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Foreword

In our 2010 annual review we said “We have always maintained that, taken in isolation, delivering and Olympic and Paralympic Games is an inherently un-sustainable thing to do. We therefore cannot call the programme truly sustainable unless the inspirational power of the Games can be used to make a tangible, far reaching difference”.

We promised that we would gather together some key players after the Games in five facilitated sessions to try to evaluate the “Olympic effect” on more sustainable practices and what needs to be done to build on the good work or to deal with issues that London 2012 was unable to tackle fully. This report is the record of those sessions, their outcomes and recommendations.

In common with all the Commission’s work, this is not a “happy sheet” celebrating all that was glorious about London 2012. We promised we would deal with some of the more controversial issues after the Games and we have. During the course of our work we have received numerous representations from stakeholders concerned about the ethical behaviour of sponsors and abuses of human rights in the supply chain. We welcomed some of those stakeholders back along with the companies that were the cause of their concerns. Although some of our corporate partners responded well, many declined our invitation to attend. This is disappointing as the Commission believes that more can be achieved through constructive engagement than adversarial activity.

This report has faithfully documented the output from the groups. This is not necessarily the view of the Commission although many of our Commissioners took part. We will use the output of this report to inform our final piece of work “Making a Difference” to be published in March 2013.

I would like to thank everybody involved but in particular Andy and Mike from Change the Conversation who did an awesome job of facilitating some difficult sessions. I would also like to thank our keynote speakers; Sir John Armitt, Jackie Brock-Doyle and Rosie Boycott. I am particularly grateful to Dame Tessa Jowell, Michelle Lemaitre from the IOC and Raimundo Macedo from Rio 2016 for taking time out of their busy schedules to get involved.

The Commission closes in March 2013 so we won’t be around to see if the recommendations of this report will make a difference but I was inspired by the enthusiasm and energy in the room and remain confident that the world will be a slightly better place as a result of this work.

Shaun McCarthy
Chair of the Commission for a Sustainable London 2012
Summary

The Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 (CSL) is an independent body that monitors and assures the sustainability of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. As part of its remit for creating a sustainability legacy from the Games, it arranged a series of full-day round table discussions that were held in London during January 2012. Each of these was concerned with one of five sustainability issues that arose during the planning and delivery of the Games and were difficult to resolve or to achieve any real progress on at the time. These were:

- **Construction and Infrastructure** – The ODA has proved that sustainable construction can be done at a reasonable cost so why aren’t commissioning organisations asking for it?
- **Food** – Is it possible to replicate and improve on the London 2012 food vision objectives (to provide affordable, healthy and sustainably sourced food) for future major events?
- **Supply chain** – How can those that commission major events contribute to improving labour standards in the supply chain?
- **Volunteering** – How does the UK harness the appetite for volunteering for the benefit of sustainable communities?
- **Corporate Sponsorship** – What does the ethical framework for sponsoring major events look like?

The round tables generally involved 12-20 participants drawn from a diverse array of sectors and organisations: London 2012 delivery and legacy bodies, representatives of future host and candidate cities for the Games and other major events, corporate sponsors and partners of the Games, NGOs, construction and infrastructure companies and private sector suppliers to the Games, sports associations, volunteer organisations, academics, CSL staff and commissioners and more.

The objectives that the Commission established for the round tables were to:

- Identify the common ground that exists between the participants about the issues.
- Unlock new thinking, agreeing key recommendations for action that can be taken forward in future Olympic and Paralympic Games and more widely in the economy.

CSL commissioned Change The Conversation, a third party cultural change agency, to design and facilitate the round table discussions. This helped to create an environment in which constructive dialogue and interaction between the participants was the norm and also helped to ensure that the focus on meeting the objectives was maintained.

A few general themes emerged from the discussions in the five round tables.
One was that London 2012 really had achieved some major progress on several fronts as far as demonstrating the practicability of making sustainability a central requirement for the building and staging of the Games and other major events. There was a real desire among the participants to build on this progress and to make sure that the learning from it was not lost, either to future Games or to the economy as a whole.

Another theme was that, while in some cases progress in the future can be achieved by independent collective action among the stakeholders represented at the round tables, in others there is a vital role for Government to play both in demonstrating leadership on sustainability issues and by being willing to legislate where needed to create an unambiguous set of standards for industry to adhere to (for example, in relation to promoting the widespread adoption of sustainable construction methods).

There was also a view that the International Olympic Committee itself is in a unique position of potential influence to ensure that real progress can be made at future Games on issues such as the ethical standards that should apply to supply chains and the selection of corporate sponsors and partners. The message from these round tables was very much one of: “There is a real opportunity now to tackle these issues in a constructive way that includes all stakeholders – but leadership by and from the top is needed if that opportunity is to be exploited”.

The feeling among the participants at all the round tables was that they wanted to remain in contact and to have the opportunity for further constructive discussions with each other. There was also a recognition of the greater difficulty of convening such discussions once CSL ceases to exist at the end of March 2013.

Each round table produced several specific recommendations for action. These were as follows:

**Construction and Infrastructure**

- Create a virtual collaborative community between organisations such as WRAP, the UK Green Building Council, the Institute for Sustainability and others to help build the business case for sustainable construction and disseminate research, learning and best practice information more effectively.
- Use the research and learning about sustainable construction to codify what should be included in building and construction regulations and identify or create an accountable body to oversee this.
- Government should take a clearer role of leadership on this issue, for example by acting on the recent report issued by the Chief Construction Advisor and by ensuring that public sector procurement embodies sustainable construction principles.
A new accountable body should be created to take the learning from London 2012 and projects like Crossrail and disseminate it more widely within the industry.

**Food**

- Local authorities should require compliance with the ISO 20121 Standard for sustainable events, and reporting using the GRI event management supplement, as part of an annual audit for venues of a capacity of at least 2,000 people.
- Clear standards should be produced so that organisations in the food and catering industries know what is expected of them by event organisers, building on the Food Legacy Pledge and incorporating issues around food waste. A core group including organisations such as WRAP, the London Food Board, Sustain and others should be convened to take this forward.
- The original members of the team that developed the London 2012 Food Vision should continue to be convened (possibly by the Mayor of London) to drive the Vision and Food Legacy Pledge forward so that it becomes widely adopted in everyday life.
- The Food Legacy pledge and the mechanism by which organisations can sign up to it should be continued and promoted.
- Sustainable, healthy food should be provided on school menus and should feature in the national curriculum.

**Supply Chains**

- Factory lists should be disclosed once event organisers and supplier brands have finalised their supplier contracts.
- Organising Committees should be encouraged to prefer local suppliers.
- The IOC should set minimum labour standards by building them into the bidding process for future host cities.
- The IOC should create a shared service to assure compliance and develop supply chain relationships and complaints mechanism.

**Volunteering**

- Build on existing structures to establish an effective national “dating agency” for volunteering matching people with the right volunteering opportunities.
- Corporates and voluntary bodies should do more to seek out each other’s expertise – an Employers Forum on Volunteering should be created.
- Create a Code of Conduct for organisations that use volunteers.
Corporate Sponsorship

- Identifying **constituents** to develop the ethical sponsorship framework and institutional **drivers** for the framework
- conducting **research, gap analysis and engage stakeholders** to provide the **evidence baseline** for the development of this global ethical sponsorship framework, a group and process possibly funded/coordinated through the IOC
- committing to a **continuance of a participatory process** engaged in developing the ethical framework, which should align with and celebrate Olympic values characterised by an engagement framework of incentives/penalties
- The establishment of an independent body to take forward the development of a framework (looking across all aspects of Olympics and Paralympics, not solely corporate sponsorship)
Introduction

Sustainability and the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games

The Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 (CSL) is an independent body that monitors and assures the sustainability of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. When London bid to host the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games it promised to have independent monitoring of the sustainability of the programme. The Commission was set up in January 2007 to fulfil this promise. It is the first time such a Commission has ever been established.

The Commission monitored the sustainability plans, objectives and progress of the organisations responsible for building and delivering the London 2012 Games (the Key Stakeholders). The results of this work have been published in a series of reports which are available on the Commission’s website, most recently the post-Games report “London 2012- From Vision to Reality”. Overall, as the latter concludes, London succeeded in delivering the most sustainable Games ever. This was reflected in many ways:

- The high sustainability standards achieved in the construction of the Olympic venues
- The successful creation of Stratford as a major public transport hub and the extent to which public transport was used to access the Olympic venues
- The use of combined cooling, heat and power and black water recycling, which ensured that energy and water were not only conserved, they were supplied from more sustainable sources.
- The creation of Europe’s biggest new urban green space for 150 years as part of the development of the Olympic Park.
- The setting and, for the most part, achievement of ambitious standards for the provision of healthy, fresh, sustainably sourced food that would suit all cultures, tastes and budgets.
- London 2012 was the first summer Games to declare a target of zero waste to landfill with 70% re-used, recycled or composted. Typical events achieve 15%.
- A sustainable sourcing code for suppliers that was particularly effective in the case of achieving timber supplies for the Games from sustainable sources

Beyond 2012: The Round Table Discussions

However, a number of important sustainability issues arose during the planning and delivery of the Games that were difficult to resolve or to achieve any real progress on at the time. The Commission felt that these issues should receive proper attention now that the Games are finished and before it finishes its work in March 2013.

It decided, therefore to arrange a series of five round table discussions to take place in January 2013, one on each of the issues concerned and with themes that were based on some carefully constructed questions. These were:
Construction and Infrastructure – The ODA has proved that sustainable construction can be done at a reasonable cost so why aren’t commissioning organisations asking for it?

Food – Is it possible to replicate and improve on the London 2012 food vision objectives (to provide affordable, healthy and sustainably sourced food) for future major events?

Supply chain – How can those that commission major events contribute to improving labour standards in the supply chain?

Volunteering – How does the UK harness the appetite for volunteering for the benefit of sustainable communities?

Corporate Sponsorship – What does the ethical framework for sponsoring major events look like?

The objectives that the Commission established for the round tables were to:

- Identify the common ground that exists between the participants about the issues. This is not the same as seeking consensus: it is important to identify areas of disagreement and to allow them to exist, even as areas of agreement are being highlighted. The intention is that the common ground that is established will provide a platform for the participants to...

- ...Unlock new thinking, agreeing key recommendations for action that can be taken forward in future Olympic and Paralympic Games and more widely in the economy. The Commission is very keen to ensure that, wherever possible, the experience, expertise and diverse outlooks of the main stakeholders in sustainability issues are turned into practical learning and action for change.

A diverse group of participants was invited to the round tables, ranging from supplier companies, Games sponsors, NGOs, government and Olympic officials and sports and community associations to representatives of Rio 2016 and future candidate cities. To encourage open, honest and constructive dialogue between them, the Commission decided to stage the events under Chatham House rules i.e. that participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed. In this report, this has been adhered to with the exception of the keynote speakers for each round table, whose identity is disclosed along with a summary of the content of their remarks.

The Commission appointed Change The Conversation (CTC) as delivery partners for the round tables. Their role was to design and facilitate the events and to co-ordinate the pre-event communications with the invitees.
Design of the Round Table Discussions

Each of the round table discussions was structured according to a specific template that was designed by CTC to help the participants do three things:

- Become aware of their collective starting point as a group at the beginning of the discussions. What views, experiences and background were they bringing to the event and what were they hoping to get from it?
- Explore different perspectives on the round table’s theme so as to build understanding and a sense of common ground between themselves
- Develop specific recommendations for action that should be implemented to help address the sustainability issues covered in the round tables.

The round tables involved various exercises and activities, including modelling using Lego Serious Play™. The design and the exercises concerned are described in more detail in Chapter 6 on Methodology.
Construction and Infrastructure

“The ODA has proved that sustainable construction can be done at a reasonable cost so why aren’t commissioning organisations asking for it?”
Organisations represented

Autoridade Pública Olímpica
Keynote speaker
Sir John Armitt (former Chair, London Olympic Development Authority)

Participants
A wide range of participants were invited to this round table. The main sectors and types of organisations invited were as shown below. The first figure in parentheses after each category shows the number of organisations who were invited and the second figure shows the number who attended):

- Major construction and infrastructure companies (6, 3)
- London 2012 delivery and legacy organisations (2, 2)
- House builders and housing trusts (14, 2)
- Representatives of Rio 2016 and other future host cities and candidate cities for the Olympics and of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) (6, 1)
- Key UK government departments (2, 0)
- Architects, design companies and professional bodies in these industries and in construction (5, 2)
- Advisory bodies with an interest in “green infrastructure” (2, 1)
- CSL staff and commissioners

In the end, 18 people attended the round table.

Keynote speech
Sir John Armitt set the context for the day’s discussion by explaining how the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games came to succeed in achieving a far more sustainable approach to the construction of the venues and infrastructure than previous Olympic Games had managed. He saw the key factors as being:

- The political pressure and commitment from Government to make London the “greenest Olympic Games ever” - even if the practical interpretation of this was not absolutely clear at the beginning.
- The creation of the Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 at the start of 2007 to provide assurance of the sustainability of the building and delivery of the Games – the first time such a body had ever been created as part of an Olympic Games.
- The right culture and “behaviours” in key organisations – and in particular the personal commitment by the leadership of the London 2012 Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) to the principles of sustainable construction from the very outset.
- The development by the ODA of a manageable number of specific targets for sustainability, covering everything from the percentage of recycled
construction materials that were to be used in building the venues to the carbon footprint, energy and water use and waste management of the construction process.

- Making sure that the contractors knew that they would be measured against these targets from the start of the bidding process and publishing the results of these measurements so that the process was transparent.

Looking to the future and to the issue of how the sustainable construction legacy of London 2012 might be secured, he expressed a personal view that having clear standards backed up where necessary by legislation was essential. Most contractors, he felt, would always be primarily responsive to the demands placed on them by their clients rather than working to sustainability standards of their own accord – and if the clients are not asking for buildings or infrastructure that meet the highest standards of sustainability then they won’t be adhered to unless there are agreed standards backed by legislation.

The Discussion
The discussion began with the group being asked what they felt were the biggest issues relating to the day’s theme. Some of the most commonly used words in the group’s individual responses included ‘business case’ ‘leadership’ and ‘cost’, and the main themes to emerge from the discussion were as follows:

Making the business case for sustainable construction
Some of the participants felt that, while the ODA had done a great deal during London 2012 to demonstrate what could be achieved in getting the Olympic and Paralympic venues and infrastructure built sustainably, there was insufficient evidence available in readily accessible forms that would make the business case for adopting such an approach in general.

Leadership and culture in the construction sector
It was felt by several people that another issue is the lack of real leadership within the construction industry about issues of sustainability. The culture in many companies, it was felt, is still more traditional in nature, focusing on minimising costs and meeting the needs of existing customers more than on making “green construction” methods the norm. In the absence of this, except in a few companies, some participants echoed Sir John Armitt’s view that standards and legislation might be needed to ensure that the latter happened.

Education and training
Another view that was expressed was about the need for more education and training about sustainable construction methods, so that the knowledge and learning gained during London 2012 could be better disseminated across the industry.
Some other points that were discussed during the perspectives exercise included the practical difficulties of balancing the many competing demands that are placed upon construction and infrastructure projects by the planning system, by clients, by finance and the need to make a profit, by pressure groups and campaigners etc. This is compounded, from the developer’s viewpoint, by the fact that local authority planning seems often to be more a matter of aiming for the lowest common denominator rather than anything very visionary by way of long term goals and objectives. Some participants also felt that planning is subject to cycles of “architectural fashion”, so that no matter how innovative a development scheme might be from a sustainability viewpoint, it would be unlikely to gain consent if it did not fit with the current fashion.

There was also mention of the some of the other “voices” in this debate that might have difficulty at the moment in getting a fair hearing. These include people working in green technologies and construction methods and also our grandchildren – who might either look back on London 2012 as a turning point in the battle against climate change or alternatively as an occasion when we had an opportunity to do something in the wake of the Games and instead did nothing.
Recommendations For Action
The group produced numerous recommendations for how the learning from London 2012 about sustainable construction and infrastructure could be more widely promoted and adopted. The group then ranked these 18 possible recommendations into their perceived overall importance. On the basis of this vote and the ensuing discussion, four recommendations were chosen for further discussion and development by sub-groups. The outcomes are described below.

Fig 2. Recommendations For Action – Construction and Infrastructure

RECOMMENDATION 1
The “House of Enlightenment”

This idea is about creating what would be primarily a virtual collaborative community between existing key organisations in the field such as WRAP, the UK Green Building Council, the Institute for Sustainability and others. The aim would be for this community to:

- Agree on the priorities for taking the case for sustainable construction forward more widely in the economy
- Commission new research from universities or other appropriate bodies, especially where this will help to build the business case for sustainable construction methods
Build channels for actively disseminating learning, research and best practice information more effectively than the member organisations have been able to do so far on their own.

It was felt that this collaboration needed to happen now, most likely at the behest of the construction industry (clients, contractors and consultants included) itself rather than by expecting government to sponsor or to fund it. Funding might come from some sort of levy on industry members; but in any event it was not seen as being a large organisation or necessarily requiring very large amounts of finance.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

**Regulation to Define Outcomes Rather Than Process**

This idea is about using the research and learning disseminated by the “House of Enlightenment” to codify what should be included in building and construction regulations, based on a review of existing regulations. It was felt that this too was an initiative that should happen immediately, to maintain the momentum created by London 2012.

After a consultation process involving the key stakeholders, an accountable body would need to be identified (or created) to oversee this process, with sponsorship from the relevant government department and enforcement being the job of local authorities.

**RECOMMENDATION 3**

**Leadership and Accountability**

This recommendation addresses the perceived current lack of leadership from government on this issue. (For example, a number of the participants noted that the Government’s Chief Construction Advisor recently produced a report on sustainable construction; but its recommendations have yet to be acted upon.) Public sector procurement should really lead the way, they felt, as a catalyst for the more widespread adoption of sustainable construction principles and practice.

As with the other recommendations, there was a sense among the sub-group working on this that it should happen soon and certainly within the term of the current government. In order to bring that about, they saw a need for lobbying of government by the construction industry and, prior to that, for lobbying of the construction companies by industry bodies, private sector clients and others involved in sustainability and construction.
RECOMMENDATION 4
Creation of a New Accountable Body

This idea was that there should be a new accountable body created as soon as possible to take the learning from London 2012 and projects like Crossrail and make sure that it was disseminated widely within the industry. As with some of the other sub-groups, it was felt that to have credibility this body should have Cabinet-level sponsorship within government but also some senior members from the industry too.

Funding for the body could possibly come from government but it was felt that a more likely route would be for it to be a form of public-private partnership with membership by subscription.
Chapter 2

Food

“Is it possible to replicate and improve on the London 2012 food vision objectives (to provide affordable, healthy and sustainably sourced food) for future major events?”
Organisations represented

Fairtrade
Food Standards Agency
London Sustainability Exchange (LSx)
Red Tractor
London Wildlife Trust
Wrap
Keynote speaker
Rosie Boycott (Chair, London Food Board)

Participants
A wide range of participants were invited to this round table. The main sectors and types of organisations invited were as shown below. The first figure in parentheses after each category shows the number of organisations who were invited and the second figure shows the number who attended:

- Major catering and food and drink companies (5,0)
- London 2012 delivery and legacy organisations (2,1)
- Charities and other NGOs active in food, fair trade and environmental campaigning and standards assurance (9,5)
- Representatives of Rio 2016 and other future host cities and candidate cities for the Olympics and of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) (7,1)
- Local government and government advisory bodies with an interest in food (3,3)
- CSL 2012 staff and commissioners

A total of 14 people took part in this round table on the day.

Keynote speech
In describing the experience of London 2012 with food provision, Rosie Boycott started by mentioning the clear commitment made by the Government from the outset to making the Games the “greenest Games ever”. There was a real desire to improve substantially on the food experience at the Beijing Olympics in 2008, which was widely seen as offering very little choice and being of not very high quality.

A key step was the establishment in 2008 of the Food Advisory Group for the Olympic Games, a body which included the London Food Board, catering consultancy the Russell Partnership, major food industry companies such as Coca-Cola, McDonalds and Cadbury along with organisations such as Sustain. The idea was that by collaboration between the many different organisations and sectors of the food industry involved, the London Olympics could become a turning point in the provision of healthy, affordable, sustainably sourced food in society at large by gearing up the farming, food manufacturing and catering industries to deliver this at a much bigger scale than before both during and after the Games.

She explained that while London 2012 had not been 100% successful in achieving this goal, some important progress had been made. Visitors to the Olympic and Paralympic venues had been pleasantly surprised at the range and
quality of food on offer and at the fact that it wasn’t simply a choice between one or other major fast food outlet. The London Food Vision enabled much more demanding standards of animal welfare, Fairtrade sourcing, waste reduction and local sourcing of food to be achieved than at any previous Olympics and the Food Legacy Pledge offers a good platform for these standards to be built upon by signatory organisations going forward. The challenge is to keep these issues in the public eye and to make sure that pressure is maintained on event organisers and on the food industry to ensure that the gains made during London 2012 are not lost.

The Discussion
In the initial Remerge question and answer session, the participants were asked: where is the debate about affordable, healthy sustainable food today? Some of the most commonly used words or sentiments in the group’s individual responses included ‘waste’ ‘cost’ and ‘lack of awareness.

The issues of food waste was in the forefront of many participants’ minds because of the publication the previous day of a report by the Institute of Mechanical Engineers suggesting that nearly half the world’s food production ends up being thrown away. The general mood of the room was one of a tension between knowing the real progress that had been made during London 2012 and realising the challenges involved in keeping the issues of food sustainability, health and affordability high on the public agenda going forward.

A second question ("What question would you ask the group?") amplified the joint concerns among the participants about, on the one hand, retaining an aspirational vision for the future and on the other wanting to focus on practical, realistic steps that can be taken now to help move things forward. Various responses to this question were recorded but the question receiving most consensus in terms of its importance was ‘what is currently being delivered that could be shared for use more widely?’

As the discussion developed during the Perspectives exercise and the Lego SP modelling, a number of other points and themes emerged:

- London 2012 visitors found it confusing in some cases to know what there were and were not allowed to bring into venues (e.g. their own picnics), a situation not helped by the failure of LOCOG to get some of the Live Sites to adopt the same policy as the Olympic and Paralympic venues.

- Mass catering as an industry is highly complex and it is hard for the public to have a full appreciation of what can and cannot be done within the constraints it operates under.

- The importance of integrating small food growers and suppliers into the supply chain effectively so that they can compete with large producers.
As food producers and food processing businesses grow over time, they have to contend with different standards relating to food manufacture and retailing, with issues about the potential additional cost of producing food to those standards, with the question of whether that might harm or enhance their competitive position in the industry and so on.

In seeking to develop and promote something like the London Food Vision more widely, it is important to recognise that it has to be adaptable to local circumstances. For example, the food industry in Brazil is structured very differently to that in the UK, with a much greater preponderance of small local growers and cooperatives and far fewer big food manufacturers and restaurant chains. It would be inappropriate, therefore, to seek to apply exactly the same food vision standards to Rio 2016 as to London 2012.

A champion (or champions) is needed to act as a public figurehead in arguing the case for the widespread adoption of the Food Vision standards. This is a role that Rosie Boycott would be ideally suited to in a UK context. Major events such as the Olympics and other flagship sporting events can serve as useful catalysts for highlighting issues about healthy and sustainable food and for improving practice but the aim has to be beyond these events and to having an impact on people’s everyday lives. Regulation is unlikely to achieve that but a sustained public campaign offers a better way forward.

Education about food and healthy eating has an important role to play in continuing to develop the public’s awareness of these issues. London 2012 could have done a bit better in communicating with visitors to the Olympics and Paralympics about the Food Vision and its practical impact on the catering provided at the Games.

**Recommendations For Action**

The participants produced quite a long list of recommendations for action in this area. The group then ranked these 17 possible recommendations into their perceived overall importance. On the basis of this vote and the ensuing discussion, five recommendations were chosen for further discussion and development by sub-groups. The outcomes are described below.

The group that they decided they wanted to choose five ideas for further development. These were as follows:

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

**Work Towards ISO 20121 Compliance**

This idea is that local authorities should require compliance with the ISO 20121 Standard for sustainable event management, and reporting using the GRI event management supplement, as part of an annual audit for venues of a capacity of at least 2,000 people, either as part of the environmental health or premises licensing processes.
As part of moving forward with this idea, it was proposed that the London 2012 Food Vision and Food Legacy Pledge should be promoted as a model of best practice and that local authorities should adopt it as the standard for their own premises and spaces. It was felt that the Mayor of London should continue to promote this. This should be done during financial year 2014/15 and ideally in time for adoption by the 2014 Commonwealth Games in Glasgow.

It was suggested that the provision of audit tools, perhaps by a third party service provider, and having ISO certification as a standard to achieve would help to drive the adoption of this proposal.

There was some uncertainty as to who should take ownership of this issue to ensure its successful uptake – the possible candidates mentioned were Sustain or the government or independent accreditation bodies.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

**Clear Standards, Commitments and Assurance**

This sub-group felt that there was a real need for clear standards to be agreed that organisations were going to be asked to sign up to, building on the Food Legacy Pledge and incorporating issues around food waste. They felt that bodies such as WRAP, Sustain and the London Food Board would provide a good “core group” to take this forward but that there would also need to be organisations included that had monitoring and assurance expertise. The core group should be kept reasonably small to begin with, so that the necessary review of current standards could be carried out fairly quickly.

The importance of also going beyond agreed standards and commitment to those to achievement was also emphasised.

**RECOMMENDATION 3**

**Stakeholder Coalition to Drive the Vision Forwards**

This recommendation was about getting the original members of the team who developed the Food Vision together to drive it forward so that it become adopted into everyday practice. This might be initiated by the Mayor of London convening a meeting that would review where sustainable food standards were before London 2012, where they are now and what had been achieved during the Games.

This meeting would also agree objectives and milestones for the future, setting out where we want to get to with the promotion of the Food Vision and Food Legacy Pledge in society. This sub-group felt that there might be a role for a celebrity champion, in helping to raise the profile of the project and to generate public awareness.
**RECOMMENDATION 4**

**Sustainable Food Pledge and Mechanism for Sign Up**

This sub-group focused on the need to continue to promote the Food Legacy Pledge and healthier catering commitment and for organisations to sign up to show their commitment to sustainable food standards. The existing scheme that is running for the hospitality industry was also mentioned as a possible model and as something that the pledge might be combined or aligned with.

Such a scheme would need to be promoted and the group felt that the Mayor of London and Rosie Boycott would be good people to enrol as champions at the outset. They also thought it would be good to engage the Scottish and Welsh governments. There was a feeling that this was an initiative that should be acted upon immediately, with a first step being a meeting between WRAP, Sustain and the London Food Board. The idea of having a group of high-profile ambassadors to talk about and promote the scheme to the wider public was discussed.

In addition to the core group of organisations mentioned above, those such as Red Tractor and Fairtrade and venue owners, event commissioners, catering companies etc should be included as an outer circle of members.

**RECOMMENDATION 5**

**Education**

This idea is about increasing the consumer demand for healthy and sustainably produced food by ensuring that it is on the menu in schools, by including these issues in the national curriculum and by providing practical tips on healthy eating etc so that people feel there are ways they can take action themselves. The importance of using the media to communicate the key messages about sustainable food, food waste etc was also emphasised.
Chapter 3

Supply Chains

“How can those that commission major events contribute to improving labour standards in the supply chain?”
Organisations represented

Fairtrade
Institute for Human Rights and Business
TUC
Keynote speaker
Shaun McCarthy (Chair, Commission for a Sustainable London 2012)

Participants
A wide range of participants were invited to this round table. The main sectors and types of organisations invited were:

- Olympics merchandise licensees and other suppliers (5,0)
- London 2012 delivery and legacy organisations (2,0)
- Charities, trade unions and other NGOs active in campaigning for workers rights and ethical labour standards in global supply chains (9,7)
- Representatives of Rio 2016 and other future host cities and candidate cities for the Olympics and of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) (7,1)
- Professional bodies in procurement and supply (1,0)
- Research bodies with an interest in business, society and supply chains: (3, 1)
- CSL 2012 staff and commissioners

A total of 14 people attended this round table.

Keynote Speech
Shaun McCarthy set the context for the day’s discussions by reviewing what LOCOG had achieved with respect to sustainable supply chains for London 2012. He pointed out that in most respects their approach had conformed to best practice:

- they set out their intentions at a very early stage by publishing a sustainable sourcing code
- they prioritised the impact of the sourcing code to particular parts of their supply chain
- they created an effective assurance framework to make sure that suppliers complied with the code

The real issue, however, was: did it work? The answer to that could only, in Shaun’s view, be “to an extent”. In many cases, the messages about labour rights and sustainable practice did not get down the supply chain to factory owners and managers as it should have. Getting disclosure of information about factory locations from the merchandise licensees and suppliers proved difficult, with the notable exceptions of Adidas. The requests for this information by LOCOG should also have been done much earlier in the process.

Overall, there is a lot of useful learning that has emerged from the experience of the ODA and LOCOG in building and staging London 2012. One important point is that both bodies are by their nature temporary; so there is no long-run buyer-supplier relationship through which a shared understanding of how to
Another issue is one of timing. The lead times involved in planning production runs for merchandise for events like an Olympic Games are such that discussions about making supply chains more ethical and sustainable need to happen as early as possible in the process.

The Discussion

The participants were asked about how they felt London 2012 had performed overall with respect to improving labour standards in the supply chain. An audit of the most common words expressed sentiments of ‘improvement’ but also highlighted ‘but still…’ ‘process’ and ‘implementation’.

These answers demonstrated a general feeling among the group that there had been something of a gap between the sourcing policy set out by LOCOG and how well it had been implemented. This echoed a point made by Shaun McCarthy in his keynote speech.

There was also a general desire to identify practical steps that would help make sure that labour rights were more effectively secured in the supply chains for future Olympic and Paralympic Games and other major sporting events. This was reflected in the top three answers to the question: “What question would you like to ask the group” which focussed on what action could be taken to make progress in this area.

During the perspectives exercise, some interesting points emerged. One was that, from the standpoint of a supplier, the “one-off” nature of bodies such as LOCOG makes the question of “what’s in it for me?” more important and more complex than in many other commercial situations. Issues of cost, compliance and the need to make money have to be weighed against the potential damage to brand and reputation if a company’s supply chains become the subject of controversy. There is no long term relationship with the supply chain or long term investment in more sustainable or ethical supply chains. Suppliers also have to deal with the potential problem of complying with multiple sets of rules (e.g. those prescribed by the Olympics, their own internal rules for each of the countries/regions in which they operate etc).

Another point that was made was that the sheer length and complexity of global supply chains now means that Olympic suppliers are often more in the position of being middle men than end suppliers. This makes it hard to apply standards drawn up in the context of a country like the UK to all parts of a long supply chain, many of which may be based in countries which have quite different cultural and legal standards and norms. However it was agreed that this was
precisely why international standards needed to be applied, and there is never an excuse for not meeting international core labour standards.

More than one participant noted that while suppliers were required by LOCOG to pay a living wage, the latter is a concept that is not always unambiguously defined. In some cases, suppliers felt able to rely on their own definition of what constituted a living wage in particular countries or labour markets even where these were at odds with what the NGOs or trade unions campaigning for better labour conditions calculated should be being paid. It should be noted that no suppliers attended these round tables so the counter-argument to this point was not presented.

Several people made the point that LOCOG’s grievance process was generally well regarded and had actually been used by at least one group of workers from a supplier’s factory in Asia in preference to the company’s own internal procedures as it was better trusted. This did also highlight again, however, the multiplicity of standards and processes which exist between event organiser s and commissioners, suppliers and their sub-contractors.

To dig a little deeper into exactly what caused the implementation of LOCOG’s sourcing code to have been so uneven in practice, the group were asked: what got in the way of implementation? Individuals’ responses to this question were focussed upon the need for designing a system with the end user in mind and also on issues to related to understanding, cost and complexity of the process. The role of the IOC and the need for the organisation to be better involved in supply chain issues around Olympic and Paralympic Games was also highlighted as important by participants.

**Recommendations for Action**

The group produced numerous recommendations related to supply chains, based on the learning from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. The group then ranked these 18 possible recommendations into their perceived overall importance. On the basis of this vote and the ensuing discussion, four recommendations were chosen for further discussion and development by sub-groups. The outcomes are described below.

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

**Disclosure of Factory Lists**

This idea was about working towards an ideal future situation in which there would be full disclosure for all supplied products of which factories they were manufactured in, with this information being made available on the internet.

The current reality is of course a very long way from this. So, to move forward, this sub-group felt that two aspects needed to be tackled. The first was to act to dispel
some of the myths about the consequences of disclosure and to show that there are substantial potential benefits to disclosure in the form of better brand image and reputation, among other things.

To do this, it was suggested that some of the relevant staff from London 2012 should get together with the organisers of future Olympics and other events and suppliers to share their experience and learning in an informal atmosphere. This has been done to an extent through the work LOCOG did with the Playfair Alliance to share learning.

The second was to ensure that factory lists should be disclosed once event organisers and supplier brands had finalised their supplier contracts, covering on a product by product basis the factory address and also the length of duration of the supplier contracts involved.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

Organising Committees should be encouraged to prefer local suppliers

This idea is about getting Olympic and Paralympic Games organising committees and the organisers of other major events to prefer local suppliers by including a statement to that effect into their sourcing code or even, if feasible, a percentage target for local supplies. The benefits of doing this are that it shortens the supply chain and focuses production on the local economy where labour standards are better understood, whilst also contributing to reducing the carbon footprint of the event.

This should be done by engaging now with the organising committees in countries currently bidding for future Olympics and Paralympics and other events to see what scope there is for making these kinds of provisions. This engagement could be done by the relevant stakeholders in the countries concerned: the business community, trades unions, NGOs etc.

It should be recognised however that some supply chains are necessarily global as demonstrated by LOCOG’s unsuccessful effort to procure pin badges locally and the procurement activity that concluded that the only company fully competent to deliver and distribute the volume of tickets required was based in the United States.

**RECOMMENDATION 3**

The IOC should set minimum labour standards by building them into the bidding process for future host cities

This idea was about the ability of the International Olympic Committee to move
things forward in a top down manner. It was suggested that it should build minimum labour standards for the supply chain into the bidding process for future Olympics and Paralympics, although it was also recognised that the earliest games this could be done for was 2024 as the bids for 2020 are already in and being evaluated. This could be achieved through the IOC working through an independent body and also potentially with the ILO.

It was also thought that similar influence might be brought on FIFA to do this for future World Cups by engaging the FA in the UK, who would have a more direct line of influence and communication to FIFA.

There might also be some scope for engaging with host cities prior to the 2024 Olympics by the people present at the round table staying in contact and using their own networks to try and take this idea forward through that route.

**RECOMMENDATION 4**

*That the IOC facilitate a shared service to assure compliance and develop supply chain relationships and complaints mechanism*

This idea is about engaging with the IOC to persuade it to facilitate or endorse a shared service that all future host cities could contribute to and use and benefit from as far as supply standards compliance and a complaints mechanism (including a mechanism to deal with any issues that might arise once individual OCOGs have ceased to exist) are concerned. This would reduce the costs and effort involved in each host city having to address these issues on a case by case basis.

To take this idea forward, a coalition of interested parties (those present at the round table, brands and supplier companies, future games organising committees, trades unions, NGOs etc) should prepare in the next six months a case for engagement with the IOC. A steering group could then be set up to look at the issues of governance, funding and process – but the work should start before the selection of the 2020 host city. It should be noted that, although the IOC were not present in this workshop due to travel commitments, they are keen to engage constructively around this issue.
Chapter 4

Volunteering

“How does the UK harness the appetite for volunteering for the benefit of sustainable communities?”
Organisations represented

Global Sustainability Institute (Anglia Ruskin University – volunteering)
London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC)
Voice 4 Change
**Keynote speaker**
Shaun McCarthy (Chair, Commission for a Sustainable London 2012))

**Participants**
A wide range of participants were invited to this round table. The main sectors and types of organisations invited were:

- National volunteering organisations and charities with volunteering schemes (12,3)
- London 2012 delivery and legacy organisations (4,2)
- Commercial organisations with community volunteering schemes (2,0)
- Representatives of Rio 2016 and other future host cities and candidate cities for the Olympics and of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) (7,0)
- Government agencies and departments (3,0)
- Academics with a research interest in volunteering issues (1,1)
- CSL 2012 staff and commissioners

Eleven participants were present at this round table.

**Keynote Speech**
In his keynote speech, Shaun McCarthy talked about the extraordinary enthusiasm that had been generated amongst the volunteers for the role that they played in helping London 2012 to be such a success; and the really positive connections that they developed with the athletes, officials, commercial operators and the members of the public with whom they came into contact. He described the question in many people’s minds as being “How do we bottle this spirit so that it can be spread elsewhere at other events and in the rest of society?”

At the same time, he offered a couple of cautionary observations. One is that London 2012 was in many respects an event and an experience that was “once in a lifetime”: few if any other opportunities for volunteering are likely to offer the same sense of involvement in something of such national and international importance and with such substantial resources of organisational expertise, training and funding to offer to potential volunteers.

He also posed the important question: where does volunteering end and unpaid labour start? This was mentioned in the context of one of the supplier companies to the Olympics who were also engaged to provide services at the Diamond Jubilee earlier in the summer. They were required to offer potential employees that they engaged for the Olympics a living wage for their work, which they did; but also said that if they were to be hired for the Olympics, they would be required to work as unpaid trainees at the Jubilee celebrations too. This kind of practice obviously needs to be resolved if volunteers aren’t to end up feeling like they are simply being exploited.
The discussion
The discussion with the group began by asking them the question: what made volunteering a success at London 2012?

The general view among the group was that there had been three main reasons for the success of volunteering at London 2012:

- The inspirational nature of the Olympic and Paralympic Games themselves – the values that they stand for and the positive aspects of humanity and human achievement that they showcase. The sense for the volunteers that they would be participating in a unique event.
- The organisational and financial resources that LOCOG were able to devote to recruiting, training and motivating the volunteers
- The recognition given by LOCOG and the public to the volunteers for the job they did, including at the closing ceremonies for both the Olympics and Paralympics.

When the discussion moved on to their ambitions for the round table itself, a different note emerged. The tone shifted to a more equivocal one: yes London 2012 had made a huge success of volunteering but now we are back in the “real world” of austerity with the Games already fading slowly into history, how do we motivate people to volunteer on a regular basis? The answers to the question “What question would you like to have answered by this group?” revealed this uncertainty quite clearly questioning what such a group could actually achieve, the steps needed to establish the widespread value of volunteering and investigating the reasons why people do or don’t volunteer and how best to engage those volunteers previously involved in London 2012.

Some other issues which came out of the perspectives exercise and the Lego SP modelling were:

- The confusion that the ordinary man and woman on the street might feel about volunteering – what opportunities are there? How do they get involved? How much of their time would it take – and over what period of time? Would they be able to get time off work or fit it in with child care arrangements? How could they fit it into already very busy lives? What would they get out of it anyway? Etc
- The potential role that blogging and other social media tools could play in keeping stories about the positive impact of volunteering on the lives of the both the volunteers and the people they work with in the spotlight. They can also provide a platform for volunteers to connect with each other and for people such as the London Olympics and Paralympics Games Makers to record their own experiences for others to share.
For the 70,000 London 2012 volunteers, there might be a real issue of "How do I top that experience?" and how to stay plugged in to the world of volunteering. LOCOG were unable to share the details of their volunteers with other volunteer bodies and charities so, for many of them, it might be hard to know how to take their enthusiasm for volunteering forward into other things.

For organisations that use or might use substantial numbers of volunteers there are still significant management and legal issues to be overcome eg safeguarding and the need for CRB checks, the transfer of legal responsibility for service provision in cases where local authority services are contracted out to voluntary organisations etc.

The group also took some time to consider the second part of the day’s theme, which refers to “sustainable communities” and to discuss what they felt that term meant. A range of elements that were considered to be important in a ‘sustainable community’ were highlighted in the discussion, including economic stability, resource efficiency, happiness, social cohesion, biodiversity, an active population, safety and a feeling of belonging and a respect for diversity.

This part of the discussion helped to set the context for volunteering as being something that can help to develop a sense of belonging to the place where you live, of the ability of everyone to make an independent contribution to their community and to engender positive community values such as tolerance, respect for others and an appreciation of the importance of environmental sustainability for how we live across all sectors of the community.

Recommendations for Action
As with the other round tables, the volunteering group produced a large number of recommendations for action and after further discussion among the group, the four that were chosen for further development were:

RECOMMENDATION 1
Build on existing structures to establish an effective national “dating agency” for volunteering matching people with the right volunteering opportunities

There are a number of online sites that list volunteering opportunities, matching potential volunteers to suitable opportunities. Nationally, the most notable scheme is Do-It and the group felt in establishing an effective national “dating agency” for volunteers and opportunities, existing services such as this should be developed or enhanced.

The group also recognised that any service would need to provide for quality and safety assurance as part of the matching process.
The group identified a number of key considerations in taking this recommendation forward:

- How might improvements or enhancements to existing ‘matching’ services be funded?
- Who should lead and take ownership of the development of this initiative? It was felt that it should naturally be led by a coalition of the major volunteering organisations in the UK such as the National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO), which now incorporates Volunteering England (VE) and VSO, but should also include the corporate and public sectors too.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

Corporates and voluntary bodies should do more to seek out each other’s expertise

To build closer ties between the corporate sector and volunteering, this idea was for the creation of an Employers Forum on Volunteering. In the first instance, this might be created as a partnership between blue chip companies with an active CSR programme and national bodies that manage or use large numbers of volunteers (NCVO/VE but also organisations like the National Trust, RNLI etc).

This dialogue and partnership could develop the accredited standard “Investing in Volunteers”, relating to the quality of outcomes for both the organisation concerned and also the community they are serving. This scheme could be further promoted by the institution of national volunteering awards, which could be funded by one of the corporate partners and hosted by the NCVO/VE. The programme could also be rolled out on a regional basis to match the regional nature of some large companies employment and CSR practice.

Funding for the standard might come from membership subscriptions from organisations (based on their ability to pay). The aim eventually would be for it to become an independent social enterprise.

It was pointed out in the discussion following the presentation of this idea that there are already a number of schemes in place on which this idea might seek to build.

---

1 NCVO and VE merged on 1st January 2013
**RECOMMENDATION 3**

Create a Code of Conduct for organisations that use volunteers

This idea was about creating a Code of Conduct that organisations could sign up for and which would be signified by a logo or badge that would confirm their membership of it. The Code would set out the responsibilities of both the organisation and the volunteer and would set out how the volunteers would be treated by the organisation.

It was felt that this was something that should be acted upon now, perhaps with the aim of having it up and running in time for the Commonwealth Games in 2014. The NCVO/VE should lead the project but it should also include the principal volunteering organisations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland as well. The first tasks should include doing more research on the standards that are already in existence, including the 3R Promise that emerged from the 2009 Volunteer Rights Enquiry.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:**

Undertake research to better understand the cost of volunteers and their needs

This idea is about gathering evidence to help counter some myths about volunteering, such as that volunteers are free labour to the beneficiary organisation. They are not: volunteers have to be recruited, trained and managed, all of which costs time and money.

The research might proceed by first of all developing a classification of the different types of volunteers and then constructing a sample data set covering each of the different types. A telephone survey might then gather data from participating organisations on their own experience of the costs of using volunteers.

This research should be undertaken prior to the next UK Government Comprehensive Spending Review, so that its results can be used in lobbying against the idea that might prevail in some policy making circles that the public provision of services can be cut because the voluntary sector will somehow magically make up the difference at no extra cost.

Volunteering England would be the most logical choice of a body to lead this work and to work with an appropriate group of academics in designing and carrying it out. Funding for it might perhaps come from some of the London 2012 sponsors and/or the Lottery legacy fund, although this would have to be investigated further.
Chapter 5

Corporate Sponsorship

“What does the ethical framework for sponsoring major events look like?”
Organisations represented

Cris/Royal Holloway
CCLA
Institute for Human Rights and Business
Kwittken
Gulf Coast Fund
Tar Sand Network
Keynote speaker
Jackie Brock-Doyle OBE (Director of Communications and Public Affairs at London 2012)

Participants
A wide range of participants were invited to this round table. The main sectors and types of organisations invited were:

- Olympics sponsors and corporate partners (18,1)
- Commercial sponsorship, PR and investment organisations (4,3)
- London 2012 delivery and legacy organisations (2,2)
- Senior UK national political figures who were involved in the delivery of London 2012 (1,1)
- NGOs active in campaigning against the social and environmental impact of certain Olympics corporate sponsors and partners (10,4)
- Representatives of Rio 2016 and other future host cities and candidate cities for the Olympics and of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) (7,1)
- UK national sporting bodies (3,0)
- Government agencies and departments (4,1)
- Academics with a research interest in business ethics (1,1)
- CSL staff and commissioners

This was the best attended of the round tables, with 21 people participating.

Key Note Speech
Jackie Brock-Doyle opened the day with a discussion of her experience in senior communication roles at both London 2012 and previously at the Sydney Olympic and Paralympic Games. She described how LOCOG had drawn on the experience of earlier Games and the subsequent evolution of the global sponsorship market to develop a process for selecting commercial partners for London 2012 that was “best in class”. She contrasted how many Australian companies had viewed the role of sponsoring the Games in Sydney in 2000 as being a matter of moral imperative (ie that this was an event that they should support to ensure that they were a success and that a positive image of Australia was conveyed to the world) with the prevailing attitude now – which is much more one of assessing sponsorship opportunities on a hard commercial basis and looking for what the return on investment is likely to be. The process developed for the London Games included setting out guidelines for sustainability and procurement and making a sub-group of the LOCOG management committee rather than just the commercial department, responsible for the selection process.
The total cost of staging the London Games was approximately £2 billion, with commercial sponsorship from 44 commercial partners making a significant contribution to this cost. This came partly in the form of cash contributions but, importantly, also in the form of value in kind (everything from air tickets to uniforms for volunteers and the Olympic torch relay). They also greatly extended the “reach” of LOCOG in promoting and marketing London 2012 to a global audience.

She explained that the relationship between organising committee and sponsor is very much that of a two-way partnership that is built over several years. This means that when a sponsor becomes involved in some form of disaster or controversy half way through the build up to an Olympic Games (as happened with BP and the Deepwater Horizon rig blow out in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010), the organising committee has a genuine dilemma to confront. Should they drop the company from its sponsorship role or continue to work with them in a constructive way? She suggested that there were no simple or general answers to such questions.

**The Discussion**

Given the theme for the day’s discussion and the very heated and polarised debate it had generated at different points during the build up to London 2012, it was always likely that there would be some strongly differing opinions in the room about it. To help give all these views an initial airing, the participants were first asked: What worked well with respect to corporate sponsorship at London 2012? And what worked less well?

The answers emphasise the many good things that sponsorship helped achieve at London 2012: not just raising cash but providing expertise to make sure the event happened on time, increasing the global marketing reach of the Games, making an attempt to link in with the values of the Olympic and Paralympic Games and even providing a globally-visible platform for opening a dialogue about the role and impact of corporations in society more widely.

In contrast, the answers to the question ‘what worked less well’ show the other side of the argument: the damage to some companies reputation and brands caused by highly controversial sponsorship roles, the accusations of “greenwash”, the lack of clarity about what terms like a “sustainable Olympics” really mean, the impact on the public of “brand policing” and so on.

With such a range of strongly differing views in the room, there were perhaps several participants who had some anxieties about whether a constructive dialogue might really be possible. However, when the group were asked: how do we need to work together today to achieve the objective?, their answers revealed an almost universal desire for working together positively. This really created a
platform for what turned out to be a day of really inspiring collaborative work by the group which in the end left many of them surprised and highly encouraged by what they had been able to achieve.

One of the main themes to emerge from the discussion during the perspectives exercise and, in particular, from what was a very rich and engaged Lego SP modelling session, was the absolute need for a clear ethical framework to guide both the selection of corporate sponsors by event organisers and to lay down what would be expected of them in that role. The joint models produced by the two sub-groups are shown in Fig. 3.

**Fig. 3 Lego SP joint models – Corporate Sponsorship**

There were two models explored which shared many similarities and some key differences. Some of the ideas about the features and characteristics the framework could have were:

- **Values** – simple, clear, internally consistent and based on a deep understanding of ethical priorities. There was a very strong plea for the framework to be a global process with global reach so that there was not continual reinventing of the wheel. There was also a lengthy discussion of the ethical value systems that might support such a framework – including whether it should be driven by values, rights, outcomes, process, or by care-based principles for example linked to the Olympic values. In addition, there was discussion about it incorporating or recognising existing standards and frameworks out there as a crucial first basis.

- **Ownership** – designed by a broad coalition of stakeholders – the IOC, Corporates, NGOs, athletes, event organisers and academics. The process by which it is developed should be absolutely transparent to all stakeholders.

- **Flexibility** – rigid to an extent but sufficiently flexible to allow for the likelihood of “difficult” external events happening during the life cycle of an Olympic Games without the framework collapsing.

- **Signing up and recognition** – Two models of an ethical framework were presented, one in which the emphasis would be on working constructively
with all (potential) sponsors and another where a line be drawn based on ethical criteria to exclude companies responsible for humanitarian or environmental disasters from being awarded sponsorship rights. Under both models, subject to differing views about whether all or only some sponsors could join, there could be different levels of achievement which companies could work towards, each of which would involve successively more stringent targets and standards of corporate behaviour and transparency. The framework would have sufficient positive recognition and status that organisations would be proud to sign up to it and to progress through the different levels. Dynamic – not be static but be based upon standards and goals for achievements that the members strive towards but which are always placed some way ahead of where current practice is so that might be viewed as a “stairway to heaven”.

- **Rewards and penalties** – a system of rewards and penalties to incentivise good corporate behaviour and some felt potentially to punish bad behaviour, perhaps by demoting an offending company. It was also felt that if there was a clearly articulated framework that had been created and which built on existing standards and had widespread support, then companies that failed to adhere to the framework would attract public opprobrium and that this would act as an incentive for them to behave well.

- **Independent oversight** – the system could have an independent body to enforce and police it

- **Crowd sourcing** – radically different model to sponsorship also featured in the discussion. This would involve unbundling sponsorship from money by requiring the cash contribution to the running costs of an Olympics that would have come from sponsorship to be raised instead from the global public by crowd-sourced funding. This would leave sponsorship to become about companies signing up for sponsor roles based purely on their behaviour (and the provision of value-in-kind). (It was pointed out that, while this idea was interesting, it would not gain the support of the IOC currently as it would leave the funding of the Games open to an unacceptable level of risk.)

**Recommendations for Action**

Out of this discussion emerged twelve recommendations for action, of which four were chosen by the group for further development. There was a strong theme among several of the recommendations that the IOC should be centrally involved in taking the issue of developing an ethical framework forward, simply because it is in a unique position of influence with its global corporate partners to be able to do so from one Olympic Games to the next. There was a greater degree of overlap between some of the recommendations than was the case in the other round tables for that reason.
The four priorities chosen were all centred upon the idea of the need for the creation of a transparent, inclusive and internally-coherent ethical framework to guide the selection and standards for sponsors of the Games and other major events. This was simply because this had emerged as the dominant theme of the day’s discussion and all four sub-groups chose to develop ideas relating to it. The four group’s recommendations to achieve a framework have been summarised as follows:

- **Identifying constituents** to develop the ethical sponsorship framework and institutional drivers for the framework
- **Conducting research, gap analysis and engage stakeholders** to provide the evidence baseline for the development of this global ethical sponsorship framework, a group and process possibly funded/coordinated through the IOC
- Committing to a continuance of a participatory process engaged in developing the ethical framework, which should align with and celebrate Olympic values characterised by an engagement framework of incentives/penalties
- The establishment of an independent body to take forward the development of a framework (looking across all aspects of Olympics and Paralympics, not solely corporate sponsorship)

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

**Identifying constituents to develop the ethical sponsorship framework and institutional drivers for the framework**

This idea was about the need to bring together a group of stakeholders who might work together to develop the main elements and objectives of an ethical framework to govern corporate sponsorship and to identify how the process might be implemented and driven in the longer term and by whom.

Among the first tasks would be convening a meeting within the first half of 2013 to include the round table participants and other interested parties, so that the learning from London 2012 can be captured fully. Such a meeting would need to review what the IOC can and cannot do in this area and would also need to identify an organisation (or partnership of organisations) that would take ownership of this issues after the CSL 2012 ceases to exist in March 2013.

The Institute of Human Rights and Business offered to take forward the coordination of this group once CSL has ended.
RECOMMENDATION 2

Conducting research, gap analysis and engage stakeholders to provide the evidence baseline for the development of this global ethical sponsorship framework, a group and process possibly funded/coordinated through the IOC

This idea is that for the framework to be developed, there is an underlying piece of work required to research existing frameworks, understand where current gaps exist and engage stakeholders over what is needed. Given that such a project requires time and resources, it was felt that it would need a process owner. The group felt that the IOC could take ownership of driving the creation of an ethical framework forward via this baseline research. To initiate the process, it was felt that CSL 2012 should make recommendations in its final “Making A Difference” report about the stakeholders that should be included and the intended scope of the work.

The IOC should convene a meeting of these stakeholders sometime between April and September 2013 to build on the momentum created at these round tables and should make use of Skype and other communications technologies to ensure that the stakeholder group is as representative and inclusive as possible. It was also felt that the IOC might approach other global commissioning bodies such as FIFA, FINA and the Commonwealth Games Federation to try to get them to join in the process of creating the framework and to adopt it for their own events.

RECOMMENDATION 3

A continuance of a participatory process engaged in developing the ethical framework, which should align with and celebrate Olympic values characterised by an engagement framework of incentives/penalties

This idea was based on taking the report from this round table and using it to solicit buy-in from the IOC for a continuation of the process of constructive dialogue about an ethical framework for corporate sponsorship. The IOC should then convene prior to the announcement of the next Olympics and Paralympics host city, a team to move the work forwards including identifying additional stakeholders that should be included in the process. In the first instance, the participants in the round table should support the IOC in establishing this team and defining its work but thereafter it should be an IOC-convened body or commission.
RECOMMENDATION 4

The establishment of an independent body to take forward the development of a framework (looking across all aspects of Olympics and Paralympics, not solely corporate sponsorship)

While this idea was also about the creation of an ethical framework and of a body to take that work forward, it envisaged a slightly different route by which this should be done. The Mayor of London’s office should be engaged to take this idea forward as part of London’s legacy for future major events – and this should happen straight away.
Chapter 6

Methodology
Change The Conversation designed the round table events with the twin objectives established for them by the Commission at the centre of their thinking. There were also two key principles that were integral to how the events were designed:

- **Everyone is right – but only in part**
  There is at least an element of wisdom in everyone’s experience and outlook on a particular subject but, equally, no-one has a monopoly on the truth. The important thing in facilitating constructive dialogue is to ensure that everyone gets a fair hearing and no individual is allowed to hi-jack the conversation.

- **A diversity of views is an asset to a group**
  A group’s collective wisdom on any given issue is enhanced if there is a range of different views and opinions and outlooks among the members. This means that a richer, more informed and useful analysis of the issue can be developed than if the group consists of people with the same or similar opinions.

With the likelihood of there being some strong differences of opinion and experience among the participants in each of the round tables, it was decided to divide each round table into three broad phases:

**Discovery**

The first part of each round table was devoted to getting the participants to know each other a little better and to discover what their various initial opinions and viewpoints were on the theme of the day. This provided a base from which they could then widen out their understanding of the issues concerned and explore a number of very different perspectives on them to help discover common ground and think freely about what actions should be taken to move things forward.

To do this, the first part of the morning was spent on a fairly short group question and answer session using the Remerge interactive system developed by the University of Central Lancashire. This enables the participants to type their answers to questions asked by the facilitators into an electronic tablet with the answers being displayed in real time on a large screen at the front of the room. Everyone can see their own and everyone else’s answers but they are not identifiable by individual so there is a semi-anonymity which encourages people to be candid in their answers. A graphic representation of the type of table generated by the group and for the group to view collectively in these sessions can be seen in Fig. 4.

Using the system in this way, it was possible to explore with the group fairly quickly what they felt about the day’s theme and issues surrounding it in a way that gave everyone present an equal voice and which allowed the group to get a sense of its collective views at the outset of the day. Using the electronic tablets,
the group could also to vote on a list of alternatives and this feature was used in one or two places, for example to get them to prioritise which of a long list of recommendations should be chosen for further development and exploration (see Fig. 4).

Remerge was also used to store a record of the other work done by the group during the day, in the form of text and digital pictures – this created a complete archive of each session.

Fig. 4 A graphic representation of the type of table generated by the group and for the group to view collectively in the Discovery part of the day

![Table Image]

After this initial discussion, the participants were taken through an exercise to allow them to explore four very different perspectives on that day’s theme. The perspectives chosen for each round table were as shown in the table below:
Perspectives Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round Table</th>
<th>Perspective 1</th>
<th>Perspective 2</th>
<th>Perspective 3</th>
<th>Perspective 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Construction and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Secretary of State for Transport</td>
<td>A commercial developer</td>
<td>A green technology expert</td>
<td>Your grandchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Jamie Oliver</td>
<td>The CEO of a major multinational restaurant chain</td>
<td>A Cuban allotment gardener</td>
<td>A London 2012 visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Chains</td>
<td>An Asian factory worker</td>
<td>A major Olympics supplier</td>
<td>A human rights lawyer</td>
<td>Commissioner of a major international sports event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>A London 2012 ambassador</td>
<td>A local councillor</td>
<td>A social media expert</td>
<td>The “man and woman on the sofa”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sponsorship</td>
<td>A major shareholder in an Olympics sponsor</td>
<td>A professor of ethics</td>
<td>A hospital nurse</td>
<td>A 1948 Olympian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intention of this exercise was to get all the participants (working together in small groups) to explore each of these perspectives in turn and really try to view things from each imaginary person’s standpoint as fully as possible. This helps people to appreciate that there are always many different ways of viewing an issue and that there is usually something of value to be found in each.

**Building**

The central part of each round table involved the participants in using Lego Serious Play™ to build models of their views on the theme of the discussion from two perspectives:

- The current situation – how things are now
- The situation as it should be ideally in the future

Lego Serious Play™ is a physical modelling tool that enables people to explore and describe their ideas and opinions about an issue using metaphorical thinking and language. The very act of making a model with one’s hands frees up mental processes and creates a more imaginative environment than simply sitting round a table and talking, as happens in most meetings and conferences.

This exercise began with the participants each building a model of their response to the day’s central question/ theme and then describing their model and its meaning to their colleagues at their table. A facilitator at each table helped to ensure that the full richness of each model was explored and captured. This process ensures that each participant gets an equal chance to contribute to the conversation and that everyone’s ideas can be presented and heard in a respectful way. An example from the Food round table is shown in Fig. 5.
The participants in each sub-group then built a joint model from their individual models. These joint models contained all the unique elements of the constituent individual models but without duplicating any ideas that appeared in more than one. Building them therefore required a collaborative approach among the groups, which provided a useful practical experience of the fact that it is possible to create something jointly with others even when there is a variety of different ideas and views among the group. An example of one of the joint models from the Sustainable Construction and Infrastructure round table is shown in Fig. 6.
**Action Planning**

The third part of each round table involved getting the participants to move from exploring the issues of the day onto discussing some practical possible ways forward. To do this, they were divided into small groups and asked to come up with some specific recommendations for action that would in their view enable progress to be made. Everyone’s recommendations were captured and the four ideas that were felt to be strongest by the group were developed further by getting a sub-group to think about the following questions in relation to each recommendation:

- What is the idea?
- What needs to happen?
- When should it happen?
- How should it happen?
- Who should do it?

Examples of the sort of recommendations that emerged from these discussions are shown in Fig. 7. These came from the Corporate Sponsorship event:

**Fig. 7 Recommendations for Action – Corporate Sponsorship**

---

**WE RECOMMEND THAT:**

1. *The IOC allocates funds* to conduct research, gap analysis and stakeholder engagement to develop a framework.
2. *The IOC prioritises ethical engagement with its sponsors*.
3. Members CSL recommends in its final report stakeholder categories to take forward this work to ensure continuity and momentum.