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## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Group</th>
<th>MCC</th>
<th>Manchester City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of Greater Manchester Authorities</td>
<td>M2002</td>
<td>Manchester 2002 Ltd (the Organising Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Tourist Authority</td>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>National Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Games Association</td>
<td>NWDA</td>
<td>North West Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Games Federation</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Organising Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Success Factor</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Culture, Media and Sport</td>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>Single Regeneration Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Athlete with Disability</td>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>Volunteer Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Tourism Council</td>
<td>WAC</td>
<td>World Athletics Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign and Commonwealth Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games Co-ordination Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester Ambulance Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester Co-ordinating Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester County Fire Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Office North West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terms of reference

This presentation of our Final Report is given in accordance with the terms of reference issued by the Commonwealth Games Lessons Learned Steering Group in May 2002.

The principal areas of the review are presented below:

**Objectives**
- Identify the factors that shaped the original bidding strategy, the approach to the organisation of the Games, budget development, the requirement for additional funding, the build up of the Games organisation and the delivery of wider opportunities and legacy.
- Identify the Lessons that can be drawn from the above.

**Considerations**
- Partnership and leadership arrangements required for bidding for and delivering the Commonwealth Games.
- Influences on development of the strategy for the infrastructure requirements of the Games.
- Manchester’s approach to the delivery of wider opportunities through the North West Opportunities Partnership programme.
- Dealing with the CGF and other sporting bodies before and during the bidding process and during the delivery process.
- The experience of defining standards for the 2002 Games.
- The budget definition process for the 2002 Games.
- The approach adopted to the build up of staffing and the evolution of M2002 from a planning to a delivery organisation.

**Basis of report**
- Our findings are based on interviews conducted with key individuals during July, August and September 2002, and review of documents provided to us at Commonwealth House in August and September 2002. These findings have been subject to a consultation process as follows:
  - 3 October – interim findings forwarded to further consultees
  - 15 November – deadline for feedback on interim findings
- The sources of information are necessarily based on individual views and perspectives and these findings should be read as such. Where views were in conflict we have sought to resolve this through further inquiry wherever possible.
Introduction
Public opinion of the Manchester Games

All those consulted for this study believed that the Games far exceeded their expectations in terms of the delivery, the atmosphere created, the relationships developed and the public and media profile.

**COMMENTS BY MEDIA AND PERSONALITIES**

**Games lessons**
Manchester has done us proud

“Manchester has made its mark and changed the Commonwealth Games forever and every country will learn”
“Manchester has shown how you can get a job done on time, on budget and successfully. It’s been a community event as well as an international event.” – Steve Bracks, Premier of Victoria

“Manchester is a fantastic place and I wouldn’t hesitate to come back. The support of the people and the welcome they gave everyone was fantastic.”
“The sense of occasion and the pride in having the Games in Manchester was very similar to Sydney and the Olympics” – Cathy Freeman, Australian athlete

**The Manchester games**
Regenerating a city as well as UK sport

The Guardian, 25 July 2002

**Glorious Games**
prove that it’s glam up North

The Mirror, 1 August 2002

**Manchester carries baton for Britain’s international hopes**

The Independent, 25 July 2002

**A triumph for disabled athletes**

Disability Times, September 2002

**GOLD MEDAL GAMES**
Any Olympic bid would count on Manchester’s example

The Times, 5 August 2002

“Manchester has been very impressed with the Games. They have been beneficial for Manchester as a city and also for the United Kingdom in terms of international reputation. I’m also pleased with the intelligent policy for after use venues.” – Jacques Rogge, President of International Olympic Committee
Introduction
Why did it go so well? – key elements

The Commonwealth Games were a huge success. Some of the key indicators of success were as follows:
- TV audiences of more than 1 billion
- Full stadia for many events
- The largest Games ever with 17 sports and 5,900 athletes and officials (20% more than the previous Games)

There are certain factors governing the success of an event that are outside organisers’ control. There are other key factors governing success that were within the direct control of the organisers. These included:

SUCCESS DRIVERS

- The leadership of MCC and effective partnerships being established between the operational partners and, critically, between MCC, Sport England and Government. These partnerships were built over time and through away weekends, operational reviews and formation of task groups. They worked well on formal and informal levels. Bodies, such as the PTE and GMP, were able to play to their strengths
- For the crucial final 12 months prior to the Games, strong and effective financial management being undertaken in a framework of public sector accountability and scrutiny. Strong cost controls were exercised throughout the organising period
- A small group of key decision makers 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 set the areas of focus, 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, that an appropriate contingency was established, and the contingency was firmly managed
- The partners made great efforts to ensure that both the City 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 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 resilience of volunteers and staff from all partners solved small problems 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, which helped to engender a feeling of excitement and pride
- The organisers tailored the scale of the event in terms of number of sports, venues etc. to suit the City. Manchester was large enough to have the ability to deliver but small enough to master the detail. There was a real local sense of going the extra mile “for the sake of the Games”
- There was strong expectation management from a PR perspective. M2002 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 eleven days of sport. The package of the Baton Relay, Spirit of Friendship Festival, Festival Live and Ceremonies enhanced the offer to sponsors and broadcasters
Introduction
Why did it go so well? – other elements

A number of other factors were regarded by consultees as important to the success of the Games. These are:

SUCCESS DRIVERS

- A lot of time was spent in 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 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 1 billion
- The marketing strategy was key to raising interest from the media, TV and public, through:
  - Use of high profile athlete ambassadors,
  - Use of landmark events
  - Strategic advertising on TV, radio and press
  - Obtaining high profile sponsorship deals
  - The Queens Jubilee Baton Relay
  - The timing of approaches to market in terms of brand exposure and ticketing and merchandising promotions
- Innovations such as the extensive use of cutting edge sports presentation to enhance the entertainment of spectators, were well received
- The commitment to integration of EADs has moved disability sport up the agenda. Inclusivity was a priority for organisers and this was reflected in the key deliverables, such as transport, games mobility, Festival Live and the volunteer program, which overall were felt to have been extremely successful from an access and inclusivity point of view
- 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 including 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 performance of home country athletes increased enthusiasm still further and provides 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 Sports 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
**Introduction**  
**Key lessons learned from Manchester**

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. From this vision the following will be developed:

### KEY LESSONS LEARNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The scale and scope of a major event, and in particular multi-sport events, will change and this should be recognised by Funders, necessitating a significant contingency, particularly in the early stages of the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic</strong></td>
<td>The personal involvement and support of the Prime Minister is critical to the credibility and importance of the event to government and the public and private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government is only likely to be a full partner when it has a financial commitment to the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>The organisational management (and external parties where applicable) must buy into a planning timetable in order to ensure effective programme management. Once agreed, this should aid procurement and change management (from a bid group, to planning team, to delivery vehicle) and ensure that significant changes do not occur after 6 months out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 against defined performance standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Critical Success Factors and related performance standards should be identified, defined and agreed by Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successful staging of a multi-sports event requires a strategic ‘buy-in’ from key stakeholders including the Government, the Host City, the Organising Committee, Sport England, and an understanding the context within which the Games are to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational input from the Organising Committee is highly desirable when setting the specifications for the capital build programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation structure</strong></td>
<td>The organisation requires people with appropriate experience to be brought in at the right time to provide “glue” at a senior level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The structure should facilitate communication and decision making, and be flexible, acknowledging that plans will evolve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Context

#### LOCAL CONTEXT
- 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 1990's. Sustainable after-use of venues was an important priority.
- East Manchester was the focus for several initiatives (New Deal for Communities, SRBS, 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 and further milestones will be achieved in the next 12 months. This helped to achieve the buy-in of the local residents because they saw the Games as a part of a strategy and as relevant to their lives.
- Involvement of the local community, eg schools also gave the event relevance and ensured that it made a real impact on people’s lives.
- Manchester bid as a City to host the Games. The Games were not a truly national project from the outset as Government and Sport England were not Funders of operational costs until much later, although national partners were aware of both the basis of MCC’s initial bid, and the subsequent pressure on scale and scope by external forces throughout the process.
- Until mid 2001, when the revised funding package was put in place, the Games were under resourced, meaning the right decisions could not always be taken at the right time.

#### NATIONAL CONTEXT
- The Commonwealth Games had been in a period of transition since 1995, characterised by rising scale and scope.
- At the time of bidding, the Games had a limited national profile and the challenge for M2002 was to develop this.
- East Manchester’s local regeneration strategy had been an accepted national priority since the mid 1990’s.
- The national policy context has moved on significantly since Manchester’s bid – for example, the Sydney Olympics changed expectations.
- Over the past few years the importance of being involved closely in National events has been recognised by the Government and as a result, the Commonwealth Games Division at DCMS was established in 2001.
- Events are also recognised as carrying major financial implications which are too big for a city to carry alone.
- Issues such as the cancellation of the Picketts Lock project placed increased pressure for future events such as the Games to be delivered successfully.
- The Government became an active partner of the Games in 1999. Sport England were an active partner at all stages, providing capital funding from the outset and operational funding in 2001.
Planning
A benchmark planning model

During the course of this review various planning models and timescales have been suggested as ideal for an international multi-sport event of the size of the Commonwealth Games. The recurring themes are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD 1</th>
<th>PERIOD 2</th>
<th>PERIOD 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Understand the product” (strategic planning)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Define aim and set strategy consistent with this (this process should involve all key stakeholders in order to provide consensus as a basis for future planning)</td>
<td>- Ensure that aim, strategy and planning timetable are communicated to operational management and their commitment to the strategy and process is achieved</td>
<td>- No significant planning changes should occur in this period except emergency actions or responses to unforeseen situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gain buy-in of all the key stakeholders, and of national and international bodies</td>
<td>- Set scope and service levels (core deliverables) for the entire organisation ensuring that scope is appropriate to strategy and consistent across functional areas and venues (and that Funders are involved in this process to approve an appropriate budget)</td>
<td>- 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 from these events and feed them into the refinement of plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure all plans for capital projects are agreed and financed with early completion dates</td>
<td>- ‘Experts’ should be involved at this stage (including sports experts). This should ensure that a reliable scope is created early in the planning process</td>
<td>- This should be a period of refining detailed plans in a venue based environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appoint strong operational leadership to drive the planning process and delivery. Ideally, develop an appropriate operational management structure to ensure consistent planning and good communication. Relevant experience is key</td>
<td>- Employ key staff and ensure good communication and financial accountability with devolved management</td>
<td>- 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure that the process of change from a bid group to an OC is managed effectively</td>
<td>- Develop plans to deliver the agreed scope and service level and further develop the budget to match (again ensuring funder buy in). Ensure that all functional area and venue planning focuses on the core deliverables and Critical Success Factors and that there is cross-pollination between functional areas and venues in relation to Games time.</td>
<td>- Evaluate the legacy benefits secured and leave in place resources to capture and measure downstream benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Set a detailed planning and delivery timetable to provide structure and focus for the organisation</td>
<td>- Ensure that the decisions made at this stage are appropriately influenced by operational advice and not excessively by financial or other factors, within the bounds of the agreed scope and service levels</td>
<td>(suggested timescale: 3 /4 years to 2½/2 years out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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</td>
<td>- Consider nice-to-haves only once 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</td>
<td>(suggested timescale: 2½/2 years to 6 months out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undertake a rigorous risk assessment</td>
<td>- Preliminary budgets at this stage should reflect the early stage of planning and high level of uncertainty and include significant contingency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Only try to address long lead time issues in detail at this stage</td>
<td>- Consider the projected legacy benefits and agree arrangements to ensure they are captured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preliminary budgets at this stage should reflect the early stage of planning and high level of uncertainty and include significant contingency</td>
<td>- Consider the projected legacy benefits and agree arrangements to ensure they are captured</td>
<td>(suggested timescale: 6 months out to post Games)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(suggested timescale: 3 /4 years to 2½/2 years out)

**“Develop operational plans” (move from strategic to tactical planning)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD 1</th>
<th>PERIOD 2</th>
<th>PERIOD 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure that aim, strategy and planning timetable are communicated to operational management and their commitment to the strategy and process is achieved</td>
<td>- Set scope and service levels (core deliverables) for the entire organisation ensuring that scope is appropriate to strategy and consistent across functional areas and venues (and that Funders are involved in this process to approve an appropriate budget)</td>
<td>- No significant planning changes should occur in this period except emergency actions or responses to unforeseen situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gain buy-in of all the key stakeholders, and of national and international bodies</td>
<td>- ‘Experts’ should be involved at this stage (including sports experts). This should ensure that a reliable scope is created early in the planning process</td>
<td>- 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 from these events and feed them into the refinement of plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure all plans for capital projects are agreed and financed with early completion dates</td>
<td>- Employ key staff and ensure good communication and financial accountability with devolved management</td>
<td>- This should be a period of refining detailed plans in a venue based environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appoint strong operational leadership to drive the planning process and delivery. Ideally, develop an appropriate operational management structure to ensure consistent planning and good communication. Relevant experience is key</td>
<td>- Develop plans to deliver the agreed scope and service level and further develop the budget to match (again ensuring funder buy in). Ensure that all functional area and venue planning focuses on the core deliverables and Critical Success Factors and that there is cross-pollination between functional areas and venues in relation to Games time.</td>
<td>- 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure that the process of change from a bid group to an OC is managed effectively</td>
<td>- Ensure that the decisions made at this stage are appropriately influenced by operational advice and not excessively by financial or other factors, within the bounds of the agreed scope and service levels</td>
<td>- Evaluate the legacy benefits secured and leave in place resources to capture and measure downstream benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Set a detailed planning and delivery timetable to provide structure and focus for the organisation</td>
<td>- Consider nice-to-haves only once 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</td>
<td>(suggested timescale: 3 /4 years to 2½/2 years out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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</td>
<td>- Preliminary budgets at this stage should reflect the early stage of planning and high level of uncertainty and include significant contingency</td>
<td>(suggested timescale: 2½/2 years to 6 months out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undertake a rigorous risk assessment</td>
<td>- Consider the projected legacy benefits and agree arrangements to ensure they are captured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Only try to address long lead time issues in detail at this stage</td>
<td>- Consider the projected legacy benefits and agree arrangements to ensure they are captured</td>
<td>(suggested timescale: 6 months out to post Games)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preliminary budgets at this stage should reflect the early stage of planning and high level of uncertainty and include significant contingency</td>
<td>- Consider the projected legacy benefits and agree arrangements to ensure they are captured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consider the projected legacy benefits and agree arrangements to ensure they are captured</td>
<td>- Consider the projected legacy benefits and agree arrangements to ensure they are captured</td>
<td>(suggested timescale: 6 months out to post Games)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By 2001, the Public Sector Funders and M2002 had defined the following shared objectives in relation to the Games:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 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 of strengthening sports participation at all levels</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To strengthen the economic and social capacity of the City/Region, recognising the importance of capturing maximum benefits to justify the significant capital investment in facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To advance policies for greater social inclusion, promotion of diversity, access to sport and volunteering</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To showcase Britain internationally and to raise the profile of the Commonwealth</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning
Defining the aim, setting the strategy and encouraging buy in

SUMMARY OF KEY DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>CGCE nominated Manchester to host Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Manchester bid based on Victoria but with 5 more sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995.11</td>
<td>Bid Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Sport England confirmed principle for substantial Lottery Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Sport England committed funds for swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur Games hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>SE resisted MCC attempt to reduce number of sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Sports Programme finalised – no sports deleted and Team sports added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Sydney Olympics hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Select Committee stated ‘Manchester faces challenge of setting a new benchmark’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Carter Review into Games resulted in Public Funding by SE and DCMS in addition to MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>WAC 2005 withdrawn from UK following cancellation of Picketts Lock project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>The events of September 11 reinforced the need for advanced security plans and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Critical Success Factors agreed by GMCC and M2002 and scope changed to deliver them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Handover of Sportscity to M2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games hosted in Manchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANCHESTER’S PLANNING EXPERIENCE

Summary of Manchester’s planning
- At the time of the bid there was little national co-ordination of major sports events and funding. The bid was local in nature.
- Manchester’s principal aim was to regenerate East Manchester, it was decided that this could be furthered by the strategy of building an East Manchester stadium and consequent local development, followed by hosting of a Commonwealth Games (which at that time was a fairly small scale event, the ‘Friendly Games’).
- Once the bid was won, planning began. Based on the size, scale and performance standards set at the Victoria Commonwealth Games 1994
- Much of the early operational planning was performed by consultants. M2002 had not yet recruited and implemented a senior operational management team with key operational posts.

Lessons learned from Manchester – successful elements
- The strategy at the outset was consistent with the aims of the key participating stakeholders at that time, principally MCC.
- Other stakeholders engaged at this stage included the CGF.
- The sports programme was a key element of the planning, influencing venues, transport, fit-out, logistics, sponsor/broadcaster appeal, country participation, gender mix of competitors, fit with home country priority sports, ticket sales etc.
- During this period M2002 was becoming aware that it was under-resourced and this affected planning and recruitment.
- All stakeholders understood that they were involved in a dynamic process and the Organising Committee would evolve over the planning and delivery stages, requiring different mixes of skills.
- Separating responsibility for construction of capital facilities and operation of the Games works very successfully.
- New sporting facilities and hosting major events can, in the right circumstances, transform and regenerate communities and bring significant and economic benefits. (East Manchester is recognised as a national regeneration priority.)
### Planning

Defining the aim, setting the strategy and encouraging buy in (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF KEY DATES</th>
<th>MANCHESTER’S PLANNING EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1994</strong></td>
<td>• CGCE nominated Manchester to host Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester bid based on Victoria but with 5 more sports</td>
<td><strong>April 1995</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1995</td>
<td>• Bid Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England confirmed principle for substantial Lottery Funding</td>
<td><strong>1996</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>• Sport England committed funds for swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuala Lumpur Games hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
<td><strong>1999</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>• SE resisted MCC attempt to reduce number of sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Programme finalised – no sports deleted and Team sports added</td>
<td><strong>1999</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>• Sydney Olympics hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Committee stated “Manchester faces challenge of setting a new benchmark”</td>
<td><strong>2001</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>• Carter Review into Games resulted in Public Funding by SE and DCMS in addition to MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAC 2005 withdrawn from UK following cancellation of Picketts Lock project</td>
<td><strong>2001</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>• The events of September 11 reinforced the need for advanced security plans and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Success Factors agreed by GMCC and M2002 and scope changed to deliver them</td>
<td><strong>2002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2002</td>
<td>• Handover of Sportscity to M2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Games hosted in Manchester</td>
<td><strong>2002</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lessons learned from Manchester - improvements

- **Government have to be an active partner from the bid stage**
- **Stronger support from the CGF in obtaining information from CGAs and in raising the profile of the Games with Governments of the Commonwealth and International Sports Federations would be of considerable benefit to Organising Committees**
- **The earlier appointment of a Chief Operating Officer would have made it easier to drive the operational planning process consistently and ensure better communication of planning and delivery timetables**
- **Greater consideration should have been given to an in-house stadium operator before a decision was taken to outsource**
- **The Games can be used more widely to celebrate the Commonwealth, Sport and Multi-culturism**
- **Better transfer of knowledge from previous Organising Committees would be hugely beneficial**
Planning
Setting the scope and service level and developing a budget

SUMMARY OF KEY DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>CGCE nominated Manchester to host Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>April 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Manchester bid based on Victoria but with 5 more sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Bid Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1995</td>
<td>Sport England confirmed principle for substantial Lottery Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Sport England committed funds for swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur Games hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>SE resisted MCC attempt to reduce number of sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Sports Programme finalised – no sports deleted and Team sports added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Sydney Olympics hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Select Committee stated “Manchester faces challenge of setting a new benchmark”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Carter Review into Games resulted in Public Funding by SE and DCMS in addition to MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>WAC 2005 withdrawn from UK following cancellation of Picketts Lock project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>The events of September 11 reinforced the need for advanced security plans and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Critical Success Factors agreed by GMCC and M2002 and scope changed to deliver them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>April 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Handover of Sportscity to M2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games hosted in Manchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANCHESTER’S PLANNING EXPERIENCE

Summary of Manchester’s planning

- Experience of Kuala Lumpur and in particular the Sydney Olympics raised expectations within the sporting community (see timeline opposite for Select Committee comments). This created uncertainty within M2002 as to strategy, scope and service levels
- M2002 invested a lot of senior management time in visiting other events and carrying out due diligence. This was a sound investment and underpinned the quality of planning and delivery of the Games
- Because of the lack of UK experience, much of Manchester’s early planning and budget setting was performed by consultants who have direct experience of organising previous games. In the first few years post award of the Games, Manchester chose not to recruit the senior operational managers as this was unrealistic so far out from the Games
- Detailed planning was undertaken by individual functional areas and by venues, which led to some functional areas planning scope and service levels which were higher than the agreed strategy and certain deliverables not being sufficiently tailored to suit the needs of each venue. As the venue teams grew in size and the emphasis of planning focused more heavily on venues rather than functional areas, these issues were resolved
- M2002 was unable to engage effectively with certain NGBs and other sports bodies to draw in resources and expertise as some were not geared up to provide this support. The Organising Committee received strong support from the NGBs at Games time, but greater support in the two years leading up to the Games would have been beneficial
- Due to funding constraints, M2002 was unable to develop venue teams early and therefore did not have the resources to staff a full matrix structure
- The events of September 11 reinforced the need for enhanced security plans and budget
Planning
Setting the scope and service level and developing a budget (cont’d)

SUMMARY OF KEY DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>CGCE nominated Manchester to host Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1995</td>
<td>Sport England confirmed principle for substantial Lottery Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Bid Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Sport England committed funds for swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur Games hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>SE resisted MCC attempt to reduce number of sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Sports Programme finalised – no sports deleted and Team sports added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Sydney Olympics hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Carter Review into Games resulted in Public Funding by SE and DCMS in addition to MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>The events of September 11 reinforced the need for advanced security plans and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Critical Success Factors agreed by GMCC and M2002 and scope changed to deliver them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2002</td>
<td>Handover of Sportscity to M2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games hosted in Manchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANCHESTER’S PLANNING EXPERIENCE

Lessons learned from Manchester – successful elements

- Problems will always occur, the key is to anticipate them correctly and have the right risk management process in place. M2002 did commit significant time and resources to contingency and continuity planning, creating plans which helped to resolve problems as they arose.
- Key stakeholders, such as disabled people’s organisations, should be fully engaged and a team responsible for identifying and removing the barriers to disabled people should be fully integrated throughout the planning from an early stage

Lessons learned from Manchester - improvements

- Initial plans should fully engage all stakeholders, and in particular Funders, so that strategy can be set to suit all and ‘buy-in’ obtained from all with regard to scope and service levels.
- Sports bodies need to be better able to respond to requests for assistance.
- A matrix structure, with stronger venue teams to ensure plans can develop along both functional area and venue lines from an early stage. This helps to ensure consistency in scope and service level planning; however for financial reasons M2002 did not build large venue teams until 2002.
- Stronger focus on core deliverables will help to avoid scope drift and deter “nice-to-have” planning from the onset.
- Adherence to a clear and widely communicated planning and delivery timetable would help to reduce last minute changes to plans.

2002

Manchester
Planning
Testing, refining and delivering

### Summary of Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>CGCE nominated Manchester to host Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Bid Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1995</td>
<td>Sport England confirmed principle for substantial Lottery Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Sport England committed funds for swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur Games hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>SE resisted MCC attempt to reduce number of sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Sports Programme finalised – no sports deleted and Team sports added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Sydney Olympics hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Carter Review into Games resulted in Public Funding by SE and DCMS in addition to MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>WAC 2005 withdrawn from UK following cancellation of Picketts Lock project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>The events of September 11 reinforced the need for advanced security plans and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Critical Success Factors agreed by GMCC and M2002 and scope changed to deliver them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Handover of Sportscity to M2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games hosted in Manchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manchester’s Planning Experience

**Summary of Manchester’s planning**

- Finalisation of operational plans was delayed in some areas as a result of funding uncertainties arising from increased expectations and the absence of a Strategic Operational Director. This led to increased delivery risk and late procurement and placed a difficult burden on the organisation.
- M2002 recruited staff late in a number of areas as plans were being finalised, which may have increased the number of non-UK staff recruited as they had proven recent experience and required minimal training time.
- The test event strategy was set before M2002 was fully funded and was therefore developed in the most cost effective manner, seeking to ‘piggyback’ on existing events wherever possible. A balance had to be struck between testing all areas of the organisation and operating test events efficiently from a financial perspective. With the benefit of hindsight, it would appear that the right balance was struck.
- Due to having small venue teams until 2002 it was difficult to mesh functional area operations with venues and across functions. The process of ensuring this ‘fit’ took significant time, but overall was a cost effective solution.
- The work done in early 2002 on CSFs was key to identifying gaps and setting priorities for efforts up to the Games, including risk management for areas such as transport.
- CGAs submissions of athlete numbers 6 months out and 30 days out differed significantly. This led to changes to the sports programme which had a negative impact on the athletes, broadcasters and spectators. The CGF needs to take a much harder line on this issue and consider how it can require the information earlier.
Planning
Testing, refining and delivering (cont’d)

Lessons learned from Manchester – successful elements
- There is value in setting aside sufficient time to run simulations to test issue resolution protocols with key partners in order to refine the Games Time operational plans and authority framework.
- A small core team with overview of the operational, financial and commercial requirements was fundamental to the success of the Games.
- Devolved decision making and accountability is needed, particularly at Games time.

Lessons learned from Manchester – improvements
- The Organising Committee would have benefited from the earlier appointment of the Chief Operating Officer to ensure that operational Divisions communicated better and that their plans were fully integrated.
- Service levels across venues should be clearly defined as early as possible to ensure that functional area planning meshes across functions.
- Detailed planning timetables should be set in advance to avoid major changes after 6 months out.
- The strategy for stewarding and static guard security should have involved the police more closely to ensure that there was sufficient experience. Alternative options should have been more fully explored.

SUMMARY OF KEY DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>CGCE nominated Manchester to host Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester bid based on Victoria but with 5 more sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 1995 Bid Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport England confirmed principle for substantial Lottery Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Sport England committed funds for swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur Games hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>SE resisted MCC attempt to reduce number of sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Sports Programme finalised – no sports deleted and Team sports added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Sydney Olympics hosted. This raised expectations of Commonwealth Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Carter Review into Games resulted in Public Funding by SE and DCMS in addition to MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>WAC 2005 withdrawn from UK following cancellation of Picketts Lock project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>The events of September 11 reinforced the need for advanced security plans and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Critical Success Factors agreed by GMCC and M2002 and scope changed to deliver them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Handover of Sportcity to M2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games hosted in Manchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANCHESTER’S PLANNING EXPERIENCE
Structure
Profile of organisation

DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Lessons learned from Manchester: successful elements

- M2002 – the Organising Committee
  - The creation of a separate organising committee to plan and run the Games was vital. The organisation could focus on this purpose alone. The OC attracted buy-in from external parties that MCC may not have generated

- Other parties
  - M2002 did not have responsibility for delivering the venues. This was the right approach

- Ongoing relationships
  - Monthly operational reviews were held to discuss progress in each functional area
  - MCC and GMPTE links with key contractors (eg transport providers) were useful in ensuring contractor performance
  - The M2002 Board provided a mix of strong media, commercial and governmental relations skills to support the Executive team
  - GMCC began after Easter 2001 and was critical to maintaining the focus on key areas such as transport and security. The partnerships developed in GMCC enabled partners to work effectively together without formality and built trust for Games time

Lessons learned from Manchester: improvements

- The creation of a separate OC does mean that the OC has to work hard to maintain partnerships, consult and share information

M2002- ORGANISATIONAL PROFILE AND EVOLUTION

Lessons learned from Manchester: improvements

- Profile
  - To ensure decisiveness and avoid lack of clarity, a strong performance management culture is the most effective
  - Good staff communications are essential for an organisation that is fast growing and short term, particularly between functional areas
  - Sport and venues teams could have worked more closely. Initially these teams were joined together, but after separation, the sports team allowed the venue plans to develop with insufficient input from sport
  - A larger, more integrated access team would have benefited the organisation and ensured a more consistent delivery of inclusivity across the piece (for example, it was felt that the incorporation of access needs into public information was not consistent)

- Evolution
  - Event organisers should recognise that there will be a good deal of evolution as this is the nature of such events
Structure
Staffing

A BENCHMARK PLAN

- The HR should be developed by strategic level organisational management in consultation with experts with 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, this should be cascaded down to create a solid core structure with flexibility to grow.
- The HR structure will go through three distinct phases in terms of scale. For the period immediately post bid there would be a small group of people (say 30), this would increase to several hundred up to 18 months before the event, culminating in tens of thousands of people at Games Time comprising volunteers, paid staff from all partners and contractor's staff. The management skills of OC need to evolve to reflect these scale changes.

During our review, several themes relating to staffing were highlighted

LESSONS LEARNED FROM MANCHESTER – SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS

- M2002's staff retention rate was high, against a background of no incentive payment scheme.
- A small core team with overview of the operational, financial and commercial requirements was fundamental to the success of the Games.
- Previous events experience is vital for certain roles such as functional area and venue heads. The organisation ensured that experience was at a sufficiently high level to provide a wide frame of reference within the organisation.
- Once these key people with experience were in place, many operational positions were filled by good managers with appropriate skills and knowledge of the role but little events experience.
- The senior management team included some good general managers to provide organisational ‘glue’ – who did not have specific areas of responsibility but were a flexible ‘trouble-shooting’ resource in the last 12 months.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM MANCHESTER - IMPROVEMENTS

- More support is needed from sports bodies to second staff to help the Organising Committee to provide a legacy for Sport in the UK.
- An earlier appointment of the Chief Operating Officer would ensure that operational departments communicated better and that their plans were more fully integrated.
Structure
Volunteer programme

The Games delivered the largest and most successful volunteering programme in peace-time Britain. Its success was a key element of the successful delivery of the Games. Our review highlighted several themes relating to volunteers which are discussed in detail below.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM MANCHESTER – SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS

- It has been widely recognised that volunteer commitment, determination and enthusiasm were vital factors in the success of the Games.
- Concerns in the UK over a lack of volunteering culture proved to be unfounded.
- M2002 demonstrated commitment to volunteer recognition through, for example, events such as Crew 2002, the training programme, Games Time recognition and post Games Party.
- The result of this commitment was a large volunteer workforce willing to work long hours, high numbers of shifts and in many cases over a period longer than the 11 days of events.
- Manchester did not try extensively to recruit long term volunteers, so the UK culture was not tested in this way. This could be tested in the future using Manchester experience and database.
- The pre-volunteer programme (PVP) was critical to the success of the volunteer programme by engaging the community four years prior to the Games and providing work experience for young people who had never previously been employed. The skills and experience developed through the PVP programme provided a valuable pool of volunteers for the Games and will help these people find employment in the future.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM MANCHESTER – IMPROVEMENTS

- In Manchester, senior management planned to use volunteers as widely as possible. This was not fully accepted by managers in some areas who had a preference for engaging paid staff.
- In certain areas volunteers could potentially have done even more, for example more use could possibly have been made of long term volunteers.
Partnerships
Summary

GMCC and M2002

New East Manchester/New Deal for communities

GMAS

Other AGMA authorities

MIDAS

UK Sport

NWDA

GONW

FCO

Home Office

HMC+E

NWTB/ETC/Marketing Manchester

CBI, business organisation

Account group

Ethnic minority organisations

Railtrack

Airports

Host Broadcaster

BTA

GMCFS

Suppliers

Sponsors and partners

CGAs

CGF

GMPTE

NGBs

GMP

Sport England

DCMS

MCC

GMCC

NGBs

CGAs

Suppliers

Sponsors and partners

Ethnic minority organisations

Account group

Railtrack

Airports

Host Broadcaster

BTA

GMCFS

GMAS

Other AGMA authorities

MIDAS

UK Sport

NWDA

GONW

FCO

Home Office

HMC+E

NWTB/ETC/Marketing Manchester

CBI, business organisation

Account group

Ethnic minority organisations

Railtrack

Airports

Host Broadcaster

BTA

GMCFS

Suppliers

Sponsors and partners

CGAs

CGF

GMPTE

NGBs

GMP

Sport England

DCMS

MCC

GMCC and M2002
Partnerships
Lessons learned

Lessons learned from Manchester: successful elements

- Manchester considered the ‘hidden burden’ that comes with the event and factored this into budgeting and resourcing plans (GMP and MCC restricted leave at Games time and all partners placed significant demands on their staff)
- The Funders were clear about their aims for becoming involved in delivering an event and shared a vision of the event
- The work involved in building partnerships and sustaining them, locally and nationally, was not underestimated
- The partnership with GMP was particularly successful. The standard of policing at the event was exceptionally high

Lessons learned from Manchester: improvements

- All potential Public Sector Funders must be actively engaged at the bid stage to ensure that they buy in to the scope and potential cost of the event from the outset
- From the outset the Organising Committee needs to have a strong Sports 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

Lessons learned from Manchester: successful elements

- The Greater Manchester Co-ordinating Committee was a key group and the quality of its leadership was fundamental to the success of the Games
- Partners were as open as possible and built trust and avoided wasted effort
- All partners recognised that plans would evolve and change as this is the nature of such events
- Funding partners combined their monitoring requirements to avoid over-burdening the Organising Committee with scrutiny and causing unnecessary planning delays
- Partners recognised that in some critical areas, detailed planning would only happen in the last 12 months before the event
- Having partners such as MCC and GMPTE with long-term relationships with third parties helped with negotiations
- Leaving delivery of public transport to the GMPTE worked well, allowing them to play to their strengths
- Partnerships improved as proximity to the Games increased. This was partly due to a shift in focus, with the event becoming the first priority for external parties, and partly due to planning timetables falling more into line as the event drew nearer
- The close working relationships (e.g. between GMP and MCC in Traffic Silver at Games time) were important to delivery
- A dedicated DCMS team was fundamental to co-ordination of Government input to the Games and integrated working with Stakeholders

Lessons learned from Manchester: improvements

- NGBs and other sports bodies were involved early. The Sports Committee, with representatives from every NGB, was formed in 1997. However, some of the NGBs were unable to provide experienced personnel and to manage their own aspects of the Games sufficiently well. The resourcing and ‘skilling-up’ of NGBs to support the delivery of future major events would help Organising Committees
## Venues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location for the main Stadium was decided before bid submitted in order to support regeneration priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The venue location strategy was developed in embryonic form early in 1996 and refined and developed over the intervening period. A schedule of venue locations is appended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Cycling Centre and Manchester Evening News Indoor Arena were already completed following the earlier Olympic bid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF VENUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy issues ie having no ‘white elephants’ determined the location of venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The location restricted the size of venues for example the number of seats in the swimming pool was limited. These issues were explained openly to the media and accepted by them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having venues available in time for testing carries financial implications that need to be factored into the budgets for future events. Management of these venues during this period is a specialist task that should be planned for when scoping the skills mix required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Procurement
excluding Capital Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOICE OF CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>OTHER FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lessons learned from Manchester: successful elements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lessons learned from Manchester: successful elements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The contractors’ ability to deal with requests for additional work were a key selection criterion, as was the robustness of the Games time management arrangements</td>
<td>- The scale and quality of the event was clearly communicated when contracts were let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some requirements, e.g. multi-sport venue management, could only have been fulfilled by a very limited number of suppliers and required innovative approaches to procurement</td>
<td>- The timing of the letting of contracts was critical to ensure efficient, cost effective delivery. M2002 delayed finalisation of contracts until the scopes of services were well defined, prior to which heads of agreement were entered into between the parties. By specifying clearly the deliverables in contracts, for all major items of procurement, M2002 ensured the delivery of the quality of services needed within the budget available and few contractual disputes arose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contractors were scrutinised closely throughout the contract to monitor their progress towards delivering their key obligations</td>
<td>- Contracts with sponsors were watertight to avoid misunderstandings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lessons learned from Manchester: improvements**

- The ability of key contractors (security, catering, cleaning, transport) to meet the needs of an event of this scale should be carefully scrutinised
- Skills for certain services are not always available in the market for such a major event. This may require the Organising Committee to adapt its plans and split responsibilities between a number of contractors or consider doing certain services ‘in-house’ by buying-in specialist personnel nationally or from overseas
- The expertise of Public Sector was generally utilised when reviewing tenders and choosing contractors. However for security, consideration could have been given to involving GMP more directly. A more direct management role for GMP was considered by M2002, and decided against in consultation with GMP. In retrospect, greater GMP involvement may have been preferable

- Buying power of partners derived from ongoing links with key contractors (eg GMPTE with transport providers) were utilised
Procurement
Capital Works

Lessons learned from Manchester

- When pursuing national projects, it is very difficult to reconcile legal requirements placed on Funding Bodies with the need to act quickly to avoid missing key construction and operational deadlines. In such circumstances procurement routes and timetables need to be tailored to maximise value for money and operational efficiency.

- The decision to procure venues through the public sector rather than M2002 was correct. This ensured the use of existing procurement skills was maximised and the correct balance was struck between the long term use and temporary Games use for the facilities.
The diagram below illustrates the potential ‘big bucket’ costs of staging an international multi-sports event, and the likely sources of funding, both commercial and public.

Potential bidders should factor all the costs noted below into their final decision, ensure 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.

TV rights and sponsorship markets fluctuate widely and bidders should set manageable targets that can be revised upwards later if achieved.
# Finance

## Budgeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISTORIC BUDGETS ‘V’ PROJECTED OUTFURRN</th>
<th>COMMENTS / KEY LESSONS LEARNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The original expenditure budget for the 2002 Games of £78 million was based on the quality and scale of Games delivered in Victoria in 1994. The 1998 Commonwealth Games in Kuala Lumpur and the 2000 Sydney Olympics raised expectations of Manchester for all Stakeholders and demonstrated the importance and value of staging a first class event in Manchester for the benefit of the City, the Country and Sport in the UK.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- As a consequence, the scale of the Games was increased and Team Sports added, service levels were redefined, the Opening and Closing Ceremonies were seen as a national event with £12 million committed to them and the Queens Jubilee Baton Relay was redefined. As a consequence the operating costs budget was increased to £156 million in 2001. The actual outturn is currently projected to be £143 million.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Commercial revenue achieved was £55 million more than double the revenue raised by previous Games and £4 million greater than the April 2001 budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Currently £15.7 million of Contingency funds remain uncommitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The biggest cost on the contingency related to telecommunication costs of £7.8 million following the administration of Atlantic Telecom. However, more than £3 million of value was generated from this sponsorship deal which is more than £1 million more than received from the majority of Games sponsors. Other contingency costs, net of savings made by M2002, 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 the athletes’ village, security, transport, fit-out and Look.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percentage contingencies, determined by the proximity to the event (the further out, the higher the contingency) should always be built into the budgets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To the extent that ‘big bucket’ 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 burden that they will have to bear, and are prepared for this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The existence of an independent Finance Committee enabled the Board to focus on strategic issues is essential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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 of the latest financial outturn. This enabled decisions to be taken quickly and in full knowledge of the financial consequences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The contracting strategy with clearly specified deliverables, risk management/insurance obligations and payment profiles, minimised 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Legacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Physical/Environmental/Cultural</th>
<th>Workforce/Organisational &amp; Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venues are available for events and sports development</td>
<td>East Manchester has already benefited from a major physical regeneration including Sportcity, the Asda-Walmart, the Ashton Canal corridor and several residential schemes that will improve the area’s tenure mix. Local residents’ expectations were realised and significant local pride was engendered.</td>
<td>There is a clear legacy of improved working relationships between MCC, GMP and GMPTE at an operational level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A future event strategy is being completed</td>
<td>It is too early to say what the final impact of the Games will be, but there are already further projects underway including: Fujitsu at North Manchester Business Park and the completion and opening of the Stadium as a 48,000 seat venue for MCFC.</td>
<td>Strong regional links were created to market the Games and for the legacy work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several major new community facilities are in place as a result of the Games</td>
<td>The Games have shown what is possible in areas such as street cleaning and dressing. This has raised resourcing questions within MCC as to how it might achieve that level of responsiveness in future.</td>
<td>Regional partners are keen to access databases collected from the Business Club, travel trade and volunteers. There are already opportunities to develop the Business Club brand at future major events, providing UK companies with wider access to sector markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC’s leisure team has focused on its sports development programme to support and boost future participation, for example, in squash and athletics</td>
<td>The Games have shown what is possible in areas such as street cleaning and dressing. This has raised resourcing questions within MCC as to how it might achieve that level of responsiveness in future.</td>
<td>The Commonwealth Games Opportunities and Legacies Partnership Board is currently assessing the future for activities such as the Business Club and the Pre Volunteer Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over one third of Leisure Services Central team worked full-time on the Games for the last year and almost all the team were involved at Games time. The skills and experience gained remain within MCC to help with future events</td>
<td>The NWDA is currently planning a major regional events programme to build on the benefits experienced as a result of the Games.</td>
<td>Strong links between the public and private sector were fostered as a result of the Games. This should be capitalised upon as a basis for future projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC has improved relationships with NGBs and aims to build on these by attracting some NGBs to Manchester for their headquarters</td>
<td>There will be significant benefits for community sports within the region as a result of its arrangements concluded with Sportcity</td>
<td>Games mobility could be very easily set up for future events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be significant benefits for community sports within the region as a result of its arrangements concluded with Sportcity</td>
<td>The successful hosting of the Games has improved awareness and tourism prospects for the region</td>
<td>There is a clear legacy of increased civic pride in Manchester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>A number of debriefing events are planned and individual agencies (GMP and GMPTE for example) are producing detailed reports to capture the lessons on a national scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The UK’s reputation for staging major events has been significantly enhanced | Work which mapped key pedestrian routes for disabled people in the City Centre will be important for future events. | }
## Implications for future

### LOCAL
- Manchester has been placed on the international map as a quality venue increasing the international reputation for Manchester as a vibrant multi-cultural City
- The Games developed a positive reputation for facilities and infrastructure in Manchester and the North West
- Manchester now has an opportunity to rebrand and reposition the City and region in the light of the success of the Games
- MCC now needs to set out its future sporting and cultural events strategy to build on the Games
- The City is already preparing a sports event strategy paper that sets out the aim to be proactive with certain target sports. It is also considering the optimal structure for spearheading the development and implementation of its future events strategy
- The City has a large sporting and cultural infrastructure than can be built upon
- Attracting governing bodies of sports to locate in Manchester will build critical mass and provide an impetus for attracting future events
- The volunteer database can be used for future events and in wider regeneration
- MCC has demonstrated enhanced service levels, for example in street cleansing and city dressing. Public expectations have been raised East Manchester should find it easier to attract positive coverage for future developments by building relationships with journalists who visited during the Games

### NATIONAL
- The UK has been repositioned internationally as a potential host of future sports events
- The reputation of sporting quality and organisations and infrastructure in the UK has been boosted
- Government is now more aware of the implications of hosting major events. Future bids should always be a national decision with Government backing
- Sports bodies need to get better at understanding the skills available in the UK and providing a database for events organisers to access these skills
- The BTA's co-ordination of tourism and promotion worked well – this should be pursued in the future as a means of avoiding confusion and capturing synergies
- Government needs to be fully involved from the outset of such events to add credibility and stability and help to attract other investors and to promote the event
- A new benchmark has been set for access and inclusivity, which should be built upon by future event organisers

### EVENT
- Manchester 2002 has pushed up the scope and scale of the Commonwealth Games
- The scope and scale are not fixed by the CGF and are therefore defined by the OC and its stakeholders
- If the scale and service levels for the Games continue to increase, only a small number of Commonwealth countries will be able to afford to stage the Games in the future

**Conclusion**
- Potential hosts should develop ‘partnership’ type relationship with the CGF to influence the scope and service level. The CGF needs to consider how host cities are provided with better information on athlete numbers
- If the size and scope of the event continues to increase, the number of nations prepared to fund the cost of hosting the event will reduce
- The CGF should consider establishing a group of 2 or 3 people with detailed event understanding who follow the event to each host city, funded by the host city
Bidding for future major events

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. This should be driven by Government.

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

There is a case to consider for future events, the governance base to ensure maximum efficiency and timely delivery.

The Commonwealth Games is the single most popular manifestation of the Commonwealth, and the strongest vehicle to promote the Commonwealth. However, the continuous improvements in performance standards and increases in scale of the event means that only a few countries will be able to fund and host the Commonwealth Games within their financial means. Because of the importance of the Games to the Commonwealth, consideration should be given at CHOGM to the role played by the Games in achieving wider objectives for the Commonwealth.
Elements of ‘Best Practice’

The diagram below illustrates the 14 elements considered key to the success of a multi-sport event of the scale of the Commonwealth Games. These have been derived from the recurring themes discussed by the consultees during the review.

**EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS**
- With expert partners including sports bodies (importance of knowledge transfer)
- With Funders
- With operational partners

**OWNERSHIP/LEADERSHIP OF PRINCIPAL STAKEHOLDER**
- Ultimate risk bearer
- Close scrutiny, guidance and assistance of OC

**EFFECTIVE ORGANISATIONAL MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE**
- Quality of leadership of OC and Board members
- ‘Glue’ at senior level
- Ability to invest in experienced staff at the right time
- Communication and decision making
- Flexible structure (recognise that plans will evolve)

**NATIONAL GOVERNMENT BUY-IN**
- At bid stage
- Continuous involvement throughout

**AGREED FUNDING**
- Core operating budget
- ‘Big Bucket’ costs
- Capital costs
- Contingencies

**FINANCIAL CONTROL**
- Strong financial control
- Independent scrutiny

**APPROPRIATE LOCATION**
- Scale
- Venues
- Infrastructure
- Passion for sport

**CONSIDERED SPORTS PROGRAMME**
- Capital and operating costs "v" commercial income per sport
- Local issues (NGB HQs)
- Effect of timing on operations

**AGREED STRATEGY AND MODEL**
- ‘Fit’ with local aims, location and wider context vital

**EFFECTIVE PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT**
- Procurement timetable
- Effective change management
- Planning timetable

**FOCUS ON DELIVERY OF CORE**
- Identification of opinion-makers
- CSF setting
- Joint ownership across all stakeholders

**EVENT SUCCESS**

- 'Fit' with local aims, location and wider context vital
- Regeneration of East Manchester
  - Physical
  - Social
  - Cultural
- Relevant to local people

- Queen's Jubilee Year
- Failure of Picketts Lock and 2005 WAC

- OC = SEPARATE ENTITY
  - OC able to focus on delivery
  - Need for special powers should be considered