

**The Rt. Hon. Tessa Jowell MP**

House of Commons  
London  
SW1A 0AA

06/12/2011

Dear Tessa,

Many thanks for your letter of 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2011 and your continued support for the work of the Commission.

As you will know, the Commission is the independent body providing assurance over the sustainability of the London 2012 programme. We assure the governance arrangements, objectives, standards and processes of the delivery bodies. We assured LOCOG's procurement process and sustainable sourcing code during 2009 and published a report in January 2010. All of our reports are available on our website.

Your questions relate primarily to the procurement of the stadium wrap and the selection of Dow Chemical as the wrap supplier. The Commission does not have a formal role in the procurement process but our remit to investigate emerging issues allows us to conduct reviews of specific activities from time to time. In this case, we decided to investigate the procurement of Dow Chemical at the end of October, after the letter from Amnesty International to Lord Coe on 24th October 2011. Our work concerned LOCOG's procurement process and how it was applied when selecting a wrap supplier and not the IOC's action to appoint Dow Chemical as a worldwide partner on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2010.

These investigations are now complete. I am able to report that LOCOG has co-operated fully with our investigation. I can confirm that six companies submitted tenders for the wrap and we have seen the sustainability questions, responses and scoring. I can confirm that the Dow Chemical offer was the most sustainable both in terms of the product offered and the current stated corporate responsibility practices of the company. I can also confirm that LOCOG carried out its due diligence exercise with regard to reputation risk in relation to this procurement. At the time, when the bids were being considered in early 2011, LOCOG found no current media, political or NGO commentary that would give cause for concern. In this respect I can confirm that LOCOG followed its procedures, that the procurement process was sound and that the most sustainable solution was selected.

We have a continuous dialogue with LOCOG, its commercial partners and wider stakeholders and we will continue this dialogue in the run-up to the Games.

During the course of our stakeholder engagement related to this investigation, our attention was drawn to the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights published by the United Nations on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2011. We believe these principles may be worthy of consideration for future Olympiads.

With regard to your specific questions, I can respond below.

*You asked if the Commission can make publicly available the documents and representations we received in relation to Dow Chemical's commitment to sustainability in the 2012 Games.*

We are not empowered to publish commercially confidential documents related to LOCOG's arrangements with its partners. However, when we review emerging issues, our protocol in these matters is to ask for sight of the documents and to interview the LOCOG people responsible for the arrangements. In addition, we seek views from a wide range of informed stakeholders and Commissioners with specific expertise in this area. We have attached a list of stakeholders we engaged in this respect. The outcome of this investigation is detailed in the previous paragraph.

*You have asked if the Commissioners discussed Dow Chemical's link to the Bhopal tragedy and whether any decisions were taken.*

The issue of sponsors generally and Dow Chemical in particular was discussed in our Commission meeting of 28<sup>th</sup> July 2010, when Dow Chemical was appointed an IOC worldwide partner. At the time the wrap was not being considered for tender. It was agreed that we would meet these new partners as part of our approach to engage sponsors as and when their contribution to the sustainability of London 2012 became clear. We re-iterated the position that it is not the role of the Commission to comment on, or try to change the behaviour of corporate partners but we must concentrate our efforts on their contribution to a sustainable Games and legacy. We will address this subject further in our forthcoming annual review.

*You asked if we could make public any representations which challenged the information provided by Dow Chemical and their commitment to sustainability.*

The wrap announcement was published on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2011. We received no representation until after the Commission's interim statement was published on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2011. We were contacted by the Bhopal Medical Appeal on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 and provided with a written briefing.

*You asked if we will be making any further statement about whether Dow Chemical acts as an ambassador for the Olympic and Paralympic values.*

We will publish this letter to convey our thoughts on the matter. We have always maintained that it is not our role to pass judgement on the corporate behaviour of partners. However, we have heard strong views on all sides. We believe that the Olympic and Paralympic values can be better supported if all parties can move away from confrontational dialogue towards one of openness and reconciliation. London 2012 cannot resolve this problem but we believe that the application of the Olympic and Paralympic values can encourage a step in the right direction.

I have tried to answer your questions as fully as possible but I would be pleased to meet you to discuss any further questions you may have.

Yours sincerely



**Shaun McCarthy**  
**Chair**  
**Commission for a Sustainable London 2012**

**Table 1: CSL Meetings, Discussions and Representations**

Date	Meeting / Discussion / Representation
Multiple	Meetings with LOCOG
Multiple	Discussions with Wider Stakeholders
Multiple	Discussions with Commissioners
21.11.2011	Representation received from Bhopal Medical Appeal
30.11.2011	Meeting with Amnesty International
02.12.2011	Meeting with Dow Chemical