

**MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL**  
**REPORT FOR RESOLUTION**

**REPORT TO:** Communities and Neighbourhoods Overview & Scrutiny  
Committee  
**Executive**

**DATE:** 17<sup>th</sup> June 2008  
**25<sup>th</sup> June 2008**

**SUBJECT:** UEFA Cup Final – 14<sup>th</sup> May 2008

**REPORT OF:** Chief Executive

---

**PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

To report on the findings of the review into arrangements put in place by the Local Organising Committee to deliver the UEFA Cup Final on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2008, including provision of facilities for ticketless fans.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Members note the successful staging of the UEFA Cup Final match in Manchester on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2008.

Note and comment on the findings of the review into the planning, management and delivery of the UEFA Cup Final.

Endorse the lessons learnt from this review set out in Section 20 and request that major event organisers within the city take account of these findings when planning any future large scale events.

**FINANCIAL CONSEQUENCES FOR THE REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS**

There are no consequences for the Council's revenue and capital budgets. The majority of the costs of the event will be met by the budget available from the Local Organising Committee and any remaining costs will be contained within existing budgets.

**CONTACT OFFICERS**

Howard Bernstein, Chief Executive, 0161 234 3006  
[h.bernstein@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:h.bernstein@manchester.gov.uk)

Steve Mycio, Deputy Chief Executive (Performance) 0161 234 3031  
[s.mycio@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:s.mycio@manchester.gov.uk)

Vicky Rosin, Assistant Chief Executive, Cultural Services 0161 234 4051  
[v.rosin@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:v.rosin@manchester.gov.uk)

**WARDS AFFECTED**

All.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR KEY COUNCIL POLICIES:**

**Anti-Poverty**

**Equal Opportunities**

**Environment**

**Employment**

No

No

No

No

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 Manchester was the host city for the 2008 UEFA Cup Final on Wednesday, 14<sup>th</sup> May 2008. The Final at the City of Manchester Stadium has been acknowledged by all parties as a major success. The Local Organising Committee did not bid for, nor was contracted to provide for, but ultimately hosted between 150,000 to 160,000 football supporters – the largest known migration of supporters for a single match - which had a significant impact on the city's infrastructure, services and facilities. Levels of anti-social behaviour during the day and incidents of public disorder in the Piccadilly area of the city centre marred the event.
- 1.2 The Executive on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2008 requested a review into the arrangements put in place by the Local Organising Committee to accommodate the extraordinary numbers of ticketless supporters and the events of the day itself in order to establish what worked well, what did not and why and what lessons can be learnt for future events in the city.
- 1.3 A wide range of stakeholders, key agencies and partners have been consulted and contributed to the review (key responses from stakeholders in Manchester and Glasgow are attached at Appendix 1). The Council has also received many letters and e-mails following the event both of complaint and compliment and the views and questions emerging from residents, businesses and visitors have all been considered as part of the review process. In addition to considering the planning, management and delivery of the event, the estimated costs and benefits to the city have been analysed by Marketing Manchester and are set out in Section 17.
- 1.4 The fundamental starting point is that we have reviewed and are reporting back on an event where the planning was based on intelligence from discussions with Glasgow Rangers Football Club, Strathclyde Police, Glasgow City Council and Rangers' fans. The help and assistance received from them is gratefully acknowledged given the difficulties in determining the intentions of a fan base which is recognised to be world wide. At the Quarter Finals stage, the estimated number of travelling fans with or without tickets was 60,000 to 70,000. This remained the best intelligence at the Semi Finals and once Rangers FC won through to the Final, anticipated numbers started to rise. By 9<sup>th</sup> May, the numbers had risen to 100,000. However, even this number was significantly exceeded and it is this key factor that sets the scene for what followed.

## **2.0 Context**

- 2.1 It is important to place the review of this event in a wider context. Manchester has hosted major finals, for example, the UEFA Champions League Final in 2003, and other international and major football matches in the city without such serious disorder. The UEFA Cup Final was part of the Manchester World Sport 08 programme which has been widely acclaimed for the delivery of UCI Track Cycling World Championships, FINA 9<sup>th</sup> World Swimming Championships (25m), the Paralympic World Cup and the BUPA Great Manchester Run. The Hi-Tec World Squash Championships will be held in October and this year of major events will be independently evaluated for both short and long term benefits. During the successful hosting of the Commonwealth Games in 2002, more than a million people visited the city over the eleven days of the Games and the City Council and partners were widely acclaimed for the planning, co-ordination and delivery of the event.

## **3.0 Background**

- 3.1 The UEFA Cup Final was managed, in partnership with UEFA and their media and sponsorship agency TEAM, by a Local Organising Committee (LOC) which comprised:-
- Manchester City Football Club (stadium operator)
  - The Football Association (host association)
  - Manchester City Council
  - Greater Manchester Police
  - Manchester Airport
  - Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority
  - Marketing Manchester
- 3.2 This partnership successfully bid to host the 2008 UEFA Cup Final in June 2006. The development of the event and its associated activities was a 12 month process which incorporated all planning elements of the event and involved input from all key stakeholders at relevant stages. Each area of planning had the agreement of all LOC partners and UEFA prior to delivery on the day of the final.
- 3.3 The City Council's core responsibilities were to deliver against the contracted obligations as host City for the 2008 UEFA Cup Final with specific reference to the 'Road to the Final' promotion of the event. This included the provision of two fan entertainment areas on match day; the facilitation of the mobility concept (in partnership with GMP, GMPTE and Manchester Airport) which incorporated the transport management of fans and attendees of the final between the airport, the city centre and the stadium; the management of VIP services in association with UEFA; the protection of UEFA and its sponsor partners' commercial rights; and to engage with the other key partners (specifically GMP and MCFC as the stadium operator) in the delivery of the safety, security and public order requirements.

- 3.4 The core strategy for the delivery of all elements of the event was established from the beginning of the project – and reviewed and adjusted as teams were eliminated from the competition and new teams (including Rangers) were incorporated at the turn of the year following elimination from the UEFA Champions League. Planning for the possibility of a UK team was addressed from February onwards and planning for the possibility of Rangers FC from the quarter finals onwards. The origin of the two finalists, and therefore the final plans that needed to be implemented, was not known until the evening of 1<sup>st</sup> May 2008.

#### **4.0 Planning**

- 4.1 The Local Organising Committee (LOC) was led by Manchester City Football Club and the detailed planning was devolved to specific functional sub-groups.
- 4.2 Manchester City Council had a specific UEFA Cup Final Project team and work was directed through a number of sub groups. These were:

Traffic and Transport Sub Group (Multi-Agency) Fan Zones Sub Group (Multi-Agency) Media and Communications Sub Group (Multi-Agency) Road to the Final Working Group (MCC)
--

- 4.3 Other groups accountable to the LOC were:

Stadium Sub Group (MCFC / GMP) GMP Planning Team (Gold, Silver, Divisional GMP) Other areas of planning covered: Host Operations, TV and Media, Sport, Commercial and Logistics
---

- 4.4 The LOC met in advance of UEFA site visits and then together with UEFA/TEAM who reviewed planning and organisational issues, gave feedback and set further programmes of work. Planning for the event concentrated on managing fans from two clubs with the intention that fans would be entertained in separate fan zones and would have segregated transport arrangements.
- 4.5 Variations to the core existing plans were explored and amended from the quarter final stage when the option of Rangers FC being one of the finalists became a distinct possibility.

## **5.0 Intelligence**

- 5.1 In the lead up to the semi-finals, intelligence received from Strathclyde police was to anticipate more than 50,000 travelling Rangers fans. At the finalists meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> May, advice received from Rangers FC was to plan for 60,000 to 70,000 travelling support. This was revised upwards in subsequent days by police and club sources to 80,000 plus.
- 5.2 On 2<sup>nd</sup> May when the two finalists, Rangers FC and FC Zenit St Petersburg were known, the initial LOC agreed response at the Finalists meeting and subsequent Press Conference was, in line with usual practice, that fans should be advised not to travel to Manchester without a ticket for the match.
- 5.3 Rangers FC were encouraged to show the match, which they ultimately did. Earlier notification of this might have discouraged some fans from travelling. In the event more than 30,000 watched the game at Ibrox.
- 5.4 On 9<sup>th</sup> May representatives from GMP and Manchester City Council visited Glasgow and met with Rangers FC, supporters' groups and Strathclyde Police when the likelihood of 100,000 fans attending the UEFA Cup Final was discussed.
- 5.5 The picture established at this meeting was that the fans were coming in large numbers, that they would drink significantly, they would be loud and boisterous but there was no anticipation of disorder. Emphasis was given to the relatively trouble free record of Rangers fans in Europe this year (one arrest). The LOC position of fans being advised not to travel without a ticket was qualified to assure those fans who intended to travel to Manchester that they could be assured of a welcome.
- 5.6 This intelligence was validated through contact with almost every coach company in Scotland, with rail companies and British Transport Police, knowledge of numbers of ferries coming from Northern Ireland and revised intelligence from Rangers FC.
- 5.7 Despite this work, there was no way of checking on the plans of thousands who decided to travel from all parts of the UK by car, nor of those who on the day, with the prospect of excellent weather and a major football carnival decided to join the event.

## **6.0 Planning for Rangers FC in the Final**

- 6.1 On confirmation that the final would be contested by FC Zenit St Petersburg and Rangers FC a number of key strategic decisions were taken in the planning process that had a direct bearing on the delivery of the event on the day.
  - The LOC primary objective was to prevent large numbers of un-ticketed fans gathering at the City of Manchester Stadium. The potential for mass public disorder and potential tragedy – as witnessed at previous stadia events in the UK and abroad - was deemed too great.

- Given the projected numbers of ticketless fans likely to descend on the city – the decision to screen the match in the fan zones was agreed by all LOC partners and UEFA.
- The LOC decided that a ‘relaxed’ stance on the designated ‘no drinking’ areas in the city centre was to be adopted – in expectation that it was practically unenforceable given the projected volume of people coming in to the city centre. This issue is returned to later in the report in section 9.

6.2 To inform the planning process the following assumptions were made:

- The capacity at the stadium for the Final was 43,000.
- FC Zenit had been allocated 8,600 tickets.
- Rangers FC had been allocated 17,000 – it was further assumed that a significant number of Rangers fans would acquire tickets from the neutral allocation and from the hospitality packages.
- For the purpose of event planning it was assumed that a minimum of 23,000 Rangers fans would be ticketed (feedback from the club was that they estimated that 30,000 ticketed fans would be realistic).
- It was assumed that the travelling fans from FC Zenit coming in to the city would be contained within their ticket allocation.

## **7.0 Options for Fan Zones**

7.1 Considerable deliberation went into the planning of the fan zones including developing worst and best case scenarios and contingencies. The LOC explored a range of options in terms of locations of the fan zones and the option to have separate screen areas for the match. There was never the option to move the holding of the Final to another, larger stadium as the LOC were contracted to holding the event at the City of Manchester Stadium.

- MUFC were approached by UEFA in April about the possibility of screening the match in the stadium or in the car parks. The request was declined due to other commitments. Similarly, the MEN Arena and Manchester Central both had existing commitments.
- Heaton Park was rejected due to the intelligence from UEFA, Rangers and supporter associations that fans would still make for the city centre and the stadium, and that with no controls over the travel arrangements of ticketed and unticketed fans, the distance from the park to the stadium and city centre would negate the impact of such a venue on their movements on the day. In addition the requirements to park, the anticipated number of coaches and vehicles around the park would be weather dependent given the need to use grassed areas.

- The options to utilise the Regional Athletics Arena adjacent to the stadium (30,000 capacity) or to utilise car parks 1 and 2 to the north of the stadium were not agreed by the LOC as it directly conflicted with the policy not to encourage fans without a ticket to go to the stadium.
  - The option to screen the game at Philips Park was advised against primarily based on the venue's inability to safely manage the access and egress of large numbers and it is not used for such large scale activities.
  - The option to utilise the Holt Town grassed area off Ashton New Road was developed and set aside on agreement to use Velodrome site.
  - The option to create screen zones along Deansgate to accommodate up to 25,000 people was advised against on grounds of safety management.
  - The option to utilise Castlefield was advised against on grounds of safety and the potential for serious negative impact on the surrounding resident population. It was also allocated for the 3v3 grassroots event.
  - Other large areas of open space – including car park facilities at Boddingtons and Collyhurst – were reviewed and rejected.
  - Other road based options – on Rowsley St and on Ashton New Road – were not advanced due to the impact on the stadium's existing operations and Major Incident Plan.
- 7.2 Based on the most recent information from Glasgow the planning process – dovetailed with the traffic and transport management plan – identified that the city centre would provide three fan zones – in Albert Square, Piccadilly Gardens and Cathedral Gardens
- 7.3 When determining the need for one or more sites as a contingency, the sites above, including the Velodrome, all posed a degree of risk, but the Velodrome and the Velodrome car parks were viewed as the better option.
- 7.4 In addition the capacity of pubs, clubs and casinos which had screen capabilities to watch the match was established at 21,000.
- 8.0 Capacity of Fan Zones**
- 8.1 The capacity established at each of the identified fan zones, including zones identified as contingency, was based on a festival measure of between 0.75 sqm and 0.5sqm per person. Add to this the capacity of the pubs and clubs in the city centre with screens and the anticipated number of Rangers fans likely to secure tickets to watch the match at the Stadium, the viewing capacity was as follows:



	<u>Capacity</u>
Albert Square 6,000sqm	12,000 *
Piccadilly Gardens 6,000sqm	12,000 *
Cathedral Gardens 4,500sqm (nb- trees etc restrict areas for viewing)	5,000
Velodrome (indoor- contingency)	5,000
Velodrome (car parks-contingency)	20,000
Exchange Square (contingency)	5,000
Pubs, clubs etc with screens	21,000
Ticketed Fans	30,000
<b>Total:</b>	<b>110,000</b>

\* The Event Management Plan gave Albert Square and Piccadilly Gardens a capacity of 8,000 each which had a generous safety factor built in which enabled this figure to be adjusted upwards to increase the capacity safely to 12,000 in each area.

- 8.2 Based on the numbers of fans expected this was felt to accommodate fans without tickets. Whilst post-event figures have ranged from 125,000 to 200,000 Rangers supporters coming in to the city – estimates of occupation of the key venues on the evening of the match immediately prior to kick-off time indicate a level of 100,000 Rangers fans in the above locations within the city centre and up to 130,000 if locations external to the city centre are incorporated.

#### **Estimated numbers of Rangers Fans in viewing locations**

Albert Sq. Fanzone	12,000
Piccadilly Gardens Fanzone	12,000
External to Piccadilly Gardens	8,000
Cathedral Gardens	5,000
Stadium (estimate)	35,000
Exchange Square	4,000
Velodrome (pre-kick off)	3,000
City centre bars + clubs	21,000
<b>Total:</b>	<b>100,000</b>

- 8.3 To note this is a minimum number with most people at the Velodrome car park assumed to have been already in Piccadilly Gardens – level of car park occupancy estimated at 15,000 by second half of match – internal at Velodrome 5,000.
- 8.4 If an additional 30% is factored in for other city centre locations and venues in external areas to the city centre or who were not actually watching the match, the projected level of Rangers visitor numbers equates to 130,000.
- 8.5 Add to this the FC Zenit St Petersburg fans, the UEFA family, VIPs and neutral supporters, these numbers rise to in excess of 150,000.

## **9.0 Alcohol**

- 9.1 The LOC gave careful consideration to the sale of alcohol and consumption of alcohol in the fan zones and in the city centre and how drinking on the streets might be prevented through the enforcement of the designated 'no drinking' areas.
- 9.2 Given the anticipated numbers of fans, the available points of distribution and the information from Rangers FC and Supporters' representatives that their fans would drink large quantities of alcohol, The LOC agreed that GMP would take a 'relaxed' stance on the designated 'no drinking' areas. The street drinking laws were effectively unenforceable due to the numbers of fans anticipated.
- 9.3 There are wider powers under the Licensing Act 2003 whereby the police can apply for a Closure Order in respect of licensed premises in a specific area where there is, or is expected to be, disorder. The intelligence received from Scotland was that there was no recent history of disorder from travelling Rangers fans in European Championships and therefore disorder was not anticipated. Such a Closure Order would have included all restaurants, bars, hotel bars, cinema and theatre bars and off-licensed premises and, given the numbers of visitors expecting to drink during the day of the event, this was deemed to be more likely to cause disorder.
- 9.4 Significant quantities of alcohol were brought into the city by visiting fans and there are very many reports of fans already being intoxicated as they arrived. Planning for the fan zones included provision of stewards to prevent glass and bottles being taken into the fan zones but to allow cans. The decision to sell alcohol within the fan zones was taken both to minimise the amount of glass/bottles in the area by using plastic and also because it was believed that the sale of alcohol in fan zones would help contain fans in those areas.
- 9.5 Both the Police and Officers from the Regulatory and Enforcement Services communicated by letter and visits to off-licensed premises in the city centre and East Manchester to advise them not to have promotions aimed specifically at football fans, and not to sell alcohol in glass bottles to fans.
- 9.6 UEFA regulations forbid the consumption of alcohol in the stadium and the LOC had a clear policy to refuse the consumption of alcohol in the immediate environment of the stadium. Another factor therefore for ensuring that fans without tickets did not migrate up to the match venue was to make it explicit that whilst drinking would be permissible within the fan zones, it would not be allowed at the Stadium. This was strictly enforced.

## **10.0 Events in the Fan Zones**

- 10.1 A significant number of Rangers fans started travelling on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> May to Manchester or surrounding towns in the region such as Blackpool. This meant that there were already several thousands of fans gathering in the city centre prior to match day. This was particularly significant for Piccadilly Gardens fan zone which is addressed below.

- 10.2 The three fan zones in Albert Square, Cathedral Gardens and Piccadilly Gardens were established as three independent but interlinked areas. Both Albert Square and Cathedral Gardens were fenced off creating a sterile site on the eve of the Final which prevented fans from gathering in these spaces until the morning of 14<sup>th</sup>. Albert Square was utilised as the coach and car park for the UEFA dinner on the eve of the final and Cathedral Gardens was closed to minimise disturbance to boarders at Chethams School of Music. Road closures around Albert Square came into effect from 6am on 14<sup>th</sup> and all gates, fences and staff positions were established by 9am.
- 10.3 Cathedral Gardens did not open as a fan zone until 11am and no live music was provided until after 5.30pm to reduce the impact on Chethams School of Music on the day.
- 10.4 The festival atmosphere in Albert Square was maintained throughout the day. Further road closures to John Dalton Street and Cross Street were effected at 1.30pm to ensure safety.
- 10.5 During the afternoon, the provision of the disabled platform in Albert Square was lost because of the volume of supporters which then gave access to the monument for people to climb. Despite early success by stewards in regaining control, sheer numbers and the determination of a group of fans meant that control of the monument was not regained prior to the screening of the match.
- 10.6 There were a number of incidents at individual gates to Albert Square and gates were closed for short durations to move people towards other points of entry or to divert them to other additional screen opportunities, but significant numbers remained determined to try and access their chosen venue.
- 10.7 Capacity levels in Albert Square reached maximum capacity of 12,000 in the evening, but the view of the events management team is that the safety of occupants of the fan zone was never compromised. Some fans threw bottles and other missiles at the screens when goals were scored during the match but other than this they remained, in the majority, a good natured crowd.
- 10.8 The provision of toilets and cleaning services are addressed separately later in the report (section 14).
- 10.9 Levels of occupancy in Cathedral Gardens were low during the day, increased in the late afternoon and reached capacity prior to the screening of the match. Control of the gates was maintained however and the decision to utilise the Exchange Square screen as a fallback measure prevented further pressure on Cathedral Gardens at match time. The closure of Withy Grove also gave additional fans sight of the screen at Cathedral Gardens. This fan zone worked well and other than damage to some immature trees and pressure at entry points, there were no incidents of disorder.

10.10 There were 260 Stewards on duty across the fan zones in the city centre throughout the day, but these numbers became inadequate as numbers trying to access fan zones reached capacity and acts of anti-social behaviour and public disorder in Piccadilly increased.

### **11.0 Piccadilly Gardens**

11.1 The management of the Piccadilly Gardens fan zone was affected by a number of issues:-

- The screen position was changed in the week before the event at the request of partner agencies – thereby making it more visible to people outside the fence lines from the road area. This in itself would not have been a problem but for the significant numbers that gathered outside of the fan zone.
- This change in screen location also isolated the screen from the core production / control area which hindered communications between event management and screen technicians at a crucial time.
- The fan zone was not sealed off prior to the event as Piccadilly Gardens is a major community hub and commuter thoroughfare and the decision to defer 'lock down' as a controlled site was to minimise disruption to residents and businesses around the Gardens. As a consequence the gardens became a focal point for Rangers fans gathering on Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> prior to the event.
- As a result of this access issue, controlling drinking within the site and especially the control of glass was compromised. There was a significant build up of debris from 13<sup>th</sup> and difficulty in positioning additional bins because of significant numbers of fans in the Gardens. Toilets were needed on 13<sup>th</sup> and overnight instead of opening in a controlled manner when staffing levels were sufficient on the morning of 14<sup>th</sup>.

11.2 Piccadilly Gardens fan zone was a contained area with busy roads and Metro lines bordering the area and as numbers built up during the morning, and with many fans already inebriated, the ability to maintain transport services safely were severely tested requiring decisions to close adjoining roads and the Metrolink connection between Victoria Station and Manchester Central.

11.3 Feedback on the day highlighted a different profile and dynamic to this fan zone and consideration of the detail of events during the day has revealed issues of anti-social behaviour and public disorder prior to the failure of the screen signal.

11.4 There was a general build up of fans between 9am and 11am by which time there were estimated to be 3,500 within the fan zone and a further 2,000 gathered in the area of Oldham St/ Piccadilly. At this point contingency bus diversions were put into place and there was significant congestion in the toilet area which was serving the needs of those within and outside the site. The volume of glass being dealt with was high.

- 11.5 At 11.30am there was the first report of anti-social behaviour – missiles being thrown at the stage and the first reported fight between fans. The first act on stage lasted only 20 minutes out of the 45 minutes scheduled because they were pelted with cans and coins. No other acts performed on stage that day for safety reasons.
- 11.6 At 12 noon there were 7,000 within the fan zone and increased reports of inebriated behaviour. Fence lines were breached and stewards tried to direct people to other fanzones with lower levels of occupancy.
- 11.7 By 1pm this fan zone was reported to be at 85% capacity. Stewards were controlling the site but had little control over the large volume of people gathering in the public areas outside the site between Market Street and Portland Street.
- 11.8 Between 1pm and 3pm the site remained about 85% occupancy, fence lines were breeched and regained. A Zenit fan who climbed onto a shop roof to wave a Zenit flag was assailed with bottles and missiles from Rangers fans and police requested that Zenit fans be re-directed to Cathedral Gardens. Metrolink lines were suspended between Victoria and Manchester Central. Roads closed between Portland Street and Lever Street because of congestion.
- 11.9 At 5pm the fan zone was approaching 100% capacity and stewards implemented measures to prevent further access but large volumes of fans forced the gates and police assistance was requested.
- 11.10 At 6pm the stewards' role changed from crowd management to protecting property and preventing public disorder. Given the pressure in this fan zone the Velodrome site was mobilised and stewards started to inform people that there was an alternative screening venue at the Velodrome.

Increasing levels of public disorder prior to match screening time

- 11.11 From 4pm the operators of the merchandise unit reported increasing problems in Piccadilly Gardens. Fans jumped over the security barrier and climbed on top of the sales unit. Large numbers of people were jumping up and down on the roof and urinating on top of the unit. Although the police were called the sheer numbers surrounding them meant there was little they could do.
- 11.12 By 7pm the unit was overrun, and all official programmes and merchandise stolen. The till units were locked away in the unit and staff left because of threats to their security. Shutters could not be closed as the electrics had been damaged and the shop was full of rowdy fans. When they returned the next day, the tills were smashed and everything stolen.
- 11.13 The Carlsberg Marquee reported similar disorder. At 6.30pm large numbers of Rangers fans climbed onto the marquee and despite suspending the service until they came down, they refused to comply. A decision was made that staff were likely to be crushed and stewards escorted them to safety. As they moved out fans smashed down the marquee and looted the contents. The nearby Carlsberg tanker was damaged beyond repair.

- 11.14 Similar levels of disorder and increasing violence were also reported by screen technicians (reported in section 12 below).
- 11.15 At 7.30pm the backstage area was invaded by fans climbing over portable buildings and infrastructure. Although control was regained, Event control was then relocated to No 1 Piccadilly.
- 11.16 Much of the above reports have been verified by reference to the (public) CCTV footage covering Piccadilly Gardens.
- 11.17 Following the announcement of the screen failure, several hundred people became directly involved in acts of disorder, some caused criminal damage and considerable violence was directed at the police. Public disorder spread throughout Piccadilly and mainly into Newton, Market and Portland Streets until it subsided after midnight.
- 11.18 The style of policing adopted by GMP for the UEFA Cup Final was to facilitate a carnival atmosphere. Many positive acknowledgements endorsing this policing style have been received by GMP. However when bottles began to be thrown in Piccadilly there was a need to respond to such behaviour for the safety of fans and members of the public.
- 11.19 In total 39 police officers were injured during the 24 hour period from 0700 14<sup>th</sup> May to 0700 on the 15<sup>th</sup> May. The majority of these officers sustained their injuries in the Piccadilly disorder. During the same period 39 fans were arrested across the city of which 30 related to public disorder, assault and possession of offensive weapons. Of these 30 arrests, 25 provided Scottish addresses, 1 from Belfast and 4 from the North West.
- 11.20 There are now two criminal investigations taking place, one examining any criminal offences that may have been committed by persons in Piccadilly and the second complaints made by members of the public against police officers. The policing style in other parts of the city did not change as a result of the disorder experienced in Piccadilly.
- 11.21 The strategy to retain the majority of those un-ticketed fans in the city centre, and remove the chance of any major incidents at the stadium was a clear risk but in principle it worked. Whilst the direct consequence of the failure of the screening in Piccadilly Gardens was a significant increase in public disorder, police and event managers believe that given the behaviour of large numbers of fans in Piccadilly throughout the day, it seems likely that some level of public disorder would have occurred.
- 11.22 Complaints and comment about whether the response of the police was proportionate to the level of violence directed to them or heavy handed will be dealt with through the police complaints procedures. The City Council and partners will share relevant information with GMP to ensure these issues are thoroughly addressed.

## **12.0 Screen in Piccadilly**

- 12.1 Meetings have been held with the Director of Lightmedia, the company responsible for the provision of all the screens for the UEFA Cup Final. They have worked closely with the City Council's events unit since 2001 and have a strong track record including providing screens for Glastonbury Festival, Love Parade in Leeds (250,000 people) and Live 8. They supply screens to the BBC and the week after the UEFA Cup Final, they screened the Cardiff / Portsmouth match in Cardiff using the same screen and equipment used in Piccadilly Gardens.
- 12.2 Prior to the event on 14<sup>th</sup> May, all the screen sites were surveyed and tested for signal strength.
- 12.3 All screens were delivered to their respective sites on Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> May, the system was set up and full, clear signals were recorded at each site.
- 12.4 Lightmedia have reported that between 9am and 5.30pm all screens were operating fine. There were several incidents of bottles or cans being thrown at the screens or technicians but no problems with the operation.
- 12.5 In the light of the pressure being experienced in all the city centre fan zones, the Velodrome contingency screens were deployed at 5.30pm. In Piccadilly Gardens, difficulties with signal reception started at about 5.30pm with a momentary glitch returning to normal. Fans were not aware of this as the screen was showing slides and DVDs provided by the Council. Many were very drunk outside the technicians' station however and radio contact told the screen company that bottles were being thrown and services such as First Aid and Merchandising were under threat.
- 12.6 A signal booster was sent for to strengthen the signal. New antenna and a new receiver were obtained and installed at 6.10pm.
- 12.7 The signal got worse however and a decision was taken to use a microwave system that was available from the Velodrome, already planned as a back up system in case of failure at any of the sites.
- 12.8 Lightmedia reported increased incidents of violence outside the technical cabin at 6.30pm. When one of the technicians went out onto the cabin roof to realign the aerial he was pelted with bottles and missiles, one of which hit him on the forehead. At this stage they couldn't get hold of events control or security as mobile phones were not working. Aware that they were working in a very volatile area the technical team continued to seek a solution to the signal malfunction and just after 7pm the microwave and power supply arrived. A message on the screen announcing that the system would be up and running shortly and to be patient, appeared to make the fans' behaviour worse.
- 12.9 In the light of comments in the media and elsewhere it must be clarified and emphasised that the issue at Piccadilly Gardens related to the strength of the signal, not the screen. The provision of two, three or more screens would have made no difference. Without the signal there could be no picture.

- 12.10 Attempts to access the roof to install the receiver became impossible because of the violence being perpetrated against them. At 7.30pm the message was relayed on the screens telling fans of other screen locations. The Director of Lightmedia who was present for the whole of this operation believes they were in serious danger and instructed his staff to abandon the screen and run. The Director of Lightmedia also maintains that, but for the violence of the crowd, the signal could and would have been rectified within 5 to 10 minutes at 7.30pm.
- 12.11 The inability of the screen company to complete their work and to abandon the screen was followed by an announcement that an alternative venue was being provided and fans should go to the Velodrome.
- 12.12 Lightmedia has spent time since the match investigating the problem and one specific line of enquiry has focused on the Vodafone transmitter locations and the possibility that the sheer volume of traffic meant the phone systems went down and potentially interfered with the signals being received by Freeview.
- 12.13 This report of the signal failure has been raised with Vodafone. They expanded the network around the stadium, aware of the UEFA Cup Final and the requirement for maximum capacity, however they were unaware until the day, of the decision to utilise big screens in the city centre and the consequent gathering of large numbers of people. The network capacity for mobile phone traffic on Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> May therefore was for a normal working day. With huge numbers of people trying to use mobile phones (New Years Eve effect) they confirm that this will have led to communication difficulties in key parts of the city centre.
- 12.14 Vodafone are unable to account for the failure of the signal to the screen however and the City Council will undertake further investigation into this.

### **13.0 Stadium and the Cup Final Match**

- 13.1 Whilst considerable attention and the focus of much of the review of the event has focused upon the planning and management of some 150,000 fans coming to the city, 80% without tickets, and the public disorder, it should not be forgotten that the principal objective for UEFA was to successfully stage the UEFA Cup Final between the two teams who had reached the final.
- 13.2 The LOC objective was to ensure that large numbers of fans without tickets did not gather at the stadium and that the arrangements for fans with tickets, for sponsors and the UEFA VIPs would ensure a quality event.
- 13.3 There were a number of fraudulent tickets in circulation prior to the match, several hundred of which were seized at the ground.
- 13.4 There was an isolated incident at the stadium prior to the match with the stabbing of an FC Zenit St Petersburg fan, and subsequently six arrests. None of the six have been charged and enquiries continue. Other than this, the delivery of the match and the management of the fans prior to and following the match was judged to be successful with no major incidents.



- 13.5 East Manchester residents were well briefed in advance of the match and there have been no complaints from residents about the organisation or impact on the local neighbourhood.
- 13.6 UEFA Communications Director William Gaillard said on ITN on 16<sup>th</sup> May: "The performance of the local organising committee, including the city government and the police and also the citizens of Manchester , has been fantastic. We're all extremely pleased and grateful for what they've done. If anything, it probably enhances English chances." (of hosting the World Cup 2018).

#### **14.0 Transport and Traffic Management**

- 14.1 There was good collaboration between the City Council and partner agencies – GMPTE, GMP, Manchester Airport and Sportcity in developing the traffic management plan. A table top exercise led by the Police in February assisted in identifying risks and developing contingency plans following the initial planning and a clear appreciation of the transport modal split there were inevitable challenges going from pre-arranged chartered flights and coaches to public and private transport. Once the finalists were known however decision making was swift and plans well co-ordinated.
- 14.2 Given the anticipated numbers of fans travelling from Scotland, pre-booked coaches were directed to the Stadium with every other coach and mini bus signed (by the Highways Agency) from the North into the parking area provided at Lancashire County Cricket Club (LCCC). In total over 800 coach spaces were provided at LCCC and the stadium.
- 14.3 Shuttlebus services were provided to and from the stadium to the city centre and the Metrolink service supplemented by additional shuttlebus services as well as a signed walk route brought visitors in from coaches parked in from LCCC. All those arriving at the coach parks were given information and maps and advised about arrangements to return to the coach parks.
- 14.4 Car parking capacity was available both within the city centre and around the stadium but at times the movement of traffic into and around the city was extremely congested. This was made more difficult with the necessary suspension of the Metrolink service from Victoria to Manchester Central.
- 14.5 There have been complaints about the lack of information about transport, particularly to assist fans getting from Piccadilly to the Velodrome when the screen signal failed. Whilst shuttlebuses did transport significant numbers of fans to the Velodrome as Piccadilly filled up in mid afternoon, the volume of fans and the noise in the area meant that announcements and megaphone instructions were not heard. Ultimately the majority of fans who got to the Velodrome walked.

- 14.6 A significant number of visiting fans arrived by train from a range of destinations, notably Glasgow, Preston and Blackpool as well as other towns within the North West. This issue was raised with the train operating companies, that whilst significant numbers were arriving by train, it was doubtful whether sufficient additional services would be available post match to transport all departing fans.
- 14.7 Train operating companies did strengthen some train services in anticipation for increased numbers but final numbers were significantly higher than expected and overwhelmed the system. There was severe disruption for all travellers in the evening at Piccadilly and post match there were few additional rail services to transport fans out of the city.
- 14.8 Many fans were stranded at Piccadilly Station which although it stayed open overnight, had to be closed at one point given the sheer number of fans converging there.
- 14.9 Although planned road closures were signed and diversions planned, the speed with which additional road closures had to be effected resulted in some parts of the city appearing to be poorly signed. Similarly although the main walking routes to the stadium were signed, many people struggled to find them from parts of the city centre. Information and maps were available from all fan zones but the levels of congestion of the day meant many fans were unaware of the availability of this.
- 14.10 The planning group was set up to provide for a major football competition and the signage and communication with fans based on this. As the focus changed to providing for a 'huge city centre party' the sufficiency of the signage from and around all parts of the city centre has clearly been questioned. As public order broke down so did the adequacy of communication with the fans assembled in Piccadilly.

#### **15.0 Litter and Toilets**

- 15.1 Television and press coverage of the city on the 15<sup>th</sup> May told most graphically of the inability on the day to manage the volumes of litter, not only in the fan zones but across the whole city centre.
- 15.2 There were waste containers placed in the fan zones but people were reluctant to move to take any waste to the waste container points. Refuse vehicles contracted to empty the containers throughout the day struggled to get through the city and those that arrived at fan zones were withdrawn because fans climbed on or into moving vehicles.
- 15.3 Although there was a ban on taking glass and bottles into fan zones, sheer numbers meant this was less strictly enforced at certain entrances and some fans threw bottles over fences. The large numbers of fans congregating outside the Piccadilly fan zone with little control over the numbers of bottles exacerbated the challenge.

- 15.4 As the day progressed and the city centre became very congested, despite directing every available additional cleansing operative into the city, the impact on the quantity of litter was marginal. Nevertheless, the covering of the grass at Cathedral Gardens and Piccadilly Gardens made these areas easier to clean and reduced long term damage.
- 15.5 The provision of adequate toilet facilities at the fan areas was a primary objective to assist the management of each site. In all over 400 temporary toilets were provided.
- 15.6 In Albert Square, 104 units plus the Mount St toilets were provided; in Piccadilly Gardens, 82 units were provided; and in Cathedral Gardens 78 units were provided. At each venue a site tanker pump unit and service staff were deployed across the duration of the event to augment capability.
- 15.7 Post-event evaluation supports the need to have split these resources into one or more locations within each venue – and to have fenced off alleyways within the sites to prevent them being utilised as impromptu urinals. As the day progressed, the density of the fan zones meant it was difficult in any event to get to the toilets. The reality is that significant numbers of people disregarded the provision of temporary toilets anyhow and urinated at the most personally convenient place as opposed utilising facilities provided for them. This behaviour has been the subject of widespread complaints and protest after the event from residents and businesses and the City Council concurs with the views expressed.
- 15.8 Outside the fan zones, additional toilets were provided on the walking route to the stadium at Pollard St (10 units), Holt Town (10 units) and Old Mill St. (10 units), and at the coach park at Old Trafford (18 units) and on the walking route via Chester Road (10 units). An additional 100 units were positioned for the Velodrome car park screen area.
- 15.9 An assumption had been made that the city's existing hospitality and retail based toilet provision would augment the temporary toilets provided in the fan areas, and therefore people's requirements could be catered for across the day. The fact that excellent weather created large outdoor gatherings at public spaces in addition to those designated as fan zones - especially outside Piccadilly Gardens meant that the demand for toilet facilities in key areas exceeded supply and a level of anti-social behaviour ensued in surrounding streets.

## **16.0 Recovering the City**

- 16.1 Street Scene Services moved 47 tonnes of waste and Enterprise a further 28 tonnes – 75 tonnes of waste in total. The waste was mainly litter, cardboard, cans and bottles and all of it was taken to the sorting plants where the majority of the waste was recycled.

- 16.2 Planned cleansing teams scheduled to commence fan zone clean-ups after the end of the match were advised by GMP to remain outside the city centre because of the public disorder. The teams were re-directed to the stadium and approach roads, thus the commencement of cleaning in the city centre was delayed and commuters and residents faced a significant level of litter in certain parts of the city the following morning. Over 300 cleansing operatives contributed to the clean up of the city, supplemented by teams from Salford City Council and Tameside Borough Council.
- 16.3 Plans put in place to high pressure wash the city streets on the night of the event could not be executed because of the volume of litter and this was commenced on the morning of 15<sup>th</sup> with ongoing washing thereafter.
- 16.4 Whilst the clean-up of the city and restoration of public areas by mid-day on the following day has been widely acclaimed and the staff commended, there was equally outrage expressed by many who contacted the Council at how the city could be allowed to get to such a state. When numbers can not be adequately predicted or controlled this remains a risk and therefore for future events the issues of control, whether that be through tickets or other methods has to be considered.
- 16.5 The fact remains however that there was remarkably little long term or infrastructure damage caused.

## **17.0 Communication**

- 17.1 Although there were communications with businesses through Cityco and other partner agencies and the intensive media messages put out through press, radio and television by the Council warning of significant disruption for both residents and businesses, they were clearly not prepared for the scale of the disruption or for the levels of litter and anti-social behaviour.
- 17.2 Email communication and the use of e-message boards with public information for city centre residents representatives did not prove to be as effective as for previous events. As the scale and news-value of the event grew, the focus of communications was in negotiating for positive media coverage, organising a media reception on the 13th, arranging media facilities on the 13th and 14th and a press conference on the 15th as well as responding to massive media interest / requests for interviews and responses to queries.
- 17.3 The official fan Guides were produced by Marketing Manchester for fans with tickets in order to promote the fan zones. Three types in total, one design – one for Rangers fans, one for Zenit fans (translated into Russian) and one for neutral fans. These guides had to go to print as soon as the finalists were known to hit production schedules and so some details became unavoidably out of date, such were the changes made in the final days of planning regarding fan areas and travel arrangements in particular.

17.4 Whilst these were designed for fans with tickets, there were also thousands of leaflets and maps printed which were given to fans arriving at the coach parks, at the main rail stations and also from the Information points at each of the Fan Zones. This did not cater for the many fans that arrived by car however, or into fan zones that had become so congested that the Information points were lost. Whilst there were volunteer greeters deployed by LOC and by TEAM to assist with information throughout the city centre, they were rendered invisible in the mass crowds.

17.5 On the day communication both with fans and between agencies was problematic. There was pressure on radios' system and regular failures of mobile phones because of pressure on the networks as reported earlier and this hampered communication between event control points.

### **18.0 Complaints and Compliments**

18.1 Given the scale of this event , the levels of public disorder, anti-social behaviour and the amount of litter , it is not surprising that there were significant numbers of letters and emails of complaint received by the City Council following the UEFA Cup Final.

18.2 There were 167 complaints which have been acknowledged and responded to and a number of Freedom of Information Act enquiries that are also being responded to. This does not include any complaints received by GMP which are being dealt with in line with the Police complaints procedures.

18.3 Broadly and in brief, the complaints to MCC covered:-

- Alcohol - why was it allowed on the streets, so easily available, on sale, why not banned?; see section 9.0
- City centre residents / businesses/ commuters - not enough warning or information; see section 17
- Cleaning arrangements - not enough rubbish bins, not enough people dealing with litter on the day, why was urinating in streets allowed?; see section 14.0
- Costs and value for money - who will meet the extra costs?, impact on council tax; see section 20.0
- Fan zones - not enough of them; no toilets inside; not enough food outlets; barriers / security not enough; see sections 7 and 8
- Forward planning – should have planned for Rangers from the outset, why fanzones in city centre?, other fanzones; not enough information points, signage; was City prepared?; see section 5
- Screen breakdown - why? Why not two screens?; was it tested?; buses to Velodrome, poor communication; see section 12.0
- Toilets- why not enough?; poor signage; why not used?; see section 14.0
- Transport –badly signed diversions; not enough trains; parking/taxi charges; shuttlebuses to Velodrome inadequate; see section 13

- 18.4 There were some complaints from other visitors who were trying to access an event at MEN Arena, from fans who felt Rangers were unjustly maligned.
- 18.5 This needs to be set against many letters of thanks – particularly from many Rangers FC fans, and concern that the level of reporting focussed on the disorder in Piccadilly and not the carnival atmosphere across the city.
- 18.6 The UEFA Director of Communications wrote:

“Both the municipal government and the police have done a fantastic job given they were faced with well over 100,000 fans coming from Scotland, I can’t believe that any other city would have done anything better.”

“Of course we are very disappointed with the behaviour of a small minority especially after the city had done everything it could to accommodate everyone’s needs and were rewarded by injured policemen and hundreds of tons of rubbish.”

“That was very discouraging but although the trouble was reprehensible it was only a small minority – the usual suspects- involved and we feel that overall the challenge has been a tremendous success of the local organising committee.”

**19.0 Benefits and costs**

- 19.1 Marketing Manchester has undertaken an Economic Assessment based on 180,000 visitors ( the maximum number which accounts for all visitors to the city at the time of the UEFA Cup Final ).
- 19.2 A number of assumptions have been made pending the results of the on site field work conducted by IPSOS/MORI in conjunction with UEFA which will form part of a full impact study available later in the year. In the meantime, data has been collected from a number of sources to give some validity to the assumptions, including the spend figures used to calculate tourism spend in Manchester through STEAM, Laterooms, Visitor Information Centre accommodation booking line and the Economic Impact of the UEFA Cup Final 2007.

19.3 The economic impact figure reached is based on the following numbers:

<b>Visitor profile</b>	<b>Number of Visitors</b>	<b>Spend per day per person</b>	<b>Economic Impact per Visitor Type</b>
Staying in hotels in GM	30,600	£ 162.33	£5,960,660
Staying in self catering in GM	5,400	£ 107.61	£697,296
Staying with friends and relatives	23,400	£ 54.05	£1,517,731
Staying in hotels outside GM but day visitors to GM	39,600	£ 70.57	£3,048,624
Staying in hotels outside GM	As above	£ 85.00	£3,672,000
Day	84,600	£ 46.52	£3,935,462
Ticket Sales			£1,200,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>£20,031,773</b>

19.4 An average of 1.2 nights per person for staying visitors has been used. The average rates for accommodation and food and drink have been increased but are still relatively conservative.

19.5 In terms of costs to the City Council, the original budget identified by the Council to discharge its obligations to the event was £150,000 as part of the Events budget.

19.6 Of this amount £100,000 had been committed prior to the event. The additional costs identified to accommodate the numbers of Rangers fans that came without tickets amount to £240,000. The total MCC revised budget is estimated to be £340,000.

19.7 The final accounts from the Local Organising Committee are not yet complete but it is anticipated that the majority of these additional costs will be met by the LOC, with any remaining costs being met by the event's budget.

19.8 There will be no impact on Manchester resident's council tax levels.

## **20.0 Conclusions and Lessons Learnt**

20.1 In drawing out the conclusions from this report and the lessons learnt it is important not to forget the elements that worked well in the planning and delivery of the UEFA Cup Final.

- The organisation undertaken by the LOC, the multi-agency working and strong partnerships that exist within Manchester ensured that the events and the Final at the City of Manchester Stadium were deemed to be hugely successful. Positive feedback has been received from many external agencies, including UEFA on the quality of the planning and the attention to detail.
- The Council compliments Greater Manchester Police for the way in which they managed and delivered the safety, security and contributed to the organisation of the event.
- 'The Road to the Final' including ticket launch, cup handover ceremony, city dressing, 3v3 grassroots event and official dinner all worked well.
- Tens of thousands of fans with and without tickets had a fantastic experience.
- The benefits to the city's economy are significant.

### **Initial response to Rangers fans**

20.2 Should the City have stuck to its original message to fans that if they didn't have a ticket they shouldn't travel to Manchester? It was inevitable from the night of the 1<sup>st</sup> May when Rangers FC won through to the final that their fans were determined to come to the final – with or without tickets.

20.3 Once all partners accepted that they would come in large numbers it was agreed that it would be better for fans to be welcomed and provided for than to start with confrontation. Similarly, not to provide alcohol or to ban alcohol at the time seemed to be more likely to cause serious disorder and a ban on every city centre premise was seen to be far too draconian and not necessary given the intelligence received.

20.4 To provide big screens or not? Again, such were the numbers that not to provide screens would have resulted in thousands of fans trying to get into city centre pubs or clubs or making their way to the Stadium to be close to the match.

20.5 All the evidence suggests that the response of the LOC, based on the anticipated numbers, was the correct one.



## Future Events

- 20.6 The following section is relevant not just to Manchester City Council but to all major event organisers within the city and it is recommended that the issues raised are considered whenever major events are planned, or bid for. However, in considering these lessons for future events, it has to be recognised that the UEFA Cup Final on 14<sup>th</sup> May was an extraordinary event with a number of coincidences unlikely ever to be repeated. Whilst there is no suggestion that the lessons learnt shall be rigidly applied to other major events nevertheless they will stand the city well in continuing to host major events.
- 20.7 Whilst accepting that this event had a number of unique factors to it - Rangers FC into a European Final for the first time in 36 years, at a venue 'just down the road' and some of the best weather of the year - there is a need to ensure that any future similar event can be adequately controlled and the numbers of visitors accurately identified and planned for.

## Lessons

- 1 **The right to party? This is an issue for UEFA and the FA. Over the last ten years there has been a growing trend amongst football fans in particular, to travel to away games to show support for their teams. Whereas this used to be a majority of fans with tickets and a minority without, (hoping to get a ticket in the host city), this has changed and more and more fans without tickets are travelling to support their team. There is a danger of this being seen as a right to party, to be entertained and looked after and to be transported away afterwards. The City Council feels this should be challenged not only because of the sorts of numbers experienced by Manchester (albeit an extreme example) but also the sense that some visitors had unrealistic expectations and felt they were let down which cannot be accepted or sustained.**
- 2 **In respect of outdoor events in the city centre where numbers are expected to be large and cannot be confirmed, consideration should be given to proceeding on a ticketed entry basis to control the numbers.**  
  
This would not have made any difference to the numbers of Rangers fans coming to the city but would have impacted on decisions as to where/ if to screen the match live.
- 3 **Live football matches with the potential to attract large crowds should only be shown in venues where conditions that currently pertain inside Premier League football grounds can be replicated including tickets, controlled access to alcohol, CCTV, access for stewarding and policing.**

For example the recent screening of the UEFA Champions League Final to 7,000 fans at the MEN Arena went very well.

- 4 Piccadilly Gardens is not a suitable space to use for a large-scale event with large numbers of people anticipated as it is difficult to control. It is surrounded by a major transport interchange including metrolink lines and bus routes.**
- 5 Infrastructure - The positioning, signage and numbers of toilets, the ability to clean fanzones and public areas and the need to ensure access into these areas for stewards and the police are all issues which will inform the planning of future events. This will require specific space to manage and control events, which will impact on numbers able to gather in public spaces in the city.**
- 6 Coach Transport - Arrangements for the provision for coaches ( 800 in all ) worked well. More stewards/ volunteers on all routes away from the stadium would have assisted wayfinding across the city centre when certain areas were subject to disorder.**
- 7 Rail Transport – Major events organisers should engage with Network Rail and rail operators to ensure that as well as additional services to bring visitors to major events, there is adequate provision for their return to home destinations.** That said, it was clear that many fans were intent on getting to the city with no real plans as to how to return and this can not be a responsibility placed on the City Council. It must be a clear responsibility of those intending to attend events that they make adequate provision to either stay overnight or have a method of travelling home.
- 8 Communication – for future major events there is a need to liaise with mobile phone operators to ensure that additional masts are deployed to maintain signal strength.**
- 9 Specific communication with residents and businesses which gives adequate prior notice of major events, especially those likely to disrupt city centre services, commuter traffic or business continuity must be built into the event planning process. It is clear that there could have been more targeted communication in this event particularly as the intelligence grew and a range of mechanisms - including using ward coordination, a Local Impact Group, Cityco and other partners more systematically - must be used to guarantee better communication.**
- 10 Alcohol – the manner of the sale of alcohol at events and by independent suppliers needs to be kept under review although it is noted that the requirements placed upon shops and off licences in respect of this event by the licensing authorities and GMP were complied with.**
- 11 These lessons along with other more detailed feedback will be used to debrief all partners so that future contingency and event control arrangements are fully informed by this event.**

## **Conclusion**

- 20.8 The ability of the City to cater for large scale events in the future should not be in question. The coordinated multi-agency approach involving all stakeholders delivered a successful UEFA Cup Final event. Had these planning mechanisms not been in place the sheer volume of travelling un-ticketed fans could have led to more serious incidents.
- 20.9 The Chamber of Commerce recognise that in the past, the hosting of major events such as this, both in promoting the city and as revenue generating opportunities have been unqualified successes and have expressed the hope that in learning the necessary lessons from the events of 14<sup>th</sup> May, the city will continue to bid for and to stage major events.
- 20.10 The visit of Glasgow Rangers to Manchester for the UEFA Cup Final in May was an extraordinary event. Well over 100,000 Glasgow Rangers fans together with fans of Zenit St Petersburg and many neutrals gathered in city centre Manchester for an impromptu party.
- 20.11 Apart from a small number of isolated incidents the only serious disorder took place in Piccadilly Gardens with fighting and looting in the afternoon turning into an assault on Police and stewards once the screen failed to function. Nevertheless it must be noted that this involved a number of hundreds of Rangers fans with 99% plus having no involvement whatsoever.
- 20.12 The sheer weight of numbers in excess of our planning meant that toilet and cleansing facilities could not cope – an issue exacerbated by the willingness of numbers of Rangers fans to urinate anywhere they wished. The recommendations in the previous section are designed to ensure residents, workers and visitors to Manchester do not have to endure such scenes again and to ensure Manchester continues to develop our world wide reputation for putting on first class events.



## Appendix 1

Submissions made by the following agencies are attached:

- Manchester City Football Club
- Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce
- Glasgow City Council
- Rangers Football Club
- Report on behalf of Rangers Supporters by the Rangers Supporters assembly
- UEFA

## **UEFA CUP FINAL 2008**

### **FC ZENIT V RANGERS FC** **14<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2008**

## **REPORT FOR MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL**

### **Introduction**

It is important, on behalf of Manchester City Football Club, to say a huge thank you for the support of Manchester City Council, Greater Manchester Police, Marketing Manchester, GMPTe and Manchester Airport with regards to the planning for this event. The whole process took over 12 months and the team working on this project worked extremely hard to achieve the key objectives.

### **Key Successes/Issues**

#### **Events**

Throughout the course of the year there were a number of events that took place, organised by Manchester City Council such as:

- 1.Event Design Launch
- 2.Ticketing Launch
- 3.Cup Handover
- 4.Official Dinner

These were all a great success, well organised/planned and a great advert for Manchester and the Stadium. Feedback from UEFA with respect to these supplementary events was extremely positive.

#### **Transport**

As far as Manchester City Football Club was concerned we had no issues with the transport arrangements. It is my understanding that the local organising committee (LOC) had more than adequately made the appropriate arrangements for spectators/supporters with regards to the walking routes, car/coach parking and the shuttle bus service. Seeing this in operation at the stadium was a phenomenal site and worked incredibly well.

#### **Commercial/Road to the Final**

I thought the 'look' of the City and the approaching key roads was great. Feedback has been received from the local community, they thought the City of Manchester and the stadium looked fantastic.

#### **Grassroots Tournament**

A major positive of the whole event. This got the local community involved, I only met the winning team and they were so excited by the whole experience – something they will remember all their lives.

## Stadium

Due to Rangers reaching the final we had no issues selling tickets – we could have sold the stadium 4 times over. This would have been a concern if we had a FC Zenit v Fiorentina final. The Rangers fans that were in the stadium, and we believe this to be approximately 37,000 of the 44,000, were extremely well behaved and good humoured – a credit to their football club.

The stadium was the focal point for the UEFA Cup Final and looked fantastic on the day. I was based at the stadium on the day of the Final and the atmosphere was amazing all day.

Major plans had been put in place to ensure that the stadium became a sterile area from approximately 3.00pm and only catered for the ticketed fans – this was essential to the site and local surrounding communities. There could have been a major incident at the stadium if the turnstiles had been charged by thousands of ticketless fans – this is something that we had to avoid.

I do appreciate that doing this meant the pressure was put elsewhere and mainly in the City Centre.

## Fanzones

Planning for the Fanzones was very much led by UEFA at the beginning and what they believed to be the appropriate area for fans to congregate. This was achieved by Manchester City Council. Thought was always given to the Rangers scenario but obviously two weeks before the Final this became reality. Mike Parrott worked exceptionally hard to develop a number of additional areas to cater for the huge numbers expected. I believe the numbers actually exceeded that expectation.

Once we knew Rangers were in the Final it was decided to only encourage ticketed fans to the City – this was taken out of our control and the message changed to “all welcome”.

Prior to this a request was made to Rangers FC to see if they would be screening the game back to their Ibrox Stadium. Rangers FC confirmed that this would be the case. I believe they had 25,000 supporters in Ibrox and a further 25,000 locked outside. A further request was made by UEFA to Manchester United to see if they would also screen the game for the ticketless fans – this was rejected.

It was a shame that the screen failed in the Piccadilly area, this would not have helped the atmosphere. I understand the supporters did not allow the engineers to fix the problem as they were throwing things at them.

What happened next is a real positive and one that has not been reported. How the authorities managed to transport 12,000 fans from the City to the Velodrome to further screens without any impact on the stadium is incredible. We, at the stadium, had no idea this was happening. 12,000 fans managed to get to see the game when they thought all was lost.

### **In Summary**

Overall the UEFA Cup Final was a huge success for both Manchester City Football Club and the City of Manchester Stadium – this is purely down to the plans put in place supported by all parties. The issues in the City Centre were a shame because so much planning had gone into the Fanzone areas and I believe the supporters spoiled it for themselves.

In hindsight there are a number of things we could do, have spare screens not serve alcohol but I have to emphasise that throughout the course of the year the planning was extremely intense and the communication between the various agencies was excellent. It was a real team effort!

I personally think the City and GMP have to be proud of what they achieved with so many supporters and untypically good weather, no City could have done any better.



## Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce



### UEFA Cup Final 14<sup>th</sup> May 2008 report on member experiences and evidence

Manchester hosted the 2008 Uefa Cup Final between Rangers FC and Zenit St Petersburg on 14<sup>th</sup> May at the City of Manchester stadium.

It is now believed that the city hosted over 150,000 supporters for the event (capacity at the stadium of c.40,000). In the most part the majority of supporters were well behaved but due to the overwhelming numbers of supporters and an outbreak of violence at the end of the evening the whole day has come under increasing scrutiny. Evidence is now emerging as to what the real cost and impact was to the city of hosting this major European sporting event, the individual circumstances that led to the disturbances and there is also a debate as to whether the city should host future sporting events on a similar scale.

The information contained in this report is a mixture of factual evidence and anecdotal from a variety of businesses across the city centre and attempts to illustrate what impact this event had both on businesses, customers and staff. Both telephone interviews and e-mail responses were obtained.

#### **Hotels, Bars and Night Time Economy.**

Hotels and bars experienced increased trade on the day with full occupancy and increases on food and bar takings. However due to excessive numbers of supporters, as the day progressed major issues began to arise around general behaviour problems and which also had a major impact on transport services affecting staff and customers. The following are examples of feedback obtained from a variety of venues across the city and illustrate the benefits as well as the costs of the day:

##### **Malmaison**

- Had predominantly corporate clients
- Didn't increase any hotel or food prices and didn't over-pack hotel
- They had a basic menu and sold 234 lunches – they normally sell 30 on an average day
- Turnover double that of an average night
- Clientele well behaved and there were no major groups/gangs or problems
- Public toilet facilities poor. Urinating on the hotel walls outside
- High security – 5 men on the door
- 40 to 50 riot police outside the hotel
- Police did an exceptional job

##### **Midland Hotel**

- Takings went up
- Had the UEFA sponsors staying at the hotel
- Problems getting staff home
- No criminal damage
- 10 security officers on duty
- Policing in the area seemed low

### **Kro Bar**

- Takings up 50% and was great for business
- Really good sales
- No major expenses
- Problems were 90 mins before the big screen broke
- 7pm critical point so closed outside bar
- Closed inside bar to people coming in at 9pm on advice of police
- Too many people
- Not well controlled by police – police were stretched
- Dirt and rubbish all over but apart from a broken window no other criminal damage
- Barely any security
- Very small % of fans causing the trouble

### **Slug & Lettuce**

- Extra security
- Ordered the largest keg ever and had lots of extra delivery of alcohol
- Were expecting huge turnout
- Wont give any further info (spoke to them before the match but they wont comment after)

### **Manchester Hotels Association – spoke to Stephen Miles at Radisson Edwardian**

- No criminal damage
- Good for business
- Extra security was out on
- Takings normal as the hotel does very well anyway
- Host hotel for UEFA delegation

### **Waxy O'Connor, Printworks.**

As they are an Irish pub they expected Rangers fans to stay away. However were busy due to the sheer numbers in Manchester. They had 400 people in the pub to watch the match and were very pleased with the crowd they had. Well behaved and a part atmosphere. Takings were up and it was business as usual for them on thurs. They thought the clean up was fantastic. In the run up they were briefed by the security team at the printworks. They commented that there were not enough bins and toilets. They believe that Manchester City Council did all they could do in advance - it was just the sheer numbers that made it hard to handle.

### **Abode Hotel, Piccadilly.**

A 4\* hotel so were selective in who they allowed to stay - were concerned about keeping their regulars and not upsetting them with football fans. Therefore they didn't benefit as much financially as other hotels. There were no major issues outside and in their cafe bar area. However, being near where the trouble was a staff member's car (actually belonging to her parents) was burnt out behind the hotel and staff could not leave for 3 hours after their shift finished due to riot police outside! When asked if they would have trouble getting staff to work for future events, she commented that many staff are young so it goes over their heads.

### **Royal Exchange Theatre**

A central part of the Manchester City Centre Emergency Response plan is the Manchester Priority Alert Scheme by which Greater Manchester Police can alert businesses in the City Centre immediately (by SMS text messages and email) to any problems including road closures, give updates on how situations are being progressed or resolved, and warn of which areas to avoid etc. This should have been used before the day of the match to let businesses know in advance which roads initially would be closed and then again on the day as events progressed and more of the City Centre ground to a halt (and indeed the day after when roads remained closed due to the high volume of debris). Greater Manchester Police did not use the system on this occasion; in fact they have not sent any

messages since late February. This makes a nonsense of businesses subscribing to the system and is a great untapped resource for disseminating information and it is a concern that in the event of some major incident occurring the Police will not use it. Those businesses like ours catering for hundreds of members of the public at indoor events need to be able to let those people know what the score is in terms of transport arrangements, vehicle access around the building, likely difficulties, arrangements for disabled customers etc.

The matinee performance passed without incident - however, during the evening performance drunken fans were trying to come in at both St Ann's Square and Cross Street so we had to physically lock the main entrance doors in St Ann's Square during the performance and have someone standing there in case of fire alarm etc and put the bolts in on the Stage Door entrance, again with someone standing there. After the show, at about 10.10pm, the audience (many elderly) were too scared to go out into Cross Street as the atmosphere was very nasty and people were let out a couple at a time or redirected through St Ann's Square entrance. Staff arriving for the evening had problems as trams had stopped - the Duty Manager had to walk from Cornbrook - and also a nightmare getting home as there were no taxis and limited public transport - one of the Catering Staff who had finished about 9.00pm was still waiting for a taxi with the Duty Manager at 12.30pm and the taxi then would only come to a point a few streets away. As they were getting into that cab someone came up and offered the driver £50 to take his party to the other side of Ancoats. Radio Cars said that this had been happening all over the City and as so many drivers were tempted by large sums of money their normal service had been severely affected, in addition to not being able to physically get into various areas.

Our entrances (like much of the City Centre around Albert Square) were turned into constant urinals - so much so that our Stage Door lift entrance in Old Bank Street was flooded with urine that went down inside the lift shaft meaning that the smell wafted back up into our main Stage Door Reception area that stank for a week afterwards.

Actual lost revenue was not an issue. In terms of lost custom on the night, Box Office took 13-14 calls from people the following day who had been unable to get into Manchester and they were reallocated tickets for other performances. There was just one letter from someone asking for their money back as they had seen the news and decided against going into Manchester. The main concern was how out of control the drink-fuelled entire event had been and the completely inadequate level of communication of information from either Manchester City Council or Greater Manchester Police to those of us trying to run our businesses in the City Centre on the actual day.

## **General Business and Retail**

### **CityCo**

General anecdotal feedback was mixed, and by all means not all negative.

One high-end retailer reported a very good sales, with a full restaurant all day ('Viva La Diva' with Darcey Bussell & Katherine Jenkins was also on at the sold-out Arena that night, which no-one seems to have remarked upon in all the comment) and only one incident due to an unruly local, and nothing to do with the UEFA final.

Positive feedback was received upon the clean-up -especially in Piccadilly.

Our footfall cameras (we have four, only in the retail core) counted 1.2M pedestrians that week 0.56M more than the same week the previous year (to be exact, an increase of 87.7% week on week compared with last year).

The Wednesday had a footfall count of 416,515 - an increase of 277,246 or just about 200% over the previous Wednesday.

Please note these are not figures of actual individuals, but movements at a point (huge areas of the city centre - inc. Piccadilly Gardens are not covered) - but the percentage change is an objective like-for-like figure.

### **Arndale Centre**

Footfall was approximately 16400 up on the corresponding Wednesday in 2007 with most increase shown in the afternoon corresponding with time when most visitors were in the city centre.

### **Primark**

- terrible night in terms of business
- lost 30% of days trade
- criminal damage to illuminated signage - cost impacts
- cleaning costs including hiring rent-a-kill because of people urinating up fire escapes and against the building so a proper waste clean up was needed which was costly
- problems with staff getting home - took 5hrs for some staff to get home when it usually takes 1/2 hr
- staff were very intimidated

### **Harvey Nichols**

- UEFA was good for business
- sales and turnover was helped on weds by Darcy Bussel show at M.E.N - there was good trade from the restaurant
- retail traded / fared well
- there was no criminal damage but there was urinating against the wall
- Other than that it was all positive
- The council could look to regulate beer sales in future.

### **General Anecdotal Evidence**

Many reports received about entrance halls and doorways of office buildings being used as urinals and also reception staff being inundated with requests by supporters to use the toilets. This, together with problems late in the afternoon with the transport system (see following section), resulted in many offices and businesses taking the decision to close early with the resultant loss of a couple of hours business.

### **Transport**

**Rail (Northern Rail and First TransPennine)** First TransPennine had been in discussion with Marketing Manchester prior to the event with regards to easy places to ship people as the hotels in Greater Manchester filled up. Blackpool, Preston, Leeds and Sheffield were seen as best places and extra carriages were put on to move people to and from those destinations.

#### Monday and Tuesday

Rail companies enjoyed increased patronage (ticket sales) and therefore enjoyed improved revenues, peak and off peak. All passengers were "well accommodated".

#### Wednesday

Rail services were "strengthened" in anticipation for increased numbers. This is standard practice for any major event in Manchester, where an increased number of carriages are added on key routes and to coincide with higher passenger flow. Increased numbers of British Transport Police were at stations as normal for a major event.

Final numbers were significantly higher than expected and overwhelmed the system. Rail services experienced severe overcrowding, in particular on the Blackpool, Preston and Manchester services. The situation became "chaotic". Passengers were allowed onto trains without tickets to speed up services and clear stations. Seating reservations were cancelled.

Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Victoria train stations were closed on the Wednesday afternoon as the stations got over whelmed and fans were forced / staggered onto the tracks, the stations simply couldn't cope with the number of people passing through. This resulted in severe disruption for all travellers in the evening.

No reports of vandalism or criminal damage. All reports suggested a happy and good natured crowd.

### Thursday

Morning services mildly disrupted due the clear up operation – some people spent the night sleeping over in the stations.

#### **Metrolink (Stagecoach)**

The service ran as normal until Wednesday afternoon when the police (security sources) advised that services be suspended from the city centre for safety reasons, mainly people on the tracks/roads. The Altrincham, Eccles and Bury services did continue and staff were on hand to direct passengers to alternative transport.

Services were intended to commence once the game had started and the streets clearer but when the big screen in Piccadilly Gardens went down, the streets became too busy/dangerous to run the service. Late on, there were safety concerns for staff.

Minor damage was reported on one tram although this seemed to stem from frustrations as passengers got stranded on a tram on Market Street, which couldn't move because of passenger numbers.

#### **Buses**

During Wednesday afternoon, many bus services were diverted away from the city centre, which caused an inconvenience for some travellers.

### Summary

It is fair to say that on the day there were winners and losers. There can be no doubt that for particular sectors the event was a massive cash boost at a time when, in general, the economy is experiencing a slow down. There were undoubted significant levels of disruption especially to transport services and, in some cases, physical damage to property. In addition to this were the low-level but numerous and persistent examples of poor behaviour that many businesses reported such as urinating in public and worse that also contributed to the negative side of the day.

The well documented breakdown of the TV screen and attempts to control the crowd following this seems to have been picked up on and used by the media as the main flashpoints, however from our evidence it can be seen that prior to this there had been major issues around crowd control and instances of vandalism/violence.

There is no doubt that the number of supporters that came to the city far outweighed all predicted estimates and the combination of fine weather and availability of alcohol – much of which was brought in by supporters - contributed in part to the problems experienced from mid afternoon onwards. Obviously having a UK team reach the final also had a significant impact as had two overseas teams been competing the numbers attending would have been significantly less.

Feedback has been mixed but, as a tool for promoting the city and also as an immediate revenue generating opportunity, hosting major events such as this is without parallel and, it must be said, that in the past the consensus has been that they have been unqualified successes.

There were things that went wrong on the day: the expected numbers of fans was eclipsed by the numbers that actually turned up; services were swamped; inadequate numbers of temporary toilets and the breakdown of the main public transport services into and through the city centre. Whilst it is difficult to obtain financial information as to the exact cost and benefits there is no doubt that the city's economy received a major boost by hosting the final. Financial impact seems to have been low apart from one or two cases and the main concerns tended to be around public disorder, travel disruption and the cost of the clean up operation.

It is hoped that as the city has become adept at hosting big events through experience and planning, that the necessary lessons have been learned from 14<sup>th</sup> May and that Manchester continues to bid for and stage major events. The business community is supportive of this but would like to have reassurances that before any future event on this scale that all possible outcomes have been planned for.

### **Acknowledgements**

Greater Manchester Chamber would like to thank all the members and businesses that took part in the preparation of this report.

Chris Fletcher  
Deputy Chief Executive  
& Policy Director  
Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce  
[Chris.fletcher@gmchamber.co.uk](mailto:Chris.fletcher@gmchamber.co.uk)  
Tel: 0161 237 4107  
Mob: 07966 904149

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL  
**Councillor Steven Purcell**  
DRUMCHAPEL/ANNIESLAND WARD 14



Our Ref: SP/CMcC

6 June 2008

Vicky Rosin  
Assistant Chief Executive: Culture  
Manchester City Council  
Town Hall (Room 219)  
MANCHESTER  
M60 2LA

Dear Ms Rosin

Thank you very much for your letter of the 23<sup>rd</sup> of May inviting me to contribute to the review of the UEFA Cup Final.

You asked for observations on what worked well and what did not on the night. I am of the view that, even though I was in the Manchester area from the day before the match and in the stadium on the night, I am not best placed to comment.

I was in the stadium when the trouble began and consequently did not witness either the trouble, the lead up to it or the police's response.

I understand from Strathclyde Police that they have been fully involved with the inquiry and am of the view that they are best placed to speak on behalf of the City.

Thank you again for your correspondence and I of course look forward to hearing the outcome of the review.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Steven Purcell'.

**COUNCILLOR STEVEN PURCELL**  
**LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**



## UEFA CUP FINAL REVIEW BY MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

### SUBMISSION BY RANGERS FOOTBALL CLUB

Date: 4 June 2008

#### Summary

Rangers Football Club is pleased to contribute to Manchester City Council's review of events surrounding the UEFA Cup Final in Manchester on May 14. We also wholly support the view expressed by the council that the purpose of the review is to assess what lessons can be learned for the future rather than apportion blame to those involved in the organisation and management of the event.

The Club has already publicly condemned the behaviour of those people in Manchester City Centre who were involved in violent disorder on the evening of the match. The Club wholly supports action to identify, prosecute and punish those involved. We are continuing to liaise with Greater Manchester Police and Strathclyde Police with a view to banning those involved from any connection to or involvement with Rangers Football Club in the future. To date we have already banned 10 supporters.

Rangers concurs with Sir Richard Leese, Leader of Manchester City Council, and Assistant Chief Constable Justine Curran, of Greater Manchester Police who, in the aftermath of the disturbances, stated clearly that the disorder in Manchester did not alter the fact that the overwhelming majority of Rangers supporters who travelled to Manchester behaved in a reasonable manner and overall they regarded the event as a success for the City of Manchester. It is deeply disappointing that a small minority of people should attempt to undermine the event by resorting to violent disorder. As far as we can ascertain, those involved in this disorder included people who could not reasonably consider themselves to be regular supporters of our Club and some who have never had any involvement with the Club nor have attended a game at our stadium in Glasgow.

It is Rangers position that no city could be expected absorb 150,000 football supporters – the largest known migration of supporters for a single match – without there being significant impact on infrastructure, services and facilities.

Rangers Football Club welcomes Manchester City Council's decision to conduct a review to establish what lessons may be learned by those involved in the organisation of the UEFA Cup Final. While there may be organisational, policing and



facilities issues to be addressed, we firmly believe that any review or inquiry into these events should take full account of the unprecedented numbers of people who were in Manchester on the day of the final.

#### Supporters' behaviour/disturbances

It is obvious that extremely high volumes of alcohol were consumed by football supporters in Manchester City Centre throughout the day on May 14. That said, it should be noted that until early evening, GMP said they were satisfied there had been little or no trouble given the enormous crowd and police activity was confined to dealing with low-level, anti-social and dysfunctional behaviour such as drunkenness and litter.

It should be noted that the sporting behaviour of Rangers supporters in and around the City of Manchester Stadium during and after the match was complimented by UEFA representatives at the stadium.

Rangers Football Club shares the belief of many that the trigger for disturbances in Manchester City Centre that evening was the failure of the large screen in Piccadilly Gardens which was filled with around 20,000 fans, many of whom had been drinking heavily.

The fact that so many supporters found themselves unable to watch the match at such a critical stage was catastrophic in terms of public order and gave the minority of troublemakers a convenient vehicle to instigate violence. While this reaction was totally unacceptable and is condemned in the strongest possible terms, the consequences of the failure to have sufficient back-up systems for the screen in Piccadilly Gardens were dire.

Rangers Football Club were competing in their 19<sup>th</sup> European match of the season on May 14 and our supporters had visited nine different European countries without a single arrest or incident of violent disorder, albeit the numbers of those travelling to watch these game was very small in comparison with those in Manchester.

#### Policing

Rangers Football Club had intensive and constructive discussions with both GMP and Strathclyde Police in the run-up to May 14. We are satisfied that GMP took on board our concerns about the potential vast numbers of fans travelling to Manchester, the majority of whom would not have tickets for the match.

The visit by GMP and Manchester City Council to Glasgow to discuss with our Club and supporters' groups the policing arrangements and the provision of facilities in Manchester for the final was also welcomed by RFC.

It is clear to our Club that the low-key and friendly approach adopted by Manchester Police on May 13 and 14 contributed greatly to the generally convivial atmosphere in Manchester City Centre, particularly in view of the huge numbers of fans congregating in the city centre.

We have a significant feedback from a number of supporters who thoroughly enjoyed their trip to Manchester and complimented GMP.

It was therefore particularly deeply disturbing for our Club to learn of the unfolding disorder on the evening of the match. It was also very disappointing to find that what had been a good relationship between GMP and people in Piccadilly Gardens had broken down and resulted in violence.

We were, and remain, absolutely appalled that any police officer was assaulted or injured in the course of their duties that evening and will do everything possible to assist GMP to identify those involved.

At Rangers we have also received significant feedback from supporters who were caught up in the disturbances, complaining of heavy-handed behaviour of police officers. We have advised those complainants to raise their issues through the appropriate channels and welcome the public confirmation by GMP that it is currently investigating a raft of complaints. We assume these complaints will be investigated thoroughly by GMP, using all available means, including CCTV and video footage which has been useful in attempting to identify those who perpetrated violence towards the police.

Concern has also been expressed by supporters in attendance in the city centre about the suddenness of the change of tactics by police. A number have stated that they were alarmed that one moment officers on duty were adopting a low-key approach then suddenly appeared in full riot equipment. Again, we hope that these concerns are addressed.

## Facilities

During our reconnaissance of Manchester on May 7/8, we, as a Club, were satisfied that Manchester city centre could accommodate large numbers of people on surface streets and open spaces. This capacity was in addition to the 23,000 capacity of the three identified fan zones and the circa 20,000 people who could be accommodated in licensed premises. At this time we advised along with Strathclyde Police that the number of persons attending was anticipated to be in excess of 100,000. We were also made aware of a contingency plan to use the Velodrome near the City of Manchester Stadium as an additional venue if required. Our head of Security and Operations was asked to treat this contingency as confidential.

We believe that consideration was given to alternative facilities and large spaces but they were ruled out due to unavailability or other disadvantages such as distance from Manchester city centre. In view of the overwhelming number of people in Manchester on the day of the UEFA Cup final it would have perhaps been of more

benefit to the organising bodies to give greater consideration to possible alternative venues for fanzones where there could have been greater provision of toilet and catering facilities.

We have received numerous reports from our supporters in Manchester that there was overcrowding at individual fanzones and arrangements for entry and exit were unsatisfactory. As a result, toilet facilities could not cope with the numbers of fans in these areas and concern has been expressed by some fans about the limited catering options within the fanzones.

#### Transport

As we have outlined earlier, it would be impossible for a city to absorb the numbers of people as were in Manchester in May 14 without major disruption to services, facilities and infrastructure.

One of the issues that has been raised with us is the impact on trains to and from surrounding towns. The services could not cope with the numbers either travelling in from towns such as Blackpool and also caused severe disruption to the general public.

#### Going forward

Rangers Football Club will give every assistance to any further inquiries deemed necessary by Manchester City Council and Greater Manchester Police.

Kenny Scott

Head of Security and Operations

Rangers Football Club

Report prepared on behalf of Rangers Supporters by the Rangers Supporters Assembly, the umbrella organisation representing Rangers Worldwide Alliance, Rangers Supporters Association, Rangers Blind Party, Rangers Disabled Club, Rangers Supporters Trust, Rangers Corporate Clients.

## **Introduction**

Having qualified for our first European final for 36 years Rangers fans were always going to travel in vast numbers, the fact the final was taking place at a venue closer to home than some of our SPL away matches simply ensured that Manchester would be invaded by the largest travelling support ever witnessed. We obviously realised that coping with such large numbers would be an extremely difficult task and the fact that stories were appearing in the media intimating that we would not be made welcome simply heightened our concerns as to what we should expect. With that in mind, the positive dialogue which took place at Ibrox prior to the match was most welcome.

Before going into our detailed report, it may well help if a short explanation is given to illustrate what appearing in the final meant to Rangers supporters.

Unlike most other clubs, Rangers fan base is worldwide as opposed to being local. At present there is well in excess of 400 registered Supporters Clubs. Although as you would expect most are based in Scotland, many others are to be found the length and breadth of the U.K. with many more based overseas, e.g. Canada, U.S.A., Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, Singapore, Mexico and throughout Europe to name but a few.

We have one if not the largest travelling support in Europe and earlier in the season had an estimated 25000 travel to Barcelona.

Based on trophies won, Rangers is in fact the most successful club in the world. Success in Europe has however eluded us for many years and being based in a small country without the funds available in say the Premiership, many of us believed we would never again compete in a European final. When we succeeded in qualifying for the UEFA Final many years of hope came to the surface and with the possibility of another final being many years away then there was no way Rangers supporters wanted to miss such an occasion no matter what obstacles were placed in their way. Within minutes of qualifying for the final messages were arriving for Australia with requests for tickets. These were quickly followed by requests from North America, Hong Kong, Dubai etc. with supporters booking flights immediately even without tickets.

On now to the report, made up of various sections, in an attempt to look at the overall picture from start to finish.

### **Meeting at Ibrox.**

Positive: The fact positive dialogue took place prior to the event was most welcome and helped to ease many of our concerns.

Negative: Nil

### **Transport:**

Positive: Travel control well organised from motorway to stadium.  
Stadium parking arrangements were excellent.  
Shuttle buses/taxis to transfer fans from stadium to city centre was excellent.

Negative: Public transport inadequate to cope with the large number of fans trying to get away from Manchester after the match.  
With so many fans in the city centre, the attempt to keep the trams running was difficult to understand and dangerous to say the least.

Comment: Although it was almost impossible to accurately estimate the numbers that would travel we did advise Greater Manchester Police that the vast majority would arrive on the day of the match and the majority of those would depart immediately after the match. All day reports were being received that vast numbers were coming by train from Blackpool etc. and yet no attempt was made to ensure the necessary level of transport would be available to take fans away from Manchester after the match. This resulted in many fans roaming around the city centre.

### **Fan Zones:**

Positive: An excellent idea in as much as they should have ensured many thousands would be able to watch the match live.  
Albert Square and Cathedral Gardens, in spite of overcrowding, were a great success.

Negative: Lack of capacity resulting in serious overcrowding.  
Insufficient toilets and they were outside the zones.  
No facilities for litter.  
No food outlets although we had been informed there would be.

Comment: When it became obvious that the fan zones were not large enough to accommodate the numbers in attendance, why was the Veldrome not brought into play?  
The screen failure in Piccadilly appears to have been central to the problems that occurred and raises a few questions:  
Was the screen, as widely reported, switched off or was there a genuine fault?  
Assuming there was a fault, why was there no contingency plan for such a major issue?

Why was there an attempt to keep fans in the zone when it was obvious they would not be able to see the match? Obviously this added to the frustration as did the fact that when they did exit Piccadilly they were prevented from going to the other zones.

Would it not have been wiser to have a massive fan zone outwith the city centre, say in a field with all the necessary facilities provided within the zone? This would also help enable the police to enforce the drinking byelaws.

### **Alcohol consumption**

Positive: Not attempting to enforce the local byelaws. Attempting to stop drinking around the fans zones would almost certainly have been a major headache for the police.

Negative: Supermarkets etc., only selling beer by the case.

Closing pubs etc., after the match was absolute madness, it simply resulted in even more fans being on the streets.

Too many interested in making money whilst accepting no responsibility.

### **Contingency Plans**

Comment: The fact that it appears there were few if any contingency plans either for faults like the one that occurred with the screen nor the likelihood of more than the estimated numbers arriving in the city centre.

From memory, when we discussed numbers at Ibrox, it was estimated a minimum of 100,000 would travel. Of these, around 20,000 would have tickets, 25,000 would be accommodated in the fans zones with the remainder being able to see the match in surrounding pubs and clubs etc. This obviously did not leave much room for error especially when the estimated number was a minimum.

### **The Match**

Positive: Excellent organisation before during and after.  
Lively pre-match entertainment.  
Fantastic atmosphere.

Negative: The result.

## **Greater Manchester Police**

Positive: Prior to the match police officers went out of their way to be helpful, cheery and willing to join in the fun. The same could be said of the locals and stewards

Negative: The way they seemed to switch from “helpful mode” to “riot mode” with no apparent middle ground.

Comments: The vast majority of the unprecedented number of fans were extremely well behaved. Whilst we would never condone any anti-social behaviour, particularly violence, as fans representatives however we would be failing in our duty if we did not highlight our concerns over the many reports received with regards to police brutality and overreaction. We have no intention of trying to make excuses for the small number of fans who quite simply are no better than animals, indeed we sincerely hope that any of the so called fans found guilty are punished accordingly however we also feel that some sort of enquiry with regards to the police action is equally necessary.

### **Summary:**

Apart from the conduct of a small minority, the occasion was a fantastic experience and one I'm sure will live in the memory of many for years to come.

The numbers involved were most certainly unprecedented and indeed may never be seen again. Like all major sporting occasions however, there are lessons to be learned. From our point of view, in recent times, we have introduced a self policing policy which has proved to be extremely successful. Nine away European ties during the season with no arrests speaks for itself however we will certainly take on board what happened in Manchester and attempt to improve our record even further.

We feel sure Greater Manchester Police will also review their role in controlling the event and if we can help in any way we will be only too happy to do so. At the same time however if they find that perhaps they could have done things differently we would hope that they make their findings public and not simply hide behind the need for confidentiality.



Union des associations européennes de football

President

Lord David Triesman - Chairman The FA  
Dr Thaksin Shinawatra - President Manchester  
City FC  
Sir Richard Leese - City of Manchester

Nyon, 11 June 2008

Dear Lord Triesman,  
Dear Dr Shinawatra,  
Dear Sir Leese,

On behalf of UEFA let me express my sincere gratitude for hosting successfully the 2008 final of the UEFA Cup.

The final is the showpiece of a competition that UEFA keeps very close to its heart and is in the process of revamping; therefore, I was extremely pleased with the outcome which helped to strengthen the values of pure football atmosphere, unpredictability and togetherness.

In fact, the atmosphere at the City of Manchester stadium has been amazing and all this has been made possible by the excellent cooperation and support UEFA received from the LOC, to which the Football Association, the football club Manchester City FC and the city of Manchester have contributed their best resources.

Particular gratitude goes to the city and its police forces for their exceptional effort and deploy of people and means to welcome and look after an unprecedented participation of FC Rangers' supporters that, profiting from the very short distance, decided to be close to their club in one of the most crucial moments of its history and, at the same time, be part of an unforgettable event.. Unfortunately it resulted in some incidents but this cannot overshadow the extraordinary work done by the city of Manchester to make them feel at home and enjoy the match on big screens.

Finally, let me congratulate you on the excellent managerial and operational skills shown by your respective organizations and the LOC project management group. I will be grateful if you will extend thanks and congratulations to your collaborators and staff.

Yours sincerely

UEFA

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Platini', written over a horizontal line.

Michel Platini  
President

Route de Genève 46  
CH-1260 Nyon 2  
Tel. +41 845 00 27 27  
Fax +41 848 01 27 27

uefa.com