requirements and detailed job descriptions should be made available to host nation sporting bodies as early as possible to maximise the opportunities for people from the host nation to work as part of the OC’s team.
E2 Non-Sporting Legacies

Overview
In the process of bidding for and hosting the Games, Manchester always made explicit its intention to create a lasting legacy for the city and the North West region. To this end, Manchester took an ambitious and innovative approach to non-sporting legacy, including the regeneration of East Manchester and the creation of world-class facilities available to local communities. All of these aspects were considered with regard to their longer-term benefits and impact.

Working with key partners from across the North West region a programme of legacy projects was developed with three key themes:

- Ensuring the whole region benefited from hosting the Games.
- Ensuring that disadvantaged communities were, and felt, involved.
- Ensuring that businesses in the region benefited from the business generated by the Games and all potential spin-offs.

This section of the Final Report outlines the various non-sporting legacies that were established including regeneration and sustainability, volunteering, education and cultural activities, and the ongoing work of the Legacy team.

Regeneration And Sustainability

Region-Wide
The Commonwealth Games Opportunities and Legacy Partnership was established in 1999 as a regional board with responsibility for developing and overseeing a comprehensive programme of social and economic legacies. The Partnership brought together regional senior managers from key North West agencies and organisations such as North West Arts Board, North West Tourist Board, North West Business Leadership Team, Sport England North West, North West Network (voluntary sector), Spirit of Friendship Festival, (M2002) along with sub-regional representation from other agencies.

The range of social initiatives included:

- Projects to ensure that residents from disadvantaged communities across the region had the opportunity, through the creation of a bespoke accredited qualification, to become volunteers at the Games, with progression support leading on to further education, training and employment. Over 2,000 people across the region gained this qualification.

- Health, education, arts and young people’s programmes such as Healthier Communities and Passport 2002 involving and benefiting thousands of people across the North West (described in more detail elsewhere in this report).

In addition, an economic programme (Prosperity North West) was developed to engage businesses from across the region. This programme included:

- Supply chain forums to ensure businesses in the region were given every opportunity to supply goods and services to the Games.

- Trade missions to target key Commonwealth markets.

- Business sector support, in particular to the tourism industry.

- Hosting of the Commonwealth Games Business Club held in the Manchester Bridgewater Hall and other North West venues at Games time (24-29 July).

East Manchester
In East Manchester a wide range of initiatives focused in and around Sportcity ensured that the legacy of the Games was substantial. In fact, the Games will be regarded as the most significant milestone and catalyst in the redevelopment of East Manchester as a whole. Short, medium and long term benefits will be derived from:

- Major investment in sports facilities and new infrastructure paving the way for improved transport (Metrolink extension), further developments (residential and commercial) and an estimated 4.5 million visitors to Sportcity annually.

- Public and private sectors working in partnership with local residents as part of the Government’s New Deal for Communities (NDC).

‘Once the Games are over, the Stadium will be used and enjoyed by the whole community for many years to come - as well as giving Manchester City Football Club a great new home. The building of the stadium and other facilities at Sportcity has also helped regenerate the area with more jobs, housing, businesses and sporting opportunities coming to East Manchester.’

David Moffet,
Chief Executive, Sport England
Hundreds of new jobs created in the construction and operation of new businesses and community facilities.

- A radical transformation of East Manchester’s image and attractiveness as a place to live, work and invest.

Specific benefits to East Manchester have already included:
- Reclamation of a former 146 hectare derelict site.
- £127 million investment in new sports facilities.
- Arrangements for community use of all new sporting facilities.
- £45 million investment in leisure and entertainment.
- 3,500 new jobs created.
- 500 Games time volunteers from East Manchester.

The ongoing delivery of this regeneration legacy will be monitored carefully using methodology devised by Cambridge Policy Consultants in May 2002.

Sporting Facilities for Local Communities

The Sportcity complex already offers world class sporting facilities to top athletes including the City of Manchester Stadium, indoor/ outdoor Tennis Centre, indoor/ outdoor Athletics facility, The National Squash Centre and the National Cycling Centre (Velodrome). But it was always intended that local communities would be given opportunities to use these new sporting facilities.

New Developments and Job Creation

Sportcity has already attracted major new investment in business and retail development creating long-term employment opportunities for East Manchester communities. Of these, the ASDA Wal-Mart superstore adjacent to the City of Manchester Stadium is the most significant. Step Ahead, a local employment service was at the hub of the recruitment process for the new store, the largest in Europe, which opened on 17 June 2002. In partnership with Job Centre Plus and the Employment and Regeneration Partnership, the Centre managed the recruitment of 850 operatives. The company is delighted that 90 per cent of its new workforce live within a 15 minute radius of the store.

Community Events

Many local activities were held to celebrate the Games and its links with the regeneration programme. In June 2002 the East Manchester Sports Action Zone (SAZ) and partners organised a local festival involving thousands of children and young people that was themed around the Games, culminating in a sports festival at the Velodrome and Philips Park.

On 3 June around 60 people from East Manchester took part in the Feast of Delight Parade in Manchester city centre presenting the work of the NDC in a ‘feast of nations’ theme. Local children created the flags of the Commonwealth nations cut into the shape of a jigsaw that fitted together to make one big picture of the Commonwealth.

Over the two weekends of the Games, the NDC team and their partners organised outdoor parties in four local parks to celebrate the regeneration of the area. Attractions included treasure hunts, live music, sports, kiddies’ funfair, tea dance, balloon races, and bouncy castles. Young local people volunteered to help at the event and were highly praised for their efforts. The parties were well attended and proved very popular with local people.

The SAZ encouraged Games ticket applications from local residents and promoted opportunities to support The Queen’s Baton Relay and Marathon Road Event as they passed through East Manchester. Thousands of local people responded.

Volunteers

The Games Volunteer Programme (presented in volume 3) was universally recognised as spectacularly successful. Inspired by the Games, many volunteers have stated their intention to continue volunteering and ongoing efforts are being made to enable them to build on this positive experience.

‘The investment, jobs and visitors that Sportcity is bringing to East Manchester is the major catalyst for new developments, new jobs, new homes and new opportunities for local people’.

Tom Russell, Chief Executive, New East Manchester Limited

---

‘The investment, jobs and visitors that Sportcity is bringing to East Manchester is the major catalyst for new developments, new jobs, new homes and new opportunities for local people’.

Tom Russell, Chief Executive, New East Manchester Limited
The Pre-Volunteer Programme established an accredited qualification in event volunteering which has been successfully achieved by over 2,000 people across the North West region. The Programme has been particularly successful in demonstrating that sport has the potential to stimulate interest from excluded groups leading to engagement with volunteering, training and employment. This activity will continue.

At the local level more than 200 East Manchester residents have already participated in the Pre-Volunteer Programme and subsequently been involved in a range of local sporting events and community activities helping to build a sense of pride in the immediate area. In partnership with Manchester College of Arts and Technology (MANCAT) 14 training courses were run during 2002, beneficiaries coming from a very diverse range of backgrounds including young people, older residents, people with disabilities and the long term unemployed. Many of these ‘graduates’ went on to be Commonwealth Games volunteers operating in a variety of capacities.

A major Post-Games Volunteering Project is underway to ensure that the enthusiasm and commitment demonstrated by volunteers is continued into other projects, both local and regional. The project will provide further volunteering opportunities including the development of a new mentoring programme. It will also continue the work of the Pre-Volunteer Programme promoting the volunteer experience as a vehicle to equip individuals from disadvantaged communities with the confidence and skills required to obtain further education, training and employment.

Development of the Post-Games Volunteer Project was accelerated by a visit to Manchester in December 2001 when the Minister for Sport met a group of long term volunteers. He was impressed by their enthusiasm but noted their anxieties with regard to opportunities beyond the Games. He continues to support the principle of a Post-Games Volunteer Project.
Ongoing support has also been received from other quarters including Sport England, United Utilities, Job Centre Plus, Liverpool Capital of Culture bid, and many other public sector organisations, community groups, and recruitment agencies.

Over recent years the United Nations has been interested in volunteering initiatives associated with the Games. The PVP and volunteer recruitment programmes have been commended for excellence by the UN (in writing) which also fully endorses the Post-Games Volunteer Project.

**The Way Ahead**

The Games Volunteer Programme was underpinned by a wide range of training initiatives and it has created an important resource for the region. This resource has legacy value, and must not be lost.

Clearly, the challenge for the Post-Games Volunteer Project is to provide opportunities for volunteers to build on their experience of the Games through participation in further volunteering initiatives and opportunities for self-improvement. With this in mind, it should be noted that the Post-Games Volunteer Project will involve up to 22,000 people as it also includes 10,500 who applied to be volunteers but were unsuccessful. Potential future involvement might also come from those who did not volunteer for the Games but as a result of the high profile success of the Volunteer Programme have developed an interest in volunteering.

In summary, the Post-Games Volunteer Project will encompass the following activities:

- **Volunteering** – encouraging participants in other volunteering opportunities particularly those related to sports (through Sport England).
- **Pre-Volunteer Programme** – continuation of the PVP model for appropriate individuals.
- **Mentoring** – further development of the mentoring programme assigning suitably skilled volunteers to mentor PVP graduates and others.
- **Attracting new participants** – bringing in new people to the programme – those who wished they had volunteered for the Games.

A team of four people will be appointed to manage this process. Their brief will include working closely with voluntary, community and statutory agencies as well as the creation of a new legacy portal and the organisation of a number of events to bring together existing and potential volunteers from across the region.

Approximately £400,000 funding has been secured from the European Social Fund, the regional Legacy Programme, the Greater Manchester Learning and Skills Council and MCC. The initial project will run to December 2003, and will include a full review and evaluation.

**Education**

It was recognised at an early stage that the Commonwealth Games provided a once in a generation opportunity for school children across the region to study a major sporting event at first hand, and to benefit from that experience. Teachers across the region were involved in the design of materials which also aimed to improve the Information and Communications Technology (ICT) skills of pupils and teachers. In Manchester alone, 700 young people from various high schools were involved in special project work associated with the Games.

**Website**

A regional educational website (www.ccp2002.com) was created delivering imaginative on-line national curriculum material to North West schools around the broad themes of sport and Commonwealth (the so-called Commonwealth Curriculum Pack). For example, curriculum material associated with sport included:

- **Numeracy Module** – using distance/time graphs for the 100 metre sprint.
- **Architecture and Buildings Module** – based on stadium design.
- **Arts Module** – using Games pictograms.

In addition, the website provided young people with a ‘Sporting Links’ section introducing them to the various sports featured in the Commonwealth Games with information on local clubs and existing facilities in the North West.
The website, which was launched in September 2001, also included three on-line games which proved to be a popular way of attracting disaffected young people onto an educational website, which received almost 250,000 hits over the period of the Games.

**Technology**

As a tangible benefit to the community, the technology procurement items offer some long-term assets for future use. The majority of the technology equipment for the Games was leased or provided as part of sponsorship deals however, the exceptions to this are:

**National Cycling Centre**

CAT 5 Cabling was installed into this venue as a permanent solution resulting from Games time technology requirements. This has now become a long-term legacy for the benefit of NCC.

**National Shooting Centre - Bisley**

CAT 5 Cabling was implemented as a permanent solution at this venue also and has been handed over for ultimate completion with network racks and Cisco networking equipment.

**Cisco Equipment**

As part of the Cisco supplier agreement all the remaining Cisco networking equipment is to be given to ‘good causes’ at the discretion of M2002/Cisco. The selected recipients include Manchester University, Bisley and MANCAT (location of the IBC) and other educational institutions in the area.

**Commonwealth Games Village**

Some of the cabling in the permanent areas of the Village has been handed over to Manchester University for permanent use.

**Software Legacy**

While the results and accreditation systems were supplied by third parties the majority of the Games enabling systems and the websites were developed in-house. These applications while bespoke to meet the specific requirements of the Manchester Games may have some value for future Commonwealth Games or other events. These bespoke services include:

- Medical consultation recording database.
- Bed tracking application for Villages.
- Uniforms inventory.
- Bio-matching profiles of competing athletes.
- Incident tracking.
- Training facilities booking system.
- Stage management application for Ceremonies.
- Budget reporting system.
- GITS - Games Information Tracking System used in the GCC.
- PIMS - Protocol Information Management System for VIPs.
- Arrivals and Departures system.

**School Forums**

Across the region a series of events were organised under the banner ‘What’s in it for Schools 2002?’ All local schools were invited to send a representative and presentations were given by organisers of the Spirit of Friendship Festival, Sport England, and the Legacy team. The forums were well attended and extremely well received by teachers, and it was heartening to hear about the range of educational activities associated with the Games, particularly the links that were established with other schools in Commonwealth nations.

**Cultural Events**

The national Spirit of Friendship Festival (SoFF) included a wide range of cultural, community, educational and sporting events and activities that collectively will deliver a lasting legacy.

On an international level, SoFF created a new model for a ‘Friendship Festival’ that can be replicated to benefit the CGF and future host cities. The new approach included:

- New ways of working in partnership with a variety of local and national agencies.
Collaborations between arts organisations both nationally and internationally.

Coordinating Festival activity with development initiatives to support cultural industries and tourism, particularly in the North West.

Research and evaluation work is continuing; for example, to assess the Festival’s impact on new audiences. There is anecdotal evidence that bids for grants were oversubscribed by ratio of 4:1 and that there were more applicants from black and minority ethnic communities than ever before.

The Festival has generated a raft of legacies in the following areas:

- A number of high profile but potentially one-off SoFF events were very successful and will now be held on a regular basis; for example, the Commonwealth Film and Literature Festivals (the latter has already attracted an overseas student bursary).
- Multi-cultural celebrations across the country attracted large crowds and television coverage providing inspiration for dozens of organisations seeking to ‘Count Themselves In’.
- In terms of perception and understanding, the Commission for Racial Equality poster campaign that encouraged tolerance is expected to create a lasting impact (5,000 copies were distributed).
- Educational initiatives mean that schoolchildren are now more aware of the cultures and traditions of competing nations and Commonwealth communities in Britain.
- Youth legacy programmes such as TOP Link and Active Talent Camps were designed to build the next generation of sports leaders and athletes. The Festival and Games provided the perfect vehicles for these initiatives and the associated publicity was intended to heighten awareness across the country.
- North West arts and culture initiatives (branded as ‘Cultureshock’) delivered their legacy through the Artists in Residence project and Let’s Celebrate programme. Participating artists produced a body of work entitled ‘Aftershock’ to provide a permanent collection of their work. The Let’s Celebrate project ensured that black and minority ethnic communities were fully engaged in appropriate events, gaining organisational experience through participation in Carnivals and Melas.
- Music workshops for young people, such as those planned in conjunction with Courtney Pine’s ‘On Track’ concert tour, were designed to develop skills among disadvantaged children.
- To promote musical appreciation and social inclusion, a subsidised ticket scheme was introduced to encourage young people to attend concerts at prestigious venues such as London’s Royal Festival Hall and the Manchester Bridgewater Hall.

Legacy Team Beyond 2002

Funding of the North West legacy programme (£20 million including £6.2 million from the Government’s Single Regeneration Budget) runs until 2005. Both staffing and operational infrastructure are in place to ensure that the legacy work continues.

Plans are underway to develop a new ‘Legacy of the Games’ office in Manchester providing a central hub for enquiries relating to the Games and legacy initiatives. Staff will maintain a Legacy website presenting the story of the Games and the regional legacy. The office will also be responsible for the Post-Games Volunteer Project and ongoing work with schools across the region.

Official Archive And Exhibition

In conjunction with MCC, the OC is compiling a permanent archive of documents from the Games to be stored at the city’s Central Reference Library. The collection will be available for public inspection and research in 2003.

A touring exhibition has been created to promote the Legacy Programme and Games memorabilia including gifts that were presented to the OC by competing teams. It is intended that this exhibition will tour the North West region giving local schools and community groups an opportunity to view objects and images that convey the very essence of the Games and its legacy. The exhibition was previewed at the Commonwealth Finance Ministers meeting in London in September 2002.
E3 Secondee Workforce

Overview
With the production of the M2002 recruitment plan devised in the spring of 1999, the OC predicted that 262 secondment staff would be required in addition to the direct hires to deliver the Commonwealth Games. MCC recognised the significant benefits of seconding staff to work for the Games, outlining the following issues:

- Better ability to manage the risk associated for the OC if there is a decline in the number of suitably qualified professionals in the market place.
- Reduction in the overall costs of the Games (MCC were the major underwriters of the Games).
- Improved skills base in such areas as IT, project management and leadership.
- Improved workforce motivation and morale.
- Added impetus to the agenda for continuous improvement.

MCC agreed to second up to 220 staff to M2002. A secondment methodology was implemented and positions were advertised to MCC staff. There was considerable interest in the secondment programme and early successes in seconding staff to M2002.

Following experiences drawn from the Sydney Olympics in 2000, it was appreciated that the benchmark for international sporting events had been raised and that Manchester's Games would need to meet revised expectations for the event to be successful. A revised recruitment plan was produced in March 2001 that predicted 660 positions of which approximately 255 could be filled by MCC secondees.

Recruitment
A funding package was put in place in June/July 2001 and a revitalised Secondment Programme was launched. The programme relied heavily on individuals applying for positions independently, but was also supplemented by headhunting for the more skilled senior and specialist positions.

Though there was still considerable interest in applying for positions with M2002, there were difficulties with the suitability of some applicants. In many cases the secondments were a difficult legacy to sell to MCC staff who worked in a stable and non-threatening Government environment. Misconceptions were developed on the basis of the temporary nature of the project or as a result of the relatively low profile the Commonwealth Games had in the local community.

As the Games drew closer interest in working for M2002 increased with more candidates applying and the quality of applicants improving. Owing to the urgency of finding suitable people and the nature of the roles being short term, from mid June 2002 onwards all applicants for secondment were accepted and placed.

Shortly before and during the Games, the need for increasing numbers of secondees to fill critical positions led to the placement of approximately 200 MCC secondees each working several shifts at venues.

The Benefits of the Secondment Programme
To inform the delivery of the Secondment Programme, during March 2001 a survey was carried out of existing MCC staff seconded to M2002. The results were overwhelmingly favourable with the vast majority of people recognising the benefits of their secondment. The survey was devised to highlight the differences between MCC and M2002 which the issues identified below reflecting the major findings:

- Secondees believed their views and opinions were valued.
- There was little bureaucracy.
- The working atmosphere was more relaxed with a greater social dimension to work.
- There were greater opportunities for self development and advancement through on the job learning in addition to formal training.
- It was necessary to work long hours.
- There was less one-to-one contact with supervisors and managers.
- The vast majority believed their increased skill base would benefit MCC.
Improved Workforce, Motivation and Morale

Motivation and morale were seen to be key issues in ensuring that people remained with the Games for the duration of their contracts/secondment. It was also seen as a major factor in encouraging people to work harder and longer. A programme of events was put in place to reinforce the importance of the Games and improve and sustain levels of motivation. A key feature of the success of this programme is the very low levels of attrition suffered through the course of the project (40 direct hires, 30 secondees over 24 months, less than 7% of the overall workforce).

Secondees returned to MCC enthused by their involvement with the Games. Both MCC and the individuals themselves will capitalise on their enthusiasm and new found skills in their future roles.

Culture/Characteristics of Working for M 2002

M 2002 was a project driven event organisation. For most people seconded from MCC it was a unique experience. Some thrived, some adapted well and some failed to make the transition (less than 5%). In an organisation of 450+ people there were inevitably several ‘micro’ cultures that existed, but the following typified the predominant positive features of working for the organisation.

- Technology – An emphasis on the use of technology (e.g. total document centres, computers and peripheral devices, telecommunications). M 2002 used some of the most up to date hardware and software.
- Most MCC secondees improved their skills in technology, either in terms of hardware or software Microsoft products. In some cases this was as a result of training courses but more often was a result of working with colleagues and day to day usage.
- Commercial Awareness – M 2002 had a Sponsor, Partner and Provider portfolio that required people to work within commercial parameters. Working alongside people whose background was in the private sector brought an appreciation of new disciplines, cultures and ways of working.
- Project Management – M 2002 was a project orientated organisation. People needed to work within project management disciplines and controls. These included working to programmes, timelines, milestones, change management processes, time critical episodes and red lining principles. This transition for MCC secondee staff was successfully achieved.
- Outcome focused – The emphasis was on getting a positive result in the time available. People were deployed where they were needed and not on the basis of structures and hierarchies.
- Flexibility in working practices was paramount, this may have meant working late and weekends. Emphasis was on the substance of reporting rather than the form and reports were kept to a short, concise bullet point format.
- Teamwork – The success of the event was only as good as the weakest team and the importance of teams was recognised and time was taken to build teams and generate a team culture.
- People formed bonds and relied on colleagues to support one another, rather than undermining each other or ‘playing games’.
- Informality at work was encouraged. If people were comfortable and relaxed they were more likely to concentrate on the job in hand and work harder and longer.
- There was a social side to work. People were also encouraged to meet outside work and events organised to bring people and sometimes their families together. People were also encouraged to have fun, but not at the expense of work.
Bringing on people with the right skills at the right time
Approximately 300 MCC employees were seconded to work for M 2002, filling key roles and doing invaluable work that was a major factor in the success of the Games.

There were some difficulties in attracting suitable people through standard recruitment practices and this led to delays in appointments being made, headhunting was therefore used to great effect. Although skills and experience were important when selecting people, it was found that committed, enthusiastic and determined people, able to learn and assimilate knowledge, made the greatest impact when working for M 2002.

M 2002 and MCC benefited hugely from having MCC staff based within M 2002 both to support the programme in terms of being able to find considerable numbers of suitable people (often at very short notice) and to resolve difficulties with individuals. The role that staff in the HR team played in supporting the Secondment Programme was invaluable and this paid dividends during Games time when approximately 200 additional staff were seconded to fill vital short-term roles.

Reduction in the overall costs of the Games
To enable M 2002 to recruit highly qualified proficient people for a short period of time, often meant having to pay in excess of the market rate. In addition, M 2002 had to pay some staff relocation monies and in several cases retention sums. Having a large core of MCC secondees that were less likely to leave than direct hires led to considerable savings in salary, relocation costs and potential retention bonuses.

Key Lessons and Recommendations
- Start the secondment programme as early as possible but place the emphasis on selecting people with commitment, enthusiasm and an ability to learn and transfer learning to work. Then use appropriately experienced and skilled individuals and learning opportunities to support and mentor people. This would help to fill a higher number of positions and provide an enhanced legacy provision. This could reduce the overall salary costs of the OC but could have higher attendant costs with the seconding organisation.
- Have a detailed plan clearly understood and articulated to maximise the legacy benefits to the seconding organisation. This will better enable secondees to focus on the Games, prevent disruption, and reduce possibility of attrition.

Conclusion
The secondment programme has been hugely beneficial to M 2002 and very successful for MCC. Secondees left M 2002 having experienced a pace of work that almost without exception had not been experienced previously. They developed skills in prioritisation, decision making and delegation. These qualities are important in any organisation but when transplanted into the changing environment of local government and with MCC, now in the vanguard of the modernisation agenda, it is anticipated that these qualities will be much prized and will be utilised to their fullest in the pursuit of continuous improvement.
The Manchester University site was used to host the Athletes and Team Officials from each CGA. The Games provided a foundation to improve the University grounds, accommodation, function rooms and facilities onsite providing a lasting legacy for the University and their students. The opportunity was taken by the University to deliver a service with a segment of their staff. Staff involvement was critical to the success of the Village and provided an opportunity for personnel training and professional development of these staff.

To make the University site ‘fit for purpose’ as an Athletes’ Village, it was necessary for M 2002 to undertake capital works of both a permanent and temporary nature.

The permanent capital works were designed and implemented in co-operation with Manchester University, who as agreed in initial negotiations, made a financial contribution to all permanent works.

The works included access ramps that made all residential buildings fully accessible to the athletes and provided an ongoing legacy and a greater choice of residential facilities for disabled students in the future.

External works, in addition to the residential works included the provision of new roads, resurfacing of existing roads, upgraded pathways and landscaping. This work dramatically improved the overall aesthetics of the campus environment and the new roadways improved the safety, access and circulation on site. These works allowed the team to create dedicated pedestrian pathways separated from vehicle routes to the site.

A significant amount of technology infrastructure, including fibre optic cabling, was left as a legacy for the University. This will enable the University to improve existing services, and provide technology services in buildings previously without access to network cabling.

Extensive works were undertaken in Oak House Halls of Residence to improve the water systems. This work included replacement of hot water cylinders, to improve capacity, and installation of over-bath showers to improve the amenity ratio for residents. These installations will provide students with significantly improved amenities and services.
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F1 Calendar of Games Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985-1989</td>
<td>Manchester City Council leads a public-private sector partnership to promote Manchester as Britain’s host city for the 1996 Olympic Games. The Bid wins backing from the British Olympic Association and a steering committee is formed to draw up proposals for a range of world-class sports venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1990</td>
<td>Manchester’s team flies to Tokyo for the judging and makes its mark but the 1996 Olympic Games go to Atlanta. Manchester’s bid team remains optimistic and is determined to try again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1993</td>
<td>Terminal 2 at Manchester Airport is opened, taking airport capacity to 20 million a year and truly global status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1993</td>
<td>In a neck-and-neck race for the 2000 Olympics, Manchester loses out to Sydney but many of its Olympic commitments are still given the go-ahead as a long-term sporting legacy for the city. Firm plans now exist for the Velodrome, an indoor arena and an international concert hall. Manchester states its intention to bid for the 2002 Commonwealth Games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Manchester wins the prestige accolade of UK City of Drama and national and international theatre companies visit the city in 12 months of exciting music, theatre, and live performance. CGCE nominates Manchester as England’s official bid city to host the Commonwealth Games in 2002, The Queen’s Golden Jubilee Year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1994</td>
<td>Opening of the Manchester Velodrome – the only purpose-built indoor cycling facility in the UK and a key part of the Olympic Bid legacy, now a major facility for the 2002 Games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1995</td>
<td>Manchester’s Commonwealth Games Bid is submitted to the Commonwealth Games Federation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1995</td>
<td>Prime Minister John Major announces support for the Bid and a team from the Commonwealth Games Federation visits Manchester for a fact-finding tour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1995</td>
<td>Opening of the new indoor arena, a further legacy of the city’s Olympic Bids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1995</td>
<td>Official announcement by the CGF meeting in Bermuda, that Manchester will host the 2002 Commonwealth Games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1996</td>
<td>Opening of the Bridgewater Hall, the city’s new world-class international concert venue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 – 2000</td>
<td>Manchester hosts a series of world championships in order to build relationships and experience in planning and delivering events to world class standard, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>World Track Cycling Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>World Table Tennis Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>World Sports Acrobatics Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>World Track Cycling Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1998</td>
<td>The new Games brand identity is launched and Kit, the M2002 mascot makes his debut at the Closing Ceremony of the Kuala Lumpur Commonwealth Games. In the first ever satellite link during a Closing Ceremony, the Games are officially handed over to Manchester. Manchester Airport is announced as the first Games Sponsor; Sport England commits funds for the new Manchester Aquatics Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1999</td>
<td>M2002 Sports Programme finalised; the BBC is announced as Host Broadcaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 October 1999</td>
<td>1000 days to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1999</td>
<td>Prime Minister Tony Blair unveils foundation stone to commemorate start of work on the new City of Manchester Stadium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2000</td>
<td>Official opening of Manchester Aquatics Centre by HM The Queen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 March 2001</td>
<td>500 days to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May</td>
<td>Volunteer Recruitment Programme launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 June</td>
<td>Spirit Of Friendship Festival Education programme launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 July</td>
<td>Government funding announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July</td>
<td>Cadbury announced as Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 July</td>
<td>Guilbert announced as Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>1 year to go – launch of the Games Information Line and the Commonwealth Games Community Factpack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July</td>
<td>Sportsworld appointed to sell international hotel packages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>Xerox announced as Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 August</td>
<td>First Mondo and turf laid at stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 September</td>
<td>Robert Hough appointed Village Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 September</td>
<td>Merchandise launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 September</td>
<td>ASDA announced as Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 September</td>
<td>Claremont announced as Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 September</td>
<td>First announced as Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 September</td>
<td>Commonwealth curriculum pack launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 October</td>
<td>Official ticket launch at Velodrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 October</td>
<td>HM The Queen unveils the Baton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 October</td>
<td>First seat fixed in Stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 November</td>
<td>Ticket lottery phase closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 November</td>
<td>The Queen's Jubilee Baton Relay route unveiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December</td>
<td>Spirit of Friendship Festival launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 January</td>
<td>Ticket sales go live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 January</td>
<td>Cultureshock launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 January</td>
<td>Boddingtons announced as Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 January</td>
<td>SoFF Education Pack launched in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 February</td>
<td>The Queen's Jubilee Baton Relay runners announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 February</td>
<td>British Diving Championships - test event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February</td>
<td>Royal Mint launches Games £2 coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>Uniform launch and Games radio station launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 March</td>
<td>Commonwealth Day – The Queen's Jubilee Baton Relay launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Business Club launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March</td>
<td>Prime Minister The Rt Hon Tony Blair MP led celebrations at the completed City of Manchester Stadium as it was handed over to organisers of Manchester’s 2002 Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>Swimming test event and Games trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 April</td>
<td>BUPA announced as Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 April</td>
<td>Crew 2002 celebration at MEN Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>Trafford Centre announced as Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May</td>
<td>Rugby test event (first event at Stadium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May</td>
<td>Rover announced as Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 May</td>
<td>Judo test event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May</td>
<td>‘Friend of the Games’ packages announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 May</td>
<td>Virgin Trains announced as Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 May</td>
<td>Athletics test event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 May</td>
<td>Transport strategy launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June</td>
<td>British Open Wrestling Championships test event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June</td>
<td>50 Days to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June</td>
<td>Box Office ticket sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 June</td>
<td>Hockey test event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June</td>
<td>Athletics test event &amp; Commonwealth Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 June</td>
<td>Mountain Bike and Lawn Bowls test events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June</td>
<td>The first 100,000 tickets sent out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 June</td>
<td>Royal Mail unveils Games stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 July</td>
<td>Athletes’ Village opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 July</td>
<td>First Team Welcome Ceremony at the Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 July</td>
<td>The Queen’s Jubilee Baton returns to the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>HM The Queen opens The XVII Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 August</td>
<td>HM The Queen makes history, having opened the Games, she also closes them, a fitting end to the most successful Games ever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 August</td>
<td>Disposal of assets - the public clamours to buy Games memorabilia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Members of the M 2002 Board

**Manchester 2002 Limited Board Members (August 2002)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Company/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Charles Allen CBE</td>
<td>Executive Chairman</td>
<td>Granada Plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Frances Done CBE</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Manchester 2002 Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Company Secretary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Leather</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Executive &amp; Finance Director</td>
<td>Manchester 2002 Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Managing Director, Operations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jules Burns</td>
<td>Managing Director, Operations</td>
<td>Granada Plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ian Emmerson OBE</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Council for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Liz Nicholl MBE</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Council for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Richard Leese CBE</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Manchester City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Craig Reedie CBE</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>British Olympic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Anil Ruia OBE</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Wrengate Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Robert Hough</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>The Manchester Ship Canal Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jim Michie</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>M 2002 Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Wade Martin</td>
<td>Deputy Chairman</td>
<td>M 2002 Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Neville Chamberlain CBE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Ritchie CB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Company/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Howard Bernstein</td>
<td>Chief Executive, MCC</td>
<td>MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Scott</td>
<td>Director of International Relations and Major Events, UK Sport</td>
<td>MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ian Fytche</td>
<td>Head of Major Projects, Sport England</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sean Holt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leader of Commonwealth Games Unit, Department for Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Robert Raine CBE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Unit, Department for Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kristian Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creative Director, M 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sue Woodward OBE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Solicitor, Finance &amp; Corporate Services, M 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Bernard Ainsworth</td>
<td></td>
<td>City Treasurer, MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M r Mike Dearing</td>
<td></td>
<td>City Solicitor, MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Richard Paver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Susan Orrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Vicky Rosin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Manchester Commonwealth Games Limited Board Members (August 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Organization/Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Charles Allen CBE</td>
<td>Executive Chairman</td>
<td>Granada Plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jules Burns</td>
<td>Managing Director, Operations</td>
<td>Granada Plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mike Fennell CD</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rt Hon Sir Christopher Chataway</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Council for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ian Emmerson OBE</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Council for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Robert Hough</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>The Manchester Ship Canal Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Richard Leese CBE</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Manchester City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Dick McCollgan MBE</td>
<td>Vice Chairman - Commonwealth Games Federation</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Council for Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Pat Karney</td>
<td>Chair, City Centre Sub Committee</td>
<td>Manchester City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Craig Reedie CBE</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>British Olympic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David G Compston CBE FR Eng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Felicity Goodey CBE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Clive Lloyd CBE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Gilbert Thompson OBE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Company Secretary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Organization/Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Leather</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Executive &amp; Finance Director</td>
<td>Manchester 2002 Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Observers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Organization/Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Howard Bernstein</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Manchester City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mike Hooper</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Robert Raine CBE</td>
<td>Leader of Commonwealth Games Unit</td>
<td>Department for Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sean Holt</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mike Dearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Organising Committee

From left to right from the top of the stairs:
Mike Hooper, Wade Martin, Jules Burns, John Scott, Liz Nicholl, Robert Hough,
Dick McCollan, Craig Reedie, Louise Martin, Ian Emmerson, Mike Fennell,
Howard Bernstein, David Leather, Bernard Ainsworth, Frances Done,
Neville Chamberlain, Jim Michie, Charles Allen, David Ritchie, Felicity Goodey,
Gilbert Thompson, Richard Leese, Sue Woodward, Sean Holt,
Anil Ruia, Mike Dearing