

London's Bid for the 2012 Olympic Games

A report from the London Assembly's Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee

January 2003

Culture, Sport and Tourism

Culture, Sport and
re, Sport and
Sport and Tourism

London's Bid for the 2012 Olympic Games

A report from the London Assembly's Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee

January 2003

copyright

**Greater London Authority
January 2003**

Published by
Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA
www.london.gov.uk
enquiries **020 7983 4100**
minicom **020 7983 4458**

ISBN 1 85261 437 9

This publication is printed on recycled paper

Chair's Foreword



We believe that London could and should host the 2012 Olympics. The benefits to London and the UK would be substantial.

If the Government decides to back a bid we ask that it is bold in its support. A faint-hearted bid will do no favours to London or the UK. "Fortune is not on the side of the faint-hearted" - we need a can do approach to bidding, especially in light of the decision that London would not host the 2005 Athletics championships.

Transport is key to a successful Olympics and major projects need to be started as soon as possible if they are to be completed on time. Bidding and losing could have a negative impact but, planned properly from day one, the legacy for London, and particularly East London, could be enormous.

London already contributes substantially to the national economy and the benefits for the UK as a whole of a London Olympic Games needs to be seen in this context.

We believe that if the will of Londoners, London government and the Government is behind a successful bid then we have a good chance of a London Olympics in 2012.

If the Government does decide to support a bid we ask that:

- It is clear and open about the funding needed and how this will be guaranteed.
- London's key transport projects are supported whether or not the bid is successful. The timescale for bidding means there needs to be a firm commitment to see these projects identified and started as soon as possible.
- It plans for a win or lose situation so that East London does not suffer from extended planning blight while we await a final decision on the host city from the International Olympic committee in 2005.
- As the main host city Londoners could benefit a great deal from social, educational, sporting and training programmes; these need to be written in from day one.
- It appoints an Olympics minister and ensures the necessary powers are in place locally and nationally to ensure swift and effective decisions are taken to a rigorous timetable.
- Local people and stakeholders are involved in constructive dialogue about the plans for and the legacy of the Games.
- It plans for how the infrastructure for the Games will be managed and funded after the event.

In short we suggest that if it backs the bid the Government will be at its best when at its boldest.

My thanks to the Mayor's advisor on the Olympics, Richard Sumray, for his time in giving evidence; to the members of the committee and the scrutiny team for their work on this report.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Meg Hillier". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Meg Hillier, Chair of the Committee

The Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee

The London Assembly established the Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee on 10 April 2002. It is one of eight committees that, between them, cover the range of policy areas relevant to London government.

The members of the Committee are:

Meg Hillier (Chair)	Labour
Angie Bray (Deputy Chair)	Conservative
Mike Tuffrey	Liberal Democrat
Brian Coleman	Conservative
Len Duvall	Labour
Victor Anderson	Green

The terms of reference of the Committee are:

“To examine and report from time to time on-

- the strategies, policies and actions of the Mayor and the Functional Bodies
- matters of importance to Greater London

as they relate to culture, sport and tourism in London

To examine and report to the Assembly from time to time on the Mayor’s Culture Strategy, in particular its implementation and revision

To take into deliberations the cross cutting themes of: the health of persons in Greater London; the achievement of sustainable development in the United Kingdom; and the promotion of opportunity account in its

To respond on behalf of the Assembly to consultations and similar processes when within its terms of reference.”

Details of the Committee’s work programme, reports, meeting agendas and minutes are available at www.london.gov.uk/assembly

Contact

Assembly Secretariat

Greg Norton, Scrutiny Manager

020 7983 4947 greg.norton@london.gov.uk

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Chair's Foreword	1
The Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee	2
Report: London's Bid to Host the 2012 Olympic Games	5
1 Introduction	5
2 The benefits should London bid and be chosen to host the Olympic Games in 2012	5
3 The cost of bidding for and hosting of the Olympic Games	7
4 The infrastructure that needs to be in place if London is to successfully host the Olympic Games in 2012	8
5 The legacy of the Games	10
6 Consultation and partnerships required if London is to bid and successfully host the Games	11
7 Conclusion	12
Annexes	
Annex A Summary of Recommendations	14
Annex B Orders and Translations	15
Annex C Principles of Assembly Scrutiny	17

London's Bid to Host the Olympic Games in 2012

1 Introduction

- 1.1 It has been over fifty years since the Olympic Games was last held in London.¹ In mid January 2003, the Government will decide whether to support London's bid to host the Olympic Games in 2012.
- 1.2 We believe that London can, and should, host the Olympic Games in 2012. It is an opportunity to reaffirm London's status as a world city, to accelerate much needed regeneration in East London and to showcase London's, and the United Kingdom's, diversity and sporting prowess on the world stage. However, as our meeting with Richard Sumray, the Mayor's Nominee to the Olympic Stakeholders Group, made clear, considerable work will be needed.
- 1.3 The British Olympic Association has formal responsibility for submitting the bid. But this must be accompanied by strong support at all levels of Government, especially central government, if the bid is to have a real chance of success in bringing long-lasting benefits to London. A bid for the Olympics must be a national decision - the Games would be hosted by London on behalf of the United Kingdom and bidding and hosting will require resources and powers far beyond those currently provided to London government. As importantly, the benefits from an Olympic Games will accrue to the whole of the UK, not just to London.
- 1.4 This short report outlines the possible benefits for London and the UK and the kinds of funding and infrastructure we would like to see in place if London is to successfully bid and host the Olympic Games.

2 The benefits should London bid and be chosen to host the Olympic Games in 2012

- 2.1 The Olympic Stakeholders Group (comprising representatives from the Government, Greater London Authority and the British Olympic Association) commissioned a report on the cost and benefit implications of the bidding for and staging the Olympic and Paralympic Games in London. This report, *London Olympics 2012: Summary*² identified the following key benefits for London from hosting the Games:
 - Growth in tourism (up to £610m additional revenue provided the government was prepared to invest £103m);
 - 3,000 full-time equivalent jobs in east London and regenerative effects
 - National prestige and 'feel good' factor
 - New sporting facilities (stadium and aquatics centre in East London)

¹ London has hosted the Olympic Games in 1908 and 1948.

² *London Olympics 2012: Summary*, Arup in association with Insignia Richard Ellis, November 2002

- Investment in Lower Lee Valley
 - Possibility of small surplus from Olympic Games (in order of £80m)
- 2.2 Many of the longer term benefits would accrue largely to London's East End. The Mayor and the Olympic Stakeholders Group believe that many of the sporting facilities for the Games should be centred in the Lower Lee Valley to maximise the regenerative impact of the Games in one of the most deprived areas in the UK.³
- 2.3 However, other events and venues are likely to be dispersed throughout the city. For example, the beach volleyball could be held in Regent's Park, the Oval could host the baseball, Wimbledon would be the site for the tennis, Wembley for the football finals and Bisley (just outside the M25 in the south-west) and Potter's Bar could be the venues for shooting and equestrian events respectively.
- 2.4 The potential advantages of London hosting the Olympics go much wider than the city – the UK as a whole would also benefit from increased tourism, economic activity and sporting facilities. We support the position that 'the benefits of the Olympic bid [should] accrue as much as possible to the UK, and not just to London.'⁴ We heard that there are at least four ways in which the benefits from hosting the Olympics could be distributed to other parts of the country:
- According to the rules of FIFA, Olympic Games football has to be held in at least four different cities within the host country – this could include not only Manchester and Birmingham, but cities in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland as well. Events like sailing would also be located outside London (for example, Weymouth and Portland Bay).
 - Training camps for Olympic Teams are often located in cities outside the hosting city. The British Olympic Team is estimated to have contributed £1 million to the economy of Australia's Gold Coast when they trained there for the Sydney Games.
 - Inward investment to the rest of the country would be boosted.
 - The four year cultural festival which is held around the Games would focus not only on London's diversity but on promoting cultural issues in the UK more generally. We would hope that the hosting of the Olympics could be coordinated with the European Capital of Culture which will be held in one of six UK cities (expected to be announced in May 2003).
- 2.5 Even if London were not chosen to host the 2012 Games, there is an argument that London could benefit just from bidding. The Arup report claimed there would be a 'potentially catalytic impact on the regeneration of the Lower Lee Valley' even from an unsuccessful bid.

³ There is a very high concentration of deprivation in east London. See for example, *London Divided: Income inequality and poverty in the capital*. GLA, November 2002. pp.89-106.

⁴ All quotes are taken from the Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting, 4 December 2002.

- 2.6 The Government's recent report on sporting policy, *Game Plan*, argues that there is slim evidence of tangible long-term returns to the economy, tourism or community. While it acknowledges that there can be some regenerative benefit if properly planned, its view is that the strongest argument for hosting an event such as the Olympic Games is the 'feelgood' factor and national pride generated.⁵ In our view, this tends to understate the galvanising effect of an Olympic Games as a 'catalyst for all sorts of change'.⁶ We reiterate that the evidence from previous Olympics Games is that there can be significant positive economic and regenerative benefits, provided they are properly planned and managed, with clear objectives from the start. Special attention must be paid to ensuring that some of the benefits, for example from additional jobs and social, educational and lasting sporting legacy are directed at the local community.

Recommendation 1

We would expect any London Olympic bid to have at its heart long-term benefits for our city.

We support the Government's emphasis on a London Olympics benefiting the United Kingdom as a whole. Planned and managed appropriately, we believe there are significant benefits to be gained from both bidding for and successful hosting of the Olympic Games.

3 The costs of the bid and hosting of the Olympic Games

- 3.1 On current estimations, the total cost of bidding for the 2012 Olympics is likely to be £13 million (of which £6 million would be funded by the public sector). Total cost for bidding, staging the Games, building facilities and purchasing land would be £1.8 billion.⁷ As we heard, most of the direct cost of the Olympics is borne by the public sector - the benefits tend to accrue directly to the private sector and only indirectly to the public purse. Arup has identified approximately £1.7 billion in potential income which would help offset these costs.
- 3.2 In response to the Arup report, concerns have been expressed about the accuracy of the £1.8 billion estimate.⁸ Certainly, the experience of previous Olympic Games, and the £110 million shortfall for the Commonwealth Games in Manchester, underlines the tendency of initial budgets to underestimate the costs.
- 3.3 There is a concern that the process of bidding for the Olympics may further delay decisions on major infrastructure projects that become linked to the bid, increasing uncertainty and the risk of regeneration blight. Richard Sumray told us that, in practice, the short time between nomination and the decision on a host city in July 2005 would mean that 'the actual level of blight is very small indeed' and that the intention is to plan in parallel - that is 'you plan in the

⁵ *Game Plan: a strategy for delivering Government's sport and physical activity objectives*. Prime Minister's Strategy Unit and Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2002. p.71

⁶ Committee Minutes of meeting with Richard Sumray

⁷ Including £109m allocated for risk

⁸ See for example, 'Blair weighs the risk of going for Olympic Gold', *Daily Telegraph*, 23 November 2002, p.14

event of a win [and] you plan if we don't win so that things are not lost on the ground.⁹ This is reassuring, but does not completely negate the risk of planning blight in the two years between the bid and the decision. The cause of blight is uncertainty. We think the only real answer to this is to ensure that regeneration initiatives that are going to be beneficial in the long-term in any event should be confirmed as soon as possible, and not made contingent on the success of an Olympics bid.

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the Government's decision on whether or not to bid to host the 2012 Olympics be swiftly followed by a schedule of regeneration, transport and infrastructure schemes that will be drawn up with stakeholders. There should be no room for the possibility of important initiatives being abandoned or further delayed if the bid is not successful. This should reduce the potential for planning blight to hit the east of London whilst the bid is being considered.

4 The infrastructure that needs to be in place if London is to successfully host the Olympic Games in 2012.

- 4.1 Quite apart from the sporting facilities, if London is to host an Olympic Games, it needs the capacity to accommodate and transport the 11,000 athletes (and their 10,000 coaches and members of the Olympic family), 20,000 journalists and up to 9 million spectators.¹⁰
- 4.2 The Arup report anticipates that there will be sufficient hotel and hostel accommodation and that the transport capacity for bringing visitors into London (via air and rail) should be adequate. The crucial issue will be moving large numbers of spectators and athletes around London easily, without causing serious delays to existing commuters. On a peak day, 150,000 spectators are expected to travel to the Olympic Zone in East London for the morning session (125,000 of these from or through central London). Most of these spectators are expected to catch public transport to enable the roads to carry competitors.
- 4.3 As a first step, there needs to be a significant improvement to the current transport infrastructure. Although firm plans for transport have not yet been finalised, Richard Sumray highlighted the need for:

the increase in capacity for the Central Line, obviously [the completion of the] Channel Tunnel Rail Link, the East London Line extensions, the extension of the Docklands Light Railway....

if the Olympics Games in London is to be hosted successfully.

- 4.4 Crossrail, the one project likely to provide the biggest single increase of rail capacity in London (estimated to be 15-20 per cent), is currently scheduled to

⁹ Committee Minutes of Meeting with Richard Sumray

¹⁰ *London Olympics 2012: Summary*. Arup in association with Insignia Richard Ellis, November 2002, p.2

be completed by early 2012¹¹ but there are already some delays on the current programme and funding for the scheme, estimated to be in the order of £6 billion (plus £3 billion in contingencies)¹², has not been agreed by Government. The Mayor has stated that 'without Crossrail you would [not] want to run the risk of trying to move everybody around the city [for the Olympics]'.¹³ On the other hand, the Arup report indicates, that while it would provide a huge boost to transport capacity, it is not essential. Clearly, there are differing views on whether Crossrail needs to be in place to host a successful Olympic Games, and whether it is deliverable within the necessary timeframe. Any bid must therefore allow for both scenarios - it would be foolish to pin a bid on a single transport project which may be subject to delays outside the control of the Olympic planners.

- 4.5 A temporary north-south road would also need to be built from the Olympic village up towards Stratford and down towards ExCel¹⁴ area, to ensure that athletes were no more than 30 minutes from venues. This road could be removed after the Games, used as a bus lane or cycle path or serve as an environmental corridor. This approach is broadly in line with the redevelopment alongside the River Lee outlined in the Mayor's draft London Plan.¹⁵
- 4.6 In addition to these improvements in transport infrastructure, there will need to be 'unprecedented' management of transport in London¹⁶. This is likely to include the establishment of an Olympic Transport Agency to manage public transport capacity and traffic flow within London. In addition to road closures, parking restrictions and temporary lanes for transporting Olympic athletes, Londoners will need to be persuaded to change their travel habits. We heard that the success of the Sydney Olympics was that 'people stayed off the [roads] because they changed their work habits for the duration of the Games.' A similar campaign is anticipated for London- although the reduction in traffic may not be as dramatic in London, as it is already the case here that only 50 per cent of daily trips are made by car,¹⁷ compared to 70 per cent in Sydney.¹⁸

¹¹ See www.crossrail.co.uk/pages/currentstatus.html

¹² Figures quoted by the Mayor, Mayor's Advisory Cabinet, 12 November 2002

¹³ Mayor's Advisory Cabinet, 12 November 2002

¹⁴ ExCel is a national conference and exhibition centre located near Canary Wharf

¹⁵ *The Draft London Plan*, GLA, June 2002, pp.88-89

¹⁶ *London Olympics 2012: Summary*. Arup in association with Insignia Richard Ellis, November 2002, p.3

¹⁷ *Transport Statistics for London*, TfL 2001, p.10

¹⁸ *Train Users in Sydney*, Transport NSW, October 2001, p.2.

Recommendation 3

We believe that the provision of adequate transport infrastructure represents the biggest challenge to London's bidding and hosting of the Games. We take into account that 'the Olympic Games concentrates the mind hugely' and the examples of rapid decision-making on major projects in Sydney and Athens.

We want to see a real commitment to improving transport infrastructure in east London whether or not the bid is won. We would therefore like to see a Government announcement supporting the bid to be accompanied by a commitment to fund and deliver these measures (with appropriate consultation with stakeholders) whether or not the bid wins.

5 The legacy of the Games

- 5.1 As we have discussed above, one of the most significant benefits of bidding for and winning the right to host an Olympic Games would be the regenerative impact on east London. The Arup report envisages an Olympic Village which could provide housing for some 4,000 people after the Olympics, an 80,000 capacity stadium, an aquatics centre and the regeneration of at least 100 hectares of land in East London. We heard that there are two possible sites for the Olympic Village – either Stratford or near Bromley-by-Bow (which could open up areas around the River Lee and is closer to the sporting facilities at the Dome and ExCel in Canary Wharf). It is likely that the stadium, aquatics centre and velodrome will be located close to Stratford.
- 5.2 We fully endorse the view that the legacy of the Olympic Games – that is, the remaining sporting and transport facilities after the Games are complete – should inform all decisions on planning and regeneration for the Olympics. As the Government's recent report noted 'if regeneration is intended as an explicit pay-off from hosting a mega event, then it must underpin the whole planning process to ensure that maximum benefit is achieved for the investment.'¹⁹ The stadium at Barcelona and, more recently, the financial difficulties of Homebush Stadium in Sydney, demonstrate the problems that can be faced by large Olympic venues once the Games are over. In relation to the two major constructions – the Olympic Village and Stadium:
- We are pleased to hear that initial discussions have already been held with a Premier League Football Club (understood to be West Ham United FC) about the possibility of converting an Olympic stadium into a home ground.
 - We also welcome the resolution to build the Olympic Village with a long-term view and the proposal that the development be privately led with discussions with local authorities about the needs of the community.

¹⁹ *Game Plan: a strategy for delivering Government's sport and physical activity objectives*. Prime Minister's Strategy Unit and Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2002. p.68

- 5.3 We heard that the upkeep and possible renovation of smaller facilities, such as the aquatic centre and other facilities, might be funded either through an endowment for London sport²⁰ supplemented by sports organisations and local authorities or through restructuring of the venue (for example, including gym facilities at a swimming centre). Whether London hosts an Olympics or not, there are some facilities – like 50 metre pools – which would benefit London and enhance its ability to hold other major sporting events.²¹ Temporary sporting facilities (for example, a velodrome) could be constructed for the Olympics and then removed, thus avoiding depreciation and maintenance costs for local authorities.

Recommendation 4

We believe the Olympic Games could provide a significant opportunity to regenerate areas of London and leave a lasting legacy in the form of sporting facilities. The social, sporting and educational impact of hosting the Olympics could be a great benefit to east Londoners in particular. We would want to see the lasting legacy in encouraging the take up of sport locally, skills training and the social impact properly planned from day one.

Recommendation 5

We are concerned, however, that there is an expectation that local authorities will be expected to contribute substantially to the ongoing maintenance and running costs of international sporting facilities, transport and accommodation facilities after the Games. Council taxpayers in the host boroughs should not be expected to foot the bill.

It is also important to be clear who is going to be responsible for the ongoing management of new facilities after the games and how these are to be funded. We recommend that there be a clear plan for this, which should be agreed at the earliest opportunity if London's bid is successful.

6 Consultation and partnerships required if London is to bid and successfully host the Games.

- 6.1 If the bid is successful, there will need to be clear, streamlined and transparent decision-making processes. Those taking the decisions will need to be given appropriate powers to act quickly and decisively when necessary. We therefore welcome the proposal to establish a mega events and projects Centre of Expertise. However, we think there remains a risk that if there is no accountable individual with overall responsibility for the arrangements, it will not be possible to take swift and effective decisions that will be necessary. There needs to be a

²⁰ According to Richard Sumray, 50% of any profit from the Olympics must go to the benefit of sport in the host country.

²¹ According to Richard Sumray, London has only one 50 metre pool whereas Paris, Rome and Berlin have approximately 20 each.

transparent chain of command and responsibilities, in which people have appropriate decision-making powers. The appointment of an Olympics Minister with responsibility for overseeing the arrangements would go some way to addressing this need.

- 6.2 This will need to be balanced with the need for accountability and participation by local people who are likely to be affected by decisions on the location and nature of new facilities and infrastructure developments. Clearly, London's local authorities and Londoners themselves should be closely involved in any decision to bid and, if the bid is successful, in the preparations for the games.
- 6.3 We heard that there has not been a lot of consultation with ordinary Londoners yet but that there will be a 'concerted effort' to engage Londoners over the next few months. A recent poll, showing that 69 per cent of Londoners supported the bid for the 2012 Olympics,²² seems to indicate considerable enthusiasm for a bid. Baroness Blackstone revealed in the House of Lords on 18 December 2002 that the Government will carry out an opinion poll before deciding whether they will back a London bid.²³
- 6.4 Richard Sumray stated that he has been meeting with boroughs in east London for the last three years. He noted that Enfield, Waltham Forest, Tower Hamlets, Haringey, Newham, Greenwich councils, as well as London First and the London Chamber of Commerce were already supportive of the bid.²⁴
- 6.5 But the decision to bid is not the end of the story. Local people will need to be kept informed of progress in the preparations for the Games, and given opportunities to engage and put forward their views.

Recommendation 6

We recommend that, should London's bid be successful, the Government appoint an Olympics Minister. This should be supported by a clear decision-making framework, to enable those responsible to act decisively and work effectively, whilst also providing for accountability and local involvement and engagement.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 To some extent, the success of the Commonwealth Games in Manchester this year has helped mollify the disappointment of the FIFA 2006 Football World Cup bid, the loss of staging rights for the 2005 World Athletics Championships and frustrations with Wembley Stadium. As the Government's recent report noted, these disappointments have tended to overshadow the UK's success in hosting a range of large sporting events.

²² YouGov online poll of 1,002 Londoners, carried out for the *Evening Standard* between 6 and 9 December 2002. 24% were against and 7% said they did not know.

²³ 'Public will have vote on 2012 bid', *Daily Telegraph*, 19 December 2002, p.S1

²⁴ Mayor's Advisory Cabinet, 12 November 2002.

- 7.2 We believe London can, and should, host the Olympic Games in 2012. It is an opportunity to reaffirm London's status as world city, to accelerate much needed regeneration in East London and to show-case London, and the United Kingdom's, diversity and sporting prowess on the world stage. Richard Sumray suggested to us that it was time for London to show a 'can-do' attitude – we are perfectly capable of delivering a successful Games, and we should have the confidence to go for it. We agree with him.
- 7.3 However, it would be better not to bid for the Olympic Games at all than to bid half-heartedly or in a way that through poor planning or short-sightedness fails to leave a positive lasting legacy. Considerable resources and energy will be required to support any bid and address infrastructure issues (especially around transport).

Recommendation 7

We believe that a Government decision to bid must include a clear explanation of the proposed funding arrangements and underwriting.

- 7.4 When the Government makes its decision we not only want a positive endorsement of a bid. We would also like to see this announcement to be swiftly followed by an analysis of infrastructure needed to host the Olympic Games in London (particularly in regards to transport) and a commitment from the Government to properly fund these projects. This should be drawn up with proper consultation with the relevant stakeholders.

Annex A: Summary of Recommendations

1. We would expect any London Olympic bid to have at its heart long-term benefits for our city. We support the Government's emphasis on a London Olympics benefiting the United Kingdom as a whole. Planned and managed appropriately, we believe there are significant benefits to be gained from both bidding for and successful hosting of the Olympic Games.
2. We recommend that the Government's decision on whether or not to bid to host the 2012 Olympics be swiftly followed by a schedule of regeneration, transport and infrastructure schemes that will be drawn up with stakeholders. There should be no room for the possibility of important initiatives being abandoned or further delayed if the bid is not successful. This should reduce the potential for planning blight to hit the east of London whilst the bid is being considered.
3. We believe that the provision of adequate transport infrastructure represents the biggest challenge to London's bidding and hosting of the Games. We take into account that 'the Olympic Games concentrates the mind hugely' and the examples of rapid decision-making on major projects in Sydney and Athens.

We want to see a real commitment to improving transport infrastructure in east London whether or not the bid is won. We would therefore like to see a Government announcement supporting the bid to be accompanied by a commitment to fund and deliver these measures (with appropriate consultation with stakeholders) whether or not the bid wins.

4. We believe the Olympic Games could provide a significant opportunity to regenerate areas of London and leave a lasting legacy in the form of sporting facilities. The social, sporting and educational impact of hosting the Olympics could be a great benefit to east Londoners in particular. We would want to see the lasting legacy in encouraging the take up of sport locally, skills training and the social impact properly planned from day one.
5. We are concerned, however, that there is an expectation that local authorities will be expected to contribute substantially to the ongoing maintenance and running costs of international sporting facilities, transport and accommodation facilities after the Games. Council taxpayers in the host boroughs should not be expected to foot the bill.

It is also important to be clear who is going to be responsible for the ongoing management of new facilities after the games and how these are to be funded. We recommend that there be a clear plan for this, which should be agreed at the earliest opportunity if London's bid is successful.

6. We recommend that, should London's bid be successful, the Government appoint an Olympics Minister. This should be supported by a clear decision-making framework, to enable those responsible to act decisively and work effectively, whilst also providing for accountability and local involvement and engagement.
7. We believe that a Government decision to bid must include a clear explanation of the proposed funding arrangements and underwriting.

Annex B: Orders and Translations

How to Order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact Greg Norton, Scrutiny Manager, on 0207 983 4947 or email at greg.norton@london.gov.uk

See it for Free on our Website

You can also view a copy of the report on the GLA website:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/approot/assembly/reports/index.jsp#cst>

Large Print, Braille or Translations

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or Braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100 or email to assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

আপনি বা আপনার পরিচিত কেউ এ রিপোর্টের সারসর্ম ও প্রস্তাবের কপি বিনামূল্যে বড়ছাপা বা ব্রেইল, অথবা তাদের নিজের ভাষায় চাইলে 020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারে ফোন করুন বা ই-মেইল করুন এ ঠিকানায়:
assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

જો તમને કે તમે જાણતા હો તેવી કોઈ વ્યક્તિને, આ અહેવાલમાંથી કાર્યકારી સંક્ષેપ અને ભલામણોની નકલ મોટા અક્ષરોમાં છપાયેલી, બ્રેઈલમાં કે તેમની પોતાની ભાષામાં વિના મૂલ્યે જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને ફોન દ્વારા 020 7983 4100 ઉપર અમારો સંપર્ક કરો અથવા આ સરનામે ઈ-મેઈલ કરો assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Se você, ou alguém de seu conhecimento, gostaria de ter uma cópia do sumário executivo e recomendações desse relatório em imprensa grande ou Braille, ou na sua língua, sem custo, favor nos contatar por telefone no número 020 7983 4100 ou email em assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਜਾਂ ਕੋਈ ਤੁਹਾਡਾ ਜਾਣ-ਪਛਾਣ ਵਾਲਾ ਇਸ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਦਾ ਅਗਜ਼ੈਕਟਿਵ ਖੁਲਾਸਾ ਅਤੇ ਸੁਝਾਵਾਂ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ, ਬ੍ਰੇਅਲ ਵਿਚ ਜਾਂ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਮੁਫਤ ਪ੍ਰਕਾਸ਼ ਕਰਨਾ ਚਾਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿ੍ਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਡੇ ਨਾਲ 020 7983 4100 ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ assembly.translations@london.gov.uk ਤੇ ਸਾਡੀ ਈ-ਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ।

Si usted, o algún conocido, quiere recibir copia del resumen ejecutivo y las recomendaciones relativos a este informe en forma de Braille, en su propia idioma, y gratis, no duden en ponerse en contacto con nosotros marcando 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico:
assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

اگر آپ یا آپ کا کوئی جاننے والا اس ایگزیکٹو سمری اور اس رپورٹ میں سے سفارشات کی ایک کاپی بڑے پرنٹ میں یا بریل پڑیا اپنی زبان میں بلا معاوضہ حاصل کرنا چاہیں تو براہ کرم ہم سے فون 020 7983 4100 پر رابطہ کریں یا assembly.translations@london.gov.uk پر ای میل کریں۔

Ta ba ri enikeni ti o ba ni ife lati ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kansiswa lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero assembly.translations@london.gov.uk. Ako ni gbowo lowo yin fun eto yi.

Haddii adiga, ama qof aad taqaanid, uu doonaayo inuu ku helo koobi ah warbixinta oo kooban iyo talooyinka far waaweyn ama farta qofka indhaha la' loogu talagalay, ama luuqadooda, oo bilaash u ah, fadlan nagala soo xiriir telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email-ka cinwaanku yahay assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Annex C: Principles of Assembly Scrutiny

The powers of the London Assembly include the power to investigate and report on the decisions and actions of the Mayor, or on matters relating to the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, and on any other matters which the Assembly considers to be of importance to Londoners. In the conduct of scrutiny and investigation the Assembly abides by a number of principles.

Scrutinies:

- aim to recommend action to achieve improvements;
- are conducted with objectivity and independence;
- examine all aspects of the Mayor's strategies;
- consult widely, having regard to issues of timeliness and cost;
- are conducted in a constructive and positive manner; and
- are conducted with an awareness of the need to spend taxpayers money wisely and well.

More information about the scrutiny work of the London Assembly, including published reports, details of committee meetings and contact information, can be found on the GLA Website at <http://www.london.gov.uk/approot/assembly/index.jsp>

Greater London Authority

City Hall

The Queen's Walk

London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk

Enquiries **020 7983 4100**

Minicom **020 7983 4458**