



# HOUSE OF LORDS

Unrevised transcript of evidence taken before

## **The Select Committee on Olympic and Paralympic Legacy**

Inquiry on

### **OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC LEGACY**

*Evidence Session No. 3*

*Heard in Public*

*Questions 38 - 63*

WEDNESDAY 19 JUNE 2013

10.45 am

Witnesses: Tim Hollingsworth, Darryl Seibel and Liz Nicholl

#### USE OF THE TRANSCRIPT

1. This is an uncorrected transcript of evidence taken in public and webcast on [www.parliamentlive.tv](http://www.parliamentlive.tv).
2. Any public use of, or reference to, the contents should make clear that neither Members nor witnesses have had the opportunity to correct the record. If in doubt as to the propriety of using the transcript, please contact the Clerk of the Committee.
3. Members and witnesses are asked to send corrections to the Clerk of the Committee within 7 days of receipt.

### Members present

Lord Harris of Haringey (Chairman)  
Lord Addington  
Earl of Arran  
Lord Bates  
Lord Best  
Baroness Billingham  
Lord Faulkner of Worcester  
Baroness King of Bow  
Lord Moynihan  
Lord Stoneham of Droxford  
Lord Wigley

---

### Witnesses

**Tim Hollingsworth**, CEO, British Paralympic Association, **Darryl Seibel**, Director of Communications and Olympic Media Strategy, British Olympic Association, and **Liz Nicholl**, CEO, UK Sport

**Q38 The Chairman:** Good morning to you. I should inform you that this is a public session; you will have gathered that. We are, I think, at the moment being broadcast on BBC Parliament, but the sessions are in any case webcast. I should explain that you will be sent an uncorrected transcript of the session and given the opportunity to suggest any corrections. However, as an incentive to send in your corrections quickly, in the mean time, the uncorrected transcripts will be made available on the Committee's website. They will be corrected once you have submitted them.

We are going to put a number of questions to you. I was going to start with a slightly general question to all three of you, and you can decide who wants to go first. Is the improved performance of UK athletes at Beijing 2008 and London 2012 largely a result of the enhanced financial support or are there other factors that are of equal importance?

**Liz Nicholl:** Shall I take that on, Mr Chairman? The resources available to support performance success are absolutely critical and, clearly, we have seen what a difference the

National Lottery has made to the world-class programmes, following Atlanta through Sydney, Athens, Beijing and London. As we have gone through each of those cycles, we have been able to invest more in the right athletes and the right sports, for the right reasons. The resource is absolutely critical, but most important is actually what is done with that resource. It is reaching the right athletes; it is developing the system, attracting and retaining world-class coaches, performance directors and sport scientists. You cannot do that without the resource, so the resource is an absolutely fundamental factor in success.

**Darryl Seibel:** I would just add very quickly that the point that Liz has made about resource is absolutely right on. It is about effective utilisation of those resources, developing a system that has the depth and talent that we have, not only with athletes, but coaches and performance specialists as well, all of whom ultimately are capable of succeeding on the international stage in the way we all saw just a year ago.

**Tim Hollingsworth:** My only addition from a Paralympic perspective would be to make the same point, but in a slightly different way. In fact, from Sydney through to London we have achieved pretty much the same outcome in Games time, in terms of medal table position. It was not so much the improved performance of the team in that sense; it was absolutely the ability of the team to maintain its position against very vastly increased opposition and competition. In that sense, the resources have been absolutely invaluable. The systematic approach to them, again in Paralympic sport, and the way that governing bodies have applied the techniques that have been perhaps more established in the Olympic context to their Paralympic programmes, has undoubtedly been a major factor, thanks to the resources and the Lottery particularly that are available.

**Baroness King of Bow:** I would agree with you that resources are absolutely critical, but I just wondered if you could let us know how then or why you would explain our under-performance in swimming, for example, where there were resources.

**Liz Nicholl:** Yes, absolutely. Swimming conducted a review immediately post Games. We were disappointed in their results; the public was disappointed in their results, and swimming were disappointed themselves—the athletes and the coaches were. At the heart of the outcome of that review was the performance management system within the sport, from the very top through the performance director to the head coach, from the head coach to the coaches, and the coaches to the athletes. It was not tight enough; it was too relaxed. There was too much freedom to make decisions at various levels, and so it was not focused enough. Swimming have been very honest in their own assessment of what went wrong and they have made changes at the very top. They are actually developing now a new strategy, which is why in fact we put them on one-year funding: so that we can reassess them this December, so that we can confirm that we are happy with the changes they have made and the new strategic approach, so that again we are investing in success through to Rio.

**Tim Hollingsworth:** If I might just add, it is really only in the Olympic context. The swimming programme in the Paralympic context was actually a successful programme in London 2012.

**Q39 Baroness Billingham:** Hello, Liz. Nice to see you. I am asking a question about decisions that you have to make. The question that I have here is: how does UK Sport decide on the level of funding that should be allocated to individual sports? Now I am sold, and I understand, the argument about money for medals. We have to accept that; that is how it is and that is international. You have talked about the right athletes for the right sports but, you will forgive me, I think it might be the Marxist in me—

**The Chairman:** You will have to explain that to one or two Members of the Committee.

**Baroness Billingham:** There are a few of us who understand it. I am always worried and I have always been haunted by this thought: the people who are successful are given more money to succeed further. To the poor people, the swimming people or the other sports

that are listed—handball, basketball—who are struggling to make an impact on the world stage, you give nothing. As a mother, that would be a very unfair way of dealing with your family. Right? Come on; give me a proper reason that you take this line about where the money goes.

**Liz Nicholl:** I understand the perspective of a mother, but our remit is to develop a system that delivers success.

**Baroness Billingham:** Who gave you the remit?

**Liz Nicholl:** That is a remit that we have from Government. That is what we are established to be. We are Government's high-performance agency and our responsibility is to deliver success on the world stage, Olympic and Paralympic.

**Baroness Billingham:** Does that never change from Government to Government?

**Liz Nicholl:** It has not since our inception. We have been created as an organisation set up to actually lead the system to world-class success. While that is my responsibility and I am accountable for it, I have to make sure that the resources we invest absolutely are targeted at our best medal potential.

The way we manage the investment is a four-year investment in an eight-year pathway. We are focusing now all our investment on 2016 medal potential and 2020 medal potential, and some into winter sports as well. It is 2016 and 2020, an eight-year pathway and four-year funding. Sports make a very clear business case to us, which is very objective and very evidence-based, about what their medal potential is and they name the athletes who could achieve the medals. We assess those cases and we put them in a meritocratic order, like a league table, of the sports that could deliver the most success and the sports that are furthest away from the podium, likely medal potential and possible medal potential. We have a league table that is very objective and the sports understand it.

Once we have assessed each and every sport, we decide the number of athlete places that sport needs to support to achieve that end result, and then our investment is about surrounding those athletes with world-class support, what it takes and what it costs. We have an equitable approach across all sports, in which every sport is the same, but we invest in their future medal potential.

The sports that miss out on funding are the sports that cannot give us any evidence and know themselves that they have no chance of a medal in 2016 or 2020, and actually are very unlikely to even qualify by right to be at Rio. We cannot invest in sports and athletes that cannot even be at the Games. We have to make those tough calls.

**Baroness Billingham:** We just write them off and say, “Basketball players”—

**Liz Nicholl:** Baroness Billingham, each of those sports does receive funding from the home nation sports councils. Sport England, for example, is actually investing in handball and indoor volleyball, for participation and for talent. The door is open. If the sport can improve their performances and show us evidence that they have got this potential that they have developed, we will pick them up. We want to invest in every medal potential.

**Q40 Lord Wigley:** I wanted to pick up the question of whether every medal is equal ranking. Quite clearly there are some sports that have a higher profile and there will be some sports, presumably, where the resources being put in can actually make a difference. Do you cost per medal and then do you have any weighting towards some sports?

**Liz Nicholl:** We do not have any weighting based on the significance of the sport. Every medal is important to us. This all comes from a high-level goal. For example, our goal for Rio, our ambition, is to do better and build on success in London. That will translate into a number of medals, and actually our focus is then which sports could actually deliver those medals. Whether it is a 100m athletics medal or one for a team in hockey, that medal appears in the medal table. Of course, there are a lot more medallists. We treat them

equally, but we provide each sport with the amount of money they need to achieve their medal potential.

**Lord Wigley:** Even if some sports need more money to get the same potential?

**Liz Nicholl:** Yes, because a sport like hockey will need 16 players and we fund 16 players. You cannot fund one athlete. You can get one medal from one athlete, but you can get one medal and 16 medallists from one team. We value the medallists, but we do not differentiate in any other way with sports.

**Baroness King of Bow:** Why would you not be investing in waterskiing then, as we do so well with European medals?

**Liz Nicholl:** They do extremely well, but they are not an Olympic or Paralympic sport. In order to focus the impact of our resources, our board has had to make the tough decision that we are not able to support non-Olympic and non-Paralympic success. Actually, for every waterskier, there is a significant number of other disciplines that are non-Olympic and non-Paralympic. I agree with you: if we had endless resources, it would be fantastic to be able to support that success. They are achieving without our investment. We have invested in the past, but we had to switch that off and they understand why.

**Q41 The Chairman:** As I understand it, the plans are based on a projection of the continuing growth in the level of Lottery funding. What plans exist if it does not grow like that?

**Liz Nicholl:** Our investment is based on using the projections that we are officially provided by the DCMS on Lottery income. The Lottery income projections that the DCMS provides to all its distributors have generally been reasonable. Past history shows that, in fact, income comes in slightly above those projections. In all our financial planning and investment—and we have just invested over £350 million in Olympic and Paralympic success for Rio—we are

assuming that we will have income based on the Lottery projections coming forward, right through the cycle.

There are two things we do to manage the risk. On a positive front, we prioritise promotion of the National Lottery. We prioritise supporting the work of Camelot. We absolutely want to do everything we can to maximise income, not only just for sport as a distributor, but also for the other good causes, because we are helping ourselves in that instance. Secondly, and this is what we have never had to call into play as yet, we have a clause in all our funding agreements that, in fact, this is all subject to the funding still remaining available. I talked about the meritocratic league ranking table and, actually, if we had to cut, the sports absolutely know and understand that we would cut the possible medals before we cut the likely medals. We would go bottom-up in terms of the impact, but we have not had to do it yet.

**The Chairman:** You would cut out areas rather than simply scale back support.

**Liz Nicholl:** Absolutely, and that is what we call our no-compromise approach. It is a very good question. Our no-compromise approach is to say that, if we salami-slice our investment, we put everything at risk. We know what it takes. It works and we want to stick to investing exactly what it takes to win, so the sport has no excuse. The sport are responsible and accountable now to us for their results, and we will do everything we can to support them to succeed, but we do not want to give them the excuse that we did not give them enough money to be able to do that. For all the governing bodies that we work with, we have a set of published investment principles. At the outset, we publish them and discuss them with the sports. They are on the web. Everybody seems to understand that and accept that these tough decisions have to be taken.

**Lord Bates:** I was listening to your comments about the cold, analytical, no-compromise message. I wonder how it is squared when you are communicating Olympic values that it is

not the winning, but it is the taking part; it is the occasion. How do you square that when you are communicating about sport?

**Liz Nicholl:** Of course I believe in the Olympic values. My background has been in sport all my life. I started in Wales, actually. But in my professional role now, my responsibility is to make sure we focus on results and on medal success. Darryl and the BOA, and Tim and the BPA, are the advocates for the very good things that are there and available to learn from sport and through sport.

**Darryl Seibel:** If I may just pick up on that, it is a difficult balance to strike. In our view, without success on the international level, without success at the Olympic and Paralympic level, it is very difficult to have that broader discussion about adherence to Olympic values and why they are important in everyday lives, particularly for young people. We are very glad and grateful that entities like Sport England continue to invest in those governing bodies that may not be receiving funding from UK Sport, but have an opportunity, by virtue of the funding they receive from a body like Sport England, to develop participation at the grassroots level, a much broader base of participation, and in doing that also imbue the Olympic values. It is a difficult balance to strike.

**Q42 Lord Stoneham of Droxford:** Is there not a danger that, in time, there is going to be a competitive financial scramble between the elite countries on the Olympics? Take cricket, for example. We went and copied the Australians to improve our resources in cricket, so we can now beat them, but what is the implication for the Olympics and your work?

**Liz Nicholl:** Of course, when you are looking at Olympic and Paralympic success, it is an international business now and it is an incredibly competitive field. I would say that, in fact, the UK/GB brand, as a result of the Games, has increased incredibly and there is a huge amount of incoming traffic in terms of countries wanting to learn about what the UK has

done and how we have succeeded. At the end of the day, on the international perspective, we have learned from the Australians; the Japanese are trying to learn from us, because they are hopeful to have Tokyo. That is just part of the business.

**Lord Stoneham of Droxford:** We just have to keep ahead of them.

**Liz Nicholl:** Absolutely, in every respect. When we do have visitors in, of course, we give them certain amounts of information, but there are certain things that we do not reveal. That is where the research and innovation work that we do and invest in through the institutes is a really important part of keeping ahead of the field.

**Darryl Seibel:** You are absolutely right: the very act of having an athlete advance to the podium in the Olympic Games, and certainly this is true in the Paralympic Games, is more challenging today than it has ever been. Countries will continue to pour unprecedented resources into supporting their Olympic athletes, notably China, but certainly other countries as well that have the wherewithal to do that and have decided that their image globally will be shaped, to a degree, by the performance of their athletes on this great international stage. It also has significant implications for how they view themselves as a country domestically. There is a risk of an arms race. It is about striking the right balance. It is remarkable that the system here has produced at such a high level. It says something to the fact that the balance has been largely right.

**Lord Stoneham of Droxford:** Can I just ask one more? What are you going to do when we start getting a very expensive market in coaches, like football? How are you going to cope with the pressure of all our good coaches going to work for other countries?

**Liz Nicholl:** We worried whether, post London, we would lose a lot of coaches to the international opposition. The feedback I have been hearing is that, in fact, not only are we a well resourced system here, but we are very ambitious and we still have a huge amount of

opportunity to further develop our world-class programmes. We are not perfect yet; there is a lot still to be done and we are ahead of the game in a number of ways.

For example, on talent, we have delivered at the top but we know the pathways are not as strong as they need to be. We know we are not as sophisticated in terms of identification and development as we need to be. There are two things that we do. Firstly, we work with the professionals across the sport. We bring them together to learn from each other, so they have professional development opportunities here that are going to help them achieve success through our system and I think they value that.

Also, we are putting a lot of resource into developing the next generation of our head coaches. We do still have some coaches who come in from overseas to support our programme, but the aim now is that they are the master coach and they have an apprentice coach within the sport. We are actually putting a lot of money into elite coach development so that, in fact, we are learning those lessons from individuals. If they do go or we lose people, we have the next group coming through.

**Darryl Seibel:** If I may add, there is one other factor that, from our perspective, is very important in the attraction and retention of coaches. Here, at the risk of sparing his blushes, I pay great tribute to Lord Moynihan. That is the commitment in this system to clean competition and the fact that, if you are a coach, whether you are a British coach, an American coach or a coach from any country, and you think about where you would like to work and where your reputation has the best opportunity to be enhanced, it is in a system like this, where there is an unwavering commitment to competing clean and absolutely zero tolerance for doping. It is right to recognise the work that Lord Moynihan and others have done. It is a very different element of our system here.

**Tim Hollingsworth:** Just to continue to put a perspective on what is the same story and coming from a slightly different take, the issue for us is not yet there in quite the same way

because, relative to the rest of the world, our resources and our capacity are still very strong. As I mentioned earlier, we have finished in the top three in the medal table since Sydney, so our position in the medal table has been one of being at the top end. By comparison, for example, in Beijing, the top three nations only won 30-plus gold medals. In London, four years later, the top six nations won 30-plus gold medals. We can see a great uplift at the top end of Paralympic sport.

Our enormous challenge now is to make sure that we retain that position with the resources that are so vital coming in from UK Sport and the Lottery in particular. Coaching is a particular example of that because, actually, for the first time, there are other nations that are able to attract Paralympic coaches of international standing. We have seen a couple of our key team leaders move overseas after London 2012 but, as Liz said, we have been able to replace them with people from within the system. It is an interesting development. Paralympic sport has not really had to consider that factor before London, but now it is very much on the agenda too.

**Q43 Lord Faulkner of Worcester:** A very quick question: can I just take you back to what you said about swimming a little while ago? Am I right in thinking that there are still very high levels of funding finding their way to swimming, not in the Paralympics, but for Olympic swimming? That is so, is it not?

**Liz Nicholl:** Yes. As I said, we are putting one-year funding in, at this point in time, so there is no promise from next April, but we will be reviewing that this December. They had a reduction on their London cycle, but they still have significant medal potential in that sport. Our aim is always to invest in their future potential. We have to reflect on their past performances; we have to leverage change, where it is needed, but we have to invest in their future potential. Our ambitions for Rio are significant and we need every sport to come to the table there.

**Lord Faulkner of Worcester:** If I understand what you are saying about your no-compromise approach then, would it be fair to say that there are no compromises generally, but swimming is excepted from that?

**Liz Nicholl:** The no-compromise approach is about supporting the athletes with the potential to deliver at the next Games, and that is exactly what we are doing. The reduction in funding was to tighten this up to make sure that the sport is taking a long hard look at what it is doing, before it tries to grow its system and get the system right, in support of those athletes, to enable them and their coaches to realise their full potential in Rio. The no-compromise approach applies equally, but it is about the right resources for the right athletes in the right sports.

**Q44 The Chairman:** Just before we move on, I would like to hear from the BOA and the British Paralympic Association as to whether they feel that the current mechanisms for delivering financial support are appropriate and effective. We will assume that UK Sport does.

**Tim Hollingsworth:** Unquestionably, the belief in the no-compromise approach, the consistent application of that and the increasingly meritocratic approach across both Olympic and Paralympic sport have led to the outcome that we saw in London. Certainly from both an Olympic and my perspective, a Paralympic perspective, the ability to point to a systematic approach to medal success is absolutely there, so I would say that that consistent application has been a very important factor for us, and yes; we do support that.

Darryl put it very well. What medals can then develop and deliver on a broader canvas is an essential part of our agenda, but we need those medals in the first place to inspire to create the role models, and particularly to attract the attention of the British public in Paralympic sport. Therefore, supporting a medals' focus at the elite end is a necessary part of that, and we do. The issue is making sure that the pathway is better joined up, so that those sports

not necessarily being funded for medal success at the next Games have the resources elsewhere in the system to start to develop those athletes for the future.

**Darryl Seibel:** This is a philosophy and approach that has created a framework through which or in which Team GB has moved from 36 in the medal table, in Atlanta 1996, to what we all witnessed a year ago—third in the medal table here at home. No country has experienced that type of progression in the Olympic medal table over such a short period of time and, reflecting back on my earlier comment, done so with an unwavering commitment to clean competition. It is undeniable that this approach has helped create a framework for that type of meteoric rise.

There are difficult decisions that UK Sport must make. We understand why a governing body that is not receiving funding for programmes at the elite level would not be happy about that. We are grateful that those governing bodies still have access to funding, through bodies like Sport England, and believe that does give them an opportunity to broaden their base of participation. It is ultimately through a broad base of participation that athletes matriculate through a system and can perform on the international level. It is a difficult discussion, though, I am sure.

**Q45 Lord Stoneham of Droxford:** Can we just turn to the reality of failure? Obviously we have talked about sports that have lost their funding, and I just wonder if you can talk a bit about those sports, how you make those decisions that their potential was not there, if we concentrate on that, and how they win back the potential to grow again.

**Liz Nicholl:** The sports that we are not funding at this point in time are handball, indoor volleyball, sitting volleyball, wrestling and table tennis. Each of them is very different. Handball and indoor volleyball, with our support, put together their business case and interrogated their potential for 2016 and 2020. Both of them concluded that, in fact, they would not have medal potential until 2024 at the very earliest and there are no guarantees

of that. There is no chance that they would qualify for Rio, and these are sports that have had seven years' funding. If we were to fund for another 12 years, that would be 19 years of funding and no likelihood of a medal at the end of the day. It is a very competitive field internationally, and those sports enjoyed the opportunity to compete in London. They had not actually competed, certainly in recent years, at an Olympic Games before. That was a fantastic opportunity and platform to profile their sport.

Those sports are now using that profile that they had over the period of the Games to increase interest and participation. They are using the resources they have on a home nation level to look at their competition opportunities. Some of the athletes are in placement in overseas teams. In some countries, there are professional leagues. On an annual basis, we invite all the sports that we are not funding to come back and have a discussion with us each autumn, so that each December we can review their potential again. Neither of those sports is likely to be funded in this cycle through that route. They are unlikely to be able to make that progression that quickly, within this cycle, because of their 2024 potential. We keep in touch with them; we talk to them.

Table tennis is different because it is an individual sport. We have some talented athletes, but those athletes are in the top-100 world ranking and the gap to podium is significant. We know that those athletes are competing in international leagues and they are being well supported, so there is the potential for them to be developed to come through and improve their performances in that international league competition that they are enjoying now. There may be a point in time over the cycle when, in fact, there are one or two athletes in table tennis we could pick up, and we would want to if there was medal potential.

The ability for Paralympic sports to make good progress from limited medal potential to possible medal potential is probably a faster trajectory than the Olympic sports. We know that from before. We would always want to look at sitting volleyball over this next cycle,

and I understand they are using their Sport England funding well to try to further develop that case to us.

We do not have a recent history in wrestling. It is complicated, because there were nationality challenges as well, with some individuals who had come over from a different country who eventually did get British passports. We are keeping an eye on it. There are two named athletes we are keeping an eye on, who do have the potential for us to give consideration to that. I am sure that wrestling will be coming back to us this autumn, giving us an update on how those athletes have been doing. That is the route: we do not take our eye off the radar with any of these sports because, to be fair, we want them to succeed. We want them to be able to present that case to say, “We are up there. We have some medal potential,” and we will support them.

**Q46 Lord Addington:** When we are talking about the relationship with the grassroots and your base, it is clearly one that is important. Do you think of how that could be improved? It would seem to be that, from what you are saying, unless you have a cultural base, it is much more difficult to succeed. I am just wondering about that complicated relationship and the way we have it set up, with you dealing with the elite end and needing that base even to identify talent to go into a development programme. How do you think that has curtailed the ability to come up or does it not actually allow growth in certain ways? I wonder if you could have a few words about that, because the two are clearly related.

**Liz Nicholl:** Yes, they absolutely are. There are two things I would say. The first is that we need world-class systems at every level—schools, communities, within sports and talent bubbling up through to elite performance. The talent pathway starts right at grassroots. That relationship is critical, and UK Sport is structured in a way that has each of the home nations’ sports councils on our board. That relationship between us and the home countries’ sports councils is very strong. Our strategies are agreed by the chairs of the

home countries' sports councils in membership of our board, so there is real connectivity there and we are working harder at making sure that connectivity is not just butting up, but it is also reaching down as well. That is our commitment and we are doing a lot on that, in terms of our strategic step-up for this year.

We also have to challenge the sports to do the same thing, and the sports realise that they have not quite got that right. Part of our investment is putting in talent pathway managers with a responsibility to reach down into the home nations to support talent development. The participation base and the competition structure nationally will drive up performance levels and that is how you create your future success. The relationship is critical; the focus is different. The agendas are different and the mechanisms, tactics and strategies you would use to increase participation are very different from the focus that we have, as an organisation, about the tactics and strategies to improve performance. Inevitably, the culture of organisations will differ because of the strategies that you have to apply.

I think it can be better, and all of us across the UK believe it can be even stronger, which is the exciting thing about it. We did fantastically in London but, if we really got this together and really worked even better together, and the connectivity was powerful, then we could be more successful.

**Baroness Billingham:** Are you relaxed that the Government's present strategy for grassroots sport in primary schools is the one that you would approve of?

**Liz Nicholl:** I do not think it is appropriate for me to speak explicitly about the detail of that, but I would say that people who succeed in sport have actually enjoyed the opportunity for good physical education through the school pathway and then the community development opportunity to develop that talent through clubs and school-club links. It is absolutely critical that we get that right, and there is some really good work going on. That

must not be put at risk. If we believe in success and we value that, then we have to be thinking about the whole pathway and getting it right all the way through.

**Q47 Lord Addington:** We created teams for the London Olympics. We went out and we recruited very tall people to be volleyball players, etc. Do you, with hindsight, think that that actually was the best way to go about it? I suppose we might have said, “If we haven’t got a good enough handball team”—and let’s face it, how many people had to Google “handball” when they first heard about it to find out what it was? Do you think that might have been a step too far, because it did not have any cultural reference in this country?

**Liz Nicholl:** First of all, we had a commitment to Government that we would invest in and support every Olympic and Paralympic sport for the unique opportunity to compete at a home Games. There was a commitment from us all to make sure that, in fact, when Team GB and Paralympic GB athletes did perform, they performed creditably on behalf of the nation.

What you describe there is a talent initiative that was not just for the likes of handball and volleyball. In fact, some of the Sporting Giants talent campaign provided medallists in rowing. This is where we challenged the sports, right across the board, about how they identify talent. Generally, they identify talent through their competition pathways. If you succeed in competitions, you are identified and you go to the next level. We were trying to broaden horizons to say, “There are other ways out there of identifying talent.” We had the opportunity, because of our position as an organisation, to promote campaigns that attracted individuals in, using the lure of London 2012, to say, “Do you have these physical attributes? Would you like to be tested for the opportunity to be identified as an athlete who could potentially make it?” The sports chose whether or not to come with us on that journey. Of course, you identify an athlete and you have to put them back into the sport.

The sport has to then develop them. In general, it was a great success and it is something we will do more of. We have learned a lot from it and will do more of that.

**Darryl Seibel:** Part of the answer to that very important question will not be known for another four, eight or twelve years, which is to say: how are those governing bodies able to take advantage of the unique spotlight and platform afforded by competing in a home Olympic Games, in some cases for the first time in decades, to convert that into increased interest and participation at the grassroots level, and, ultimately over time, allow the base to grow and the talent level to grow?

**Lord Addington:** When would we start to get a realistic idea about that level of success? Some will have succeeded and some will not. What would you actually say is a timeframe to getting some idea about that?

**Liz Nicholl:** We are constantly monitoring that. We know how many athletes we tested, for example. We know only a very small number of those went through to be part of world-class programmes. We know a few of those went on to become medallists, not least Helen Glover in rowing. We will monitor that on an annual basis and we would be happy to provide further information about what that looks like.

**Tim Hollingsworth:** I would just make the observation that it was a tactical intervention in a very strategic landscape. London did provide the opportunity, uniquely, to be a shop window for all our sports, both Olympic and Paralympic. In the Paralympic context, that was a crucial part of the story and the narrative that emerged. You mentioned not many people knew handball; I would wager that fewer knew goalball, for example, as a sport. Actually, if you are visually impaired, it is the key team sport available to you. There was an opportunity for people to be made aware of that sport and the opportunity that it provides, particularly for women; it is actually the only sport that women can play as a team sport, if they are visually impaired, within the Paralympic context. To not have that opportunity

taken at every level would have been a big miss for London 2012, and I am strongly supportive of it.

**Q48 The Chairman:** Just before we move on, can I just clarify the role of the BOA in this process, in terms of their selection policy? As I understand it, the BOA selects, leads and manages Team GB at an Olympic Games. Where does the BOA fit into this, in terms of their selection approach?

**Darryl Seibel:** In terms of selecting athletes to the team, you are absolutely right as to the role and remit of the BOA. Athletes are nominated by their national governing body to the BOA for formal selection and acceptance to the team. It is a process that involves both the national governing body and the BOA, but the formal act of selecting an athlete to Team GB is administered by the British Olympic Association.

**The Chairman:** Is it just a formal act? Do you simply receive a recommendation? I assume it is rather more than that.

**Darryl Seibel:** We rely heavily on the national governing bodies to direct performance within their sports. We do not employ a team of 50 coaches that work in athletics to develop track athletes, so it is not entirely a formality, but it is largely a decision taken by a national governing body to nominate that athlete to the BOA. There are criteria that we measure against to make certain that athlete is eligible, anti-doping requirements, that they have met the appropriate international standards and all of that, but it is a decision made first by the national governing body, in accordance with selection procedures that we approve.

**Baroness King of Bow:** Is there ever any controversy?

**Darryl Seibel:** Yes.

**Tim Hollingsworth:** Indeed, what was fascinating for London in that context, for both organisations, was a further development where host nation slots were made available to athletes who otherwise would normally not be able to qualify for the Games. Therefore,

you did absolutely have to have a criterion for what you believe credible performance would be in that context. I would argue a lesson from London that has been learned, certainly for Rio, from our perspective, is an understanding of what our qualification selection principles should be to find that balance between the opportunity for every athlete who has the capability to go to a Games, but not to pick a team that actually is not credible in wearing a British tracksuit and representing their nation in the Paralympics.

**Baroness King of Bow:** What are the BOA's criteria for selection then? Is there any difference?

**Darryl Seibel:** There is, and thank you for the question. Perhaps this gets more to the point of your question. Every sport is governed to a degree by an international federation that will determine the qualification standard by which an athlete from any country is eligible to compete in an Olympic Games. We, the BOA, work with every one of the governing bodies to assess that international standard and then set our own standard which, in almost every case, is higher and more rigorous than the international standard, in part because there is a significant investment of public funds in British sport, but also because, particularly at a home Games, the imperative around delivering a credible performance that could in fact be a catalyst to stimulate increased participation was absolutely critical. We do work with each of the governing bodies to review selection criteria, to assess the international standard and, in almost every case, set a higher bar than that, because we know we are capable of achieving that.

**The Chairman:** It almost feels like we have had two separate answers to that. You started off by implying that, actually, BOA did not need to be involved at all, because it was almost a rubber-stamping process. You are now telling us that, actually, you listen to what is being said by the sport's governing body and then you set a higher bar.

**Darryl Seibel:** In conjunction with the governing body, indeed. My first response was with respect to the actual process of selecting Athlete A and nominating Athlete A. That is done by the national governing body, but it is done in accordance with standards that we have agreed.

**The Chairman:** To clarify it in my own mind, it would be quite useful just to have a note explaining that, because I am left slightly fuzzy as to how that works. We must move on.

**Q49 Earl of Arran:** We have already touched upon this point, but it is a fact that, if one is a host nation, it would appear from percentage terms that one does very much better than if one is not a host nation—I think I saw the figure of 54% somewhere. Probably it was much higher in our case; I do not know. In our particular case, does this apply to all across-the-board sports or does it apply to certain types of sports?

**Liz Nicholl:** It is very difficult to identify exactly what the home advantage is. Anybody who was in a stadium during the Olympic and Paralympic Games probably felt the inspiration of being in front of a home crowd, and my personal belief is that some of our fourths converted to thirds, and some of our seconds converted to firsts, because of that huge support from the public. There is a view that, in fact, when you have a home event, championship or major games, then it seems to be beneficial to judged sports or the environmental sports. Those are sports like sailing, equestrian, boxing and gymnastics. Of course, there is no hard evidence for that at all, but we have done some research at UK Sport about uplift in home country performances at various major championships, and there is about a 20% uplift in performance across about 75% of home nations, but you can never say it is because it is here.

If you look at London, it was not because it was in London but, because it was in London, we had an additional resource. Because we had an additional resource, we would be able to apply that really effectively, so there are a lot of factors involved in that. The greatest thing

about the home Games is it brought the nation together like never before. It brought the sporting system together like never before, behind a shared goal for success.

**Darryl Seibel:** There is an undeniable benefit to having the opportunity to compete at home. As Liz says, whether it is in a world championship or an event like the Olympic or Paralympic Games, there is an undeniable benefit. As a percentage, it is more pronounced in the Winter Games than in the Summer Games, because the field of play for most summer sports is relatively fixed. 400m is 400m is 400m. You see much more variation in winter sport around the field of play, so a home nation will see a bigger uplift or a bigger benefit from that, but undeniably there is a benefit to competing at home. It is part of why you bid.

**Q50 Lord Best:** This is about sponsorship. I know that the BOA had to hold back because this was a home Games and LOCOG had to be given a clear run, so there are implications for the BOA there. First of all, in terms of UK Sport, having the home Games did bring in, did it not, a lot of extra sponsorship? How will you replicate that when it is not people like Visa? Was that £18 million from Visa?

**Liz Nicholl:** I should explain that that is not UK Sport. UK Sport owns very limited rights itself, as a public body. Our targets for generating sponsorship income over a four-year period might be £1.2 million, and some of that might be partnership value in kind from British Aerospace. We are not big in that world at all, but we want the sports to actually be successful and we want the BOA and the BPA to be successful. We certainly do not want to confuse the marketplace either by looking at that collectively, because the collective perspective is there from the BOA and BPA, and then the sports themselves have generated some significant sponsors on the back of the high profile that the London Games provided them in the lead-up to the Games. Clearly some of them have some renewal and some of them have some challenges now post Games.

**Darryl Seibel:** You are absolutely right that, when a city earns the honour of hosting the Games, it is a requirement that the national Olympic committee in that country, in our case the British Olympic Association, must enter into a joint marketing agreement with the Games' organising committee. Through that, effectively, all of the national Olympic committee's commercial rights are assigned to the Games' organising committee. This is a requirement of the International Olympic Committee; you are not able to host the Games unless, as a national Olympic committee, you are willing to enter into such an agreement.

In that seven-year period from when you are awarded the Games to when the Games are staged, the national Olympic committee is effectively out of the market as a commercial entity; those rights having been assigned to the Games' organising committee. The reason the IOC requires this, in part, is that they do not want to have two entities that are of Olympic pedigree, in the same market, competing against one another. That model may work perfectly well if you are a national Olympic committee that is entirely or principally funded by your Government. It is a challenging model if you are a national Olympic committee, as we are, that relies, if not entirely, principally on generating your own revenue from private sources. There will be a change leadership at the IOC this autumn. I suspect that issue, because it has implications in a greater sense for the IOC, is something they will look at going forward: is that the right model?

**Lord Best:** Have you recovered from the fact that you were not in a position to pick up the sponsorship you would normally expect?

**Darryl Seibel:** We are recovering. We are very pleased to have secured now three corporate partners, who are with us through the journey to Rio 2016, two of which have been announced. There is interest in other categories but, as many of our governing bodies would point out as well, it is a very difficult corporate sponsorship environment.

**Tim Hollingsworth:** If I can add to that, I would completely recognise the environment that Darryl has painted and, indeed, the uniqueness of the joint marketing agreement, which the British Paralympic Organisation was also asked to be a signatory to and to hand over the rights to the Paralympic movement. I guess it was a symptom of where we were, relative to the BOA, in our journey that, by 2005, actually there was some great solidity around being part of the joint marketing agreement, because we did not give over those rights without any income in return. That gave us as an organisation the chance to plan with perhaps a good deal more solidity and better to create relationships with the 40-plus sponsors that LOCOG took on board, which enabled us, both into the Games, to fundraise against that and to provide additional revenues and now, out of the Games, to create unique relationships with them in a commercial context. I have to say that, from a Paralympics perspective, it is a slightly different take on the same story. It has actually been quite a beneficial arrangement for us in the state of growth that we are at, relative to the Olympic movement.

**Lord Best:** Good, but the overall picture is that, this time round, sponsorship was bound to be higher for the home Games, and that will be more difficult for all of you for the collective effort next time round, will it not? Is that going to impact on availability of resources for Rio and beyond?

**Darryl Seibel:** Our approach to generating revenue from a British Olympic Association perspective is a blended approach, where we rely upon corporate sponsorship and private donors, who have been very generous in supporting our efforts. Our challenge over the next four years is significant. You are right: there is less available; there is less on offer. The offer for a corporate sponsor over the preceding four years was not just Team GB rights through the BOA; it was not just Paralympics GB rights through the BPA, but the larger opportunity associated with the domestic Games. That has now gone, so we have had to

reassess the value of our rights and take those to market now. It is a challenging environment.

**Tim Hollingsworth:** There is one element to our environment that is worth pointing to, which is all about the message that commercial partners are receiving. The Paralympic movement is rather newer to them. They have not necessarily exploited it—for want of a better word—in the way that they had perhaps the Olympic movement. Consequently, we are finding there is an opportunity in commercial terms for Paralympic sport. We actually have five announced partners out of London 2012, with some more to come as well. That is not to make a comparative point, but to show the relative interest that is there for the Paralympics, outside of the Olympics. Our commercial revenues into Rio will actually be greater than the amount that the joint marketing agreement provided for us in London.

**Q51 Lord Stoneham of Droxford:** Can we just turn to the legacy of the training and competition facilities from the Olympics, and also comment on what that means for the capacity and the skills of our training and coaching facilities?

**Liz Nicholl:** Shall we start with the competition facilities? Clearly, some fantastic competition facilities are now available in the Olympic Park, and the sports are working with us on the bidding for hosting major events, right throughout the UK, over the period we are now planning, going on until 2019. We are targeting over 70 major championships to come to the UK, not all to London to the Olympic Park, right throughout the UK. Some of those will be in the Olympic Park. It really adds to the portfolio of possible world-class venues and, of course, it is an attraction to international federations when they are making a decision about which host nation to support when a European swimming championships or a hockey championships could come to this country and athletes have a chance to come back to the Olympic venue. We are working very hard with the sports on that, and part of our decision making about which events we support, in bidding and hosting, is about legacy use

of facilities. It is also about performance benefits, economic benefits and the opportunity to increase engagement in sport and participation.

In terms of the training venues, what we saw in the period leading up to the Games was more of an investment in some significant training venues that sports are located at—world-class programmes are located at. If I think about the national centres, Bisham Abbey and Lilleshall, there were really beneficial upgrades there that our team could use for preparation. They also hosted some of the visiting countries as well, but they are now much more world-class than they were before. There have also been upgrades in Manchester, Loughborough and Bath, and those are key sites for our world-class programmes.

Yes, there is a legacy and there is an ongoing commitment to looking in detail at what the sports are telling us that they still need to improve in their elite sport training environment. We do not have a capital budget at UK Sport, but we work with partners to try to leverage those decisions to support that further development. It is looking good: there is definitely a legacy out there for the world-class performance system.

**Earl of Arran:** Forgive me; you may have answered this question before. In very simple English, are we losing top-class coaches and trainers because we cannot afford them?

**Liz Nicholl:** No, not in the Olympic and Paralympic movement.

**Earl of Arran:** We are paying top world fees.

**Liz Nicholl:** The sports have the resource to pay what it takes. We do not set limits on the salaries, because this is an international market. There is no indication that we are not able to attract and recruit the very best. There is a lot of interest out there. People want to come into this very successful system.

**Q52 Baroness King of Bow:** Over 50% of our medals at Beijing and London went to athletes who were educated in the independent sector. That would be fine, except that sector only covers 7% of British school kids, so the vast majority of British kids are outside

that talent pool. In terms of legacy, what can you do to provide legacy for state kids in areas like three-day eventing, dressage and sailing, areas that cost a lot of money?

**Liz Nicholl:** First of all, I should say we support 1,400 athletes on our world-class programmes, Olympic and Paralympic. 80% of those, when we last did a survey, went only to state schools, so there is a huge amount of support going to talented athletes from the state sector. At the end of the day, the opportunity is there for talented athletes from the state sector. At the end of the day, the opportunity is there for talented athletes from all walks of life.

There are some great examples. If you take a sport like rowing, it is really reaching out now to communities. The campaign we talked about earlier was not a campaign targeted at public schools; it was a campaign targeted at the general public, looking for athletes with the physical attributes that could make them of interest to the sport. There is a lot more work now going on, thanks to the work that is done by the home country sports councils, their participatory programmes and their talent programmes, working with the sports, to actually broaden the perspective of our governing bodies to attract a much wider range of talent right across communities.

**Q53 Lord Wigley:** Perhaps I could concentrate particularly on Paralympic sport. If the Olympic Games themselves were successful, and they certainly were, the Paralympics were something really special. I would like to ask your perception of how the Games did change attitudes to Paralympic sport, amongst the media, sponsors and indeed the general public. Are there plans and resources in place to maximise that part of the legacy for Paralympic sport?

**Tim Hollingsworth:** Thank you, Lord Wigley. I will start, although I am sure others will have a perspective. The question you have asked hits upon probably the single biggest issue that has emerged for us as an organisation and indeed the Paralympic movement out of

London, which is not just how we sustain, coming out of London, the performance success of our athletes, but also how we try now to capture and sustain the much broader agenda that was introduced as a result of those performances in a wider society sense. There is no question but that it had a profound impact at every level of people, both disabled and non-disabled, over the course of the Games and coming out, in terms of attitudes. Disabled people, evidence suggests, felt much more emboldened than perhaps they had been before by what the Paralympics showed and the way that Channel 4 treated disability and some of the issues that were raised. Non-disabled people had their perceptions challenged in a way that we hoped would happen, but we could not necessarily have expected would happen in the way that it did.

The factors now are what we can do as a result of this stardust and the fantastic positive sense that the Paralympics have given to approach other aspects of society, in terms of disability and the lives of disabled people. Our ambition as an organisation is for our athletes to be a catalyst for that change, but not obviously to see that we have some responsibility for wider society. The best message I can leave is that nobody would believe that the job has, in any way, been done or completed, but the platform that London has provided for change is obvious. It is obvious for schools, with our athletes going back into the schools and the local communities in which they live. Their disability is a factor of their story, but it is actually about their success and about what they have achieved, and very often what they have achieved against what people might have perceived to be a greater level of hardship. Those stories are immensely powerful and are having a great impact in schools. The work collectively that we are doing with UK Sport and the Lottery to try to make athletes more aware of that—actually, they are pretty good at it—and go back into schools and communities is a very important point.

We are trying where we can to provide opportunities for more disabled people to be engaged with and to become aware of what sport is available to them. We have had two very successful events that we have called Sports Fests, held in different parts of the UK. Indeed we partnered with Disability Sport Wales for their own Spectacular, as they called it, last month as well, where we are using the excitement and the brand of the Paralympics and the presence of our athletes to inspire young disabled people, in particular, to come along, try a sport and have a go. We have all the sports in one place, with the opportunity to have a go and to try it, often for the first time, and then capture that hopefully and introduce them into it in a community context.

**Q54 Lord Wigley:** If there was one single thing that would make a difference to make sure that this was not a one-night wonder but something that does perpetuate, what would be the one single thing that you would want to see?

**Tim Hollingsworth:** To go back to what we have been speaking about previously, I believe that the continued success of our athletes on the field of play is the one single thing that will continue to deliver it, because it was the inspirational effect of that. Actually, the broader story of the Paralympics was that everyone is encountering the sport often for the first time. That was quite a factor. That will not necessarily be the case this time around, so it is even more important that our athletes on the field of play succeed, because they are the role models and they are the inspiration to what can then be wider societal change. I do not think anyone thinks we are at the summit, but everyone feels in base camp that they can see the route up the mountain now. That is probably how it feels after London.

**Liz Nicholl:** I should add that the inspirational impact of the Paralympic Games was just enormous, even for those of us who have been involved with sport and with the Paralympic movement over years. That was just extraordinary. For the first time, the nation saw the

ability in these young athletes, as opposed to the disability. It has the potential to continue to change attitudes enormously.

One of the things we are doing now is that, when we came through the Games, the Government made an extraordinary commitment to give us Exchequer funding right through to 2017. In being given that additional resource, we were required—and it is a nice thing to be required to do—to activate the inspiration of the athletes more proactively, by requiring our athletes—all of them, Olympic and Paralympic, any funded athlete, 1,400 of them—to give five days of their time to going out into the local communities and inspiring the next generation through school and community sport. That visibility of the success that we all felt during the Games, we do not have to wait until the next Paralympic Games to feel in our local communities. We will see an increase in growth of this over the next four years, of athletes getting out there and modelling what is possible and inspiring local communities. That would be one thing.

The second thing is we have increased our investment in Paralympic sports by 43%. We are putting in £70 million over the next four years, so we know that the programmes can grow even more, that there are more potential athletes out there who could be future role models. We are all heading in the right direction. It will take a little bit of time for us to see the tangible impact, but we can all feel the potential.

**Lord Wigley:** I have one final point to you. You mentioned schools. If it is a challenge sometimes to get the resources and the teachers with the background to bring children on in schools in the generality, is that much more when you are talking in terms of disabled children? It is so easy to think of activities as opposed to sport, and to parking them in the library or something, rather than involving them. How may we overcome that?

**Tim Hollingsworth:** I will maybe answer one direct question there. You have hit upon a very specific issue that arose in the consideration that came out of people paying much more

attention to pathways and understanding of where future generations of disabled athletes will come from. As disabled children have been more integrated into mainstream schooling, the issue of how you then identify them for sport has become a different challenge to when perhaps they were in more specialist schools. It is one area where, to go back to the commercial point that was raised earlier, we have a programme now, instigated through our relationship with Sainsbury's. They are investing close to £1 million in specific disability inclusion training for PE teachers in mainstream schools, because it is a massive gap. PE teachers desire to involve disabled children but, quite often, they did not actually have the capability or the awareness of how to do it. To overcome that thing where, yes, disabled children are not included is a fundamental challenge that we are trying to address.

This scheme that is in place now is by no means going to be the answer to everything, but it is a very good example of how you can practically intervene, because of the new profile that the sport has got that a sponsor like Sainsbury's will commit resources to. We are targeting that 500,000 disabled children will have been impacted by this inclusion training over the next five years.

**Q55 Lord Addington:** Just one point about the success of the Paralympics rather took me by surprise. Were you surprised when you actually had people saying, "Wait a minute; not every disabled person is this fit, strong and healthy. Do not think this is a reason why I am a shirker if my benefits are cut," and things like that. I had heard little hints of that before, working in the disability field, but actually suddenly people got slightly frightened and worried about it—it made such a big impact. I just wondered if this had any effect on your movement or is it something that you basically ducked your heads down from? I do not know. It took me by surprise.

**Tim Hollingsworth:** We try not to duck our heads, but I do not think equally we can, as BPA, take it on, because it is an issue for society and an issue for those responsible for policy

within society, around wider disability issues. Where we have an obligation, however, is to a positive agenda. We have an obligation with our athletes to provide a positive agenda for, as Liz said, what is possible and for the fact that our athletes are principally wanting to be seen as exactly that: as people who are achieving in their chosen area of life. That is not to underplay in any way the fact that that is not necessarily the experience of every disabled person, and it is not, by any means, to suggest therefore that II days in London last year provided the panacea for all ills. That would be quite wrong. What we can do is provide a positive context for change to be considered and discussed, because what athletes have shown and what the Games showed was that we can, as a society, actually react very positively to issues of disability.

**Lord Addington:** The other side of that is have you actually done things like saying that, for instance, if you are as strong, as healthy and as fit as you can be in a wheelchair, you will have much less problem getting around than if you are somebody who has not taken exercise?

**Tim Hollingsworth:** We do not have an explicit agenda around that, but I certainly think there is an implicit point about what is possible, yes.

**Baroness Billingham:** You have partially answered the question that I had in my mind. We are very lucky in the House of Lords, because we have Baroness Tanni Grey-Thompson as one of our peers and colleagues. She regularly speaks and has enlightened us enormously.

**The Chairman:** She is also pretty dangerous if you get on the wrong side of her wheelchair.

**Baroness Billingham:** Absolutely, but she has done an enormous amount to put the spotlight on people with disability in sport. My worry is roughly the same as yours. For parents with children with disability, their hopes have been raised. They suddenly see an opportunity not to be shuffled off into the library, as somebody has mentioned, but actually

to be partaking in mainstream sports or, if needs be, into their own specialist areas. I want to know how you are persuading the Government to allow time within the curriculum. We have already talked about state schools. 94% of our kids are educated in state schools and, when we look at the future of physical education in state schools, I think it is bleak. I am just wondering how you are going to persuade the Government of the day, whoever they are, whichever coalition of whatever rainbow colour, that they are a priority.

**Tim Hollingsworth:** Obviously, we believe we have an opportunity, as every organisation does, to try to influence Government policy in that way. Our principal means of influence is through the demonstrable positive impact of the role models that our athletes have become. Talking, as you say, with Baroness Grey-Thompson, who has taken on a fantastic role in terms of leading thought in this area, in many ways, her view is absolutely right: that we should not only see it as being in terms of the sporting context that everyone enjoyed; it is also about the reality of life that everyone has on a day-to-day basis, not just in schools, but issues to do with physical accessibility in buildings and all the other issues that can relate to the everyday experience of a disabled person. We are engaged very closely with groups like the Paralympic Legacy Advisory Group within the Cabinet Office now. What we hope is that the agenda that the Paralympics has set can make some of that change possible, because people's consideration of it is much higher than it was previously. I do not think that it is possible and certainly would not advocate the BPA taking on a broader role. We are busy enough with our core role as it is, in taking the team to the Games, but we can inspire that agenda, and hopefully we will.

**Q56 Baroness King of Bow:** The Paralympics obviously transformed attitudes and helped remove some of the stigma around disability. A lot of that stigma remains around mental health and also those with special educational needs. I wonder if you could just clarify for us firstly what the Special Olympics do and why they receive no equal status with the

Paralympics. What can be done for those people who would take part in the Special Olympics? Why can they not have some of that gold dust that you were talking about?

**Tim Hollingsworth:** There is the opportunity in some sports for athletes with intellectual disability to be part of the Paralympic Games. That has been reintroduced in a small-scale way in London, having been taken out of the programme for unfortunate reasons to do with the veracity of the athletes competing some time ago. There is a programme, I think it is fair to say, to increase that across the movement. It is an area where there is a gap in terms of the depth of field of nations across the world actually being able to put competitors forward. Actually, the Special Olympics is helping to build that capacity, because it sits as an event and a movement at a level in performance terms that is below Paralympic standard generally. Obviously, there will be exceptions but, generally, that is where it sits, so it provides an opportunity for competitors with an intellectual disability to actually have an event to which they can go, compete and enjoy that element of that athletic career, but it is not at Paralympic standard, so the separation is quite a logical one in that sense.

**Q57 Lord Bates:** Given the long history of the relationship with injured armed service men and women, what part of the legacy for Paralympic sport involves that special relationship, through organisations like Headley Court, etc., building upon that to give a future and opportunity for people injured in the service of their country?

**Tim Hollingsworth:** It is a very important part of the future, just as it is a key part of the narrative of the past of the Paralympic movement from Stoke Mandeville onwards. It is right to put it into context. It may surprise, but only 3% of our team in London were wounded service personnel. It may increase and will increase as a result of what is going on and the programmes that are running through, as you say, Headley Court or indeed the Help for Heroes charity and their programmes. We have formally engaged with Help for Heroes, as the BPA. We have a memorandum of understanding between the two bodies to try to

make that systematic and actually allow for injured service men and women coming out of the armed forces, who see sport as a potential, first of all, tool for their rehabilitation and then possibly a career or a commitment for their future lives, so that is actually created for them in a much more systematic and effective way. There is a very important link-up with UK Sport there, in relation to then how certain of those athletes may actually get to the level where their talent can be spotted for Paralympic sport and move into programmes that are funded by UK Sport with the potential for medal success.

Absolutely, it is becoming systematically part of it. It is a really important relationship, and there is a cohort for both winter and summer sport, actually, because winter sport is quite attractive to quite a lot of service personnel, which will definitely develop in the future. I would caveat against thinking that that is going to become the story and the narrative of our future team. It is never going to be in terms of numbers, but also of course there is a range of impairment groups and disciplines in the Paralympics, which do not necessarily equate to an acquired injury. They could be congenital in the way that cerebral palsy is, for example. Absolutely, they will be a key part of the team going forward as well.

**Q58 Lord Bates:** My official question now. You have impressed us this morning by the way that you have worked together and been very joined up in your approach. I wanted to ask specifically what were the strengths and weaknesses of operating as a single organising committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Are there any impacts in the way that the three organisations worked together, in the light of your experience, for the future and for the legacy of the Games?

**Darryl Seibel:** Tim, do you want to come in on the single organising committee dimension, and then we can talk about how our organisations work together?

**Tim Hollingsworth:** I suspect you are asking the Paralympic Association, because actually it was a unique approach by LOCOG to integrate the Paralympics in the way that they did for

the organisation of the Games. From the outset, it was the LOCOG organising committee for both Olympic and Paralympic Games. Indeed, we benefited hugely from that approach in terms of the way that the organisation had the same person responsible for both the Olympics and the Paralympics for their area of specialism, be it transport or venues or whatever it was. The Games were not seen as separate in that way, but integrated.

That was unquestionably one of the reasons why we had the successful Paralympic Games that we did, whilst also recognising that they took the strategic decision to separately market the Games. That was a key factor as well, from the different TV broadcaster in Channel 4 to the BBC, which gave a unique focus to the Paralympics, because that was their interest, through to the different branding, the different approach to ticketing and the way that it was actually presented to the general public. If I sound universally positive about this aspect, it was because we have set a template. We should be very proud that we have set a template for future organising committees to realise that, actually, integrating the Paralympics in its delivery, but separating it in its presentation, is a very good model to take forward.

**Darryl Seibel:** If I may just add to that quickly, to Tim's point, that is a model you will see the International Olympic Committee insist future Games' organising committees embrace, which is to say a consistent level of expertise and professionalism in the delivery and staging of two very, very important events, but a slightly different approach to how those events are marketed and broadcast.

**Liz Nicholl:** I will just add that, from our perspective at UK Sport, we could see that in fact this was a much easier engagement for the sports. They did not have to have two sets of discussions with two different groups of people. Also, we were involved in supporting test events that were held prior to the Olympic and the Paralympic Games. Again, for engagement, it just made everything so much simpler. It minimised the distraction and the

challenges leading up to the Games, which will have all contributed to the ultimate success of the whole operation.

**Q59 Lord Addington:** The Games gave us a chance to increase our impact on the sporting world. I just wondered what the major benefits we have taken from that are and what levers we should be applying to make sure that the United Kingdom plc is getting the best out of this, in terms of sporting prestige, influence and approach.

**Liz Nicholl:** That is a really interesting question, and UK Sport as an agency is also involved in international development and international influencing work with the sports. We have provided the executive team behind the International Inspiration work, and so we have frontline teams working across more than 20 countries internationally, talking to ministries. I suppose it is UK's CSR really, reaching out and showing that we are not just about performance, but we do care about there being a healthy, thriving international sporting movement and sporting community. Our brand has increased incredibly and we are being asked to add value in broader ways now, whether about our performance expertise, our approach to governance within sports or our expertise in leadership that can help develop leaders in local communities.

The other side of the coin is the international influencing work, which we support our governing bodies with, which is about positioning us to have a greater voice at international federation level and, because of the success of London, individuals have greater credibility and the nation has greater credibility. What we are seeing now are more opportunities to have more people operating at significant decision-making level on governance structures within international federations. That is important, because that is where all the big decisions are made about the rules of sports and the Games. That is our way of also giving back to the international sporting environment, because it does affect us directly and it is in our interests to do so.

The other part of this is about tourism. Success in hosting major events will mean that we should be more successful in bringing more major events to the nation in future, at sport-specific world championship level, which has economic and tourism benefits. What we have noticed over recent years, through our partnership work with engineering experts in the UK, is that that innovation that has supported our sports to win those medals is also something that will reflect well on the nation. We are in a people business here and it is about expertise. That expertise is now available; it is respected and there are great opportunities for promoting the UK and our talent.

**Darryl Seibel:** A very specific example of that is a reflection not of the success of Team GB or Paralympics GB, but of the Games in a broader sense. The BOA is now in a position to work with suppliers, businesses that supply goods and services to either LOCOG or the ODA, to provide them with a licence that recognises the work they did in support of the successful planning and delivery of the Games, for the purposes of generating new business. That has never happened before coming out of a Games; no country has been in a position to provide its local businesses with an official designation upon which they can build marketing opportunities. Already, more than 600 companies that supplied goods and services, either to LOCOG or the ODA, have secured their licences and are in fact pitching and participating in tender offers for opportunities in Rio and other countries that are hosting major international events. That is a programme that we have been able to administer largely through the support of DCMS. It is very important as regards the business legacy of this great success.

**Lord Addington:** It is not totally unprecedented, because I remember when this started we got lots of Australian accents through. They were a part of it. What is required to keep that going for as long as possible, because presumably one day we will become out of date and old-fashioned? What is required to keep that going?

**Liz Nicholl:** It is further development. As I said earlier, in terms of our major event hosting, there are still many more major events to be delivering, developing more people with more skills.

**Lord Addington:** It is vulnerable. How big a knock could it take at the moment and still be viable?

**Liz Nicholl:** I am sorry; I am not sure I understand your question.

**Lord Addington:** What happens if we get something horribly wrong in the Rugby Union World Cup?

**Liz Nicholl:** It is vulnerable, absolutely. Anything that is so public on a world stage is very vulnerable. You are only as good as your last match in sport. There is a little bit of that in terms of the perception of the broader ability that we obviously have.

**Q60 Lord Faulkner of Worcester:** Do you think we should be trying really hard to get other great world sporting events in the UK?

**Liz Nicholl:** Yes. As I said, we at UK Sport have established a campaign called the Gold Event Series to provide “a stage to inspire”. That is the strapline and that is why we bring them to the UK. We are working across all the sports, and every Olympic, Paralympic and Commonwealth sport is invited to tell us what major events are on their radar that they would like to bring to the UK. Similar to our performance investment, we have a meritocratic approach to that as well. We evaluate the return on investment. Is it going to be really good for our performances? Is it going to be good for the economy? Is it going to be good for tourism? Will it attract a lot of spectators? Are we able to balance the budget here? Can we put on a great event?

We have a hit list of about 70 events that we are hoping to bring to the nation over the next six or seven years, and we have already secured about 23 of those. In fact, we actually have three major events happening next weekend. It is important for all those objectives. There

is a ranking system internationally, called the Global Sports Nation Index, and we are the fourth ranked nation on that Global Sports Nation Index, which has been done by independent researchers. We are in a good position to continue to attract major events to the nation.

**Lord Faulkner of Worcester:** How high up in your order of priorities is international football and how much do you work with FIFA, UEFA or the home associations of the UK?

**Liz Nicholl:** In terms of events?

**Lord Faulkner of Worcester:** Yes. For example, was UK Sport involved at all in the bid to get the FIFA World Cup here?

**Liz Nicholl:** Not at all, because we would call that a mega event, beyond our capacity, beyond our budgets.

**Lord Faulkner of Worcester:** There is major and mega.

**Liz Nicholl:** Exactly. That would have to be of governmental level. In football, for example, we do not put any money through the FA. We do not put any money through rugby.

**Lord Faulkner of Worcester:** Do you think you could have run the bid better than they did?

**Liz Nicholl:** I think we could have provided them some really good advice. There is a reputation to grow, again, there. That is important, but that would be one that is too big for us to be involved in, but with events like that we are always available. We have expertise and we are prepared to share expertise, but we would not invest in football, to be honest, because there is enough money in the sport and we have other priorities for the use of that investment.

**Lord Faulkner of Worcester:** How do you balance the national prestige that comes from staging a big international event against the objective of encouraging greater sports

participation? There may be some international events where you can get many more people to participate in a similar event here that do not attract major international attention.

**Liz Nicholl:** The way we approach the event assessment, as to whether it is significant, is through whether it has a performance impact and whether it has a participation impact. It does not have to be very high in all of those areas, so we could actually support an event for a sport that is predominantly about participation impact or general public engagement that might lead to participation. An example of that would be the ice skating world championship. We are only supporting two athletes, so it is not great in terms of having a performance impact, but crowd and public interest are significant in the sport of ice skating. That would be an example of a sport where the participation and engagement agenda drove the decision to provide support, as opposed to performance, and of course you have the economic and tourism benefits that also go with that, and they are valuable to the nation. We put about £5 million a year into our major events. Compare that to £350 million in performance over four years, so it is £20 million and £350 million. You can see the relative prioritisation within our organisation, but it is a high priority to get those events where we can, with that £5 million resource.

**Q61 The Chairman:** I am going to ask you to speculate. It was 64 years between the 1948 Olympics in London and the 2012 Olympics. We received evidence that told us that, following a string of three unsuccessful bids for other British cities to host the Olympic Games, it had to be London. Presumably part of what you are telling us is that you are building up the capacity to host international sporting events. When do you think the country can bid for another city in the United Kingdom to host the Olympic Games? I am looking really at the BOA.

**Darryl Seibel:** It will be some time. I hope we are all here when that happens. There are a multitude of factors, as you would appreciate. I will get to the point very quickly here, but

organisations such as the IOC and FIFA are now engaged in something of their own 21st-century space race, trying to see who can move into new markets and new territories with their marquee properties, as soon as possible. It will be very difficult. In my previous life, I worked on two unsuccessful bids from the United States. It will be very difficult for cities from Western Europe and North America to prevail strictly on merit, in bidding for the Olympic Games in the foreseeable future. There are a number of cities in parts of the world that have not had the benefit of hosting the Olympic Games or the World Cup, which are now preparing to do just that. Colleagues of mine in the United States who are looking very carefully at a bid for a US Games in 2024 know that will be a very tall order. They have not had the Summer Games since 1996, so the reality is we could be a generation away.

**Baroness Billingham:** Yesterday we had a demo out here. I nearly went to join them, the Brazilians. It was a very good demo. I have to say to you there is that factor. Here are the Brazilians: they have no health service, virtually no education and no infrastructure whatsoever. In the next five years, they are going to be hosting the World Cup and the Olympics. Now, come on; there is something wrong there, folks.

**The Chairman:** Was that rhetorical?

**Baroness Billingham:** Do you agree?

**Liz Nicholl:** It is a massive challenge.

**Q62 The Chairman:** On the principle of speculation, what level of performance do you expect at Rio 2016 and how confident are you that Team GB will become the first home nation to win more medals at a subsequent Olympic Games? You have been telling us about all your preparations and the investment. Let us have some numbers.

**Liz Nicholl:** Let me lead on that one. The first number is that we have invested £350 million and, for that amount of public investment—Exchequer and Lottery—there is the expectation of a very clear outcome. Our aspiration, our shared ambition, is that we

can build on the success in London, the ambition being to do what no host nation has done in recent history and that is win more Olympic and more Paralympic medals. Previous host nations have recently won more Olympic or more Paralympic. It is an ambitious goal; it is quite audacious. Clearly it is a different environment, a challenging environment for the Brazilians and for visiting countries as well.

We did not just pluck that out of the air. I mentioned earlier that we have business cases from each and every sport. At the start of every business case, the sport has to set out what its medal potential for Rio is, and what the worst-case and best-case scenarios are. We have got, for every Olympic and every Paralympic sport, a complete list of the worst and the best they could do. We know that doing better than London is well within that range, so it is possible. We cannot say it is guaranteed, but it is possible. It is the journey we are starting on and it is the ambition that will inspire us all to do everything we possibly can do to bring out the very best performances in London.

We will review those specific targets with sports on an annual basis, because things change. Athletes change; athletes retire; athletes get injured. We will review them on an annual basis and we will make them very public. We will confirm them and we will have discussions about that in 2016. Just prior to the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, we will confirm them, just as we did in London. They will be the sports' targets that they have agreed with us: what they are saying they will deliver, the worst-case scenario and best-case scenario. We will then set that final target for Rio. It is just to show that it is evidence-based and not something that has been plucked out of the air.

**Darryl Seibel:** I will just add to that very quickly. We are quite open about this with Liz and her team. We recognise this as an extremely challenging ambition. We are glad to be in a position to even consider something like that. As Liz said, no country has achieved at least

what, at a very early point in a four-year cycle, has been set out. We are glad to have the depth in our system to even have that discussion.

If I may, I have a very quick fact to share with you, referring to our friends in Australia and their experience, since Sydney 2000, and comparing that to our own trajectory. Since Sydney 2000, Team GB has nearly tripled its gold medal production, going from 11 to 29, and rising from ninth to third in the medals table. Australia, in that same period of time, has seen its gold medal production cut in half from 16 to 7, and has fallen from fourth to tenth in the medals table. We are in an enviable position in even being able to consider an aspiration or an ambition as lofty as that. We will be guided by UK Sport and the work they do with the national governing bodies to inform this as we get closer. The science will be more specific, of course, as we get closer. It is a challenging ambition.

**Tim Hollingsworth:** The relation to the Paralympic movement has been discussed over the course of this agenda. I completely concur with the view that, at this stage of the cycle, it would be quite wrong not to be ambitious. It would be quite wrong to be taking a step out of London and saying, “We do not think we can continue as a nation to improve.” Where we are in relation to the Paralympics are the growing pains of the sports that I alluded to earlier. The fact that so many more nations are becoming competitive at the top end means that even retaining where our position is will be a tremendous achievement for our athletes. At the same time, whilst we won more medals across more sports in London, we actually won fewer gold medals than we had at the Beijing Games, which is the ultimate measure for medal tables for the way that they are described. There is still room for improvement within the Paralympic movement in this country as well, in terms of where we go from London towards Rio. That is the shared ambition at this stage, without putting on a number, recognising that, for £350 million worth of public investment, as a taxpayer you want to see an income.

**Q63 The Chairman:** How well do you expect to do in the Winter Olympics next year?

**Darryl Seibel:** We are very optimistic. This is setting up to be the most competitive team we have ever taken to the Winter Games. There is a greater degree of variability around predicting performance there, because you are on a friction-less surface in most sports. Snow and ice, by definition, does not lend itself to accurate science, but we are seeing good work there. The depth across our winter sports is greater than it has ever been. This very well could be our strongest winter team ever.

**The Chairman:** Which sports do you expect to win medals in?

**Liz Nicholl:** In this last winter season, we won 10 world-level medals across Olympic and Paralympic sports. That included disability skiing, curling and bob skeleton. We are in a better place than we have been. We take the same approach to winter sports. A few months prior to the Winter Games, we will be announcing what the medal target is, but we are very optimistic. We know where we are now and it is in a better place than we have previously been. As Darryl said, it is a high-risk environment: all those slippery slopes.

**Darryl Seibel:** I would also note that it has been interesting to hear a number of our winter sport coaches and athletes reflect upon the impact London has had on them, in their preparation. We recognise that the London effect for athletes at the top end of the system is not just summer athletes; our winter athletes in many ways have been motivated and inspired by what they saw a year ago as well.

**Earl of Arran:** In view of the appalling climate in this country, do we have sufficient indoor sporting facilities?

**Liz Nicholl:** To be honest, I am not well positioned to say if we have sufficient. I can have a personal opinion, but I have no data that I have access to about that. I am assuming that the Committee is taking evidence from Sport England, because some of the questions around participation, community impact and facilities are absolutely their domain.

**The Chairman:** We will certainly be returning to them. Can I thank you very much for your evidence today? It has been most helpful. Thank you very much indeed.