



Triple Bottom Line Assessment of the XVIII Commonwealth Games

October 2006

**Report to The Office of Commonwealth
Games Coordination**

Insight Economics Pty Ltd

ABN 65 118 264912
www.insighteconomics.com.au

Melbourne

Level 1, 530 Lt Collins Street
Melbourne VIC 3000
Ph: +61 3 9909 7545

Perth

Level 29, 221 St Georges Terrace
Perth WA 6000
Ph: +61 8 9480 3780

Disclaimer:

While Insight Economics endeavours to provide reliable analysis and believes the material it presents is accurate, it will not be liable for any claim by any party acting on such information.

© Insight Economics 2006

ACRONYMS

ACMI	Australian Centre for the Moving Image
ASC	Australian Sports Commission
BCA	Business Club Australia
CAE	Centre for Adult Education
CALD	Culturally and Linguistically Diverse
CAV	Consumer Affairs Victoria
CFMEU	Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union
CGA	Commonwealth Games Association
CGF	Commonwealth Games Federation
CGFM	Commonwealth Games Family Members
CGPO	Commonwealth Games Planning Office
DEWR	Department of Employment and Workplace Relations
DIIRD	Department of Innovation, Industry and Regional Development
DOI	Department of Infrastructure
DVC	Department of Victorian Communities
EAD	Elite Athletes with a Disability
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
EPA	Environmental Protection Authority
ERASS	Education Recreation and Sports Survey

ICN	Industry Capability Network
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
M2006	Melbourne2006
MGC	Melbourne Cricket Ground
MPMSAA	Master Plumbers & Mechanical Services Association of Australia
MSAC	Melbourne Sports and Aquatic Centre
NCTC	National Counter Terrorism Committee
NGV	National Gallery of Victoria
OCGC	Office of Commonwealth Games Coordination
PTD	Public Transport Division
QMR	Quantum Market Research
RLA	Rod Laver Arena
SNHC	State Netball Hockey Centre
VIPP	Victorian Industry Participation Policy
VIS	Victorian Institute of Sport

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vii
The Commonwealth Games: origins and purpose	vii
Delivering the Games	viii
Vision and objectives	ix
Organisation	x
Hosting a great event	xi
Building lasting infrastructure	xii
Economic impacts	xiii
Social impacts	xv
Environmental impacts	xv
Triple bottom line assessment	xvi
Conclusion	xvii
Chapter 1	1
<i>Report Background and Methodology</i>	<i>1</i>
1.1 Study context	1
1.2 Methodology: KPI scorecard for Games objectives	2
1.3 Report structure	4
Chapter 2	5
<i>The Games Vision and Objectives</i>	<i>5</i>
2.1 The Commonwealth Games — more than a major sporting event	5
2.2 Manchester's objectives as a Games host	6
2.3 The decision to bid for the 2006 Games	7
2.4 The vision for the 2006 Commonwealth Games evolves	8
Chapter 3	13
<i>Getting it Right</i>	<i>13</i>
3.1 Implementing the Games vision and objectives	13

3.2	Setting the budget	20
3.3	Planning the capital works programs	23
3.4	Planning and staging the Games	29
3.5	Planning to support Victorian business — economic impacts of the Games	49
3.6	Planning the social programs	52
3.7	Planning for the environment at the Games	59

Chapter 4 **67**

Hosting a Great Event **67**

4.1	The Queen's Baton Relay	67
4.2	The Opening Ceremony	68
4.3	Visitor numbers and profiles	69
4.4	Ticket sales and attendance across Victoria	72
4.5	Event accessibility at the Commonwealth Games	75
4.6	Games-time security and venue management	77
4.7	Transport and traffic management	78
4.8	Melbourne's volunteers	79
4.9	Sporting achievements	80
4.10	Festival Melbourne2006	81
4.11	Promoting environmental awareness through the Games	94
4.12	Learning through the Games	95
4.13	Business impacts	97
4.14	The Closing Ceremony	100

Chapter 5 **102**

Delivering lasting infrastructure **102**

5.1	Melbourne Sports and Aquatics Centre	102
5.2	Melbourne Cricket Ground redevelopment	104
5.3	The Athletes Village	107
5.4	State Lawn Bowls Centre	110
5.5	Other community infrastructure	111

Chapter 6 **113**

The Triple Bottom Line Assessment **113**

6.1	Assessing outcomes against Games objectives	113
6.2	Hosting a great event: assessment	114
6.3	Delivering lasting infrastructure	127
6.4	Economic impact of the Games	129
6.5	Social impact of the Games	145
6.6	Environmental impact assessment	153
6.7	Overall assessment of the XVIII Commonwealth Games	159

APPENDIX A **162**

Legacy Programs **162**

A.1	Business programs	163
A.2	Social programs	165

A.3	Environmental programs	170
A.4	Event excellence programs	179
APPENDIX B		183
<i>References</i>		<i>183</i>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This triple bottom line assessment of the 2006 Commonwealth Games in Melbourne, by Insight Economics, was commissioned by the Office of Commonwealth Games Coordination (OCGC). In making an overall evaluation of the event, it draws substantially on separate assessments, undertaken by other consultants, of the net economic, social and environmental impacts of the Games.

Insight Economics' major objective has been to produce a systematic, thorough and credible assessment of how the Victorian Government planned for and organised the Games. To this end, the consultants have scrutinised many documents and interviewed a large number of stakeholders.

Having said that, it is pleasing to be able to conclude that the 2006 Commonwealth Games were a considerable success. They were well organised, they brought great pleasure to a large number of people and they were a credit to the people of Melbourne and Victoria. After the Games, both the visitors who left Melbourne and the hosts who remained generally 'felt good' about the shared experience. Achievable objectives were set in regard to the economic, social and environmental impact of the Games and these were largely met. The Festival Melbourne2006, of which little was expected early on in the process and which had a very limited budget, turned out to be highly successful and created a strong sense of inclusion in the Games throughout the city. In terms of the economics of the Games, they came in within what was a reasonable budget for an event of this kind and the economic benefits of the Games are estimated to have exceeded their costs to the community. This report finds that the Games achieved the objectives set out by the Government, and provides some minor recommendations for improving the delivery of future major events.

The Commonwealth Games: origins and purpose

The Commonwealth Games, held every four years, is a significant international event. About 4,500 athletes from 71 countries compete in nearly 250 individual events. The constituent nations, however, are extremely diverse. The only common factor that

draws them together is that almost all of them were, in the recent past, subject to British rule.¹

First held in 1930, when the British Empire was at its apogee, the Games were originally conceived both as a showcase for Britain's imperial reach and to celebrate the sporting foundations of the Empire. Now that the imperial sun has set and the ex-colonies regularly defeat the mother country on the sporting field, the continuing relevance of what are now the Commonwealth Games is a tribute to our capacity to adapt and adjust to totally different circumstances. The contemporary Games bring together a truly eclectic group of independent nations that share an Anglophone tradition, some common elements in their cultural heritage and a general aspiration (not always delivered) to a democratic form of government and the rule of law.

In practical terms, the coming together of over seventy countries with diverse cultures and political systems to join in elite competitive sport appears much more likely to enhance the level of understanding between the members of the global village than to diminish it. Beyond that, the Games provide the opportunity for a host community to promote itself to a wider international audience and to form the deeper relationships which lie at the heart of business and political success in the global economy. Indeed, if we subscribe to the view of the revisionist historian, Niall Ferguson, that the British Empire represented the first cornerstone of what we now know as globalisation, the contemporary Games have a highly relevant role that builds on the best features of that legacy.²

Despite these benefits, however, most communities would be reluctant to host the Commonwealth Games on a *pro bono* basis. While the Games may indeed be a 'good thing' and provide an opportunity for relationship building, they would clearly be better still if the host city derived a net benefit from staging them rather than incurring an enduring net debt.

Delivering the Games

As well as meticulous planning and good organisation, any major event needs a modicum of luck in order to be truly successful. The Melbourne Games, staged in March 2006, enjoyed a particular run of good fortune. The sun shone, there was no hint of a terrorist threat, after initial signs of indifference Melburnians flocked to the Games and the public transport system ran like clockwork. Of course, to some extent you make your own luck. March is probably the most reliable month in terms of Melbourne's weather, the security precautions were highly effective and the transport operators performed at their peak. While most things that could be done were done, nevertheless misfortunes could have occurred in any of these and other areas.

Melbourne is a city that specialises in hosting major annual sporting events. Apart from the Boxing Day Test and the AFL Grand Final, the Grand Prix at Albert Park and the Australian Tennis Open at Melbourne Park each represent one in a series of similar international events and the Australian versions are rated very highly

¹ Mozambique, whose membership dates from 1995, is the only Commonwealth country that has never had any constitutional link to the British Empire or another Commonwealth member country.

² Ferguson, Niall, *Empire: How Britain Made the Modern World*, Allen Lane, London, 2003.

worldwide. Yet the Commonwealth Games was the largest event to be held in Melbourne in half a century and, apart from the Sydney Olympics in 2000, also the biggest in Australia over that period.

In bidding for the right to host the Commonwealth Games, governments incur a significant risk. A considerable investment in infrastructure and facilities is required. This investment may not generate a satisfactory return if the costs blow out or attendances fall short of expectations. Apart from the economics of the Games, even the intangible effects may be negative if, for example, the transport systems break down, the resident population is not supportive or the weather is bad. In these circumstances, visitors can leave a city in a surly mood and with a negative impression. In some instances, host cities have not seen a positive quantifiable economic return from hosting the Commonwealth Games. In those cases, the *post-hoc* justification for staging the event has often relied on the assumption of intangible gains, in terms perhaps of an enhanced reputation for the particular city or various social benefits.

There are two key questions to be addressed in this triple bottom line assessment. Did the outcomes from the Melbourne Commonwealth Games achieve the original government objectives? From the perspective of the Victorian community as a whole, did the considerable investment in the Games, made on their behalf, pay off?

Vision and objectives

The bid for the Commonwealth Games was lodged by the Kennett Government in the mid-1990s. The decision by the Commonwealth Games Association to award the Games to Melbourne was announced in the caretaker period just before the 1999 election brought the Bracks Government to power. Both parties, however, had given their full support to the Games bid.

The new Victorian Government saw the Games as offering an opportunity to reinforce Melbourne's position as the major events capital of Australia and to capture a range of associated economic benefits. In addition to their economic objectives, the Bracks Government also viewed the Games as a platform for building social capital and contributing to environmental outcomes. Potential avenues toward achieving these objectives included:

- addressing social policy objectives, such as improving accessibility, diversity and community participation;
- respecting the rights of indigenous communities;
- engaging Victorian communities in both sporting and cultural events;
- increasing sporting participation;
- developing a sustainable environmental framework for the Games; and
- maximising the education benefits from the staging of the Games.

The State government's vision for the Commonwealth Games was that:

The Games will be a landmark in Melbourne's history with long term benefits for all Victorians, Australians and the Commonwealth.

Within the framework of this overarching vision, the Victorian Government summarised its objectives as being threefold:

- to host a great event;
- to deliver lasting infrastructure; and
- to deliver lasting social, environmental and economic benefits to the Victorian community.

These objectives, together with goals for safety, financial responsibility and the enhancement of the profile of Commonwealth nations, were enshrined in the *Commonwealth Games Arrangements Act (2001)*.

Organisation

The Government appointed Justin Madden as Minister for the Commonwealth Games and established the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games Corporation (M2006) with a strong Board chaired by Ron Walker. The Office of Commonwealth Games Coordination (OCGC) was also established within the Victorian public service to deliver the Games at a cost of around \$1.1 billion (less than had been spent on the Manchester Games four years earlier). The OCGC, located within the Department for Victorian Communities and with a staff of around 600 at its peak, was charged with designing and overseeing the implementation of the Games in collaboration with M2006 and for coordinating efforts across and within Government.

The OCGC was also responsible for overseeing the whole of Games budget, which included planning and implementing the capital works program. Structures within the OCGC were developed to scope and plan precinct and venue utilisation, develop strategies for the achievement of ongoing benefits for Victoria, develop the Festival Melbourne2006 cultural program, communicate key messages and ensure the adequacy of new and existing infrastructure. Ongoing consultations were held to ensure stakeholder involvement and influence as appropriate.

Apart from the highly publicised withdrawal of Commonwealth Government funding for the MCG re-development, the cooperation between the two levels of government was good. The State Government contributed around \$691 million to the provision of the Games and the Commonwealth made important financial and in-kind contributions, including in particular security resources.

About 13,150 volunteers assisted at Games time. Without their contribution it is difficult to see how events of this kind could successfully be delivered within a reasonable budget.

At the outset it should be noted that both M2006 and the OCGC maintained a fairly low profile throughout the operational phase. In some ways this is a mark of success and suggests that a management job was executed in a way that avoided the constant media speculation and political interventions that affected the work of the Sydney Olympics Organising Committee leading up to 2000.

Hosting a great event

In terms of the first objective, with over 4,000 elite athletes coming to Melbourne, the 2006 Commonwealth Games were clearly always going to be a 'great event'. The relevant question is 'how great were they relative to their potential?'

The Games were attended by a number of dignitaries, including from overseas the Queen, the British Prime Minister, the US Secretary of State and the Commonwealth Secretary-General. The Melbourne Cricket Ground, now completely re-developed into a world class stadium, provided the main arena for the Games and for the opening and closing ceremonies. The Opening Ceremony on 15 March 2006 was grand in its scale and creative in its content — the flying tram, the fireworks and the inclusion of the Yarra River will remain in many people's memories — with one theme that many non-Melburnians would have found arcane, centred on a local cartoonist's mythical duck. Overall, the reaction to both the opening and closing ceremonies was positive and they featured prominently in the media in the various nations of the Commonwealth.

Large and enthusiastic audiences watched the Games. The standard of competition was high, including in flagship events such as the Men's 100 metre sprint, where the world record holder, Asafa Powell, won Gold in a world class field. Six world records were broken at the Games, all in the pool. For the local audience there was sufficient Australian success and drama to maintain a high level of interest. In the pool the women's team was dominant, with Leisel Jones's three breaststroke victories and Libby Lenton's five Gold Medals being exceptional performances. In track and field Jana Pittman's win in the 400 metre hurdles and Kerryn McCann's Marathon victory were high points, while Scott Martin, winner of the Men's Discus, became a cult figure as a result of a series of advertisements. Regional centres also hosted sporting events, with a keen interest in the basketball in Ballarat, Bendigo, Geelong and Traralgon.

This was only the second Commonwealth Games to include events for elite athletes with a disability (EAD). The EAD program was expanded to 12 events, which were all watched by large crowds. Matthew Cowdrey won two EAD finals and distinguished himself in an unexpected way by being the only Australian male swimmer to win Gold.

The crowds for the Games were significantly larger than in Manchester in 2002 and revenue from ticket sales was also much greater. Crowds of over 80,000 were regularly seen at the MCG in the evening sessions. Even in the mornings, when heats were being held, there was nearly always a full house in the pool and large crowds at the MCG. Some observers considered the tickets were overpriced, but for an economist 'equity is often in the eye of the beholder' and the fact remains that ticket sales were high. Some free tickets were provided, mainly for volunteers, but this was usually for morning events where there would not have been a full house anyway. While in retrospect it can be argued that some tickets for the opening and closing ceremonies were too expensive, designing the appropriate pricing policy is a difficult art in advance of an event for which there are few recent precedents. Although the Games complied with all relevant legislation, one lesson is that there is some scope for

improving ticket allocation at future major events in order to enhance community perceptions of fairness.

The success of the cultural events held under the Festival Melbourne2006 probably exceeded many people's expectations. In the words of one of the organisers, the objective of the Festival Melbourne2006 was 'to expose a cultural Commonwealth alive with arts, culture and energy'.³ The events were free and were held both in Melbourne and in regional centres, with the performances in the Public Domain areas being particularly popular. Crowds of over 250,000 were attracted to the Festival Melbourne2006 on some days. Never before had a host city attempted such an ambitious cultural festival yet the budget was only around \$12 million for the core festival. The Festival Melbourne2006 was unquestionably a considerable success that enhanced perceptions of the overall excellence of the Games.

There is substantial evidence to support the contention that the Games were perceived as a success by Victorians, other Australians and international audiences. The 'feel good' sensation in the city at the time was confirmed by post-Games market research that indicated that Victorians felt considerable pride in successfully hosting the Games. Over 90 per cent of overseas visitors stated that they would return to Melbourne or recommend it as a place to visit. By all accounts (although not documented) the Commonwealth Games Federation was happy with the outcomes, with the President, Michael Fennell, stating that the Melbourne Games were 'simply the best'.

The Games programs were well organised and executed, with strong community engagement and the enthusiastic participation of large crowds. The Festival Melbourne2006 involved the city in a way not before seen at a Commonwealth Games. In our assessment, the State Government clearly met its first objective — hosting a great event.

Building lasting infrastructure

Much of the budget for the Games was devoted to investing in new and improved facilities in order for Melbourne to be capable of hosting a great event. Overall, the investments came in within budget. The size of the investment appears to have been appropriate in the sense that the facilities provided for the Games were clearly more than adequate for their purpose. But it is important in such events to ensure that capital expenditures do not create 'white elephants', such as a brand new stadium that will have limited usefulness beyond the Games.

Major investments included:

- Athletes Village (including a \$35 million social housing investment);
- the re-development of the MCG;
- the Olympic Park Athletics Track;
- Melbourne Sports and Aquatic Centre; and

³ Dow, Rob, Director, Cultural and Entertainment Programs.

-
- the State Netball Hockey Centre.

There was also an investment in regional sporting and cultural infrastructure, with the State Government providing funding, for example, for improved basketball facilities in Ballarat, Bendigo, Geelong and Traralgon.⁴

The Games also leveraged significant spending by the private sector, including, for example, on the redevelopment of the MCG by the Melbourne Cricket Club. KPMG's economic impact assessment has shown that total construction activity amounted to \$1,524 million over the period 2002 to 2006. This total included:

- private sector spending on major events venues;
- Commonwealth Games capital works (Victorian Government);
- the Athletes Village (treated as an operational expense in the State Government budget); and
- investments in other infrastructure, such as upgrades to regional basketball venues, shooting venues and the MCG Athletics Track (Victorian Government expenditure, but not included in the Commonwealth Games budget).

Most projects came in on or below budget. The only projects that were substantially over budget were the Melbourne Sports and Aquatics Centre and the William Barak Bridge.

By and large, the public and private investment in infrastructure catalysed by the Games has left a significant and positive legacy to the Victorian community. Public expenditure was within budget and it would be difficult to argue that any 'white elephants' were built. While some of the new and improved facilities may have been provided anyway at some future time, the Games at least provided the opportunity to bring the investment forward. These facilities will provide benefits well into the future, both in terms of their enjoyment by Victorians and their ability to contribute to the attraction of future major events. One obvious example of this is the fact that the MCG can now accommodate significantly larger crowds for flagship events like the AFL Grand Final in September and the Boxing Day cricket test match.

The Games are assessed as having delivered on their second objective — building lasting infrastructure.

Economic impacts

There are a number of ways in which major events such as the Commonwealth Games have an impact on the economy. First, are the direct effects, which may be a mixture of both positive impacts, such as higher investment expenditure and tourist spending, and negative effects, such as the fact that taxation is higher than it may otherwise have been. There are also important indirect effects, however, resulting from the flow-on of expenditures through the economic system. Finally, there are a number of

⁴ These investments were funded outside the Commonwealth Games budget, but were catalysed by the Games.

intangible effects that may translate into direct and indirect impacts down the track, such as the goodwill created by business relationships and tourism.

In terms of the direct impact of the Games, over \$1.5 billion of capital expenditure was injected into the Victorian economy while international and interstate tourism targets were exceeded. Tourist expenditure was estimated to be \$252 million, resulting in better tourism outcomes than for any other major event Melbourne has hosted.

A credible assessment of the economic outcomes, however, requires the estimation of the *total* impact of the activity associated with the Games, including both the direct and indirect effects. The total impact of the direct and indirect effects can only be estimated with any accuracy through the use of a computable general equilibrium (CGE) economic model.

Economic modelling undertaken by KPMG, using the well regarded Monash Model, suggests that the total economic benefits of the Games exceeded the costs to the Victorian community. The modelling results showed that increased investment in capital works, operational expenditure by all levels of Government and tourist spending contributed to a positive stimulation of the Victorian economy. Relative to a business-as-usual base case over the 20 year period to 2022, the modelling showed that the Games activity led to:

- Victoria's GSP being higher by \$1.6 billion in real NPV_{7%} terms;
- Victorian consumption, which is a proxy for economic welfare, being higher by \$1.3 billion in real NPV_{7%}; and
- the creation in Victoria of an additional 13,600 full time jobs.

Because of the difficulty in measuring future returns on the public investment, it may also be that the benefits of the Games were under-estimated in the CGE modelling exercise. For example, the modelling assumed that the Games were funded by borrowing rather than current revenue and also made no allowance for potential economic benefits to Victoria in the future from future events that can be held, or larger crowds accommodated, as a result of infrastructure improvements. The modelling also cannot take account of any intangible benefits, such as the creation of business goodwill for the future.

In total, the economic benefits of the Games were significant. There also may be considerable unquantified benefits that will come from an enhanced profile for Victorian businesses. There are already early indications that Victorian businesses may secure contracts for the 2010 Delhi Commonwealth Games. More than 60 per cent of international Business Club Australia (BCA) members that participated in the Melbourne 2006 BCA events reported increased awareness of Melbourne, Victoria and Australia as places to do business. In addition, 55 per cent of domestic BCA members placed a 'high' or 'very high' probability of securing export sales to key markets within two years time. The value of the business relationships formed during the Games and also the benefits to 'Brand Melbourne' from the successful staging of the event are impossible to quantify but may be significant.

Social impacts

The Government placed a strong emphasis placed on social outcomes as a key objective for the Games. Social benefits are expected to be delivered through the:

- *Volunteering legacy of the Games.* The benefits of the Games volunteer program are expected to extend into the future, particularly in Victoria. The Department for Victorian Communities has reported that more than half of the Games volunteers — 7,000 people — have indicated they want to keep volunteering.
- *Increased interest in attending future cultural and art events.* In Victoria, market research undertaken by Quantum Market Research showed that 38 per cent of stakeholders and 32 per cent of the general public reported a great or moderate increase in willingness to attend future arts and cultural events.
- *Increased willingness to participate in community events.* Market research suggested that 41 per cent of the general public and 44 per cent of stakeholders indicated some level of desire to participate in a community event in the future.
- *Education program.* Market research showed that 80 per cent of the general public felt that the Games had been successful in encouraging involvement in schools.
- *Increased participation in sport.* Market research showed that the Games-time programs aimed at increasing sports participation had resulted in modest increases within the community in willingness to increase their participation in sport.

Overall the evidence suggests that the Games generated social benefits for Victorians. While the value of these benefits, and how long they will endure, is difficult to assess, the outcomes appear to be positive.

Environmental impacts

The environmental programs delivered through the Games were directed towards achieving both short term ecological objectives and lasting behavioural change. The main programs were WaterWise, Carbon Neutral and Low Waste.

As a result of the WaterWise initiatives:

- 18,000 trees were planted;
- four hectares of wetlands were constructed in Royal Park adjacent to the Games;
- rainwater collection systems and other conservation infrastructure were constructed at several venues; and
- more than \$55,000 was raised for a clean water project in East Timor.

Under the Carbon Neutral program, approximately one million trees were planted to offset the impact of Games-related activity on greenhouse gas emissions. The planting of the trees involved approximately 2,000 volunteers and took place across Victoria. The tree plantings in many cases also increased biodiversity in the region and reduced salinity. The Carbon Neutral plan also required that:

- the Athletes Village be built to a six-star energy rating;
- Green Power be sourced for the Games;

- bicycle facilities be available at all Games venues;
- increased public transport be available for ticket holders; and
- fuel efficient vehicles be used on Games business.

The Low Waste programs involved a number of initiatives aimed at raising awareness about waste minimisation not only among Games attendees, but also among suppliers and venue operators. Analysis by CES found that the goal of significant waste minimisation was achieved: 40 per cent less waste was produced at the venues than was projected to occur (only 598 tonnes of waste were produced compared to the forecast 1,600 tonnes) and of this waste approximately 57 per cent was recycled (by weight). The Athletes Village recycled 60 per cent of its waste by weight, and the City of Melbourne recycled 52 per cent by weight. The Public Domain Waste Management Program was the only area to have underperformed substantially relative to its target, achieving a recycling rate of 26 per cent.

While it is difficult to assess whether any lasting behavioural change will result from the environmental programs, overall these programs achieved their targets.

Triple bottom line assessment

As can be seen from the assessment presented above, the Government’s objectives for the Games were largely met. Economic, social and environmental outcomes were positive.

TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT OF THE GAMES

Opportunities for better delivery of major events	Earlier rollout of business leveraging programs		Better recycling at venues building on Melbourne 2006 lessons
Lasting Benefits of the Games achieved	<i>Lasting relationships</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased local capability • Enhanced economic relationships, export sales and foreign awareness of Australian business opportunities • Indications of future tourism • Promotion of Melbourne as a 'can do' place 	<i>Behavioural change</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volunteering legacy • Greater social inclusion and connectedness • Greater social awareness 	<i>Behavioural change</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater awareness of environmental issues • Greater willingness to benefit environment • Knowledge transfer in construction trades • Increased uptake of technology
	Immediate Benefits of the Games achieved	Tourist targets were met Businesses reported feeling prepared for Games Significant economic stimulation	Significant participation in sporting and Festival Melbourne 2006 Strong family involvement Mix of metro and regional events
	Economic	Social	Environmental

Given the size and complexity of the Commonwealth Games and the conscious effort to break new ground in a number of directions, however, it would be surprising if there had not been some lessons learned. Two lessons that stand out concern ticketing and the business programs. There would appear to be scope for revisions to ticketing

policies to improve sales to overseas markets and to reduce community perceptions of unfairness. There are also indications that a roll out of business-related programs up to six months earlier than occurred would have increased the number of businesses able to take advantage of the Games.

Conclusion

Overall, post Games research shows that Victorians were very positive about the Games and felt that through them Victoria's strengths had been showcased effectively to the Commonwealth. The KPI scorecard analysis (attached) indicates that the objectives of the Victorian Government were achieved.

In short, the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games were a great event. The planning and organisation were very good, government expenditure was kept within a moderate budget and the Games provided lasting benefits to the Victorian and Australian communities as well as to the Commonwealth of Nations.